

TUESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 1993

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

Assent to the following Bills reported by Mr Speaker—

Motor Vehicles Safety Amendment Bill;
Public Officers' Superannuation Benefits Recovery Amendment Bill;
Golden Casket Art Union Amendment Bill;
Cairns Casino Agreement Bill;
Jurisdiction of Courts (Cross-vesting) Amendment Bill;
Grain Industry (Restructuring) Amendment Bill;
Magistrates Courts Jurisdiction Amendment Bill;
Trustee Companies Amendment Bill;
Education (Capital Assistance) Bill.

PAPER TABLED DURING RECESS

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I advise the House that a paper was tabled during the recess in accordance with the list circulated to members in the Chamber.

The Clerk of the Parliament—

Board of Trustees of the Brisbane Grammar School—Annual Report for 1992.

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

Crown Lease Rental Fees

From **Mr Turner** (14 signatories) praying for action to be taken to alleviate financial hardship caused by the proposed increase in Crown lease rental fees implemented on 1 July 1993.

Education

From **Mr Slack** (94 signatories) praying that the status quo be maintained in current school situations and that overall funding to education be maintained or increased as needs demand.

Railway Services

From **Mr Burns** (422 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will reverse the decision to close railway lines in central and south-west Queensland.

A similar petition was received from **Mr Hobbs** (91 signatories).

Railway Services

From **Mr Burns** (794 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take action to reverse the decision of the Minister for Transport to close the Biggenden to Taragoola railway line.

Southern Brisbane Bypass, Karawatha

From **Mr Robertson** (126 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take action to abandon any plans to build the southern Brisbane by-pass through Karawatha and surrounding bushland, especially in the more sensitive areas south of Compton Road to the Logan Motorway.

Railway Services

From **Mr Burns** (820 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will enact legislation which secures the services provided by 29 railway branch lines which are to be closed.

Traffic Lights, Caboolture

From **Mr J. H. Sullivan** (430 signatories) praying that urgent action be taken to install traffic lights at the intersection of Bellmere Road and the D'Aguiar Highway at Caboolture.

Crown Land, Bongaree

From **Mr J. H. Sullivan** (1 359 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will ensure that Crown land adjacent to the recreation reserve in First Avenue, Bongaree is made available for community use together with all necessary approvals for development in accordance with adopted plans.

Petitions received.

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

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

- Auctioneers and Agents Act—
 Auctioneers and Agents (Exemptions)
 Regulation 1993, No. 343
- Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road Act—
 Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road
 Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 1993,
 No. 337
- Dental Act—
 Dental Amendment By-law (No. 2) 1993,
 No. 344
- Fair Trading Act—
 Fair Trading (Child Cot Restraints) Order
 1993, No. 338
- Health Act—
 Health (Scientific Research and Studies)
 Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 1993,
 No. 339
 Poisons Amendment Regulation (No. 3)
 1993, No. 345
- State Transport Act—
 State Transport Amendment Regulation
 (No. 2) 1993, No. 336
- Statute Law (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act
 (No. 2)—
 Proclamation—amendments 2 and 3 of the
 Rural Training Schools Act 1965
 commence 10 September 1993, No. 342
- Supreme Court Act—
 Barristers' Admission Rules Amendment
 Order (No. 1) 1993, No. 341
 Solicitors' Admission Rules Amendment
 Order (No. 1) 1993, No. 340
- Workplace Health and Safety Act—
 Workplace Health and Safety Amendment
 Regulation (No. 3) 1993, No. 346.

PAPER

The following paper was laid on the table—

- Minister for Health (Mr Hayward)—
 Mental Health Submission Queensland
 1993.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Starcke Pastoral Holdings

Hon. W. K. GOSS (Logan—Premier and Minister for Economic and Trade Development) (10.05 a.m.), by leave: The Queensland Government will this week introduce special legislation to protect the environmental values of the Starcke Pastoral Holdings on the eastern coast of Cape York Peninsula. This legislation will ensure that this important piece of coastal land will be protected from both overseas sale and

inappropriate development. The land in question covers 225 126 hectares and includes 24 464 hectares of freehold land, 23 173 hectares of occupational licences—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members, I would like to hear the statement, and I insist that I do. I give a general warning that I am not going to put up with inane and irrelevant interjections.

Mr W. K. GOSS:—479 hectares of special lease and 177 000 hectares of pastoral lease, which has development conditions.

The Starcke Pastoral Holdings was purchased by George Quaid Holdings in 1972 for \$919,711. That part of the holdings, which is now freehold, was converted from leasehold in 1989 at a cost to the lessee of \$30,802.

Mr Stoneman interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Burnett! I am on my feet. This is not a debate; it is a ministerial statement. I intend to listen to it. I warn the member for Burnett under Standing Order 123A.

Mr W. K. GOSS: The lessee was required to carry out improvements prior to the conversion. It is claimed that more than \$800,000 was spent on improvements. The land in question, which is an outstanding natural area yielding a host of new plant species, including a number of unique rainforest scrubs, was offered for sale in the United States for US\$18m. Within the freehold, there are particularly scenic coastal dunes south of the Jeannie River and a mountain spine backdrop runs the full length of the holding.

Advice from the Department of Environment and Heritage is that the holding is within a distinct environmental province of Cape York, and it contains many ecosystems not represented within the State's existing national park estate. The freehold area contains the distinctive parabolic high dune systems of white silica sand, which is poorly represented within Queensland's parks. Also, there is a unique palm woodland of *livistona muelleri*, regarded as the best example of its structural type known on the cape. Littoral rainforest scrubs also occur within the coastal dune system. Of the total area, only two sections have been substantially disturbed in the past—4 000 hectares south of Hummock Creek to the Starcke River and an area of about 500 hectares near the homestead. Advice is that both areas will regenerate in time.

Of particular conservation interest is the occupational lease which contains a very complex area of sand dunes, marine plains, salt flats, swamps and gallery riverine forests, as well as a spectacular headland at Barrow Point. This area contains a newly identified eucalypt species. The Sandstone Ranges, which run the length of the holding, house ecosystems not seen in the parks on the peninsula. There are small rainforest communities which are botanically significant. For example, one 15 hectare patch has yielded three new species. In other parts, species occur as distinct populations with affinities to species occurring in south-east Queensland.

The land also encompasses the traditional clan estates of two separate Aboriginal language groups. These clans are said to number almost 200 people, and some elders are reported as remembering traditional life on land currently within the holding.

The State Government has carried out some research and the advice is that any claim to native title based on the High Court's Mabo decision would not succeed because all land within the Starcke Holding was formerly pastoral lease. Accordingly, any native title in the entire area would have been extinguished. All of these above factors make the future of this land important, not just to Queensland but to the nation.

The major question facing the Government is whether to purchase just the significant coastal part of the holding or to purchase the entire 225 000 hectares. The Government is committed to acquiring the relevant coastal section of the property. Because of the various regimes associated with freehold title, leases and occupational licences, it is more practical to acquire the whole of the holding. This also means that we can protect the conservation values with certainty. Therefore, Cabinet's preferred position is to acquire all of the Starcke Holding and use special legislation to effect the transaction. The Minister for Lands will introduce the legislation tomorrow and allow it to lie on the table of the House while negotiations proceed with the owner of the titles.

Our preferred position is that we settle this matter by negotiation and officers of the Department of Lands will seek to reach agreement with Mr Quaid. If agreement cannot be reached, the issue of compensation will be settled in the Land Court under the provisions of existing legislation.

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Southport!

Mr W. K. GOSS: The Government has also decided to appoint an independent Queen's Counsel to conduct a thorough administrative review of a range of issues related to Starcke Pastoral Holdings. These include the validity of the freehold tenure and leases, the owner's compliance with lease conditions, the propriety of the allocation of land tenure and the policy in force at the time of the various transactions taking place. This review will consist of an examination of all of the relevant documents and papers related to Starcke Pastoral Holdings. The report of the independent QC will be presented to Cabinet when a decision will be taken on what, if any, further action might be necessary to alleviate public concern about these transactions.

As I said before, the Government seeks to purchase the whole of the land in question. We took this decision based on the offer by the Federal Government, as stated by the Commonwealth Environment Minister, Mrs Kelly, to enter into matching finance on any purchase. However, this apparent willingness on the part of the Commonwealth now looks less certain. We will continue to discuss this issue with the Commonwealth and, hopefully, such discussions will be fruitful. But our ability to purchase all of the land in question could be problematic if the Federal Government is not able to maintain its offer of matching finance for the purchase of this internationally significant land. This Government is proud of its environment record and we believe that the purchase of this land will add significantly to our national park estate. We also believe that we can reach agreement with the descendants of the traditional occupiers of the land about the future management of the land.

The Government does not regard this proposed purchase or this special legislation as a precedent or a signal to land-holders. We regard this as a one-off issue which is merely a reflection of the particular circumstances of the history of the Starcke property and the need to protect it from overseas sale or inappropriate development. Given the circumstances of this proposed course of action, the Government invites the opposition parties to join with us in approving this important acquisition.

PRIVILEGE

Threatening Telephone Call

Mr GRICE (Broadwater) (10.14 a.m.): I rise on a matter of privilege. On the night of Sunday, 5 September, I returned from interstate and took a call at home on my telephone which has an unlisted number. The caller was a man who warned me to, "Drop off the copper story . . . (expletive)". He mentioned my daughters' names and the school that they attend. The person is obviously scum.

I have given full details of the call to the appropriate authorities and will not canvass them further here. I raise the incident in the House rather than in the media because it relates directly to my duties as a member of this Parliament. When the caller warned me off "the copper story", that was an obvious reference to a speech I made in the House two weeks ago about the Medusa cover-up. Such a call made to any citizen is clearly a breach of the law. When the threat is aimed at preventing a parliamentarian from doing his duty, it threatens our parliamentary democracy. I will not retreat from my duty to the people of Queensland. I am confident that no member of the House would wish me to do that.

The call raises serious questions which I believe should be considered by the Privileges Committee. The call came on a telephone which has an unlisted number. Who has the resources to obtain such a number? I suggest that that sort of access is available only to some Telecom staff, some senior police, and the Criminal Justice Commission. Whoever was behind the call had access to family information not easily available to ordinary citizens. Again, that suggests official sources. In the interests of the effective independence of this Parliament I ask you, Mr Speaker, to refer the matter to the Privileges Committee for its consideration.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Political Donation

Mr BORBIDGE: In directing a question to the Premier, I refer to the expunged parliamentary debate concerning a \$5,000 donation to the Minister for Local Government, a transcript of which I now table, and the Premier's claim that the Minister had listed this cash donation in the register of pecuniary interests. I now table the relevant documentation, which shows no such listing. I ask: why did the Premier mislead the Parliament?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! With regard to——

Opposition members: Oh!

Mr SPEAKER: No, the Premier will answer the question, but I just want to make one matter clear to the House. With regard to the transcript—I am aware, of course, that a transcript has actually been published in the paper and has been referred to in a television report. Notwithstanding that, there is a matter with regard to a citizen of Queensland that relates to that transcript. A criminal charge is being laid and a hearing is pending. Therefore, I have to consider this matter. The tabling of a document now actually gives that document privilege, and I will seek advice as to whether the tabling of that document will be allowed.

Mr BORBIDGE: Mr Speaker, to assist you, the Opposition is prepared to provide legal advice from a prominent QC.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs SHELDON: Excuse me, Mr Speaker——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will not debate this issue. I will take points of order. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for that offer of assistance, but I really do not need it. Does the Deputy Leader of the Coalition wish to take a point of order on what I have just said?

Mrs SHELDON: Yes. Mr Speaker, I would like to table that QC's advice.

Mr Mackenroth: There is no need to table it. It has already appeared in Federal *Hansard*. There is no need to table it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Whatever happens with regard to contempt of proceedings and the judicial process in other places may be all right, but as Speaker of this Parliament I intend to meet fully the conventions of sub judice that allow people to have a trial without matters being raised that will prejudice their trial. I intend to do that fully. I have just indicated that I will look into this matter and will rule on it later accordingly. The Premier may now answer the question.

Mr W. K. GOSS: Mr Speaker, I answer the question in two parts. Firstly, I make the point that the Attorney-General took the action he did on a request by the prosecuting authorities from the Commonwealth and, as I recall it, after advice from the State Crown Solicitor. In relation to the offending material which related to proceedings that were before the court on that very day, as has been pointed out in previous discussions, all of this material has now been published—albeit improperly—in the Senate's *Hansard*, so there is nothing new in relation to the availability of this material. It is well known and has been widely published. In defence of the Attorney-

General, I repeat that the action that was taken was proper and was on the basis of advice and at the request of the appropriate prosecuting authorities.

In relation to the second point with respect to the declaration—the honourable Leader of the Opposition has made the same mistake that the *7.30 Report* made last week. As I pointed out to the presenter of that program, if he had done the ethical thing and simply put that matter to me prior to the program being broadcast, he would have avoided one of a number of serious errors. A declaration of interests by members and Ministers did not occur until some time, I think from memory, in about mid 1991. That was simply due to the fact that it was part of a series of reports that had to be considered and delivered by EARC.

I thought that that period would have warranted an unnecessary delay. In the first half of 1990, pending the institution of a formal requirement arising out of the EARC report, I asked Ministers to furnish to me as the Chairman of Cabinet a declaration of pecuniary interests.

Mr Borbidge: That is not what you said in the Parliament.

Mr W. K. GOSS: It was a declaration of pecuniary interests. I required of Ministers a declaration of pecuniary interests, and a declaration of pecuniary interests was supplied by all Ministers.

Mr Littleproud: Words, words, words.

Mr W. K. GOSS: No. It is true.

Mr Borbidge: Cabinet records. Read what you said.

Mr W. K. GOSS: I said that there was a declaration of pecuniary interests, and there was. The Cabinet records show that that was brought into being for all Cabinet Ministers, because our Government was not prepared to tolerate the situation that existed under the National and Liberal Party Governments whereby Ministers could, without detection and without disclosure, sit in on matters in respect of which they could be regarded as having an interest.

I make two further points on that question. The declaration of interests by Ministers, which I required and with which all Ministers complied—although it occurred in 1990—is not as important in terms of good faith and disclosure as the documents that are in the possession of the relevant member, which predate the election. The test of good faith, the test of disclosure by the member in question, is demonstrated by the fact that,

prior to being in Government and prior to being a Minister, the relevant member had seen to it that official documents were issued in relation to the donation.

Furthermore, if the presenter of the *7.30 Report* who made other errors last week had inquired of me, he would have found out what I told Sir Max Bingham and what is also shown on the Cabinet records, that is, that when relevant matters came before the Cabinet, the Minister concerned excused himself from any discussion.

Political Donation

Mr BORBIDGE: I ask the Premier: why has he publicly maintained that he referred circumstances of a \$5,000 cash donation made to the Minister for Local Government to the Criminal Justice Commission, when Sir Max Bingham has indicated that he only discussed the matter informally and that no formal reference was made by him? Who is telling the truth—Sir Max Bingham or the Premier?

Mr W. K. GOSS: That is a pathetic smokescreen for the problems of the coalition partners, is it not? They try to beat up a non-existent controversy to smokescreen the marriage of the wimps—the coalition of wimps. In relation to Sir Max Bingham—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr W. K. GOSS: I want some silence because I want coalition members to hear this. I told and put before Sir Max Bingham all of the information at my disposal—I repeat, all of the information at my disposal. At the time, Sir Max Bingham was the chairman of an independent commission with all the powers in the world to institute an inquiry, to call for documents, to ask questions and to command answers. I outlined the facts to him.

The facts were these: firstly, that a donation had been made to the member and a receipt had been issued; secondly, that the moneys had been banked in the normal local Labor Party campaign account; thirdly, that when relevant matters came before the Cabinet for discussion, the relevant member took no part and excused himself from the room; and fourthly, that it was declared in the register of pecuniary interests furnished by all Ministers.

I also advised Sir Max Bingham that I had been shown two or three pages of a transcript—not “given”, but “shown”, and it was then taken away—with the names deleted. I told him that I had worked out or that I had

ascertained who the parties were, and Sir Max Bingham—

Mr Littleproud: Did you tell him everything?

Mr W. K. GOSS: Yes, yes. Sir Max Bingham considered those matters—

Mr Borbidge: Sir Max is wrong.

Mr W. K. GOSS: No. Sir Max was absolutely right, because he said that the member had behaved entirely properly. Sir Max Bingham was right. He said that the member had behaved entirely properly, and Sir Max, as a former Liberal politician, understood only too well the process by which members may receive donations in the normal course of events. Sir Max Bingham was entirely satisfied. Subsequently, he wrote me a confidential letter, in which he said there was no impropriety.

Furthermore, about the closest friend of Sir Max in this State in the past three years was the Police Commissioner, Noel Newnham—the person who had somehow come into possession of the transcript. Sir Max could have obtained the transcript from Mr Newnham. He could have held an inquiry, but he saw no necessity whatsoever to do so. Sir Max Bingham was right. The member had behaved properly. After the matter was raised in Parliament, Sir Max Bingham wrote to me and said that there was no impropriety.

Furthermore, after the matter was raised in Parliament, under the new chairman the Criminal Justice Commission conducted a full and formal investigation—a full and formal inquiry—of the kind that Sir Max Bingham, it is suggested, might have conducted if he had known more—not that there was any more to know. So one QC, Sir Max Bingham, considered the matter and said that there was no impropriety. Then subsequent to the matter being raised in Parliament, the Criminal Justice Commission carried out, this time, a full and formal investigation, and it found no impropriety.

So we had Bingham, QC, and O'Regan, QC, of the Criminal Justice Commission, and then the matter was referred to an independent QC—the third QC—at the Brisbane Bar for his opinion. So the CJC received a third opinion that there was no impropriety and no evidence to support any allegation of impropriety. The member has acted properly. I have acted properly in referring the matter to the CJC. What Sir Max Bingham does by way of an inquiry is a matter for him, not for me to dictate to him. The same goes for Mr O'Regan in terms of the

inquiry that he carried out, and the same goes for the deliberative process carried out by the third independent QC. We have acted entirely properly. This is nothing but a beat-up to smokescreen the internal problems of the coalition.

Gladstone Power Station

Mr PITT: In directing a question to the Premier, I refer him to current negotiations between the State Government and Comalco on the sale of the Gladstone Power Station, and I ask: is it true that if the sale goes ahead, the Government will legislate to give effect to the deal later this year? Can the Premier inform the House what is proposed to be done with the proceeds from any sale?

Mr W. K. GOSS: Let me say that this has nothing to do with the Budget. The Budget does not depend on this sale. Even if the sale does not go through, the Budget will still realise the negative NFR outlined by the Treasurer. It is important to note that, unlike other States, we will apply the full proceeds of such a sale to debt reduction. I want to knock on the head the very silly assertion—and I will not say who made it, because she has enough trouble already—that it is somehow going to put a hole in the Budget. If the responsible course of action which this Government is proposing was not followed—and that is to apply the proceeds of the sale to debt reduction—the QEC would have to borrow around another \$750m. The QEC would have an annual liability for debt repayments of about \$140m. The result would be about a 7 per cent increase in electricity charges.

I gather that a suggestion was made that this could be used to eliminate payroll tax by halving it one year and halving it again the next. However, after a couple of years, the money would be gone and we would be back to needing \$830m or so a year from payroll tax. That would occur because, after a couple of years, the money would have been blown. That is the sort of financial management alternative that is being put to the people of Queensland. If the \$830m of payroll tax was not reimposed, what would the consequences be? The consequences would be a reduction in the number of teachers by 9 800, nurses by 7 700 and police by 1 500.

In conclusion, the only thing that I want to say in response to this very silly argument is this: anybody who is prepared to reduce the work force of teachers, nurses and police by those numbers—

Mr Cooper interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Crows Nest!

Mr W. K. GOSS: Anybody who is prepared to reduce the work force of police, nurses and teachers by those numbers—

Mr Cooper interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Crows Nest under Standing Order 123A.

Mr W. K. GOSS:—is certainly no wimp.

Racing Industry

Mr PITT: I ask the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing: is he aware of Opposition claims that he is using the Criminal Justice Commission to persecute racing industry figures and have them dismissed from employment? Can the Minister give any background to the dismissal of people mentioned in a recent *Sunday Telegraph* article?

Mr GIBBS: The article which appeared in the press at the weekend was obviously the result of mischief-making by the member for Indooroopilly. Mr Everingham's statements in the *Courier-Mail* this morning about people being discredited and having no credibility in the community could not apply more accurately to anyone than to the member for Indooroopilly. He suggested in the Sunday papers in a very veiled way that there was some type of conspiracy between me and the Criminal Justice Commission involving people within the racing industry who have since departed the scene.

For the information of honourable members, and particularly for the information of the member for Indooroopilly, I refer to the Criminal Justice Act 1989 under the heading of "Division 4A—Complaints Section". It states—

"Referral of matter to section. (1) Any person may furnish to the Complaints Section a complaint or information concerning conduct that is perceived as, or may be, official misconduct."

Section (2) states—

"It is the duty of each of the following persons to refer to the Complaints Section all matters that he suspects involve, or may involve, official misconduct."

That applies to the principal officer in a unit of public administration. As far as I am concerned, the description of the principal

officer in a unit of public administration would apply to my director-general. However, I consider that that responsibility lies with me, as well.

However, the honourable member for Indooroopilly went beyond the bounds of credibility in his statements to the media at the weekend. As a result of that newspaper article at the weekend, he leaves me with no option but to quote—particularly in relation to one person, and I am talking about the former chief steward at the Gold Coast—a letter dated 19 August 1993 which was sent to me by the Criminal Justice Commission. The letter states—

"Dear Mr Gibbs

RE: QUEENSLAND PRINCIPAL CLUB AND RELATED MATTERS

(iv) Complaint concerning Angus Chisholm Mackenzie Ross, Senior Stipendiary Steward.

Mr Ross is a Senior Stipendiary Steward with the Queensland Principal Club, and Chief Steward with the Gold Coast Turf Club.

The Commission has investigated allegations that Ross has on divers occasions misappropriated various sums of money which had come to him on account of the Queensland Principal Club.

The Auditor-General's report of 19 March 1993 contained reference to the collection of various monies from licensees within the racing industry by stipendiary stewards in the South East Region and made particular mention of a \$1,000 cash bond lodged with Ross by a Gold Coast jockey on 28 May 1992 being missing. It appears that after a closed inquiry by Chief Stipendiary Steward Mr Ray Murrhy, Ross made good this amount which he paid into the account of the Queensland Principal Club. The shortfall was not reported to the Auditor-General as required by Public Finance Standard 234.

As a result of the Auditor-General's report in relation to the missing money, the Commission made enquiries which disclosed that whilst acting as Chief Steward at the Gold Coast, Ross had on numerous occasions over the last four years, collected fees, bonds and other monies from persons involved in the racing industry which were never received by the Queensland Principal Club, or alternatively, were received only after

enquiries had been made in respect of the whereabouts of the payments."

Mr Stoneman: Table it.

Mr GIBBS: No, I will not table it. I shall read the document, as I am entitled to do as a result of the disgraceful article instigated by the member for Indooroopilly. The letter continues—

"The Commission has concluded that Ross had the opportunity to misappropriate money received by him on account of the Queensland Principal Club and the repeated instances of shortfalls cast suspicion upon Ross."

I will not read the rest of the letter, but I will table the letter so that the honourable member has full knowledge of the facts.

Can I simply say that one of the relevant points is that this correspondence states, "on numerous occasions this has taken place over the last four years". I say to the honourable member for Indooroopilly once again: his friends in a certain place, who are whispering in his ear, are very wide of the mark. He should go back to the sources who put him up to that little story at the weekend and ask them: when the Queensland Principal Club has been in operation officially in this State for less than 18 months, and this alleged misappropriation has been going on for the last four years, why was not appropriate action taken by the former principal club and those in charge of the principal club at that time?

Finally, I will say this: on two occasions, Ross was asked to appear before the Queensland Principal Club to give an explanation of the behaviour in which he had indulged, and on two occasions he refused to go to the Queensland Principal Club on the basis that he was suffering ill health. He resigned a week and a half ago for that reason. I say to the member for Indooroopilly that he should check his facts. He has done his run for the leadership a hell of a lot of damage.

Political Donation

Mrs SHELDON: I direct a question to the Premier. In early 1990, he held a meeting with the then CJC Chairman, Sir Max Bingham, at which he raised the circumstances surrounding the cash payment of \$5,000 to the member for Chatsworth prior to the 1989 State election. I table the transcript of the tape-recorded conversation— which runs into nine pages—and I ask: in light of Sir Max's comments—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Again, I advise the House that since on tabling that document becomes privileged, I will be considering whether I will allow it to be tabled. I call the Deputy Leader of the Coalition.

Mrs SHELDON: I ask: in light of Sir Max's comments that he would have treated the matter very differently had he known all the facts, why did the Premier not inform the CJC Chairman at that meeting of the existence of the tape-recorded phone conversations related to the cash payment?

Mr W. K. GOSS: I did not see Sir Max Bingham's interview on the *7.30 Report* last week, so I am relying on second-hand reports as to what he said.

Mr Borbidge: You heard about it.

Mr W. K. GOSS: I did hear about it. I am saying that I am relying on second-hand reports about what he said. As I understand it, he said two things in essence. He said, firstly, that he could confirm that we had discussed it, that I had outlined certain facts to him, and that he agreed that there was no impropriety. However, he also said, as I am advised, something to the effect that, had I given him the transcript—

Mrs Sheldon: You had been given the transcript.

Mr W. K. GOSS: My recollection is that I did mention the transcript. Why else would I call the chairman in? The way in which Sir Max Bingham conducts his investigations is a matter for him, not a matter for me. I did not have the transcript to give him. It was not given to me; it was taken away. As I said, the names were blank. I outlined the facts to Sir Max Bingham as I knew them. Sir Max Bingham concluded that there was no impropriety. One or two years later when the matter came up in Parliament and the allegations were made again, I referred Sir Max Bingham to the debate in Parliament, which was printed in the newspapers. As I recall it, reference to the transcript and all the other business that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition improperly raised—

Mr Borbidge: You expunged it.

Mr W. K. GOSS: But the honourable member sent it to the Senate. The honourable member improperly breached the privileges of this House by sending it to a mate in the Senate on a fax from this building. The honourable member breached the privileges of this Parliament.

Mr Johnson interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Gregory!

Mr W. K. GOSS: As I was saying, whenever Sir Max Bingham wrote to me subsequently, a year or two later, when there was plenty of time for reflection and when Sir Max Bingham was now the experienced chairman that he may not have been in 1990—that is according to him, not to me—he confirmed again that there was no impropriety. I say again that it was then the subject of another investigation. This time it was a full and formal investigation by the CJC. Again, no impropriety was found. Then it was referred to a third investigation.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition under Standing Order 123A.

Mr W. K. GOSS: It was referred to a third independent QC, who found no impropriety.

Mr Littleproud interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Western Downs under Standing Order 123A.

Mr W. K. GOSS: What I conclude out of this—and I am not a QC; I am a humble solicitor, as everybody knows—is that when three independent QCs one after another say that there is no impropriety and no evidence to substantiate corruption, I am inclined to accept that. The Leader of the Liberal Party may want a fourth investigation, but she will not get one.

The last point that I wish to make in respect of this matter is that the Leader of the Liberal Party has been prattling on about how she was desperate for a debate. Last week, she said that when she got into Parliament this week she would demand a debate. We are back in Parliament! When “Any other business?” was called, did she respond? No. Members opposite know they have nothing to raise in a debate. They know they only have some smear and slur questions to roll up. We are not afraid of a debate. Tonight, we will initiate the debate ourselves to blow this smokescreen out of the way.

Former Police Commissioner Newnham

Mrs SHELDON: In directing a question to the Premier, I refer to his meeting with former Police Commissioner Noel Newnham concerning the \$5,000 cash payment to the member for Chatsworth.

Mr De Lacy: Why don't you give up?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Treasurer. I want to listen to the question and hear the reply. I ask for order.

Mrs SHELDON: I refer to the Premier's meeting with former Police Commissioner Noel Newnham concerning the \$5,000 cash payment to the member for Chatsworth. I ask: why did the Premier subsequently carry out an orchestrated smear campaign against Mr Newnham leading to his eventual dismissal? How could he accuse the Police Commissioner of going behind the Minister's back when the Minister himself was likely to be the subject of further investigation? Will he now table the Minister's entry in the pecuniary interests register?

Mr W. K. GOSS: I rise to a point of order. I find the statement that I conducted a smear campaign against the commissioner untrue and offensive. I seek its withdrawal.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader of the Coalition to withdraw.

Mrs SHELDON: I withdraw. I would like the question answered.

Mr W. K. GOSS: That is fine. I have no worries with that. I repeat that this matter has now been before three QCs between 1990 and the end of 1992.

Mrs Sheldon: That's not the answer to that question.

Mr W. K. GOSS: The Deputy Leader of the Coalition asks the questions and I give the answers. Over a period of three years, three independent QCs have given opinions that there was no impropriety. Furthermore, as far as I am concerned, my integrity stands unchallenged in this matter in the sense that, when it was drawn to my attention by the Police Commissioner, I called in the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission and drew it to his attention. What he did after that was a matter for him. But Sir Max Bingham came properly to the conclusion that it was as clear as crystal, on a cursory glance at the matter, that there was no impropriety.

As to any documents that are in the possession of the Minister concerned—what he does with those documents is a matter for him. They are his documents; he has possession of them.

Transport Planning and Coordination Legislation

Mr LIVINGSTONE: In directing a question to the Minister for Transport, I refer to the proposed transport planning and coordination legislation. I ask: can he inform the House of the benefits to Queensland of this legislation?

Mr HAMILL: One of the high priorities of this Government is to try to reduce the quantity of legislation and regulation—in other

words, the red tape—which bedevils the Government and the community.

Mr Elder interjected.

Mr HAMILL: I take the interjection of the Minister for Small Business in this regard. The transport planning coordination legislation is part of a package of legislation which will reduce some 55 separate pieces of legislation to 20 and, with respect to the planning and coordination aspects of transport, enable the Parliament to view an integrated transport plan which encompasses both rail and road as well as maritime infrastructure needs for the State. It is an important piece of legislation. For the first time, it will allow us to analyse the whole approach to the provision of the transport needs of Queensland. Most particularly, it will provide a new framework for legislation in this State. It will include matters dealing with infrastructure and transport services. The other aspect—one which is of particular interest to the people of Queensland and perhaps one of the most controversial from a day-to-day operational viewpoint for the Department of Transport—is the vexed issue of land acquisition.

Although people demand better access, better transport services, better roads and so on, the land corridors are not so easy to acquire. Currently, there are six separate pieces of legislation under which the State Government can acquire land for transport infrastructure purposes. That is unduly confusing and an unnecessary duplication of effort and endeavour. It will be consolidated in this one piece of legislation so that there can be surety and clarity. The people of Queensland will be able to see quite clearly what their rights are in relation to land acquisition by the Government, and the Government will have a clear indication as to what its responsibilities are to the community in regard to the provision of that transport infrastructure.

Drought

Mr LIVINGSTONE: I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: can he inform the House what measures are being taken to deal with the prolonged drought in Queensland?

Mr CASEY: Queensland is in the grip of one of the worst droughts ever experienced in the lifetime of all people engaged in the primary sector. As a result of that, we as a Government have been meeting constantly with industry groups and our industry/Government working group to look at the hot spots or the real problem areas as

they develop and other areas in which relief can be given to our primary producers. As an example, yesterday, State Cabinet considered a submission from me in relation to the ceiling figure on State freight subsidy schemes for fodder and livestock transportation. We have decided to extend that ceiling figure from \$20,000 per year to \$30,000 per year. We have probably reached a situation in which many primary producers have been without income for something like three years. Those who have put cattle and sheep on agistment are looking forward to bringing that stock back onto their properties when the drought breaks so that they can recommence breeding stock on their properties. The maximum of \$20,000 will probably not be enough. For instance, last year, six primary producers in Queensland breached that maximum figure. We expect it to be a lot more during this financial year. That is why the Treasurer has made more funds available for this purpose in the Budget.

Statistics show how producers' costs are escalating. As at 13 September—yesterday—in the 34 shires, the three part-shires and the 1 623 independent properties that are drought declared in Queensland, a total of \$5.523m has been paid in freight subsidy claims for the financial year, including \$2.31m in July, \$2.231 in August and \$0.98m as at 13 September. Each week, we receive an average of 620 claims for assistance under the drought relief measures. Recent rain has provided some relief, but supplementary feeding of stock continues to be widespread. It is expected that approximately half the planned wheat and barley crops will have to be baled for feed or grazed. Some relief in the weather conditions is in sight, but we all know how Queensland's weather conditions can be fickle.

We have introduced an enormous number of measures, including the one yesterday, to continue to help drought-affected primary producers in this State. We will continue to support those people throughout the State who are suffering from the drought, as well as the community as a whole. Our support has gone not just to primary producers. We have also provided \$1.2m for the Queensland Drought Appeal and \$400,000—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is now debating the question.

Mr CASEY: I am pointing out the many measures that we have put in place.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Mount Coot-tha.

Special Education

Mrs EDMOND: In directing a question to the Minister for Education, I refer to the work commissioned by the metropolitan east region of his department to examine ways of improving educational services for students with special needs, and I ask: can the Minister inform the House when the report on that study will be released and what further action is to be taken?

Mr COMBEN: The honourable member's interest in special education needs, particularly around Barooka and the Barooka Special School, is well known. There has been much speculation within the department and the community concerning special education. As to when the report commissioned by metropolitan east titled the Report and Operational Plan for the Provision of Special Education 1993 to 1996 Metropolitan East Educational Region will be released—this morning, I attended a breakfast with special educators and saw the report's release by John Fitzgerald, the executive director of the region. I was supported by the director-general of my department.

It is a very positive report. It is probably the most comprehensive examination of special education needs ever commissioned in Queensland. The two authors, Professor John Elkins and Dr Bob Andrews, are pre-eminent in their field. They have provided a report that makes recommendations and suggestions. It is no policy of the Department of Education to endorse that report. It has no policy standing whatsoever. But we have distributed it for public discussion in one local region. We await the response to that report and look forward to a constructive debate.

I encourage all members who have an interest in our students, particularly students with special needs, to take the time to examine the report. I shall make copies of the report available to any interested member and certainly to all members within metropolitan east. I shall also arrange to have an offer of a special briefing on this report made to my opposite number.

I stress that the report is not Government policy. But the uncertainty surrounding the non-release of the report was doing damage to the morale of the department. No recommendations have been accepted. The report is a discussion document, not a statement of policy. It is attempting to improve the service delivery to students with special needs. I therefore appeal to members not to play politics with the report or its recommendations. I stress again to members

that the report was commissioned by public servants to do their job better. I could have hidden it, but I chose to put it on the table. It is far beyond politics. Let us have a discussion.

Urban Transport Services

Mrs EDMOND: I ask the Minister for Transport: with Queensland's significant population growth putting pressure on our roads, what initiatives are being progressed by the Government to improve the standard of services available to commuters in our urban areas?

Mr HAMILL: One of the key issues that came from the South East Queensland Passenger Transport Study was that many of the new suburbs on the fringe of the metropolitan area—

Mr Johnson: Tell us about the subsidy.

Mr HAMILL: I shall come to that in a moment. The issue also applies to provincial cities. I refer to the paucity of public transport provision in those areas. In many new suburbs, families are relatively isolated because of their total dependence on the motor car for their transport needs. In response to that particular community need, we have put in place an analysis of the public transport system. I believe that the findings of that analysis may be of interest even to honourable members of the Opposition.

The existing system has created a situation in which there is an inflexible arrangement with respect to the provision of bus services. Members might like to ask people in their electorates about this. What they will invariably say is that, outside peak times and certainly at weekends, there are very few—if any—services available for people in those areas. Quite frankly, what sort of service is it if it does not exist?

Furthermore, we have a subsidy system which members opposite put in place and which penalises operators who carry pensioners and children. The system has to change.

Mr Johnson interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Gregory.

Mr HAMILL: It will change as this Government puts in place performance standards and links those standards to the payment of subsidies.

Mr Johnson interjected.

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

Mr HAMILL: That change must occur. Likewise, the change must occur within the bureaucracy, because the very rigid framework in which passenger transport has been organised for the past 40 years is suffocating innovation and inhibiting the extension of services. We need to reward operators who want to provide innovative services. We want to reward operators who want to provide off-peak services and weekend services. We need to improve passenger transport provision.

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

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Political Donation

Mrs SHELDON (Caloundra—Leader of the Liberal Party) (11 a.m.): I rise today to speak about an issue which has been kept from public debate for 15 months by this Government. I am, of course, referring to the \$5,000 cash payment by a dubious person to the member for Chatsworth in November 1989, just prior to the State election. This payment was accidentally unearthed through a listening device placed by the Federal Police who were investigating tax evasion at the time. The amount of \$5,000 is a considerable amount of money to be donated by an individual to an Opposition member soon to be facing an important State election.

However, today, I am not going to speculate on the reasons for this sizeable donation. Today, I wish to speak about the questions that have been raised through this entire affair—questions of probity by this Government; questions of who knew what and how much; and questions of whether the so-called clean skin Government went off the rails within months of its election. In fact, despite the Government's best efforts, this affair has still managed to raise more questions than answers over the 15 months since I first raised this issue in this place.

On 7 May last year, the State Government took the almost unprecedented step of expunging from *Hansard* two questions asked by me, and the Premier's answers. What is worse is that this Government then continued its abuse of Parliament by also expunging the ensuing debate from *Hansard*. The Government did this by citing advice from the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions, Michael Rozenes, QC—advice which, unfortunately—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am having trouble hearing the speaker. There is too much conversation in the Chamber. I ask members who need to have a conversation to go outside the Chamber.

Mrs SHELDON: The fact is that Mr Rozenes was given only half the story by the Attorney-General, and consequently was unable to give a truly informed opinion, as was revealed in our conversations with him later that day. The Government misled Mr Rozenes over the content of my questions to the Premier on May 7 last year. Further, Mr Rozenes did not know that the matter was raised in the Senate, or that Mr Mackenroth had left the House after the expunging of the questions and answers and held an open press conference with the media.

This matter is now no longer before the courts and there is no reason why it cannot be discussed here today. On that day, 7 May, I asked the Premier—

“Did Commissioner Newnham ever raise with the Premier the possibility of illegal donations being made to a Labor member of Parliament or to the Labor Party?”

The Premier began to answer and, in fact, said “Mr Newnham raised this with me” before interjections from the Government benches caused Mr Speaker to call order and asked me to repeat the question, which I did. Mr Goss then answered—

“Ah, no, he did not.”

I now submit that the Premier misled the House on that day with that answer, because Commissioner Newnham had, in early 1990, approached the Premier with a taped conversation, in which two figures then under investigation for criminal activity spoke about giving \$5,000 in cash to the member for Chatsworth, Terry Mackenroth, and the fact that they did not want, or receive, a receipt for that donation. This conversation had taken place on 13 November 1989, only weeks before the State election.

Mr MACKENROTH: I rise to a point of order. The claim made by the Deputy Leader of the Coalition that they did not receive a receipt is untrue, it is offensive, and I want it withdrawn. I would say that, if she wishes, I will have the details released from security, where I am holding them, and this afternoon, when I get them, she can come and have a look at them, and then I will ask her for an apology.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Minister, in the

first part of his point of order, is seeking a withdrawal, which is valid.

Mrs SHELDON: I did not say that.

Mr BORBIDGE: Speaking to the point of order—the Deputy Leader of the Coalition was not referring to the Minister, she was referring to other individuals.

Mr MACKENROTH: She referred to the fact that I did not give a receipt. That is untrue.

Mrs SHELDON: No, excuse me. I will repeat it, if the honourable member wishes.

Mr MACKENROTH: I want it withdrawn.

Mrs SHELDON: And the fact that they did not want, or receive, a receipt for that donation. Where is the reflection on the member?

Mr MACKENROTH: It does not show that, either.

Mrs SHELDON: I do not see why that should be withdrawn. It is not a reference to the member.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Standing Orders are clear: if a member says that a statement is untrue and asks for a withdrawal, I must ask that it be withdrawn.

Mrs SHELDON: Mr Speaker, with due respect, I did not mention that it was the member.

Mr SPEAKER: All right.

Mrs SHELDON: This conversation had taken place on 13 November 1989, only weeks before the State election. My question specifically referred to the “possibility” of an illegal donation, and we have yet to have any evidence from the Premier or anyone else that the donation was made aboveboard, that a receipt was issued and that the donation was properly banked and recorded with the Australian Labor Party. I submit that the Police Commissioner brought the matter to the attention of the Premier for the very reason that he believed that the donation might be illegal.

I also contend that the Premier misled the House in relation to my second question on 7 May 1992. My second question was—

“Is it a fact that Commissioner Newnham forwarded directly to you a copy of a Federal police transcript of a telephone conversation in which a \$5,000 bribe was discussed by the former?”—

Mr MACKENROTH: I rise to a point of order. I take objection to the word “bribe” being used, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader of the Coalition to withdraw that word.

Mrs SHELDON: I withdraw the word. The question continues—

“. . . disgraced Police Minister, the member for Chatsworth, with another person under Federal police investigation?”

Is it a fact that following this advice from Commissioner Newnham arrangements were made for the \$5,000 to be listed as a legal donation to the Australian Labor Party?”

In his reply to my second question, the Premier stated—

“I made inquiries and I found, I was able to confirm that in fact, there had been a declaration of the donation by the member in his declaration of pecuniary interests.”

Wrong! No such declaration exists in the member’s pecuniary interests, which were tabled in March 1991.

Mr MACKENROTH: I rise to a point of order. What the member said just then did not refer to a pecuniary interest that was tabled in this Parliament a year after that; it was referring to something that was given in Cabinet.

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

Mrs SHELDON: So the Premier blatantly misled the House. Could it be that these occasions on which the Premier misled the House on 7 May are the real reasons why the questions, answers and subsequent debate were expunged? I contend that this is exactly why the Government panicked and expunged the material from the record of the House. My two questions on that day did not make any reference to ongoing court cases or to any persons involved. In fact, it was the Premier who made the connection, and it was the Premier who was caught out.

I return to the fateful day when, after being given transcripts of the tapes in which Mr Mackenroth was implicated, the Premier called the then Criminal Justice Commission Chairman, Sir Max Bingham, over to his office for an informal discussion. “An informal discussion”, is the way Sir Max described it on the *7.30 Report* last Thursday night. This is the same meeting which the Premier constantly refers to as “calling in the CJC”. It seems that the recollection of this meeting by the Premier and the former CJC Chairman differs somewhat. Sir Max thought that he was

there for an informal chat, while the Premier is beating up this meeting as "calling in the CJC".

What else happened at this meeting? The Premier informally brought up that one of his Ministers had received a \$5,000 donation, but that it was all aboveboard and everything was okay. Sir Max, of course, took the Premier on his word—he is, after all, the leader of the State. But here is the real crux of the matter: why did not the Premier inform Sir Max of the existence of the taped conversation between these persons, in which the \$5,000 cash gift was discussed? The Premier had, in his own words this morning, seen a copy of the transcript of that conversation. It had been shown to him by the Police Commissioner. He had known already, because the member, in his own words, had tabled a list of his pecuniary interests with Cabinet. Members would note that this morning, when I asked the Premier to table that list of pecuniary interests, he refused to do so. Be it a Cabinet document or not, it is in the public interest that it should be tabled.

The Premier failed to tell the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission of the existence of this tape and the transcript—a transcript which casts a deep shadow over Mr Mackenroth's involvement with these two men and the circumstances surrounding the donation. This could not be an oversight by the Premier. In fact, I contend that this was anything but an oversight by the Premier. I contend that the Premier, with his action, or inaction, on that day when he met with Sir Max, became a conspirator. In fact, I contend that the Premier on that day, in his meeting with Sir Max, sought to cover up the real facts behind the donation.

Mr W. K. GOSS: I rise to a point of order. I take objection to the words "conspirator" and being part of a cover-up. That is untrue and offensive. I gave the Chairman of the CJC all the information that I had at my disposal. I seek a withdrawal of those two terms.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Does the Premier seek a withdrawal?

Mr W. K. GOSS: Yes.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! A withdrawal is sought.

Mrs SHELDON: I withdraw the two terms. In fact, I will quote what the Premier said on the *7.30 Report*, just to make sure everyone realises that he did know exactly what was going on before he spoke to Sir Max. The Premier said—

"My responsibility in the matter is, once these matters were drawn to my attention by the Police Commissioner, what should I do? Now I didn't cover up for somebody who was a ministerial colleague, indeed somebody who was a friend, what I said was I have no choice in this matter other than to call in the Criminal Justice Commission"—

or the Police Commissioner himself. So we hear from the Premier's own mouth exactly what happened. The Premier was alerted to the tapes by the Police Commissioner. He then called in Sir Max and failed to reveal the existence of the tapes to the Chairman of the CJC. This is negligence in the extreme by the Premier.

These are very serious accusations, but there can be no other reason for the Premier's action on the day. The reasons for this cover-up have become abundantly clear.

Mr W. K. GOSS: I rise to a point of order. I have already sought the withdrawal of that term. I think that it is contemptuous of the speaker to repeat it, and I seek a withdrawal.

Mrs SHELDON: I withdraw the comment. Sir Max, again speaking on the *7.30 Report* last week, stated—

"The questions raised by those telephone tapes had not emerged."

He went on—

"If I'd been conscious of the background, ramifications, the sort of flavour of the transaction, I would have taken a totally different view about it."

Time expired.

Liberal Party Fundraising and Political Donations

Mr BEATTIE (Brisbane Central) (11.10 a.m.): I rise today to expose in the House attempts by the Liberal Party to avoid disclosure laws for political donations and to encourage tax avoidance. Before I provide specific details of those matters, I think it is important that I mention in the House the issues that the Honourable Paul Everingham has addressed to the parliamentary Liberal Party. Today, I was absolutely staggered to read on the front page of the *Courier-Mail* that the Liberal Party President had stated—

"The proof of the pudding is that the state parliamentary Liberal Party is held in contempt by our supporters and the public."

He got one right! I could not believe that I would ever agree with Paul Everingham, but he got one right. Two weeks ago in this House, I attacked Paul Everingham, and what did he do? He wrote to all members of the Liberal Party and said, "You're a pack of wimps because you didn't defend me." I would like the Leader of the Liberal Party to table that letter in the House. I look forward to it.

Let me inform the House of what Mr Everingham said. What a charitable man he is! The article states—

"The nine-member team of Liberals in the Queensland Parliament is held in contempt by party supporters and the public, according to party President Paul Everingham.

...

In the letter, Mr Everingham accused Mr Goss of being a 'wimp'."

On this occasion, I shall defend the member for Aspley. He is not a wimp. I think Mr Everingham's attack is unfair and un-Christian. What an un-Christian thing to say!

Mr J. N. GOSS: I rise to a point of order. My wife thinks I'm a stud.

Mr BEATTIE: I want that assertion tested. I do not have any verification of that.

Mr T. B. Sullivan: Lay the evidence on the table.

Mr BEATTIE: I take that interjection, but we will need a much stronger table. What an extraordinary set of circumstances! The Liberal Party President wants the Liberal Party Leader to attack Queensland business. What would the late Sir Robert Menzies think of that? He would turn in his grave. How would the likes of the late Sir Gordon Chalk and even Sir Llew Edwards stand for the President of the Liberal Party wanting the Liberal Party members of Parliament to attack the business community? What has happened to that famous political party, the Liberal Party? These are the depths to which it has sunk. What a sad day!

Mr Ardill interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: It is, too. What a sad day.

Mr Fenlon: It is not the party that we knew and loved so much.

Mr BEATTIE: It is certainly not the party we knew. Whether or not we loved it is another matter. The President of the Liberal Party was threatening the parliamentary Liberal Party, and if I were the Liberal Party Leader I would be worried about it. He stated—

"These things are reciprocal and if the Liberal Legislative Assembly members are not prepared to assist the party's local authority efforts and deter turncoat businessmen from supporting Soorley, then our enthusiasm to assist state members"—

Mr CONNOR: I rise to a point of order. I find the word "threatening" offensive and I ask for it to be withdrawn.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am on my feet. I have heard the member's point of order. There is no point of order.

Mr BEATTIE: As I was saying, Paul Everingham stated—

". . . our enthusiasm to assist state members at an organisational level will rapidly evaporate."

In other words, Everingham is saying that he will not even support State Liberal members at the next State election. What a joke!

I want to table this document for posterity. It is important that it should be on the public record. Of course, Everingham was not finished. He stated further—

"In the final analysis, what is the use of having state members if they are not prepared to assist the party?"

In other words, Everingham is asking what the point is in having a parliamentary Liberal Party, and I have to say that he is right again. There is no point in having a parliamentary Liberal Party. On the occasion when Mr John Goss proved he was not a wimp, he stated—

"I am still of the strong belief that the decision made by my colleagues and myself was correct and that the request was an emotive reaction lacking in sound political judgment."

Mr John Goss got it right: Everingham has no political judgment, and on that point I agree also. For the information of the House, I table that letter.

I wish to raise a number of other matters. Currently, the Queensland Liberal Party organisation is involved in a scam to raise desperately needed funds for the Liberal Party's forthcoming Brisbane City Council campaign and for the bankrupt Liberal Party itself. Today, I raise in the House my concern about the Liberal Party's deliberate attempt to encourage business in Queensland to avoid the political disclosure laws and to use donations to the Liberal Party as a tax deduction. Mr Con Galtos, the Vice President of the Queensland Liberal Party and a very

close friend of the Liberal Party's President, Paul Everingham, wrote a letter to a number of Queensland business people. In that letter, he offered for sale so-called *Blueprints for Industry*, which is a quarterly publication supposedly covering areas such as the building industry, small business, retailing, transport, and the professional sector. For an amount of \$1,490 for an annual subscription, the offer entitles businesses to receive a copy of a particular industry blueprint, a copy of *Political Insight*, and three political press releases and other general purpose political publications.

Mr Littleproud interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Western Downs will interject only from his correct place.

Mr BEATTIE: In the letter which Mr Galtos sent to industry, he said—

"The development of our new series of publications of 'Blueprints for Industry' represents a major new initiative by the Queensland Liberal Party to underpin a new partnership with business."

This is a bit of a joke, bearing in mind what he was trying to get the Leader of the parliamentary Liberal Party to do. He went on to state—

"We are seeking to flag issues of concern to business and to ensure that as far as possible, party policy addresses those issues."

He went on to state—

"Copies of blueprints for the above industries . . . the first of the series to be published, are attached. Each of the 'Blueprint' series will be published quarterly. Included with each subscription of 'Blueprint' will be a deal of political information relevant to that industry. Also included, free of charge, will be the bi-monthly publication 'Political Insight', Australia's foremost political magazine.

As an added service, subscribers could be placed on the mailing list"—

this sounds like another threat—

"for Federal Coalition media releases covering their particular industry, by indicating their interest on the order/invoice form attached."

Now, here comes the crucial bit. In the publication signed by Mr Galtos—which I have in my possession—he states the following in terms of cost—

"The cost of one year's subscription to a particular industry 'Blueprint' is \$1,490. Subscribers cheque or credit card payment for \$1,490 per industry should be made out to the publisher 'LPQ Pty Ltd' which is a trustee of a discretionary trust, set up for the benefit of the Queensland Liberal Party. The attached order/invoice form should be used to record details of the subscriptions. Receipts will be issued by LPQ Pty Ltd and forwarded to the subscribers. From the subscribers standpoint please note that: subscription to 'Blueprint' does not constitute a political donation under the Political Disclosure Laws . . ."

What he is trying to do is raise money and avoid the disclosure of political donations.

Mr T. B. Sullivan: Shame!

Mr BEATTIE: It is a shame, all right. It is a disgrace. He goes on—and get a load of this—to state—

". . . and a subscriber operating in the relevant industry would be able to claim a tax deduction through a subscription to 'Blueprint'."

Mr J. H. Sullivan: It is a fraud.

Mr BEATTIE: Indeed. What we have is the Liberal Party trying to raise funds for its coffers and encouraging donations to be given, but it is doing it in a shonky way by selling a subscription to *Blueprint*. It is being done in such a way that the subscription would not be caught by the political donation disclosure laws. In other words, we have a deliberate attempt by the Queensland Liberals to avoid the political donation disclosure laws.

One has to ask: what is the Liberal Party trying to hide? Why is it trying to break the law? Moreover, there is encouragement for Liberal Party fundraising efforts to be used as tax deductions by Queensland business. What a sleazy way to operate! I wish to table this document for the information of the House so that everybody can read how the Liberal Party is encouraging people to break the law. I table the document.

On page 2 of Mr Galtos' letter, he fleshes out a little bit what the Liberal Party is trying to do in a secret bid to raise funds and avoid the law. On page 2, he states—

"If the 'Blueprint' series is to develop to its maximum potential, it will be essential that we obtain the full cooperation of business people, who are both personally committed and knowledgeable. Such people will be well

placed to persuade others to subscribe, which is really the key to success."

He mentions a couple of themes and goes on to state exactly what will be given for the money.

In the limited time that remains for my speech, I want to refer to an important fact. In the document titled *Blueprint* are a number of articles by people such as the honourable member for Aspley and the honourable member for Nerang. However, nowhere in this document is there any mention of the parliamentary Liberal Party Leader. This great document that is being used as a fundraiser for the Liberal Party and to discuss the Liberal Party's close cooperation with business does not once mention the Leader of the parliamentary Liberal Party. If I received that sort of support from the President of the Australian Labor Party, I would give up. I really think it is about time that Joan Sheldon gave up. If she cannot do better than that, it is really a sad day for the Liberal Party. She has my sympathy.

Time expired.

Gurulmundi Toxic Waste Dump

Mr SLACK (Burnett) (11.20 a.m.): From the time that the State Labor Government made the final decision to site a toxic waste dump at Gurulmundi, one continuing and worrying concern has been raised by the community but totally ignored by the State Government. That concern emerged in July 1991 and has continued to exist. The concern is that the site is on an aquifer recharge area. A body of evidence, including new evidence, points to the site being on an aquifer recharge area. The substance of that scientific data should be examined by the State Labor Government before waste is put in the landfill.

An overview of the evidence shows that the Bureau of Mineral Resources in Canberra, which did all of the original work on the Great Artesian Basin, showed in map form that the site is over the J aquifer. Maps held by the Water Resources Commission—a State Government body—show that the toxic dump site is over the Great Artesian Basin. Dr George Gibson of the University of Southern Queensland said that the two most important aquifers feeding the Surat Basin were near the dump site. He said that some of the aquifers in the area linked to other basins such as Eromanga. Dr Gibson said that the Gurulmundi site posed some risk to the Great Artesian Basin but that just how great that risk was was not for him to say. He questioned the

permeability of surrounding rock, saying that the most favourable site was one where there was shale bedrock well away from any permeable layers such as sandstone. He said that, within the Gurulmundi site, a large proportion of sandstone may be semipermeable. Dr Gibson also said that, on a world standard, the Gurulmundi site would have been the least favourable location for a toxic waste dump.

Dr Brian Senior, a respected geologist with more than 20 years' experience, in a report dated April 1993 titled "The Stratigraphic and Hydrogeological Environment of the Gurulmundi Secure Landfill", has provided more scientific evidence that the Gurulmundi site is unsuitable. The substance of the report, coupled with the previous studies, is such that the Government—indeed, any Government with concern for the public interest and the community interest—should not progress any further with the Gurulmundi site and should quietly examine the new scientific material.

The conclusions of the new scientific study are such that they cause more than reasonable concern. For the benefit of the House, I will read the summary to the report, which stated—

"Several rock specimens, collected at various depths and locations from within the recently excavated Gurulmundi secure landfill, were forwarded for geological analyses.

These rocks were identified and sent to Amdel for thin-sectioning and micropetrographic descriptions.

In addition, the sandstones were subject to porosity and permeability measurements.

The results of this work are assessed along with the broader stratigraphic and hydrogeological environment, regarding the efficacy of these sedimentary rocks for the long term secure containment of toxic wastes.

These data demonstrate that the sandstones, which comprise about two-thirds of the containment, have moderately high porosities (average 32%) but have variable permeabilities which range from nearly zero to 301MD.

A photographic survey of the excavation also shows abundant iron-oxide staining and mottling indicating where groundwater has moved along fractures and within inter-layered permeable zones.

Collectively these measurements and observations indicate that this layered sedimentary sequence is likely to prove to be an unsuitable environment for the long term containment of toxic waste.

Furthermore, an accompanying report on the suitability of the 'calcium' type bentonitic clay for impoundment of the cement and fly ash encapsulated toxic waste, indicated that it is likely to be insecure largely due to the chemical degradation between the emplaced material with the bentonite.

The location of the toxic waste site near the geographic axis of the Great Divide and presence of widespread superficial sandy soils, indicates that the area is likely to be a zone of natural infiltration of the meteoric water and aquifer recharge.

If the containment leaks"—

Mr Budd: You obviously didn't write this speech.

Mr SLACK: I am quoting the gentleman. He stated—

"If the containment leaks, concern is expressed that in the medium to long term, widely utilised aquifers within the Surat Basin sequence will be at risk."

That was said by a senior man with all of the credentials. In other words, real concerns were raised in that report which should cause the State Labor Government—indeed, any Government—to cease development action on the site until the scientifically researched conclusions have been examined.

The standard that all Governments now apply to services, projects, etc., is world's best practice. It is not in keeping with that standard for the Government to fob off the new scientific study by waving around an aged memorandum on the report of the Water Resources Commission, which states in part—

"The area cannot be a major intake area of the Great Artesian Basin . . . and the absence of major aquifers under the site means that even if leakage to the sediments under the site could occur, it is extremely unlikely that any main aquifer could be contaminated."

The petrol excise is being increased to ensure that lead levels in the atmosphere are reduced. The use of chlorofluorocarbons has been reduced to stop damage to the ozone layer. One could go on talking for another hour about measures to preserve the

environment and to prevent and combat pollution. Yet, in the instance of the Gurulmundi site, the State Government will proceed with a landfill that contradicts its Water Resources Commission memorandum. Dr Senior's report states—

"It appears likely, in the medium to long term, that, for the first time, this otherwise pristine and economically valuable groundwater resource is in danger of widespread man-made pollution."

Millions of dollars have been spent on World Heritage listing, etc., yet the most valuable of resources—water—gets bypassed. The policy of the Labor Government obviously provides for the possibility of a toxic landfill contaminating the underground water supply. No world's best practice is involved in the siting of the toxic waste dump at Gurulmundi. Sufficient doubts have now been raised for the project to be halted subject to further investigation into the suitability of the site. There is a need for a moratorium on the development of the site, and a commission of inquiry should be established comprising leading scientists and technical experts to determine the impact of the toxic waste on the soil and water environment of the area.

The House will recall that the Government outlaid some \$3m at Kingston for purely political reasons. Surely, the same amount could be made available to ensure that underground water supplies will not be contaminated by the siting of a toxic waste dump on an aquifer. The State Government has been quick to dismiss claims by experts, whose views should be respected, in its determination to site the toxic waste dump at Gurulmundi. Over the past two years, the Government has not been fair to the people of Miles on that issue. That was highlighted in another piece of scientific research conducted for the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission by Cameron Hazelhurst, Greg Terrill and Sue Mendra.

I have gone through the major reasons why the coalition believes that the decision on the landfill site should be postponed. The reasons are compelling. I have done so not for a political purpose, that is, to score points against the Government, but for the purpose of ensuring that that aquifer is protected. There is no doubt that serious concerns were raised by people who have standing within the scientific profession. That, in itself, is sufficient to warrant a halt to the process for a period while the Government gives further consideration to the matter.

Although the coalition would have liked to have made this presentation to the Parliament in a Matter of Special Public Importance debate, we will not have that opportunity, so we raise it now during this Matters of Public Interest debate. The member for Western Downs will also make a contribution and, because time does not allow further contributions this morning, tonight in the Adjournment debate the member for Mooloolah will speak on the issue. Members of the coalition feel very strongly about the issue. We do not raise it in order to score political points. We beseech the Government to look at the submission objectively and to recognise the weight of opinion that is now being expressed in regard to that dump site. That weight of opinion is not to the effect that the landfill is absolutely secure in terms of the aquifer underneath.

Pasture Watch; Landcare

Ms POWER (Mansfield) (11.30 a.m.): On 3 September, at Rochedale State High School, I had the pleasure to co-launch Pasture Watch while the Minister for Primary Industries, the Honourable Ed Casey, was at Pimlico State High School in Townsville. The day was to celebrate the second National Landcare Day. Last year's National Landcare Day was a great success in focusing media and community attention on Landcare nationally and at the local level. After working with the Department of Primary Industries on the Landcare program for the mulga areas of south-west Queensland, I was pleased to participate in the launch of Pasture Watch in my own electorate at Rochedale State High School, whose achievements in agricultural science are well recognised. The success of the program relies on community involvement, both in rural and urban areas. The extension of the Landcare program into Pasture Watch for schools strengthens the work of the network. The national Landcare group now numbers some 1 600 and its members make up 25 per cent of the farming community.

Queensland has 120 Landcare groups undertaking a diverse range of activities, including erosion control, property management planning, woody weed control, rangeland and other pasture management programs, salinity control and water quality monitoring. The number of Landcare groups undertaking activities in urban areas is also growing rapidly. I understand that a recent urban Landcare seminar attracted many people who, although they did not call themselves Landcare groups, were

undertaking Landcare activities in urban areas.

The Goss Government is committed to Landcare. From the 1993-94 Budget, about \$2.6m has been allocated for Landcare activities, including land conservation planning and extension. In addition, this Government has provided a further \$561,000 this year as part of an allocation of \$1.5m over the next three years to enhance the Landcare and catchment management activities. National Landcare Day is aimed at promoting the success of the Landcare movement and letting urban people know that the care of our land, water and other biological resources is the most important environmental issue facing Australia today. History will show this to be the most important community movement of the nineties.

One such Landcare issue is native pasture health. Australia has the largest area of native pasture land of any nation in the world, and Queensland has the largest area of native pasture of all the Australian States. Eighty-seven per cent of Queensland's land area is native pasture, and about half of this area is degraded in some way. Nature pasture ecosystems—grasses, woodlands, herbs, etc.—are important from an economic, ecological and social perspective. However, the community as a whole knows little about them.

Landcare is not an exercise of laying blame. The action research education program that I launched with the Minister on 3 September will help those who participate better understand and appreciate native pastures. Pasture Watch has been initiated as part of the decade of Landcare plan. Pasture Watch encourages students, land-holders and community groups to learn from each other by working together. It provides for a study of an important ecosystem within the Australian environment. Pasture Watch also provides opportunities for students to communicate with other students and land-holders outside their own region, thus encouraging good relations between rural and urban schools. Those involved in the Pasture Watch program include Department of Primary Industries land conservation officers, with national Landcare program support; other DPI groups, including drought and pasture management; and the Department of Education, including personnel and teachers from schools around the State.

By participating in Pasture Watch, groups of students, land-holders and DPI support personnel will focus on understanding native pasture ecosystems—the relationship

between vegetation, climate, soils and land use. This will be done through classroom and field activities. During the launch on 3 September, we were treated to a range of those activities. Even in the limited space of Rochedale State High School, we could see variations of vegetation, soil and land use. Hopefully, the students will widen their experiences with other farming areas in the Rochedale region. Each school or class will be linked with a land-holder on whose property the field work can be conducted. Participating schools will receive a free copy of both the classroom and field activities books and satellite imagery. They will also be given assistance to find a land-holder interested in a Pasture Watch partnership, as well as in-service training. A nominated officer from each DPI region will be the contact point for teachers seeking assistance with any component of the program.

To date, approximately 60 schools from Atherton to Boulia and Goondiwindi wish to be involved. Participating schools have been sent the resource package. Although it was originally intended for only secondary students, such interest has developed that a number of primary schools are also participating. Discussions are also being held with distance education schools to make any modifications necessary so that remote families can also participate in Pasture Watch.

Also celebrating National Landcare Day were 45 western Queensland School of the Air Year 5 students. The students, who were participating in a special session, went out the day before and, using the principles set out in the Pasture Watch program, recorded what they saw in their back paddock. The students discussed on air what they found and related that information to land management. They will be encouraged to express their ideas further through poetry and drawing. What an exciting change it will be to see young people actually analysing the land on which they live, and reporting on it at school. I think that it changes one's whole perspective if school becomes so relevant that it is related to one's backyard.

I was particularly pleased to see both rural and urban schools participate in the launch of Pasture Watch, thus creating the linkages necessary between urban and rural communities. For too long, we have had the attitude that those who live east of the Great Divide are different from those who live west of the Great Divide. At the end of the day, Landcare management will rely on everybody who lives in Queensland and Australia, not just those who live east of the divide or west of

the divide. Charters Towers State High School and the Mount Carmel College at Charters Towers were linked with Pimlico State High School for the launch activities in Townsville.

As I mentioned earlier, Landcare will be recognised in the future as a major achievement for the nineties. Its success will rely on community involvement and the participation of young people. The launch on 3 September of Pasture Watch was another demonstration of this Government's commitment, as well as that of the community and youth, to Landcare. My thanks go to all those involved in the launch to further the cause of Landcare in our vast State. I thank the Department of Primary Industries, which was well represented at the launch. Those officers demonstrated their commitment and their interest in their department and also in the future by attending to give support to the students. I thank the Queensland Landcare Council, which was represented by its Chairman, Jock Douglas. Jock, who comes from Roma, has a special interest in land management issues, having lived on the land for many years. It was a very useful exercise to have Jock in attendance at the launch. He represented the link between urban and rural areas. He was able to talk to the students about his experiences in the Roma district compared with the farming experiences in Rochedale. Having observed farming practices in both areas, I think that they are quite different.

Mrs Woodgate interjected.

Ms POWER: Just a little. I want to particularly place on record my congratulations to the principal, staff and students of Rochedale State High School. It is very easy to criticise schools and young people. However, I believe that Rochedale State High School meets its commitments and takes on all challenges. Rochedale prides itself on being a very caring school, and that was certainly demonstrated on the day. We were out in the field under a mango tree and, in the background, we were waiting for one of the goats to deliver kids. I have been warned never to share the stage with animals or children. I did both on that day, but it was certainly a pleasurable experience.

Mr FitzGerald: They might have the same policy in reverse.

Ms POWER: They may. I want to also place on record my thanks and the thanks of the Departments of Education and Primary Industries to Melva Hobbs, a science master who is on secondment from the Department of Education to the Department of Primary

Industries to produce the school programs. I am sure that the success of the whole program will lie with the enthusiasm that Melva Hobbs brings from the Department of Education to Primary Industries, particularly in the areas of Landcare and Pasture Watch.

Gurulmundi Toxic Waste Dump

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Western Downs) (11.40 a.m.): My colleague the honourable member for Burnett has just advised the House that an independent expert in geology questions the suitability of the landfill site at Gurulmundi. Today, I want to question why this Government is not prepared to put the project on hold, when an opinion exists that the landfill is likely to fail. I want to inform the House also that an alternate process called ecologic has been developed. This process can treat the type of toxic wastes destined for Gurulmundi.

In August this year, I wrote to Mr Michael Kinnane, Director of the CHEM Unit, asking him to advise me why he asserts that this ecologic waste disposal process is, in his words, "untried and unproven". It is the hope of many people that a safer alternative to the Gurulmundi landfill can be found. Ecologic appears to be such an alternative. I am in possession of letters from the owners of this process, Environmental Solutions International Limited, written both before and after I wrote to Mr Kinnane. I am in possession also of some press clippings relating to the same issue written since I wrote to Mr Kinnane. I table those documents.

From that material, several points need to be made. On the one hand, Mr Kinnane claims that the ecologic process has not been granted a formal approval by the United States Environmental Protection Authority, the Government environmental authority of the USA. He claims that no formal analytical tests or approval will be available until November 1993. On the other hand, Mr Trevor Bridle, the technical director of the firm which developed ecologic, wrote to the *Courier-Mail* on 26 August and to me on 6 September asserting that the process is now ready for commercial use. Either way, rather than take even the most remote chance that the Great Artesian Basin will be permanently contaminated, why would the Government not put the use of the Gurulmundi landfill on hold for a few short months until the results of more exhaustive tests on the ecologic process will be available from the authority in the USA?

I remind honourable members that the new process—this alternative to landfill—can

destroy the waste completely, and it can be done on site where the toxic wastes are generated. Any alternative process that can save the Great Artesian Basin from any risk is surely worth a three-month delay.

My second point is that claims have been made that the cost of the ecologic process may well be excessive. Alderman Patricia Vaughan of the Brisbane City Council and that council's representatives on the Gurulmundi Landfill Management Committee said—

"It is pointless using alternative technology which may price generators"—
that means generators of the waste—
"out of using it."

Her comments have been answered. Mr Trevor Bridle, technical director of the ecologic process, had this to say in the *Toowoomba Chronicle* on 6 September 1993—

"The ecologic costs are very comparable, and may even be cheaper than the proposed cost of waste disposal at Gurulmundi.

Documentation from the Brisbane City Council indicates that disposal costs at the Willawong liquid waste treatment plant vary from \$2.36 a litre for pesticide wastes to \$4.74 a litre for halogenated solvent.

By contrast all charges for treatment of pesticides and solvent wastes via ecologic would likely be about .60 cents a litre."

If there is a chance that significant savings can be made, would it not be worth waiting until November?

The third point I wish to make is that Mr Kinnane, Director of the CHEM Unit, claims that the ecologic process would need to be commercially viable. He questions whether the ecologic plant, with a capacity of 10 to 15 tonnes per day, could successfully cope with the waste stream at Willawong. I again quote the words of Mr Trevor Bridle on ecologic—

"The 25 tonne per day ecologic plant used during the USEPA audit in Michigan is a full scale plant.

This plant has a capacity of 25 TPD of contaminated soil and about 10 TPD of aqueous waste. Dr Bill Razzell of the Brisbane City Council told me"—

that is Mr Bridle—

"that 1500 tonnes per year of pesticides, paint and solvent waste (at roughly 5 per cent organic content) require disposal."

That is disposed of in Brisbane. Mr Bridle stated further—

“The existing ecologic plant can be used to dispose of their wastes”—

the Brisbane wastes—

“and would dispose of this in less than six months . . .”

So you can see, Mr Speaker, that Mr Kinnane’s claims have been disproved.

Mrs Bird: You have got no proof. You have just got hearsay.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I remind the honourable member that I have just tabled the documents. The ecologic plant—a plant that would not put the Great Artesian Basin at risk—is capable of handling these toxic wastes.

I turn to my fourth point. In an article in the *Chinchilla News* on 2 September 1993, Mr Kinnane went to great lengths to discredit the ecologic process. I have already tabled assurances from people who claim that his criticisms are baseless. In that article in the *Chinchilla News*, he raised a further point about which I wish to inform this House. Mr Kinnane claimed that ecologic represents new technology which uses hydrogen at very high temperatures—850 degrees celsius—and produces methane gas. He claimed that occupational safety aspects would need to be considered. So what! What is new? I would bet London to a brick that occupational safety aspects have to be considered in hundreds of industrial processes every day of the year. Honourable members should note that he said “would need to be considered”. He did not say that the problem was insurmountable. In fact, he did not say that it was even a problem. I suspect that Mr Kinnane used those words as a lame excuse.

That raises the point: is Mr Kinnane more intent on discrediting the alternative ecologic process and more intent on defending the decision to build the landfill at Gurulmundi than he is on ensuring that the best available process is used? I can appreciate that this ecologic process has been developed since the landfill decision was taken. I can appreciate that millions of dollars have already been spent in digging the hole at Gurulmundi and in preparing the site for the receipt of waste in October. But I cannot accept that the process is unworthy of close and careful scrutiny. I cannot accept that it is not possible to delay using the landfill until the results of the full analytical tests of the USEPA become available in November.

I remind honourable members that there is no ironclad guarantee that this landfill will not fail. When the matter was debated in this House in 1990, the then Minister, Neville Warburton, refused to give a guarantee that it would not leak. Mr Slack told this House earlier today that an independent expert has found serious fault with the landfill site. This expert has a detailed knowledge of his area of interest and, more importantly, he offers an independent opinion. Surely, if an expert has serious doubts, it is absolutely ludicrous to use the landfill before ecologic, the cheaper and safer alternative, is assessed and these doubts about the landfill are fully investigated by another independent expert.

My final plea to the backbench members of the Government is: they have the chance to ensure that the Great Artesian Basin is not put at risk. If they sit on their hands and do nothing, they may well make a mistake that will haunt them forever.

I wish to quote from the Hazelhurst report commissioned by EARC in April 1993—

“On 8 February 1989, the Crown Solicitor forwarded advice to the Director-General of the Premier’s Department that statutory authority would ordinarily confer immunity from legal liability, except in circumstances of negligence causing loss or damage as a result of the storage or escape of hazardous waste, and that failure on the part of a government, local authority or other authority to ensure that ‘the storage facility is as safe as current scientific knowledge and engineering expertise can make it’ would expose the parties to liability. The advice cited Fleming on Torts, 7th Edition (1987) at p. 320:

The statutory immunity is lost if the grantee fails in his duty of care to avoid all unnecessary harm. He must observe the strictest safety standards, proportioned to the high degree of risk involved with respect to the construction, management and possible improvement of the plant; and, to this end, is expected to avail himself of all accessible scientific aid, including independent experts.

The advice went on to state:

It . . . would not take very much to convince a Court that if a safe alternative method had been available, even though considerably more expensive, and it was not used, then the person storing the

waste should be held liable in negligence.”

Honourable members should ponder that statement. That is advice from the Crown Solicitor.

I urge backbench members to talk to their Cabinet colleagues, and to reconsider our request that until such time as ecologic is properly assessed in the United States in November, this project be put on hold.

Mr Budd: How far did you go to find a study when it was going to be put at Redbank?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: That is another issue. Time expired.

Gurulmundi Toxic Waste Dump

Mrs WOODGATE (Kurwongbah) (11.50 a.m.): As the State Government's representative on the Gurulmundi tripartite committee, I could not let this opportunity pass without making a few comments about the remarks made by the honourable members for Burnett and Western Downs. I want to address a couple of points made by the honourable member for Burnett. I really took exception to his statement that the State Government is fobbing off that new scientific study. The State Government would love to have a look at Dr Senior's study.

On 18 June, the chairperson of the Gurulmundi tripartite committee wrote to the PATCH people asking for a copy of the study so that it could be studied and assessed. It was no surprise to receive a reply from the PATCH people to the effect that we were not allowed to have a look at that report. Last Friday, in my electorate office at Strathpine, I was visited by a couple of people from PATCH, namely, Mr Jim Richards and Mr David Hinds. They brought the reports along. I asked them to leave the reports with me, which they refused to do. All I was allowed to do was photocopy the covers of those two reports. I do not know how I could possibly have studied two large reports in the 20 minutes that were allocated for those people, who were 40 minutes late. That is why we had only 20 minutes of the allocated hour.

I gave those people a personal guarantee that, if they left the reports with me for a week, I would have those reports assessed by an independent person. At that stage, I did not know whom I meant, but I gave the undertaking that I would contact the university and speak to people in the CHEM Unit and around the ridges to arrange an

independent assessment of the report. They were quite happy to take that back to the PATCH people, which they did.

On Monday of this week, surprise, surprise! I received a letter from PATCH to the effect that they had declined my offer and that I was not allowed access to those reports. I do not know how the honourable member for Burnett can say that the State Government is fobbing off those reports when we cannot even get a look at them—which we want to do. I said to them, “Get the Opposition to table them in the House so that we can have a look at them.” That offer was also declined.

As to the rocks that those people claim to have collected at the site—we have not been able to ascertain where those rocks came from. When I was at Miles earlier this year, it was put to me by officials on site that the rocks were taken from the top of the rim. The PATCH people claim that they came from the bottom of the rim. We do not know.

Mr Littleproud: They came from the various stages down the side.

Mrs WOODGATE: Nobody has been able to explain this to me satisfactorily, but I am open to suggestions. In the letter that I received from PATCH about the independent assessment, another reason given for knocking it back was that Dr Senior and Dr Graham have no peers, so there is nobody to assess their statements. I doubt whether we can take PATCH seriously.

The landfill at Gurulmundi is secure. It will commence operations in October. Nobody could deny that it has been built to the highest international standards following a comprehensive impact assessment study in which a range of critical issues were considered. Two very important conclusions emanated from that study, namely, that there is no threat to the Great Artesian Basin or the local water supplies. The point that is often missed by members opposite and the PATCH people is that the waste destined for disposal at Gurulmundi is solid, treated waste from the manufacture of paints, pesticides and solvents. No liquid waste is being buried at Gurulmundi.

Mr Littleproud: It is generated and then transported.

Mrs WOODGATE: The honourable member had his chance. He should give a lady a break. The waste will be treated at Willawong and placed in solid form before being transported to Gurulmundi. I emphasise that the waste will be solid waste from paints, pesticides and solvents. The site will not

accept PCBs or radioactive waste. Lots of claims have been made about the so-called alternative technology called ecologic. Some people, including the PATCH people in Miles, have suggested that ecologic is a proper alternative to Gurulmundi. Following comments made by the member for Western Downs, I shall speak briefly about the ecologic processes.

At this point in time, ecologic is not an alternative to the solidification and interment of the paints, pesticides and solvent waste at the Gurulmundi secure landfill. Two years down the track, that may prove to be the case. But I must point out that the tests carried out in the United States have not been carried out on our types of paints, pesticides or solvent wastes. They have been carried out on other types of waste, not the types of wastes that are being processed at Willawong.

Not one commercial ecologic plant has been built by Eli-Ecologic anywhere in the world, including the United States and Canada, where the technology is being developed. It is not an approved technology in the United States for the destruction of any particular type of waste. It has been assessed by the United States Environment Protection Agency, but it has not yet issued its technical and commercial analysis report for the pilot trials.

As the honourable member for Western Downs would know, under the terms of the Gurulmundi Secure Landfill Agreement Act of 1992, the landfill management committee is obliged to consider alternative technologies at regular intervals. In fact, earlier this year, a report on known alternative technologies was presented to the landfill management committee by Dr Bill Razzell of the BCC Scientific Services Branch. The time is not right yet. I am not saying, "Throw it out with the bathwater." Two years down the track, it may be that this is the way to go, but not at the present time.

Eli-Ecologic has not demonstrated, even in its pilot trials, that the ecologic technology will satisfactorily destroy the chemical contaminants within PPS-type wastes destined for solidification and secure landfill at Gurulmundi. The technology has been trialled on PCB oils, water contaminated with PCBs and sediments contaminated with coal tars containing PAHs. It has not been trialled on our types of wastes. It has not been demonstrated to be a suitable mechanism for the destruction of every type of aqueous waste just because it appears to be a technically feasible process for PCB-

contaminated water. Success of the ecologic technology to process particular aqueous waste streams will depend upon its ability to chemically destroy each of the contaminants present and convert them into innocuous by-products.

I want to speak in defence of the CHEM Unit, for which I have the highest regard. The personnel of the CHEM Unit have acted in a most professional manner ever since Gurulmundi has been on the drawing board. After speaking with me, Mr Mike Kinnane, the director of the CHEM Unit, took it upon himself to ring the United States twice—I think it was two weeks ago, but I am not sure of the date. Mr Kinnane has issued me with details of the relevant conversations about that matter.

I have nothing to hide on the committee. I am more than satisfied with what has come from conversations with the USEPA in the United States. I appreciate Mr Kinnane taking his own time late at night, because of the time difference, to sit up until half past 10 on a couple of occasions and spend 45 minutes on the telephone to get to the bottom of all the claims and counterclaims. I have studied them all and I am satisfied.

Members of this House must remember that ecologic is not a proven and available technology for the destruction of PPS wastes. Technical staff of the CHEM Unit, the Department of Environment and Heritage and the BCC all state that, from their experience, it will take Eli-Ecologic Canada and ESI Perth two years to develop the process to the stage at which it could be proven to be an appropriate technology and locally available in Australia. I do not know about you, Mr Speaker, but I am not prepared to sit down and wait, put Gurulmundi on hold for two years and back it up at Willawong.

Mr Ardill: Nor am I.

Mrs WOODGATE: Nor is the member for Archerfield. We are not going to put everything on hold. This has all been stirred up by a report commissioned by the PATCH people, which they refuse to release to the Government. I am informed that they gave copies of the report to the Opposition. I understand that they got a pretty brief look at it, also. As I said, all I could photocopy were the covers. They said that, if I wanted to check it out, I should ring the authors and talk to them. That is no way to assess a document. I do not have the necessary technical expertise. I gave an undertaking to check it out and find independent people who would give me an honest appraisal of it.

I thought that the PATCH people might have taken up my offer. But by Monday, they had attended their PATCH meeting and decided that they want it put on hold; they want it brought to the Bar of the House. If no-one is allowed to look at it, how is it going to get to the Bar of the House? Is it going to be wrapped in brown paper? Will it be tabled without anyone looking at it? I would love to have a look at it. I would also love to give it to the CHEM Unit, Water Resources, Primary Industries, experts at the university and somebody in Canberra. I gave the undertaking, but I have been knocked back. I do not know what more I can do.

Eli-Ecologic does have sole responsibility for developing and proving the viability of the new technology for the destruction of particular waste. The CHEM Unit is not responsible for developing and proving emerging technologies for the commercial benefit of any profit-making private enterprise, whether it be Australian or from overseas. The member for Western Downs and I have been talking about this, because we are concerned about what is happening there. I have nothing but admiration for the shire chairman and the councillors of the Murilla Shire.

Time expired.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 2 September (see p. 4190).

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise—Leader of the Opposition) (12 noon): Never before has a Government spent so much but delivered so little. Never before has a Government deceived so many for so long as the warning bells of financial disaster ring loudly in our ears. I ask the people of Queensland to judge this Government on its record; to cut through the glossy PR; to do more than applaud this Budget after one cursory glance; to read between the lines; to ask themselves one simple question: are we any better off today than we were on 2 December 1989? Has the extra \$1,700 that a family pays to run the State been put to good use? Has it improved their standard of living? Does one get more for one's Government dollar? For so many and, in particular, the record 172 000 unemployed, the answer is, "No!"

The 1993-94 Budget cements the Goss Government's reputation as far and away the biggest spending State Government in the country—a reputation firmly established

between the 1990-91 and 1992-93 Estimates and the massive 20.6 per cent increase in total outlays; a record of spending which has exceeded even the disgraced Labor Government in Victoria which, in its death throes under Joan Kirner, could manage to increase its spending by only 20.4 per cent; a record which compares with a 3.4 per cent increase in New South Wales, a 5.6 per cent increase in South Australia and a 8 per cent increase in Western Australia; a record which, in the last financial year, saw spending increase by more than 9 per cent on an actual-to-actual basis. Nine per cent in one year! That is more than most other States managed in two years. By any measure, and in light of the Government's promises not to introduce new taxes and to keep tax rises to the rate of inflation, this is a massive and unsustainable increase. It is one that over the long term Queensland can neither afford nor will its Government, or its Treasurer, be able to deliver.

In this the 1993-94 Budget, we again see a substantial increase in outlays—a massive \$570m increase in recurrent spending alone. On an Estimate-to-estimate basis, the increase is over \$430m, or 4.5 per cent, while it shrinks to 2.5 per cent only in light of a comparison between 1993-94 Estimates and 1992-93 actuals. Given this Government's abysmal Budget forecasts over its three previous Budgets, one would be a fool to believe that either of these spending targets will be met. They will quite likely be exceeded by tens of millions of dollars. Take, for instance, last year's Government forecast of a 6 per cent, or \$179m increase, in taxes, fees and fines. After some post-Budget—or at least post-drop the Budget and run to the polls—tinkering, income in these areas was actually up over \$311m, or 10.5 per cent.

While the Parliament should not expect the Treasurer to estimate to the dollar, it does deserve better than a \$132m discrepancy. With the precedent for hidden rubbery figures now part of the Budget equation, we can expect to see much the same phenomenon to develop at some stage this financial year. In any event, there is nothing surer than, by the end of this financial year, we will have seen a growth in outlays over the life of this Government of around \$2 billion, or 25 per cent. That is a staggering and unsustainable rate of expenditure—three and four times the rate of growth in many other States. It begs the serious question: "Why are they doing it?"

If one believes the Labor Party, Queensland was in desperate need of a massive injection of funds into the public

sector post-1989, because of the Labor claim that the previous Government had neglected core services; that somehow Queensland's teachers, nurses and police enjoyed conditions equivalent to those in some Third World country. That is a true piece of Labor mythology which fails to stand up to even a cursory examination. I refer honourable members to the Commonwealth Government's own Economic Planning and Advisory Committee report of 1990 into the relationship between spending and service delivery. It shows, emphatically, that Queensland's lower levels of expenditure did not, in fact, reduce the standard of service delivery at the point of service delivery. Services provided by the former National Party Government were at least equal and, in most cases, superior to those in other States on account of superior management. These are not my words; these are the words of the Commonwealth Government's Economic Planning Advisory Committee.

The reality is that the Government's effort to justify increases in spending was simply a variation on a theme long established by the Labor Party. What the Treasurer wanted was a peg to hang it on, so he dreamt up the peg of neglect. What he was chasing were not remedies for neglect, but the spending levels established by other Labor Governments in other States. The achievement of Labor in Queensland would be that he would bring our spending levels up to those of the other Labor States.

Not one word—no mention whatsoever was made—of the concepts of service delivery or value for money. No, this Labor Government wanted, above all else, to increase spending to national levels on the assumption that if it spends as much as they do, then it must be as good as they are. I for one believe that Queenslanders have a habit of doing things better and of being able, through a history of sound and prudent management, to deliver services cheaper than they are delivered in the other States. I for one do not wish to seek out as some sort of goal the sort of discredited spending levels which sent Victoria broke, and almost crippled Western Australia and South Australia.

Mrs Edmond interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: For the benefit of the member who is interjecting, and other Government members, I point out that it seems that neither do some of the Premier's closest advisers. Along with Peter Coaldrake—and Government members like him—David Shand was one of the founding

commissioners of the Premier's own Public Sector Management Commission. When called on to examine the first term of Labor in Queensland, Mr Shand, the Premier's own appointment to the PSMC, said—

“When the Government first came to office there was a great rush to get spending up to national average levels—particularly in the areas of education and health.”

He went on to say—

“They weren't necessarily clear what they wanted to spend the money on, the important thing was spending up to the national level, and that was particularly the case I might say in the area of health.”

The core of the message from Labor's own Dr Shand is worth repeating and repeating—

“They weren't . . . clear about what they wanted to spend the money on, the important thing was . . . spending . . .”

High spending of itself means nothing. The history of our country in the 1980s of debt and bankruptcy, of failure after failure, should have taught this Government a lesson. In Western Australia and Victoria, we have Governments trying to resurrect their public economies from ruin. For those States, it is going to be a long and painful job.

When we spend up big, we have to pay for it somehow. One of this Government's main claims is that Queensland can afford to chase these levels of spending because it does not have the debt of the other States. As the Budget papers indicate, the percentage of Queensland's receipts dedicated to debt servicing is just over 1 per cent, compared to almost 25 per cent in Victoria. That sound position, inherited by the Treasurer, is based on a number of elements of good government established by successive coalition Governments in this State.

That just did not happen, and it just did not happen after 1989. These included the full funding of public sector superannuation, the full funding of the Workers Compensation Fund and full funding of third party insurance. But the thin line between holding it together and having it all fall down around the Government is getting thinner and thinner with each and every Labor Budget. Keeping expenditure under control—at levels the State could afford and also enabling prudent savings—is the very basis of this State's low debt. Once people start to turn that situation around, they are heading for trouble. And as

with much of this Government's management style, the attack on debt is being done, in part, with mirrors.

The Treasurer himself put the attack on debt in perspective in his Budget Speech when he said that the State will continue to have debt and to incur debt. It most certainly is accruing debt, and there are a number of unsettling examples. One is the highly unstable HOME Scheme which was brought to Queensland by the very man who visited the same disaster on New South Wales. Each Budget from this Government—except the current one—has provided \$500m for this totally discredited program. This year, the figure is some \$240m. Technically, the Government can claim that HOME loans secure the debt. The experience in New South Wales suggests that protection in this case is highly technical. In any event, what the HOME Scheme proves is that this Government is prepared to finance its massive expenditure program on the basis of debt.

Another myth of this Government has been the claim that there will be no increases in the tax burden. The tobacco tax levy was perhaps the most indicative of the Government's slyness in its approach to the revenue issue. The Government dumped the previous Budget in the House on 24 August last year, and announced an election and a leap in the tobacco levy in one breath. Tobacco receipts were listed, quite dishonestly and quite blatantly, with the same estimate as on 24 August—\$174m. That was, of course, about \$97m off the pace. The levy actually brought in about \$270m. The gaming machine levy also brought in \$46m last year compared with around \$4m the year before, and will bring in around \$60m next year. With the fees on rentals, pokies will become a \$100m boost to the State Budget this financial year.

To help it tread water against these spending increases, the Government has had the luxury of massive increases in revenue through tobacco and poker machines. The one-off injection got it out of trouble this time. Next year, it will not be there, but the spending will be. It is little wonder then that the Government has now floated the idea of betting on a couple of flies crawling up a wall. Members of the Government are so desperate for money, they have propped up successive Budgets with massive increases in gambling—massive increases which, socially, are costing this State dearly. And not content with damage inflicted already, they now seek

to create new markets and new revenue measures within the TAB.

The No. 1 priority facing Governments is the need to create jobs. Last Thursday, Queensland posted a record level of unemployment—levels never seen in this State under Governments of any political persuasion.

Mr Beanland: Shameful!

Mr BORBIDGE: Shameful, as the member for Indooroopilly suggests. On that day, 172 100 Queenslanders were unable to find work, which is an increase of 77 300. Unemployment is 81.5 per cent higher than it was when Labor came to office in 1989. That is not a bad record. I hope members of the Government appreciate how they are looking after the workers and the unemployed. There is record unemployment in this State. It is up 81.5 per cent, and that is a record in the history of Queensland. Youth unemployment now stands at 31.5 per cent, which means it is up a massive 13 percentage points on its December 1989 level.

Mr Stoneman: They should hang their heads in shame.

Mr BORBIDGE: As the member suggests, they should hang their heads in shame.

An Opposition member: But they have no shame.

Mr BORBIDGE: I am reminded that they have no shame. Unemployment represents a crisis for this Government, and its response to date has been totally inadequate. In previous Budgets and again in this Budget, the Government has used its Capital Works Program as the centrepiece—as the linchpin—of its job creation strategy. That represented a significant turnaround for the member for Cairns—the Treasurer—and other members of the caucus who, in 1990, strongly criticised the need for such a Capital Works Program. There is a need for the words of the Treasurer to be repeated in this place today, as they go to the core of the managerial incompetence of this Government. In response to calls by the member for Burdekin for an increased Capital Works Program, the Treasurer said in November 1990—

Mr Stoneman: Remember this?

Mr BORBIDGE: Does the Treasurer remember this? He stated—

“Other Governments have tried to do that—particularly those in Western Australia and Victoria. Stimulation of the

economy from the public sector does not work and is not the way that this Government will run the State."

Those are the Treasurer's own words, but he got better! He went on to state—

"These sort of artificial subsidies—to stimulate business—may achieve something in the short term, but in the long term they will simply lead the State into trouble."

They are the very words out of the mouth of the very Treasurer who today claims the Capital Works Program to be the centrepiece of the Government's job creation strategy. In common with everything else it has touched, the Government's approach to capital works has been inconsistent, knee jerk and downright dishonest—I repeat, "downright dishonest"—and, above all else, it has failed. This claim is borne out when one considers the spiralling rate of unemployment.

This Budget contains the third alleged \$3 billion Capital Works Program. The truth, however, is that not one of the previous Capital Works Programs has reached this level. Despite all the promises, the ballyhoo and the chest-beating, we have not yet spent \$3 billion or anywhere near that amount! It is one of the great cons of Queensland politics, and I wager that we will not do it this year, either. These are the facts on capital works and this Government's dishonesty as revealed in its own Budget papers. In the Government's second Budget—after the Treasurer's spectacular backflip on economic theory—we saw an estimate for a \$3.009 billion Capital Works Program. We actually got a \$2.7 billion Capital Works Program—\$300m short. When half a billion dollars that was directed to the Government's bodgie HOME Scheme is added to that, the \$3 billion program becomes a \$2.2 billion program.

People should then consider the fact, as presented in this Budget, that last year's Capital Works Program was underspent by \$411m, which leaves a genuine Capital Works Program for 1992-93 of only \$2.3 billion. The bottom line is that capital works spending under this Government has increased over 1989-90 levels by around \$100m, or about 5 per cent. In other words, it does not even cater for inflation. It will then come as no surprise—or should come as no surprise—that the Government has also sought to con the people of Queensland in relation to its own budgetary commitment to capital works. State-based commitments to capital works under this Government have been in steady decline. The State-based contribution in 1990-91 was

\$1.249 billion, or 53 per cent of the total. In 1991-92, it was \$1.215 billion, or 43 per cent of the alleged total program, and then in 1992-93 it dropped even further to \$945m, or only 29 per cent of the supposed \$3 billion-plus program. Only in 1993-94 do we actually see a small increase in the State-based commitment to capital works, but it still comes in at less than one-third of the total program. It is little wonder that Queensland continues to post record levels of unemployment and that young people are still unable to find work.

Mr De Lacy: You've got your figures wrong.

Mr BORBIDGE: If I have my figures wrong, then the Treasurer has got his Budget wrong because the figures are out of his Budget papers. I would put my reputation above his any day on who fudges figures. The Treasurer is the champion of fudge. He is the champion of deceit and he is the champion con man when it comes to misrepresenting the facts about the true financial situation in Queensland.

The tragedy is that young people are still unable to find work. That jobs tragedy continues. Another fact, according to the ABS, is that since the Goss Government was elected in 1989, it has created only 42 600 jobs—mostly part-timers, I might add. So the Capital Works Program has had a minimal effect on unemployment in Queensland. There are three primary reasons for that. Firstly, the program was instituted too late—long after the recession began and far too late to have any significant impact at the bottom end of the cycle. About the only employment generated so far has been in the architectural and engineering fields; it has yet to reach the job-intensive industries. Secondly, as I pointed out previously, the Government's commitment to the fund has been inadequate and second rate. Thirdly, the program has been poorly directed and managed by a Government with a great ability to misallocate scarce resources.

While jobs remain the Government's No. 1 priority, the crisis is that our State health system runs a close second. In health, the tragedy is that, for all of the money—for all of the \$700m—and for all of the 44 per cent increase in spending on health under the Government, the Queensland health system is in crisis. The money is being spent, but nobody knows where it is being spent. Nobody seems to care. We have thousands more nurses but, as the AMA points out, they are not at the bedside. We have hundreds more bureaucrats but declining rates of surgery.

For the first time in the history of Queensland, we have a debate on a State Budget without a Minister in charge of the House. What a disgrace! Not one Minister is in the Parliament when the Budget is being debated—the first day of the debate on the Appropriation Bill. What a disgrace! What an absolute disgrace! There is no Government control of the House. The Speaker has left. What a disgrace! The Minister has left. For the first time in the history of Queensland—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Palaszczuk): Order! The House will come to order. The Leader of the Opposition will continue.

Mr BORBIDGE: We have hundreds more bureaucrats but declining rates of surgery. Waiting lists have blown out from weeks or months to months or years. Welcome back, Keith, we are getting used to your being a dingo.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat.

Mr De Lacy interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will cease interjecting. I request that the Leader of the Opposition withdraw the unparliamentary term that he used previously.

Mr BORBIDGE: Certainly, Mr Deputy Speaker. Waiting lists have blown out from weeks or months to months or years. People are dying as they wait for the Government to get its health system in order. Those facts are now so well known and such a topic of daily attention that they barely need restating. I state them broadly and simply to add to the canvas of the Government's performance and to highlight the increasingly valid comparisons between the Government's performance in the nineties and that of its interstate mentors in the eighties. The Government has been intent on rapid and sustained growth in expenditure and, in common with its predecessors, the money is disappearing down a bureaucratic black hole. That disease is commonly referred to as bureaucratic blow-out, and the Treasurer has an overdose.

The Opposition has long maintained that, under the Government, too much money is going into the bureaucracy. In relation to health as much as any other area of Government, the proof of that is in the Budget. According to the Budget Estimates, administration of the health system this financial year will carry a cost of \$546.044m. In just four years, the cost of administering the Queensland health system will have increased by over \$130m. That is almost one-third more to run the bureaucracy, and the probability is

that the increase will be much higher by the end of the financial year because, last year, the cost of administration in health blew out by more than \$30m.

Angioplasties and accident and emergency services are being wound back. Hospitals were forced to close over Easter. However, the bureaucracy marches on and on and on. Let me give honourable members one other example of mismanagement in that crucial area of health care. If a Government is to staff a system as big as is Queensland Health, it needs a central plan, not 13 separate fiefdoms competing with each other to see which is the biggest region on the block.

In 1990-91, the Government missed its employment target in health by 364 people—not bad in a department that size. In 1991-92, it missed by 190—again, not bad. Last year, Queensland Health missed its employment target by almost 2 000! For better or worse, last year we were to see growth in the system. Through mismanagement and bungling, Queensland Health ended up 2 000 short. This year—or so we are told—we will see an additional 1 000 employees in Queensland Health. But who can believe it? What is the trend? Where is the system going? No-one seems to know! Worse still, no-one seems to care. I now move to the Queensland Ambulance Service.

Mr Beanland: Where they stole the money.

Mr BORBIDGE: Where the Government stole the money, as my friend reminds me. What a disgraceful mess the State Government has made of the once-proud Queensland Ambulance Service. It is a mess in which the entire Government is culpable, particularly the Premier, former Ministers Mackenroth and Warburton, and now the Minister for "Westwind", Mr Braddy. When the Government took over the Queensland Ambulance Service, it was a vibrant organisation doing a marvellous job servicing the people of Queensland. It harnessed the collective community-mindedness and local spirit of the State. People in the Ambulance Service took great pride in the fact that they charted their own destiny, and they usually did it well.

Now, some four years later, we have in ambulance services what has become the trademark signature of this Government—big bureaucracy, an incompetent Minister and nobody knowing where the money goes, or, in this case, where the money went. This year in the Budget, we see that the remaining

moneys from decades of community effort, which over time have totalled millions of dollars, now barely reach the \$2m mark. Two years ago, the Government garnished over \$44m from communities throughout the State. The Government closed down all of the accounts, took the money and, in true Labor tradition—the tradition of the true believers—spent it. We now have nothing short of an unmitigated disaster. The Government blew it.

The railroading of a former Ambulance Commissioner, Noel Gillard, and the standing down of the Director of Emergency Services, Howard Baker, on account of that mess is one of the Government's more infamous of its many acts of ducking for cover and of blaming someone else for its own shortcomings. It is on a par with a former Police Minister's demolition of former Police Commissioner Newnham.

The facts in the ambulance matter are that the Government forced the Queensland Ambulance Service to predicate its 1992-93 budget on draconian cuts in vehicles, manpower and services, and that was the conclusion that Mr Gillard reluctantly reached after studying the available money. The former Minister accepted that interpretation of the proposed budget. He accepted that the Ambulance Service was condemned to massive cuts by the budget, and he pushed that budget through. However, shortly before riding into the sunset, the Minister put the whole rationalisation plan on hold for further negotiations.

Mr Gillard and Mr Baker were left holding the baby. They had a budget predicated by the Government on savage cuts in the system; a budget that they could not institute because the Minister would not let them, because the Minister would not lead and because the Minister would not make a decision. So what were the men holding the baby supposed to do? They had to nip and tuck, like every other manager in the State had to do, after the Government did not pass its Budget until near the end of the last calendar year because it had an election in between, leaving the entire public sector to fly blind for half a financial year. Money originally meant for capital programs ended up in recurrent operations of the ambulance. That, allegedly, was the crime of Mr Gillard and Mr Baker. Confronted with a Minister who ducked for cover, they managed the affairs of the ambulance as best they could. Specifically, their crime, according to the Minister, was that they allocated moneys meant for capital programs to operational expenditure.

I ask honourable members to pause for just a moment to ponder on that point and to recollect. Last year, according to the Government, it had a \$3.2 billion Capital Works Program. It actually managed to spend around \$2.8 billion—or over \$400m below its target. One of the other victims of that underspending on capital works, where there was also a blow-out in recurrent expenditure, was, interestingly enough, another area of the member for Rockhampton's responsibilities. In fact, in the capital works arena, Mr Braddy's department—not just the ambulance but also the police department and some areas attached to the Attorney-General's responsibility—spent barely half its \$62.9m budget last year. The point is that if transferral of money set aside—or allegedly set aside—for capital works is a criterion for being sacked or being stood aside, as the Government lamely claims in the case of the Queensland Ambulance Service, there would not be a director-general left standing in the State after the overall Government performance on capital works last year.

It will not come as a surprise to learn that in this Budget there are reduced capital works allocations for the Queensland Ambulance Service and the Police Service. In other words, the Government's response to the failure of the Capital Works Program in the ambulance area last year, for whatever reason, is to cut it to ribbons this year—from \$10m to just under \$3m. There is also a tread-water budget for the ambulance overall in 1993-94, which further threatens its viability. The Estimate last year was for a total budget of \$115m, and this year it is \$114m. We see here further evidence of the global trend under this Government where, as a direct result of its policy framework, recurrent expenditure is growing at a cost to capital works.

In relation to the ambulance, we are told—in fact, the Treasurer even made reference to it in his speech, so it must be right—that the contribution from consolidated revenue to the ambulance this year will be up some \$15m and around 50 per cent. The increase is simply not apparent in the Budget, where we see recorded in the program statements an increase of only \$2.4m. The Government is fudging it again! Perhaps the Treasurer can explain where the extra \$13m or so is. I have heard reference only to concessions to pensioners on ambulance subscriptions as evidence of further Government support, and that is valued elsewhere in the Budget at just over half a million. Meanwhile, of course, we have an Ambulance Service which is becoming as

dysfunctional as the overall health system, and for precisely the same reason—a total inability on the part of this Government to manage money and to manage programs.

Ambulancemen, who have continued to do their duty despite these problems, are now cadging linen from hard-pressed hospitals and running out of petrol money. They are doing the best they can, despite their Minister and despite this Government, and now they are threatening strike action. Who can blame them? The experience of the Queensland Ambulance Service under this Government is another potent example of its overall inability to manage either money or human resources, and I spent considerable time on it today for that very reason.

Another area of justifiable unrest on the part of Queensland workers, on the basis of the performance of this Government, is within the Queensland education system. The reaction of teachers, parents and students to the Budget of course pre-dates the Budget, which brings to mind a phenomenon of which all honourable members should be very much aware as they consider this Budget. We are dealing, just as we did last year, and for almost precisely the same reasons, with a Budget in two parts. Last year, an election broke proper consideration of the Budget conveniently into two for political motives.

This year, for motives equally political, the Government sought to separate out what it perceived to be the bad news of the Budget from the Budget proper via the now infamous Cairns interim statement. That was the statement which maintained, quite dishonestly, as the Budget itself reveals, that the Government had suffered dreadfully at the hands of the Commonwealth at the Premiers Conference and would have to make a series of savage cuts. These included shutting down almost one-third of the Queensland rail system, as well as substantial cuts in education and health. I remind honourable members of the Cairns mini-Budget only to highlight the fact that the negatives of it must be considered in the context of the wider document now before us and the failings of that wider document, as well as to draw attention to education in particular.

We see in the Government's handling of the education system many of the same failings that afflict the health system, the ambulance system and most other public systems in this State. We see a great deal of money going nobody quite knows where. The Education Department budget this year is some \$460m—or just shy of 25 per cent larger

than it was as recently as 1990-91. The total Education budget is slightly in excess of half a billion dollars larger, in that same short space of time. But what have we got for the money? We have seen some worthwhile additions to school-based equipment, but we have not seen anywhere near \$460m worth of value for money. We have seen exactly the same thing develop as we have seen develop in Health. We have seen the trends. We have seen spending sky-rocket with insufficient attention paid to where that money is going. We have seen a massive growth in the bureaucracy, in much the same ratio that we have seen in Health.

In 1990-91, it took \$134m to administer the Department of Education. The Estimate in this Budget for 1993-94 is \$232m—a growth in the bureaucracy of almost \$100m, or over 70 per cent in four years. That is where the Government's record spending is going—into the bureaucracy; into the fat cats; and into the red tape—the “King of the Red Tape”. Just as with Health, we also saw a blow-out in excess of \$30m in administration costs last year in the Education Department.

The various fiefdoms that have emerged in Education as a result of regionalisation are vying with the various fiefdoms in Health under the same dysfunctional, discredited approach to managing the taxpayers' money. It is not the Government's money; it is not my money. It is the money of the taxpayers of Queensland. They are seeing how many of their bureaucrats they can turn into fat cats. Meanwhile, the Education Minister, like the Health Minister and particularly like the Premier, simply and stupidly believe that, because they have increased spending much closer to national average levels—the levels that sent other States broke—they are doing a good job. Have they not learned a thing? Have they not learned anything from the failed Labor administrations of Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia, Tasmania and Western Australia—the great heroes and role models of this Government?

Mr Santoro: “What Cain did for Victoria, we're going to do for Queensland.”

Mr BORBIDGE: The member for Clayfield reminds me of the famous words of the Premier—“What John Cain did for Victoria, we're going to do for Queensland.” This Government is doing just that.

I want to deal with one other important area of this Budget. I am sticking to those areas that the Government has misguidedly prided itself on. I refer to the Government's record, exemplified in this Budget, in relation

to the Police Service. As with all the other areas the Government has prided itself on, we have seen a great deal of publicity, very little execution and a great many symptoms of very poor planning. This Budget suggests an increased allocation to police of some \$25m, or 5.4 per cent. The fault in that claim is that it is based on Estimate to Estimate. A bit more fudging of the figures by the "King of Fudge" who sits opposite! When one works from actual expenditure last year to Estimate, the increase is just 3 per cent which, even with low inflation, is no increase at all.

We see in this Budget a continuation of the decline in moneys allocated for public works—from last year's mythical \$26.1m to what will doubtless prove to be a mythical allocation this year of \$22.8m. We see not one extra policeman in this Budget, which is a continuation of one of the most painful of the cons perpetrated by this Government on the people of Queensland in the wake of the Fitzgerald report.

Mr Barton interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: The honourable member should listen to this. He might learn something. We were promised 1 200 extra police in the Government's first term, and although there is evidence that the total strength of the service grew by around 1 000 in that period, a look at the Budget papers reveals that, coming into the current financial year, the growth of on-the-street presence was minimal. As usual with this Government, the growth was in the bureaucracy. Almost all of those 1 000, according to the 1992-93 program Estimates, did not end up in the streets; they ended up in corporate services—in administration. In the areas of prevention and detection of offences—representing the on-street strength—there was to have been an actual decline, on the Government's estimate—

Mr De Lacy interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: These are the Treasurer's figures, which indicate that there was to have been an actual decline from 5 653 personnel to 5 568. This Budget, interestingly, makes it impossible to follow through those projections because the formatting of the police program has been turned on its head in this Budget. I wonder why we had to change the format. A cynic might suggest it is to hide what is going on. However, we give Mr O'Sullivan more credit than his Minister—a little more credit than the Treasurer—and take his promise to boost on-street presence at face value, at least for the

time being; but we are watching. Obviously, the commissioner has got his job cut out.

This Budget continues the attack on the rural lifeblood of the Queensland economy, an attack which has been ongoing since this Government was elected in 1989—the politics of division, the politics of hate, the politics of the city versus the country. The most obvious evidence of that attack was in the Interim Budget Statement which pronounced closure of almost one-third of the State's railway system, despite the written assurances of the Minister that no lines would be closed. Despite the Government's best efforts to back away from that move, there is little doubt that soon the Deputy Premier, in the hope that resistance would have died down and the anger would have subsided, will reannounce a number of closures. He should think again. So, too, should those rural leaders who so readily embraced this Budget—a Budget which again sees the dismantling of the Primary Industries Department, the once proud department that has been torn apart.

Mr Veivers: It has been gutted.

Mr BORBIDGE: A DPI budget which has been gutted, as my friend interjects, and which has not even moved while Government spending across-the-board under Labor has increased by 25 per cent—a Primary Industries Department which will have at a minimum 150 fewer people as a result of measures introduced in this Budget. If this is the Government's commitment to rural and regional Queensland, then it falls well short of the mark. I say to the people of rural Queensland, "Don't trust this Government when it comes to services to the bush!" It gives with one hand and takes plenty more with the other.

Mr Speaker, this Budget continues the direction established by this Government in its very first Budget. It is a Budget which further increases the gulf between the haves and the have-nots both inside Government and out. It is a Budget of massive growth in recurrent spending, and a Budget which further erodes the State's capital base. It is a big spending Budget from the last of the big spenders. Queenslanders have become too complacent when it comes to this Government and its record of economic management. We still are the best State. We always will be the best State. But the warning signs are there. The bells are ringing. We must not dismiss them.

The philosophy that this Government has brought to bear on this Budget does nothing—above all else—for the generation of the wellbeing of Queenslanders via that most

basic staple of all—a job. Where are the jobs in this Budget? Where are the jobs to be delivered by this Government? The Government's commitment to jobs is not worth the press release it is written on. And the proof is there for everybody to see. I hope that honourable members opposite will listen. They might enjoy this statistic, because we on this side feel that it is one of the most shameful indictments of their Government.

Mr Santoro: It is Labor's disgrace.

Mr BORBIDGE: It is Labor's disgrace. On each and every day of the 1 740 days that Wayne Goss has been in power, 45 Queenslanders have been shoved onto the end of a dole queue which stretches from Parliament House to the Gold Coast and back again. Today, there are 45 more unemployed. Tomorrow, there will be 45 more unemployed. The next day there will be 45 more unemployed. It has occurred on each and every day of the 1 740 days that they have been in Government. And what is the Government doing about it? It is going about building the biggest bureaucracy Australia has ever seen. It is boosting recurrent spending at a rate fast enough to make one's eyes water. It is cutting back on capital spending. It is increasing its tax take on business and ordinary Queensland families. It is taking from the poor through new and improved gambling methods.

Mr Santoro: Class warfare in reverse.

Mr BORBIDGE: As the member for Clayfield reminds me, it is class warfare in reverse. For four years this Government has been pulling the wool over the eyes of the people of Queensland by saying one thing and doing another. It is spending, because it says it has to spend. But it does not know what it is spending on. And it is spending in ways that will lead it to even greater levels of spending in the future. After 1 740 days of this Government, are the people of Queensland any better off? The Opposition says "No!"

Mr Veivers: Much worse off.

Mr BORBIDGE: As my friend interjects, they are much worse off. I acknowledge that this is a Budget which has been reasonably well received, but it is a Budget which will not stand the test of time.

Mr De Lacy: But you said that last year and the year before.

Mr BORBIDGE: I take the Treasurer's interjection because I want to remind him of his growing similarity to one discredited Rob Jolly in Victoria. While the Treasurer will no doubt bask in his editorial glory, I want for a

moment to take honourable members back to the fourth Budgets of Cain, Bannon and Burke. They are the Treasurer's heroes. He got them up to Queensland to campaign for him. Various political and economic commentators described those Budgets as "responsible", "competent", "frugal" and "a step in the right direction". In the fourth Cain Budget, the Victorian Treasurer said—

"... the Government could now reduce the level of new borrowings and the level of net public debt."

I will repeat that for the benefit of the Treasurer. The Victorian Treasurer, in the fourth Cain Budget, stated—

"... the Government could now reduce the level of new borrowings and the level of net public debt."

Mr Speaker, if that does not sound familiar to you—I am sure that it does—it sounds very familiar to me. It sounds very much like the Treasurer's own Budget Speech almost word for word. The tragedy is that everyone believed him—the media, the press gallery, the commentators, and those who did not look between the lines or at the fine print or over their shoulders.

I have in front of me, again for the benefit of the Treasurer, the editorial from the *Melbourne Age* of Wednesday, 25 September 1985, the day after the Cain Labor Government delivered its fourth Budget. We know how the *Melbourne Age* supported Labor and we know how, in time, the *Melbourne Age's* credibility was destroyed for years and years. But the day after the Cain Labor Government delivered its fourth Budget, the editorial said—

"It is a striking departure from tradition which makes the fourth Cain Budget so remarkable . . . There are no shocks . . . The Cain Government is entitled to feel pleased with this Budget. It has generally managed the economy well in the past three years . . . And this Budget testifies to its moderation and its competence."

That article, which appeared in the *Melbourne Age* on Wednesday, 25 September 1985, talked about the fourth Cain Labor Government.

Mr Beanland: \$80 billion.

Mr BORBIDGE: Yes, \$80 billion debt, as my friend reminds me. How wrong the *Melbourne Age* proved to be! In Queensland, it is not too late, but in a couple of years it may well be.

Mr SZCZERBANIK (Albert) (12.50 p.m.): I welcome this opportunity to be the Government's first speaker on this, the fourth Labor State Budget. Contrary to what the Opposition members on the Gold Coast would have us believe, Albert did not receive the crumbs of the 1993-94 Queensland State Budget. In fact, it did extremely well.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Palaszczuk): Order! The House will come to order. Members leaving the Chamber will do so expeditiously.

Mr SZCZERBANIK: If Opposition members take the time to listen to what I have to say, the facts will speak for themselves. It is high time the poor conservatives realised that this Government is trying to increase services to an area that, under the previous Government's administration, saw schools left unpainted for 20 years at a time, a grossly underfunded Police Service and developers producing ad hoc developments to the detriment of the electorate.

The Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition have tried desperately to find ways of criticising this excellent Labor Budget. I even heard them criticising the fact that this is a "big spending Government". Well, that is absolutely right, and we have done it without introducing new taxes. We have also done it without compromising our high level of service throughout the State.

In 1993-94, the Goss Labor Government has committed nearly \$100m to improve services in this once-neglected area. Criticism that the Gold Coast did not receive its fair share is little more than nonsense stirred up by an Opposition desperately searching for something to complain about. This is a Budget which has seen a record \$2.35 billion allocated to the education of our children—up \$97m on last year's Budget.

Albert itself has fared extremely well, receiving nearly \$7m for capital works in education. As an example, I am pleased to announce the following projects within my electorate: the construction of Stage 1 of the Bahrs Scrub High School at a cost of \$4.73m; Stage 5 of Helensvale State High School at a cost of \$934,000; completion of Stage 4, \$127,000; completion of a manual arts shop, \$2,000; completion of third and fourth science blocks, \$24,000; a fourth arts space, \$25,000; and a textiles space, \$20,000.

The Oxenford State School amenities block will cost \$108,000. Windaroo State School will receive four new learning areas at a total cost of \$305,000 to accommodate the school's exploding population. Following my

commitment to the residents of the Wolffdene area, the Cedar Creek State School will receive its first permanent building—a full, double-storey general learning area block at a cost of \$455,000.

I am also pleased to announce that a State school should and will be built in the Studio Village Estate for Term 1 of 1995. Given the incredible mushrooming development occurring in that area, the announcement of that school will be most welcomed by the residents of that and surrounding estates.

The Goss Government is also providing \$12.5m to implement the initiative "Helping P & Cs with the Basics", which will ensure that every school is equipped with an agreed list of basic equipment. Previously, P & Cs in the Albert electorate had to fend for themselves, struggling for every dollar to help their own children. Now this is changing.

The sum of \$9.2m is being provided for expansion of computers and computer-based learning in schools. Earlier this year, three schools in Albert received \$35,250 under the Computers in Schools Program. This is the first allocation under the Computers in Schools pre-election promise, which involves a total of \$40m in funding over five years. The allocation has already gone out to Beenleigh, Ormeau and Windaroo State Schools and has been well received by the parents and students.

Furthermore, I am pleased to see that \$37.6m has been allocated for the School Refurbishment Program. This is particularly gratifying as I have only just learnt that the Helensvale State School will finally receive its adventure playground. My particular thanks must go out to the school's Deputy Principal, Mrs Val Faulks, who lobbied me so vigorously on this issue.

It is also gratifying to see the money being spent on covered walkways for the Beenleigh State School. For 13 years, that school has been applying for covered walkways to protect the children from rain and sun as they go back and forth to the toilet block. Recently, I took the opportunity to invite the Deputy Premier and Minister for Administrative Services, the Honourable Tom Burns, to the school. Sure enough, I hear that the school will have their walkways in about three to four weeks.

The record allocation of funding for capital works in the 1993-94 State Education Budget proves this Government's commitment to quality education to all Queenslanders. New schools, school buildings and education

facilities in a range of locations will ensure that all Queensland students receive an education that is second to none. The record spending on capital works is a result of this Government's promise to put more money back into classrooms. The allocation of \$154.7m for capital works confirms our commitment to providing Queensland students with the highest quality resources and facilities.

Given the massive population explosion currently under way within Albert and the rising age of the electorate as a whole, it is good to see that this Budget has allocated \$3.4m for Stage 1 of a community health facility in the Beenleigh area. I have been fighting for this health facility for quite a long time, so it is good to see that my lobbying has finally paid off.

Being a registered nurse and a member of the parliamentary health committee, I see the needs of this community through different eyes, and I have taken the chance on many occasions to lobby the Health Minister for this facility. Currently, it is either a trip to Brisbane or the Gold Coast for the residents in that area. With this new facility, the medical needs of Beenleigh and the surrounding community can be provided for.

There are currently six sites being considered in the Beenleigh area. I do not particularly mind where the facility is placed, as long as the whole Beenleigh district can gain the benefit. I know that my colleague the member for Waterford is also fighting for a site for that health facility. As long as it is located in Beenleigh, I do not particularly care where it is positioned.

The first stage of development will offer a range of allied health services, including community health and child care. Beenleigh is one of 11 community health care centres being built throughout the State at a total cost of almost \$20m. Rather than a trip to Brisbane or the Gold Coast, this local facility places more emphasis on individuals looking after their own health through health promotion and illness prevention programs.

It is also welcoming to see that this year's record State Health budget includes health capital works projects and medical equipment purchases totalling \$13.5m for the Gold Coast Hospital as part of the Budget's doubled capital works component. This expenditure is part of the Goss Government's \$1.5 billion, 10-year hospital rebuilding and modernising program promised during the last State election campaign.

Projects on the Gold Coast of which Albert residents can take advantage include: \$1.5m to redevelop two operating theatres and \$532,000 to begin airconditioning floors 4 to 9 of the hospital, theatres, and kitchens. The total cost of that project alone is expected to be \$10.73m. I welcome this announcement as my family has had first-hand experience of how unbearable that hospital is without airconditioning when people are unwell.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.30 p.m.

Mr SZCZERBANK: Airconditioning the Gold Coast Hospital is something that should have been done when it was built, but political interference and the pursuit of cost savings meant that it was not. An amount of \$1m will also be spent in providing for new diagnostic equipment for the hospital. Prior to the election of this Government, the Gold Coast Hospital was little more than a white elephant. Sure, it was a tall, glamorous building, but the previous National Party Government was not committed to providing the very best health service and, as such, did not spend the money it should have. Opposition members may say that we should be spending more dollars, but I would argue that we must spend our money wisely to provide the best service possible at a price the community can afford.

Realistically, health is one of those issues which can become an area where large amounts of money will not provide any real improvement in service. The electorate must realise that the rising expectation of the health dollar is linked directly to what the electorate is willing to pay. Sure, if the electorate wants everyone to have a heart transplant and live to be 100 years of age, medical science can provide that service. But the catch is, people must be willing to pay for it. The money has to come from somewhere. My argument has always been to preserve the quality of life, not the quantity of life.

Another issue that affects my electorate is transport infrastructure. It is an issue that is debated widely within my electorate. The member for Nerang will be happy to hear that his so-called "Ghost Train" is running to its timetable, and it will arrive on time at Helensvale in 1995. The Brisbane to Gold Coast Rail Project is to receive a further \$40.4m allocation this financial year as part of this massive \$300m-plus project. Tenders for the train have been called, so perhaps the Member for Nerang, who has been the project's biggest critic on the Gold Coast, should consider buying his ticket now to beat the rush.

I further wish to publicise the Government's commitment to the Eastern Corridor Project. This project has been a contentious issue right from the start, but the point I wish to make is that we need to plan for our future now and, to do so, we need to make the hard decisions now. Maybe the corridor will not be needed for another 10 years or so, but at least the corridor will be in place to allow people to plan their lives around it. An amount of \$21.76m has been allocated towards the planning of this project. The money will be used to tidy up land resumptions south of Beattie Road, Coomera, and north of Smith Street, Arundel. At present, the department has secured some five properties along this route and is negotiating with a further 10 landowners, including such major property developers as Monterey Quays and Helensvale Estates. This land needs to be resumed now as the area is undergoing a rapid housing and population boom.

I am also pleased to announce that the money will also be used to construct a joint road and rail overpass over the Gold Coast Highway at the notorious Crab Farm. It is estimated that the Government will save around \$14m by undertaking these projects at the same time. The construction of this overpass is the first concrete symbol for all to see that the Government is committed to the Eastern Corridor Project, and to the proper planning of it. At the same time, this overpass will remove a trouble spot which unfortunately, in the past, has seen some bad accidents.

Some of the allocation will also be used to undertake a flood study in the Alberton district as a part of the environmental impact assessment. The Alberton community has been worried about the looming corridor for some time. The flood study is the first step towards letting people know exactly which properties will and will not be affected by the project. The outcome of the study will be used in a planned EIA on the preferred route between the Beenleigh-Redland Bay Road and Gilberton. The Alberton community has also been concerned at the effect another 1974-type flood will have on the district. The flood study should provide us with those answers.

The Goss Government is committed to providing a safe highway between Brisbane and the Gold Coast. As part of that commitment, the Government is removing the highway crossovers as quickly as possible, and is constructing overpasses in their place. The communities that use the highway need a safer access to it. That is why the Goss

Government has committed \$1.25m to complete the Canowindra interchange, which will be finished shortly. The total cost of this interchange has been \$4.38m. The Goss Government has also undertaken to provide \$2m this financial year to the construction of the Yawalpah Road interchange and associated works. The total cost of this project will be \$7.9m.

Other transport departmental funding in my electorate is in the area of safety for many boat enthusiasts. A total of \$158,000 is to be spent on boat ramps for the area. The Goss Government has committed \$55,000 to the Bannockburn boat ramp, \$100,000 to the Santa Barbara boat ramp and \$30,000 to the Cabbage Tree Creek boat ramp. This money will be used for either upgrading the existing facilities or building new facilities. Part of this money is to go into tourism infrastructure in Albert. Albert lies upon the waters of Moreton Bay and, therefore, that tourist infrastructure will provide benefit to everyone in the Albert electorate.

In summing up, I have been a part of this Government for the past four years, and I have pushed for many changes which I am pleased to see have happened or are about to happen. As the member for Albert, I understand the needs of the community and the problems associated with this being one of the fastest-growing electorates in the State. Albert is facing unique problems associated with this population boom, including the need to provide adequate schooling for the many families which are choosing to live in Albert.

I wish to assure my constituents that, as a member of the Goss Labor Government, I am committed to Albert's future. This Government is committed to providing proper and responsible planning for the area. Albert has been ignored in the past. I see a future for Albert that will bring great prosperity for our children, and this fourth Goss Labor Budget is continuing that future.

Mrs SHELDON (Caloundra—Leader of the Liberal Party) (2.38 p.m.): As part of the background to this address, I table a copy of the Budget response which I wrote and which was published in *Business Queensland* this week. In doing so, I condemn this Government for the way it has stifled informed debate about the 1993-94 Budget. The timing of the Opposition's Budget response in this House is unacceptable.

The Budget should be presented to Queensland in a balanced form. That means the assessment of it by the Queensland Opposition should be accorded the

prominence considered appropriate for Oppositions in other Australian Parliaments. The notion that the Opposition viewpoint in Queensland should be held back from parliamentary discussion until 12 days after the event is a joke. It is absurd to think that the Government, with all the Treasury and departmental representatives at its disposal, is paranoid about receiving critical comment. Yet it has used these 12 days to mount a Statewide propaganda exercise that would be admired by Dr Goebbels. The reality is that Queenslanders should not have to buy *Business Queensland* or have breakfast at a five-star hotel in Brisbane to hear an authoritative and timely analysis of Budget details that the Government does not want to discuss. These are the 1990s, yet that is the state of affairs in Queensland today.

There is little in this Budget that is not dressed up for media consumption. Unhappily for the Treasurer, his sweetened version of our economic position does not add up in several important areas. The most obvious and monumental failure of this Budget is its demonstrated failure to deliver long-term, sustainable jobs. Last Thursday, with the Budget just one week old, the Treasurer was admitting on ABC radio that he would be back to rework his figures in the light of economic statistics for August. We are one-quarter into the financial year, and the employment trend for Queensland is headed in the direction opposite to the one forecast by the Treasurer.

The Treasurer must report back to this House on the result of his investigation and the ramifications of a significant miscalculation on unemployment for the Budget and the State economy. Members will remember that, last year, the Treasurer promised a \$3.3 billion Capital Works Program that would create 39 000 jobs. Instead, the Government spent \$2.8 billion and, on the Treasurer's own admission, created only 8 000 full-time jobs. It is a savage irony for Queensland job seekers to hear the Treasurer talking about tens of thousands of jobs while the State unemployment rate goes through the roof and tens of thousands of new faces appear on the State dole queues each month. They would choke to hear the lame explanation the Treasurer gave for his 1992 forecast when he addressed a seminar in June on private investment in Queensland. He stated—

“Over 39 000 person-years of employment will have been generated as a result of the Queensland Government's spending on capital works.”

What a lot of rubbish! That is the limit of Labor's Queensland job strategy. This State Government wants Queenslanders to believe that unemployment can be fought from an armchair using a list of expenditure and a few quick sums written on the back of an envelope. This year, the Treasurer estimates that he will create 43 600 person-years of employment because he is spending \$3.4 billion. In this State, the record number of unemployed people really do not believe the Treasurer's sums. Those Queenslanders—both young and old—and their parents and children all have a much clearer perception about unemployment in Queensland than does the State Treasurer.

In the four years since this Government was elected in December 1989, the number of workers employed in the private sector in Queensland dropped from 715 200 to 666 300. The Australian Bureau of Statistics has documented that between December 1989 and December 1992, the number of employed wage and salary earners in the Queensland private sector declined by 48 900. They are the real figures. I repeat that the number of people employed in the private sector declined by 48 900. I suggest that the Treasurer explain that figure. It is a disgrace. These people have experienced the suffering that Labor has brought this lucky country—in this nation's “leading State”! Their plight is the sorry achievement of a Labor Government that inherited a full bank book, a State with unequalled resources and a first-class reputation. For four years, members of this Government have talked tough about the recession, but in reality they have not had to confront the tough decisions that the recession has necessitated elsewhere.

In this Budget, the Treasurer has an opportunity to do something effective and long-lasting in relation to employment. He is budgeting to receive a \$750m windfall from the sale of the Gladstone Power Station, but once he gets the money, there are many options for its use. One should say “if he gets the money”, because there are Mabo claims hanging over this situation and there is no guarantee that the sale will go ahead.

Mr McGrady: What situation are you talking about?

Mrs SHELDON: I suggest that, as Minister for Mines and Energy, the member would be well aware of the totality of Mabo claims. I hope he is, but I very much doubt that he is. For the sake of miners and people in this State who want jobs, I suggest that he acquaint himself with the facts.

In my view, the Treasurer is obliged to put that money to good use. In the current environment, the best use for the money is in creating jobs. Instead, the Treasurer will spend about \$100m buying back power from the new owner of the station and \$650m in retiring debt. That is a poor and short-sighted strategy in a State that, historically, has low levels of net debt. If any State can afford employment stimulus to the private sector, it is Queensland. I have said that the Treasurer could halve payroll tax for the next two years on the basis of the power station sale alone. Within three years, this regressive tax on jobs could be wiped out completely in Queensland, if the Treasurer so desired.

This morning, the Premier spent quite some time trying to knock the idea that payroll tax in Queensland should be regarded as an overly expensive option which we can no longer afford. That is not the case. In three years, the removal of payroll tax in this State would be accomplished by a coalition administration as certainly as the State Government has eliminated inefficiency in departmental service delivery in four years. In the last three years under Labor, the Goss Government has increased expenditure on salaries and administration by \$368.6m a year. The result is a bloated public sector that can be reduced without any of the absurd consequences dreamt up by the Premier this morning.

As I have indicated, proceeds from the sale of the power station could be used to at least halve payroll tax for two years. For each of those two years, ongoing cuts of \$277m could be found to strike out the need for a payroll tax by the third year. Over three years, revenue from other taxes will increase naturally as the economy grows. Assuming that the economy grows at 3 per cent a year, this will translate into extra revenue for the Government in the third year in the amount of \$132m; thus, the need for cuts is reduced.

Mr De Lacy: I can't believe this.

Mrs SHELDON: The Treasurer should just listen to the figures. To the extent that statutory authorities and departments contribute to the payroll tax take, the need for cuts can be even further reduced. Mr Deputy Speaker, you must remember that the \$830m in total revenue which is attributed to payroll tax represents income from many different sources. Any public authority contribution to the overall figure will not need to be offset at all. Once all the offsets have been removed and the necessary cuts have been made, the accumulated savings at the end of the third

year will total \$830m, which is a permanent reduction in expenditure to compensate for the reduction in the tax burden.

Why should Queenslanders be saddled with a Labor tax on jobs when there is clearly an alternative? The financial statements of this Government reveal a trail of bureaucratic overexpenditure that has not resulted in improvements in the delivery of services. For far too long, Queenslanders have suffered the self-indulgent policies of the Labor Party. This is where the coalition offers an effective alternative to our current state of stagnation.

The Institute of Chartered Accountants has conducted a survey of the problems currently hampering growth in small business. The resulting document, *The Road to Recovery*, charts a completely different direction from that being followed by the Queensland Government. On the list of priorities, small businesspeople across the nation identified the cost of regulation, overregulation and high taxes imposed by Governments as three of the top four problems facing the private sector. Because the Treasurer is not listening, I am sure that he is not really interested in the private sector.

The direction put forward by the coalition is the one favoured by small business in this State—I know that the Labor Party is not interested in small business—and will provide real incentives. It will also restore confidence in the private sector. I suggest that the Treasurer needs to get off their backs—that is what they are screaming about—but will he take his foot off their necks? Of course not. This Treasurer has done nothing but repeat his silly rhetoric from 1992. The Treasurer's excuse for doing nothing about payroll tax is his feigned concern about electricity prices. If he preferred, he could use electricity prices rather than payroll tax as a stimulus to private enterprise, but have we seen a huge drop in electricity prices in this Budget? Indeed, we have not. The Treasurer is indulging himself with talk of a clean ledger by 1996 instead of creating long-term jobs for Queensland workers.

There are winners and losers in the 1993 State Budget, which continues the Queensland Labor Government's dedicated campaign for winners in Government at the expense of the losers in the private sector. This is a Budget designed to lock Labor into power by generating wealth in the public sector to benefit public servants, particularly those closest to the Labor administration. Is it any wonder that while private sector employment under Labor has literally gone

through the floor, public sector employment has flourished? In the four years since December 1989, the number of public sector wage and salary earners documented by the ABS has risen by 19 500 from 178 300 to 197 800.

This is the bureaucratic soup kitchen through which the Treasurer expects to provide employment incentives in capital works projects. At best, the Treasurer is offering the unemployed more of the same. His strategies are those Labor ones of Kirner and Keating that have made Australia's job queues what they are today. At worst, he is striving to justify specific measures that will discourage job creation. In particular, Queensland employers will be hit by the widening of the payroll tax net to take in fringe benefits.

The latest ANZ Bank employment advertisement series showed that while national advertisement growth continued its steady rise over the last few months, Queensland recorded one of the lowest rates in the country. Over the past four months, the monthly percentage trend has continued its slide from 1.3 per cent in May to 0.9 per cent in June, 0.7 per cent in July and 0.2 per cent in August. The record unemployment in Queensland this month is a monument to Labor mismanagement: 11.2 per cent of Queenslanders are without a job. Even Government members must admit that that is a disgrace.

This is a Government that does not understand the factors that generate real growth, wealth and jobs in Queensland. Unwavering Government support for the private sector built this State. The Labor Government's neglect of the private sector will destroy it. In putting its claim for the health of the economy, the Government relies on an estimate of 3.8 per cent growth in gross State product, or GSP. In common with the Government's job forecasts, that requires further analysis. Given GSP of 3.8 per cent, growth in output per head of population in Queensland is only 1.3 per cent. It is significantly less than the national average of 1.75 per cent.

The Budget demonstrates that GSP in Queensland is growing on the back of the State's population growth and not as a result of economic change. Is it any wonder that Budget figures show that total private investment in Queensland dropped from \$11.3 billion in 1989-90 to \$10.6 billion in 1992-93? That is an incredible statistic. We are told again and again by the Labor

Government that this is Australia's leading State yet, over four years, Labor has driven private investment in Queensland down by \$600m.

Even with the serious impact of the Labor Party's national recession taken into account, perceptions about Joh's healthy economic legacy in Queensland compared with chronically sick economies elsewhere in the nation should have guaranteed a different result by 1993. But the Government will continue to preside over a massive blow-out in public sector bureaucracy without any corresponding improvement in efficiency or the delivery of services. In fact, quite the opposite.

Today, the administration of Queensland health and education shows the adverse effects of bureaucratic growth of Jurassic proportions. For example, the Treasurer says that education funding is up 5.5 per cent, yet the Budget papers show that funding has risen only 2.79 per cent from last year's actual expenditure of \$2.707 billion. The overall increase in funding is barely in line with inflation, yet the administration component increased by 7.7 per cent—more than double the total Budget increase. Unlike the number of education bureaucrats, the number of classroom teachers will decrease this year by 98.

Bureaucratic expenditure within the Premier's own department is another example of Labor excess. Salaries, wages and related expenses in the Department of the Premier, Economic and Trade Development will increase this year by 11 per cent, or \$2.6m. Administration costs will increase by 15.9 per cent, or \$4.2m. Those spectacular increases come in the wake of a 30 per cent blow-out in expenditure by that same department last financial year.

So while the Treasurer makes noises about increasing spending and services, the departments soak up the funds through increased administration. Wages and administration operating costs for the big-spending, bureaucratic Labor Government are continuing to blow out and now make up 65.1 per cent of the total Consolidated Fund, up from 60.9 per cent last year. Salaries and related costs consume 46 per cent of the bill for wages and administration, up by 4.6 per cent. Administration and operating costs are up by 9.4 per cent to 19.1 per cent. Meanwhile, capital expenditure has dropped from 15 per cent to 13 per cent of the Consolidated Fund.

Where is the stimulus for business and employment growth? The failure by the Goss Government to seize a position of clear advantage is brought dramatically into focus when one considers that those figures are stated in nominal dollar terms. The Treasurer has deleted inflation from the equation. Private investment activity in Queensland is so poor that the only venture in this State this financial year that will involve private investment in new plant and equipment is the proposed sale of the Gladstone Power Station. Without the sale, the Treasurer's fantastic Budget projections of 25 per cent growth in plant and equipment evaporate, and he is left with negative growth of 0.2 per cent.

Counting the power station, the Treasurer says that State business investment will grow by 16.8 per cent. Without it, business investment drops to a pitiful 1.2 per cent. The Treasurer needed that power station to prop up his figures. Once the power station is deleted from the equation, private investment figures in the Budget papers also drop from 7.3 per cent to 1 per cent. Everything in the Budget, from statistics about investment to the program to reduce net Government debt from \$1.9 billion to zero by 1995-96, relies on the power station being sold by 31 December.

Queenslanders would be concerned to see the way in which the Treasurer has used the power station sale as a prop for investment statistics in the Budget. That transaction involves the transfer of a second-hand, 12-year-old power station to Comalco. Regularly, balance of payments figures issued by the Federal Treasurer include specific warnings that a particularly large, one-off transaction has been incorporated. Aircraft purchases by Australian carriers are a good example. The Treasurer is in the same position, but he has chosen to marginalise the importance of the sale. The Treasurer's determination to document that transaction as a part of new investment in the State is a weak attempt to disguise the poor performance of the Queensland private sector under Labor.

As a result of Labor mismanagement, the major factor driving the Queensland economy today is the influx of southerners moving north because of the weather. Proof that our economy is surviving on the strength of interstate migration is provided in Budget figures on housing. According to the Treasurer, housing now accounts for 43 per cent, or almost half, of all private investment activity in the State. In 1989-90, housing took up 33 per cent of all private investment. One could argue that, faced by tough times and an

increasing southern influx, a responsible move might be to nurture positive job and wealth creating spin-offs, such as in housing.

But not from this Government. Any form of private sector growth appears to worry the Treasurer, because he has responded to signs of health in the housing sector in the traditional Labor way. In this Budget, the Treasurer has jumped on the housing sector from a great height. He has scrapped stamp duty concessions for Queenslanders buying land on which to build their principal place of residence. As a result, the Real Estate Institute of Queensland calculates that he has added \$3,000 to the cost of an average block of land. That will hit first home buyers in this State.

His cut to concessions for those buying homes worth more than \$160,000 means that thousands of Queensland home buyers will be hit again. The Labor Party calls it a mansion tax, but if one were to ask the average home buyers, they would say that it is more like a fibro shack tax. At the rate at which house prices are rising, there will be nothing under \$160,000 within 12 months or so, anyway. I am sure that the Government is expecting a huge rake-off from the total abolition of stamp duty concessions on homes worth over \$250,000. Today, that is the worth of homes in the middle of the market. Given a few short years, those provisions will apply to the vast majority of home sales in the State.

Changes to payments of land tax will also severely hurt Queensland property owners, particularly those whose rateable value of land continues to increase. Previously, landowners were protected from booms in property values because land tax was levied on the average valuation over five years.

Time expired.

Mr DAVIES (Mundingburra) (2.58 p.m.): This Budget is built on no new taxes. It is built on growth. It is built on capital works, infrastructure, land tax reform and a whole range of other measures. It is quite disappointing to sit here and listen to the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Coalition, who are seemingly unable to understand what the Budget is all about.

Mr J. H. Sullivan: She's had 12 days to do it and she wanted to do it quicker.

Mr DAVIES: I take the interjection from the honourable member. Her contribution goes to show that coalition members would never get jobs as financial journalists in this State. In contrast to the comments of those

honourable members, the Budget has been praised not only up and down the length and breadth of Queensland but also in the other States and particularly by Alan Wood of the *Australian*.

This is a good Budget. For me, the most significant point of the Budget is the financial responsibility over the past four years under Treasurer De Lacy's stewardship, as a result of which debt has been reduced by approximately \$3 billion. That is a significant achievement at a time when debt in all of the other States is approximately \$90 billion. Within three years—in other words, by 1996—this State will have a negative net financing requirement.

Queensland will be the only State to have achieved that position. That is a worthwhile goal for this State. This Government is aiming to ensure that our kids do not have to pay for any excesses of today. We are not committed to the excesses of Governments in Australia or in other countries. We are trying to ensure that our kids get a good chance in life. The best way to ensure that that occurs is by reducing the amount of debt that we as a society leave to them tomorrow and into the future. Obviously, if more of the Budget has to be paid in interest and redemption, more taxes have to be increased and more imposts have to be placed on business.

Members opposite are supposed to represent business. They have been decrying this Budget and saying how terrible it is, but not one financial writer in Australia believes that it is a terrible Budget. The *Cairns Post* carried the headline "State Budget deserves praise". The editorial of the *Townsville Bulletin* used the phrase "introducing a real Labor Budget". Those publications spoke in glowing terms about this Budget. For the last four years, the *Townsville Bulletin*, which is a newspaper from my neck of the woods, has praised every single Budget that this Treasurer has brought down. Why? Because they have all been jolly good Budgets. The *Australian* used the words, "De Lacy's Budget strategy sound". The *Australian Financial Review* stated, "Surplus today; debt-free tomorrow", which is the concept to which I alluded a moment ago.

This Government is about setting financial standards. This State is setting the financial standards for the rest of Australia to follow. As I stated earlier—and I will be a little more specific now—in the first three Budgets of the Goss Government, net debt has fallen from \$4.3 billion to \$1.9 billion. The forecast net negative financing requirement—including,

for the benefit of the Deputy Leader of the Coalition, whom I note has left the Chamber, the power station sale—for 1993-94 should see net debt fall further to around \$1 billion.

Mr Bennett: She still hasn't grasped that issue.

Mr DAVIES: I take the interjection by the member for Gladstone. She has not grasped that issue. I think that is because a certain phrase is still locked in the word processor. Every time her speech writer writes a speech, out comes the phrase "and it all depends on selling the Gladstone Power Station". It does not depend on that but, obviously, if the Gladstone Power Station is sold, it only makes the position better.

Mr Bredhauer: It keeps going over the top.

Mr DAVIES: It does keep going over the top, but I do not think that the comments that appeared on the front page of the *Courier-Mail* this morning would be going over the top.

Mr Bredhauer: They call her "Rosebud" because she's surrounded by so many petals.

Mr DAVIES: I think that there will be lots of little meetings around this place over the next few weeks, even during the school holidays. On current trends, by 1995-96, Queensland will have more financial assets than liabilities. In other words, by 1995-96, Queensland will be net debt free. That will put this State in a very positive and significant position.

There has been praise for this Budget right throughout Queensland. Rural groups have welcomed the boost to capital works. According to the member for Toowoomba South, Mr Horan, Toowoomba fared well in the Budget. Environmentalists have talked about the \$4.6m allocated to acquiring national parks. They have also praised the commitment of this Government—and this was not a Budget initiative—to finally do something about the disgraceful Starcke land deal which occurred before we were elected to office.

This Budget includes other significant features which have all been acknowledged in the financial press. For example, there is the \$7m that will go to charities as a result of a change to the percentage which larger clubs will have to pay on their turnover from poker machines. That will help some of the charities in Queensland which have been struggling since we introduced poker machines. We do not walk away from that. Instead, we have examined the problem and said, "Yes, there is a legitimate case to try to help those charities."

A community benefit fund will be established, which will take only a very small proportion of the income from the poker machines of some of the major clubs. As I understand it, that will be applied on a sliding scale. It will be done in an effort to try to overcome some of the difficulties that have arisen as a result of the introduction of poker machines.

The returns of some charities—such as the Endeavour Foundation—from bingo and similar activities have been reduced. Some clubs have acted in a positive manner. Their social conscience has prevailed, and they have put aside some of their profits from poker machines to help charities. However, I believe that the community benefit fund is a more equitable way of doing things. It will be very similar to the community benefit funds to which Jupiters Casino and the Breakwater Island Casino contribute. I assume that those types of schemes will apply also to the two new casinos to come on-line in Brisbane and Cairns.

A few comments were made by members opposite that I want to address quickly. The Deputy Leader of the Coalition is locked into a mind-set that this Budget depends on the sale of the power station at Gladstone. Hopefully, she will eventually realise the folly of what she has been saying about that matter over the past few weeks. The Deputy Leader of the Coalition referred to the self-indulgent policies of this Government. Nothing could be further from the truth. We are the leaders in financial management in Australia. We are the leaders in employment and training. We are the leaders in terms of our educational programs. We are also the leaders in terms of the money that we are putting into educational capital works. That should be compared with what happened under the previous Government. I took over a National Party seat. I could not believe, in terms of education and in terms of infrastructure, how that electorate had been ignored.

Opposition members: Pork-barrelling!

Mr DAVIES: I take the interjection, because I want to address the comment. Members opposite were in Government for 32 years. The Mundingburra State School is 107 years old. It was in an appalling condition. The Pimlico school, which was not in my electorate previously but is now, was also in an appalling condition. Those schools had not been maintained. Although the desks and chairs might not have been falling apart, the tables were made of chipboard and they were crumbling. When I saw the types of things that had been allowed to occur in schools

throughout Queensland, I said to myself, "How could any parent ever have voted for the other crowd, the National Party?" I finally came to the conclusion that the reason is that most parents never go inside a school or a classroom. They just did not see the state of some schools. Kids are very hardy and they will accept most things. Kids would not go home and complain. They would not say, "Look, the resources we have are terrible. The tables and chairs are all terrible; they are falling to pieces." I believe that is why members opposite got away with it. This Government does not operate in that way. As I said, we are the leaders in education. We are addressing education——

Mr Budd interjected.

Mr DAVIES: As the honourable member for Redlands said, we are a caring party. Under Labor, education gets a very high priority.

As to law enforcement—we are providing extra police stations throughout the State. Unfortunately, in one year, two years, three years, four years or even five, six or seven years, we cannot address the backlog in the areas of police, education and health. However, through the capital works programs that we are implementing, we are attempting to address the backlog in those areas that was allowed to accumulate under previous National and Liberal Party Governments. The Liberal Party does not escape scot free, because it was in coalition for a long time.

In terms of health, we have established the Townsville General Hospital as the major centre of health excellence outside the south-east corner of Queensland. In the vicinity of \$16.6m has been allocated for radiation oncology.

Mr Pitt: What about Cairns?

Mr DAVIES: Cairns does pretty well in those areas, also. I guarantee that, in the near future, instead of people having to fly from Cairns to Brisbane for an operation on their heart, they will be able to have the operation in Townsville.

Mr Pitt: A great boost to country people.

Mr DAVIES: It is. For too long the crowd on the other side have ignored regional Queenslanders. Being members of the old Country Party and the National Party, it is incredible how they ignored regional Queensland. They might have looked after particular areas, but the greater areas of regional Queensland were ignored.

I will return to my theme. We are also the leaders in environmental management. Under

this Government over the last four years, Queensland has accumulated an incredible area of national parks. The next phase will be to put significant resources into managing those national parks. Why would we do that? For the benefit of Australians, so that they can all use the great national parks of Queensland. One of the things that members on the other side forget is that national parks and World Heritage areas can be major tourist attractions. We are putting significant funding into national parks, World Heritage areas and the Wet Tropics Management Authority. We are also looking after rural and regional Queensland. I was particularly pleased to hear the comments of Ian Macfarlane and others who welcomed—

Mr Cooper: One of your lackeys.

Mr DAVIES: I take the interjection.

Mr Cooper interjected.

Mr De Lacy: Take that interjection, as well.

Mr DAVIES: I will take that interjection, as well.

Ms Spence: Did you understand it?

Mr DAVIES: No, but the Treasurer did. Maybe he can tell Hansard what he said. Coming from Longreach, I do not like to see rural and regional Queensland being ignored. This Government is addressing many of the problems in those areas. It is not just a Brisbane party. One only has to look at the representation on this side of the House to see that it is not just a Brisbane party. The Government also has a significant commitment to social justice and to trying to make sure that the less well off in the State are looked after.

I am a firm believer in having a very productive private sector. The reason that I ascribe to things such as keeping Queensland as a low-tax State and making sure that we do not impose fuel taxes is to keep us productive, efficient and making profits. It is only by making profits that we as a Government can provide the resources to look after the less fortunate in society. That is what it is all about. That is the big role for us to play in terms of providing services—not to pork-barrel certain electorates, as those on the other side did, but to try to ensure that all electorates receive fair treatment and that the less fortunate in society are looked after.

I listened to the Leader of the Opposition try to attack the 1993-94 State Budget. As I said at the outset, he would never obtain a job as a financial journalist in Queensland. We all know that the Budget has been accepted

throughout the length and breadth of Queensland. We all know that the Government has a significant commitment to rebuilding hospitals. We all know that the Government has a significant commitment to employment and training in the State. The Government is spending \$431.7m on TAFE education and a further \$15.9m to operate the apprenticeships and traineeships schemes.

As I said earlier, the Government is looking after the environment. Queensland's environment is our greatest asset now and it will be in the future. As a Government, we are committed to protecting our heritage. As I said earlier, we are also committed to education, because education is, above all, about giving our children a decent future. This Budget allocates a record \$2.35 billion to ease the financial burden on parents.

Every woman has a fundamental right to personal safety. The Government is trying to assist in that area by allocating a record Police budget of \$477m. It is providing extra child care in the sum of \$18.6m over three years to create 8 900 new child-care places on top of the 7 655 child-care places provided in the first term.

Last week, I was pleased to have the Minister for Housing and Local Government, Terry Mackenroth, in my electorate to launch the Home Secure Program. For too long, we have not looked after our older citizens. That is one of the programs—we have also introduced the Seniors Card since we have been in Government—that has been put in place to try to help that segment of the population. The Government is also committed to encouraging youth. Providing jobs for the young people is Queensland's most important challenge.

In my electorate, this Budget has been welcomed very well by the *Townsville Bulletin*, which is pleasing to see. Townsville, Cairns and Mackay are significant cities in this State, and a \$750m Capital Works Program is being carried out in those areas. The record Capital Works Program that we have brought in in this Budget through the allocation of \$3.4 billion is \$100m more than that in last year's Budget, but in real terms it is significantly higher than that.

Finally, it would be remiss of me if I did not acknowledge once again this Budget from the Treasurer and the dedicated services of Mr Henry Smerdon, his Under Treasurer.

Time expired.

Mr GRICE (Broadwater) (3.18 p.m.): The Goss Labor Government has shown a great willingness to spend millions of dollars each year on a great range of inquiries. For the most part, those inquiries have been nothing more than vendettas aimed at supposed National Party figures. They have been political witch-hunts thinly disguised as independent legal inquiries as part of the so-called Fitzgerald process. They have bled the taxpayers of this State for the political advancement of the Goss Government and the Australian Labor Party.

Mrs Woodgate: And successful, too.

Mr GRICE: I hear the bevy of bathyspheres at the back.

Mrs Woodgate: Why "bathyspheres"?

Mr GRICE: Because their comrades down the front keep them so far under the surface that they do not hear the truth. They should listen. I believe that it is time to spend some money on a real inquiry into matters of vital importance to all the people of Queensland and not just to the Goss Labor Government and some of its Ministers. I recently called for a royal commission into secret contracts used by the Labor Government to silence police who investigated former Superintendent John Huey. I was concerned about the implications for our democracy of the growing use of secrecy contracts, and I am pleased to say that others have given support to that general point of view.

Honourable members would no doubt recall the comments of the CJC Chairman, Mr Rob O'Regan, and law professor Chris Gilbert in this regard. They were reported in detail by the *Sunday Mail*. Professor Gilbert said that such contracts were "part and parcel of the politicisation of the public service" and that we were "drifting away from the old Westminster model of an apolitical public service". Mr O'Regan put a more serious slant on the problem when he said that it was important "that a confidentiality clause not be misused in order to effect a cover-up in circumstances where the public interest demands disclosure". My concerns about John Huey were and still remain secondary to the general principle of using such contracts to shut people up. Since I made that call for a royal commission, many people have contacted me. Some offered information. Others told me that I would be targeted in a smear campaign by the Labor Party and others in very powerful positions—people with too much to lose.

Mr DAVIES: I rise to a point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Palaszczuk): Order! What is the member's point of order?

Mr DAVIES: I understood that members were speaking to Appropriation Bill (No. 2).

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will make that decision. There is no point of order. The honourable member for Broadwater will continue.

Mr GRICE: As I said, since I made that call for a royal commission, many people have contacted me. Some offered information. Others told me that I would be targeted in a smear campaign by the Labor Party and others in very powerful positions—people with too much to lose. As I told the House this morning, another call contained a threat involving my children. At least I now know what the rules are.

The people protecting Huey have picked the wrong bloke. If they think that threats of harm to me or my children scare me, they are right. If they think that those threats will scare me off, they are wrong. They have guaranteed an inquiry, if not now then under the next coalition Government. So those with something to hide had better enjoy themselves while they can. The people who orchestrated threats to my children simply raised the ante.

John William Huey is very well known in criminal law circles in Queensland. I am told that he is a man whom criminal lawyers would love to get into the witness box. Lawyers tell me that he is a liar and a perjurer. They tell me that he was a policeman who made up his mind on questions of guilt or innocence and that he treated evidence selectively in order to have his own way. In the language of the street, he decided who was right for the job and then proceeded to fit them.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Broadwater will resume his seat. The Chair has been very tolerant up until now in allowing the member for Broadwater to pursue the argument that he is pursuing. However, I must remind him that members are speaking to the Appropriation Bill and the Budget. If the member does not return to the Budget, I shall sit him down.

Mr FITZGERALD: I rise to a point of order. The member raised the issue of the expenditure of money. He said that money needs to be spent on an inquiry. He referred to the Budget papers and said that money has been spent on inquiries. I plead with you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that the member is speaking about the appropriation of money for an inquiry and is giving his reasons.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have made my ruling and I shall stick to that ruling.

Mr GRICE: The whole thrust of my speech is in regard to the responsible expenditure of public moneys and the allocation of public moneys.

As I was saying, I am told that Huey was a policeman who made up his mind on questions of guilt or innocence. It is almost like something out of Hollywood—the detective who takes the law into his own hands and rewrites the rules. A lawyer suggested that I look at the second report of the Parliamentary Judges Commission of Inquiry, which was funded from public moneys and furnished to the Parliament in 1989. Huey features heavily in that report by three of the most eminent and respected judges in the nation, namely, Gibbs, Lush and Helsham. The judges could hardly have been less complimentary of Huey. They reviewed a number of matters that Huey had investigated, and others in which both Huey and Judge Pratt had been involved. The judges were paid out of public money.

There are some interesting summary paragraphs in the report. For example, on page 56 it states—

“. . . the tribunal was entitled to consider that as an investigator Inspector Huey was not always able to see both sides and take an objective view, and that he was not always fully frank in disclosing material which conflicted with his theories.”

Another comment on page 62 of that report is as follows—

“It is true that the Ready matter in particular”——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have given the member his chance. He has not returned to the contents of the Appropriation Bill. He will now resume his seat. I call the member for Waterford.

Mr FITZGERALD: I move—

“That the member for Broadwater be further heard.”

Question—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 30—Beanland, Borbidge, Connor, Cooper, Davidson, Elliott, FitzGerald, Gamin, Gilmore, Grice, Healy, Hobbs, Horan, Lester, Lingard, Littleproud, Mitchell, Quinn, Randell, Rowell, Santoro, Sheldon, Simpson, Slack, Stephan, Stoneman, Turner, Watson *Tellers:* Springborg, Laming

NOES, 45—Ardill, Barton, Beattie, Bennett, Braddy, Bredhauer, Briskey, Budd, Burns, Campbell, Clark, Comben, D’Arcy, Davies, De Lacy, Dollin, Edmond,

Elder, Fenlon, Foley, Hamill, Hayward, Hollis, McElligott, McGrady, Milliner, Nuttall, Pearce, Power, Purcell, Robertson, Robson, Rose, Smith, Spence, Sullivan J. H., Sullivan T. B., Szczerbanik, Vaughan, Warner, Welford, Wells, Woodgate
Tellers: Pitt, Livingstone

Resolved in the **negative**.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Waterford.

Debate interrupted.

PRIVILEGE

Scope of Budget Debate

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise—Leader of the Opposition) (3.32 p.m.): I rise on a matter of privilege.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If honourable members are leaving the Chamber, I ask them to do so quickly. If they are going to sit down, I ask them to resume their seats quickly.

Mr BORBIDGE: My matter of privilege is simply that, as I understand it, the member for Broadwater was putting forward arguments as to why money should be approved for certain inquiries following threats against his family.

Government members interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: I just want to make the point that, unlike those members who are now interjecting, I have been a member of this Parliament since 1980, and it has been a tradition of this Parliament that during Budget debates such matters could be raised and canvassed. If the procedures and conventions of this place are to be changed in regard to what has been permitted to be discussed during Budget debates in the past, I believe it is appropriate that there be a ruling from the Chair on what matters can be discussed and what matters cannot be discussed. I believe that there is a reasonable ground to ask for an explanation to be given as to why a member of Parliament cannot call for funds to be allocated for a specific purpose, particularly when the matters that he raised relate to threats that have been made against his children. This is unprecedented; it is shameful. The result of the vote that has just been taken in this House is an absolute disgrace.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Mr BARTON (Waterford) (3.34 p.m.): I rise to support the Budget. This is——

Mr BEANLAND: I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition has just raised what I believe to be a very pertinent point. I was listening very intently to what the member for Broadwater had to say. He was talking about appropriation. Members come into this Chamber and make wide-ranging speeches about appropriation, and the member for Broadwater was doing just that. I think that we have every right to be given some sort of ruling from the Chair on this matter because it is going to affect all of our speeches. We know what has been the accepted practice in the past in this place, and I think that all of us have spoken on a wide range of matters to do with appropriation. That seems to have now changed.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Palaszczuk): Order! I will seek advice. I stick by my ruling that I made in relation to the honourable member for Broadwater, in that I gave him the opportunity to return to the contents of the Appropriation Bill. At no stage in the final four minutes of his speech did the member refer to money matters at all. Therefore, I found him in contempt of the Chair, and I asked him to resume his seat. I have made my ruling and I shall abide by that.

Mr BORBIDGE: I give notice that tomorrow I shall move that Mr Deputy Speaker's ruling in relation to the matters raised by the member for Broadwater on Tuesday, 14 September 1993 be dissented from.

Mr BARTON: This is a traditional Labor Budget. That has already been said since the Budget was presented, but I want to stress it. It is a Budget that looks after the interests of the people. It is a Budget that encourages economic development in this State. It is a Budget that is all about creating jobs. It is also a Budget that supports business. It is a Budget which ensures that Queensland continues to be the low-tax State.

The most basic needs of any community are jobs, good education and excellent health care. This Budget addresses all of those issues in a most positive manner. Transport and support for business are important in a modern society, and this Budget also addresses those issues most comprehensively. This Budget is a responsible economic tool. It represents the appropriate balance of expenditure on initiatives and maintains a tight rein on recurrent expenditure areas. It is the Goss Labor Party Government's fourth Budget; it is Treasurer Keith De Lacy's fourth Budget; and, very importantly, it is this Government's Budget.

Members opposite are still claiming that this Budget is building on the backs of what was achieved by the National/Liberal Party Governments. I want to say to them very clearly that it has been a long time since the National Party was in Government—some four years. It is a long, long time since the Liberals sat on the Treasury benches—10 years ago. So I do not see how they can claim any credit—if any credit was due—for the state of the Queensland economy before the Goss Government came to power nearly four years ago. The Nationals and the Liberals cannot claim any kudos, because this Budget is very much this Government's Budget.

What does the Budget provide? It provides for jobs. Queensland will continue to generate more jobs than any other State. Budget forecasts are that some 43 600 jobs will be created as a result of the Capital Works Program alone. This Budget provides for growth in Queensland. That growth has been projected at some 3.8 per cent, compared with national growth projections of 2.75 per cent. This Budget will ensure that Queensland maintains its position as the leading State. This Budget provides for record capital works of \$3.4 billion. Importantly, it provides for infrastructure that is needed in our community. Some \$1.5 billion—including \$635m for rail and \$690m for roads—has been allocated to transport alone. An amount of \$150m has been allocated for capital expenditure in hospitals. In common with the member for Albert, who spoke earlier, I am also pleased that my electorate of Waterford gains a fair share of this expenditure. The widening of the South East Freeway from Beenleigh to Redland Bay Road from four lanes to six lanes at a cost of \$2.2m is important to the constituents of Waterford, particularly those who work in the city or near-city areas.

The Logan Hospital continues to be developed—something that would not have occurred if the Treasury benches had still been occupied by members of the National Party. A commitment of \$4.1m has been made to Stage IIIA of the Logan Hospital and \$1.6m for a new day surgery unit at that hospital. Also important is the allocation of some millions of dollars for the Beenleigh Community Health Centre. I join with the member for Albert in saying that this is a very important facility for the community of Beenleigh and surrounding areas. It is not really important exactly where it goes, provided that it is close to the community it serves and close to transport for people who do not have easy access to it.

In the electorate of Waterford, this Budget means jobs while fairly high levels of construction take place, and it also means jobs in Waterford in the long term in the staffing of important facilities. Most importantly, however, is the provision of much-needed facilities for the community—facilities that were ignored in the area of my electorate while the National Party held the Treasury benches and in the deep, dark past when the Liberal Party was part of the coalition Government.

Services are most important. The electorate of Waterford is placed in the middle of the growth corridor in Logan and North Albert. In the SEQ 2001 document that was released recently, the Waterford electorate was shown to be right in the middle of the big red mark on the map showing urban development. It is an area that was neglected by the Nationals in Government because the area contained new suburbs that were populated by traditional Labor Party voters. The Goss Government is now providing many of these overdue services.

Stage II of the Logan Hospital was recently opened by the Premier. Provision is made in this Budget for Stage IIIA and the day surgery unit, and the Beenleigh Community Health Centre will complement the great work that has been taking place and will continue to take place at the Logan Hospital. These are services that are important to the women who live in Beenleigh and in the surrounding region because, until now, they had not had maternity facilities or access to the type of support that growing families with young children require. Those facilities are now coming on line at the Logan Hospital.

In terms of road funding—the widening of the freeway is a priority project. In this Budget, much is being done, but much more needs to be done in Waterford in terms of transport, because of the awful legacy of the National Party Government. Many of the roads that still urgently need to be upgraded were in the hands of the Albert Shire Council until they were taken over recently by the Goss Government. Those roads were handed over to this Government in a condition that was absolutely disgraceful. Roads such as the Beenleigh-Kingston road, including Waterford Bridge, and that section of the Beenleigh ring road comprised by Logan Street and Boundary Road, were handed over in a disgraceful condition by the Albert Shire Council to this Government.

The Albert Shire Council received no support from the National Party while it was in

Government in this State; but, of course, that has not stopped the council from complaining about the condition of those roads since this Government took them over. This is specially the case in relation to a Liberal Party member, Councillor Ray Hackwood, who, because he is only six months away from a local authority election, is busily trying to pretend that he is not a member of the Liberal Party. On this occasion, he has again come out of his closet and is complaining about the condition of roads that the council did absolutely nothing about when it was in control. Those roads need attention, and I am sure that, as soon as is practicable, they will receive the necessary attention, bearing in mind that other priorities have to be taken into account.

People should not forget that the National Party Government allowed those roads to get into a disgraceful condition in the first place. Moreover, during that period, the schools were also neglected by that Government. In the National Party Government's era, new schools simply meant the provision of buildings, a fence, and the most basic equipment, and everything else was left to the parents to generate. In a low-wage area such as the Waterford electorate, parents found this very difficult. Only now are the schools in my electorate able to catch up as a result of the expenditure that has taken place over the last four years.

This Budget will provide the disadvantaged parents who live in Waterford and the disadvantaged schools in my electorate with some necessary equipment, such as computers, as well as other basic equipment. This is part of the \$9.2m program for the provision of computers in primary and secondary schools. In addition, \$63.9m has been provided in school grants; \$12.5m has been provided to assist parents and citizens organisations; and \$22.1m has been provided for text books and resources allocations. I cannot stress enough how important is the provision of those funds to parents in a low-wage area who have children at school, which is the case in most of my electorate of Waterford. This is a very important and overdue reform in education. It is one that this Budget has taken by the scruff of the neck and dealt with in a very appropriate manner.

During the past 12 months since the 1992 election, schools in Waterford have had significant refurbishment work carried out. This work has been long overdue. For the first time, some schools have received their first maintenance coat of paint since they were built. Playgrounds have also been properly established. For example, at the Waterford

West State School, the land that was provided for the playground was very poorly drained. It was inadequate for the children to play on, but at last it has been brought up to proper condition for the children to enjoy. Dangerous playground equipment that was left during the years of National Party Government has also been replaced. The refurbishment work, which continues as part of this Budget, has been carried out by the old master of Labor politics, the battlers' friend, Deputy Premier Tom Burns. He personally came down and inspected much of what needed to be done at these schools and, by giving instructions to his departmental officers on the spot, took a personal interest in ensuring that it was carried out.

This year, the program of refurbishment will continue with an allocation of \$37.6m from the tobacco tax. If what has taken place in the schools in my electorate of Waterford is an example of what is occurring right across this State, then that is one of the most important features of this Budget. The Education budget is giving kids at school a fair go. It builds on the work that has already been achieved over the past four years. It overturns decades—and I emphasise “decades”—of neglect that was brought about when the members of the National Party were in power in their own right, and during some 20 years prior to that when the Liberals were in coalition. This obviously shows that members of the coalition did not then have a commitment to looking after ordinary working people any more than they do now.

I wish to refer to teachers, briefly. In my electorate of Waterford, this Budget is recognised by the teachers whom I met on Monday of last week as fair and reasonable. Certainly, they indicated that they have some reservations about teacher numbers. At the stage I met them, they had some reservations about the redundancy package details which they received only late last week. Bearing in mind all the difficulties that have taken place in relation to teachers' concerns, I think it is very important to record that at a meeting with me where teachers received information about precisely what had been provided for education in the Budget, those who attended the meeting believed that it was fair and reasonable.

This Budget supports business because it supports and accepts the role of the private sector in economic development in Queensland. This development brings jobs and it also brings new population. A higher population will increase this State's relative

economic clout at a national and international level. What does this Budget not do? I believe it is important that this question be asked. What is it that the Budget simply does not do? Firstly, it does not increase taxes. It maintains Queensland as the low-tax State and the State with the lowest payroll tax. Of course, payroll tax is an issue on which quite a bit has been heard from the Liberal Party, particularly from the “giant” shadow Treasurer, the Deputy Leader of the Coalition. Members of the Liberal Party have said that they will remove payroll tax altogether. It is important, therefore, to examine what is taking place in other States that are controlled by the Liberal Party.

In their speeches in this Budget debate, members of the Liberal Party want to talk about what happens in other States because it suits them to do so, but in the Liberal-controlled States of New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia and Tasmania, there are high levels of payroll tax and nothing is being done to reduce those levels. This is another example of the Liberal Party playing pick-a-box by trying to give everybody what he or she wants to hear, as long as it is popular. In one breath, they say, “Cut existing taxes.” In the next breath, they say, “Cut expenditure.” However, on issues that do not suit them, Liberal Party members are not backward in coming forward to say that more money should be spent on a whole range of areas that they believe will help them to gain some level of popular support. When expenditure on jobs is being increased, they oppose it. When difficult decisions must be made and some affected groups are upset, members of the Liberal Party are always opportunist and try to side with the disaffected group.

Are we not lucky that Liberal Party members have been away from the Treasury benches for 10 years. With the way that they are going, with nobody holding the tiller, they are at least another 10 years away from having any chance of regaining the Treasury benches. Their coalition partners the National Party are pursuing the same inappropriate strategies.

I will return to the business aspect of the Budget. It continues the lowest payroll tax and the lowest business taxes and charges, does not provide for a State fuel tax and provides support for business by providing \$4.8m for the National Industry Extension Service. That service is jointly funded by the State Government and the Federal Government. The scheme assists business to operate most effectively by adopting the latest technology,

adopting world's best practice work methods and providing an enterprise industrial relations focus to put the new technology and work methods into place.

The Budget also provides for continued strong support for the Queensland Small Business Corporation. That maintains the level of support for that corporation to assist new small businesses to get up and running. That is why new business in this State is starting at an ever-increasing rate.

I will also look closely at the Capital Works Program. The record \$3.4 billion Capital Works Program assists the private sector. Of that \$3.4 billion, it is estimated that some 80 per cent will be spent within the private sector, which will assist the State's businesses to become more prosperous. It will increase investment and the number of jobs and will have an important multiplier effect down the track to small business. The old days when public sector capital expenditure had little effect on the private sector are gone. Most work is now put out to contract to the private sector. That is important for those people who will be contractors, subcontractors and suppliers.

The industrial relations climate in Queensland is also the best in Australia. Apparently, except for the National Party and the Liberal Party, we all learned very difficult lessons in the 1980s. We have learned to work closely and effectively with business to ensure that we maintain that good industrial relations climate in Queensland. If we look at the Department of Employment, Training and Industrial Relations, the Minister is also to be congratulated on being a sleeper in this Budget and quietly getting on with the job. The Minister is certainly a quiet achiever.

In his department, there is \$431.7m for TAFE, \$15.9m for the operation of traineeship and apprenticeship schemes, an increase of 33 500 TAFE places, assistance to a further 25 000 people through the \$150m Jobs Plan, almost \$100m in other employment and training initiatives, \$1.75m for training and placement programs through private providers, and \$50m in capital works for the upgrading of existing TAFE facilities and the provision of additional TAFE facilities. Those are most important initiatives, including some \$800,000 to assist enterprise bargaining in the private and public sector.

I have covered a small part of the Budget. I repeat that it is a good, traditional Labor Budget, one of which the Government and the back bench are very proud. The

Budget is good for Queensland and good for my electorate of Waterford. It has the support of a majority of Queenslanders, apart from the small number of Opposition members, and they do not count.

Mr LINGARD (Beaudesert—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (3.54 p.m.): It was only a few months ago that the Premier and the Treasurer of this State returned from their annual pilgrimage to the Premiers Conference in Canberra. They both came back wringing their hands and regaling us with tales of woe, financial disaster and cutbacks to Government spending throughout Queensland. We were told that railway lines must be closed, that teachers must be sacked and that schools throughout Queensland must close or amalgamate and share principals. The public was led to assume that the State was facing economic ruin.

So we saw a period of rationalisation, when clearly the Government removed, or tried to remove those services that it had honestly always believed could not be sustained because they were not viable. Clearly, rural Queensland was affected. Yet, magically, the Treasurer has managed to pull out of his hat enough money to increase the Education budget by 4.3 per cent, the Health budget by 8.4 per cent and the Queensland Police Service budget by 5.4 per cent—a typical socialist Budget. So the Treasurer either misled thousands of Queenslanders, especially rural Queenslanders, or he has found a large amount of money from somewhere.

Mr Dollin: A hollow log.

Mr LINGARD: That is right. It came from a hollow log, as the Opposition has said before. Let us look closely at the Budget to determine, firstly, what it will do for Queensland and, secondly, how the Treasurer and the Premier have managed to cook the figures to bring down a so-called balanced Budget. Queensland is facing a jobs crisis, with less than 50 per cent of people entering the Queensland labour force being able to find employment. We have a youth unemployment rate of 31.5 per cent. Yet the Government does nothing to provide jobs for Queenslanders unless they are members of the ALP employed in the Queensland public service. Under the Labor Government, employment in the Queensland public service grew by 12 per cent, and employment in the private sector dropped by 7 per cent.

The Government will tell people that the increase in the public service employment figures is all due to more teachers, more

nurses or more police officers. That is not true. The public sector grew by nearly 21 000 people. Very few of those people work at the coalface and provide a direct service to Queensland taxpayers. The real growth in the public service has been in management and administration. In the Premier's own office, his department, his Public Sector Management Commission and his Office of the Cabinet, hundreds of extra people have been employed to cover his tail. As I have said before in this House, Queenslanders do not mind paying taxes when they can see a benefit from those taxes. However, under this Government, we have seen no improvement in the provision of services to Queenslanders.

We have seen fewer school teachers, an increase in class sizes, cutbacks to the number of subjects being taught and the threat of school closures. In the police force, overtime is cut. Police stations are no longer manned after hours and on weekends. The CJC and the Government have been so oppressive towards the police force that it is becoming virtually impossible for police officers to perform their functions. The Health Department is in chaos, its waiting times being listed in years. Patients are being callously left to die while on the waiting lists. Wards are being closed permanently or shut down over vital holiday periods, and doctors, nurses and other health professionals have become more and more disappointed, more frustrated and increasingly angry.

It is obvious that any increase in the budgets of those departments will not result in any improvement to the welfare of Queenslanders; the money will instead be wasted on administration, so-called management training, endless committees, navel gazing and general dithering. We have seen salaries of administrators double and vast amounts spent on supplying them with private cars, but nothing for Mr and Mrs Queensland.

The Government has no qualms about wasting money on itself and its supporters, so I warn the taxpayers of Queensland that they should not expect to see any improvements for the money that the Goss Government is taking off them from gambling and tobacco and from new and increased taxes associated with house and land purchases. The Budget has many faults—some glaring and some well hidden. Unfortunately for the Treasurer and his Premier, those faults are not hidden well enough. The entire revenue outlet for the State is under a cloud. The Government—the typical, big-spending Labor Government—relies heavily on the Commonwealth to fund

its high-spending and glamorous lifestyle, yet the future of Commonwealth funding is uncertain after June of next year, and it is highly likely that this Government could face severe financial cutbacks—and I mean real cutbacks, not just a reduction in its overly ambitious wish list.

Revenue raising within the State by the Goss Government is also facing an uncertain future. Currently before the High Court is the case of Capital Duplicators v. The ACT. There is a distinct possibility that the High Court may rule in favour of Capital Duplicators. This would mean that State business franchise fees are invalid; consequently, tobacco and liquor licence fees would no longer be able to be applied. As liquor licences are expected to bring in \$107m and tobacco licences will bring in \$340m this financial year, any cancellation of those licences and consequent refunds of that revenue will be disastrous for the State of Queensland.

Apart from the problems that the Government may face with its revenue base, one other major area in the Budget should cause all Queenslanders grave concern. I refer, of course, to the Statement of Unforeseen Expenditure to be Appropriated for the financial year 1992-93. Unforeseen expenditure to be appropriated for 1992-93 comprises \$311m in the consolidated fund and \$1.68 billion in the trust and special funds—a total of \$2 billion worth of unforeseen expenditure last year. The full story behind that unforeseen expenditure actually starts with the 1991-92 Budget, which ran up some \$412m in unforeseen expenses. Of course, that did not show up until the 1992-93 Budget was brought down last year. What we find is that in its second Budget the Goss Labor Government went nearly half a billion dollars over its anticipated expenditure. It did not take the Goss Government long to start following in the path of the Labor administrations of Cain, Bannon and Burke.

Of course, when the Goss Government brought down its 1992-93 Budget, which ran some \$2 billion over anticipated expenditure, it must have known that the intended expenditure would blow out way beyond the Budget forecast. No Treasurer—not even Keith De Lacy—could be 15 per cent out on every expenditure item and always the one way—that is, over expenditure—without having some idea that his original Budget forecast was not factual. In my area of responsibility alone—that is, Administrative Services—the budget blew out by \$150m last year. I will have to more to say about that in the Estimates debate.

How did this \$2 billion in unforeseen expenditure come about, and how is it being funded? Firstly, all the trust and all the special accounts are rapidly being milked by the Labor Government to help keep the Budget on an even keel. Unfortunately for the Treasurer, those funds are rapidly drawing to a close. The other method which the Government is using to keep its head temporarily above water is the Queensland Treasury Corporation's accounts. The QTC fund last year blew out by \$1.16 billion. What is obviously happening is that the Government is using the QTC to balance its books. I noted that this year's Budget, under the heading "Composition of financial asset and liability balances", states—

"QTC's gross liabilities are excluded as these relate to the QTC's financial market activities and include borrowings undertaken in advance of forthcoming debt maturities, for the liquidity management activities and on account of sinking funds held against future debt maturities."

What that means in plain English is that the Government is saying that it has borrowed to the eyeballs to pay for the current expenditures. The amounts have now become so large that they cannot conveniently be hidden in the Budget, so the QTC's liabilities will be excluded entirely to ensure that nobody finds out the true state of what is happening in Queensland.

This Government—if it had any intention of presenting a truthful and accurate Budget—would be showing the total Government liabilities and total liabilities of all departments and statutory authorities within Queensland. Only in this way could the public of Queensland find out exactly what the Government is up to. The Treasurer may respond by saying that the QTC's annual report was not ready or finalised in time for the printing of the Budget, and that further details of the QTC's operations would be found when that report is released. However, we all know that all business accounts are balanced on a certain date each year, and those figures would have been available for some time. There should be no need for us to have to wait for a glossy annual report.

In the 1992-93 Budget papers, under the heading "Real Queensland State Government debt", there is an explanation which reads—

"The increase in gross liabilities substantially reflects market valuation adjustment by the Queensland Treasury

Corporation, resulting from interest rate changes during the year."

1992-93 was a year that saw stable interest rates at their worst and certainly falling interest rates for virtually everybody. Yet somehow, the gross liabilities of the QTC increased dramatically. That could have come about only by dramatically increased borrowing, because with falling interest rates, liabilities must decrease.

What this Budget really shows is that the Goss Labor Government has lost control of the finances of Queensland; that it is unable to prevent a \$2 billion blow-out in unforeseen expenditure; and that it is fudging the figures to try to cover up the true state of Queensland's finances. Within only a couple of years, the Labor Government started spending half a billion dollars more than it had allowed for and, within three years, that half a billion dollars had grown to \$2 billion. The 1992-93 Budget may have been balanced at the time, but it was certainly not balanced when \$2 billion of unforeseen expenditure was added to it. There is no phrase to describe the 1992-93 Budget other than a total disaster.

If unforeseen expenditure can jump from half a billion dollars to \$2 billion in one year, what will unforeseen expenditure this year—1993-94—amount to when it is published next year? Will \$2 billion of unforeseen expenditure last year blow out to \$2 billion or \$3 billion this year? Where has the Government found the money to meet the \$2.5 billion worth of expenditure that it has incurred so far?

All Queenslanders witnessed the panic in which the Goss Government found itself as a result of the land claim against Comalco following the Mabo decision. Naturally, if its bauxite mining operations were going to be threatened, there is no way that Comalco was going to be interested in buying the Gladstone Power House from the Goss Labor Government. Goss moved heaven and earth to try to negate the land claim against Comalco. He has not reacted in a similar fashion to any other land claims throughout Queensland. Why? Does the Premier have a special affinity to Comalco? Does the thought of bauxite mining fill him with glee? Of course not! He desperately needs the money from that Gladstone Power House; he desperately needs the \$800m that it could bring him to balance a Budget where expenditure will exceed revenue by billions of dollars.

The Gladstone Power House was paid for by all Queenslanders. Every time they paid their electricity accounts, they contributed towards the construction of powerhouses such

as the one at Gladstone. We do not trust Mr Goss and Mr De Lacy. We do not trust them to hand that \$800m to the Queensland Electricity Commission and say, "Go ahead; build a new, modern, clean powerhouse with it." We do not expect them to agree to reduce the tariffs on all electricity charges so that all Queenslanders can benefit from the sale. We can guarantee that the Government will not do that. What will happen in reality to Queenslanders' money is that the Government will grab it with both hands and throw it into consolidated revenue to try to prop up one more year of fiscal irresponsibility.

On top of the \$2 billion that the Treasurer did not expect to spend last financial year, we find in this year's Budget that the Labor Government is once again desperately stealing from the savings and reserves of Queensland's taxpayers. I refer, of course, to the intrapublic accounts transfers, which have risen from \$163m last year to \$321m this year. I note that in this year's Budget an explanation is given as to what intrapublic accounts transfers are. Unfortunately for the Treasurer, we all knew what they were last year. Those transfers are derived from the Labor Government stealing money from such accounts as the Auctioneers and Agents Fidelity Guarantee Fund, the electricity fund and the ambulance and fire service funds. All of those funds comprise money either raised by Queenslanders or taxed from Queenslanders to provide them with better services or to guarantee the liabilities incurred by business operations. All of that money has been swallowed—and I repeat, "swallowed"—by the Labor Government to pay for its spending. What we are doing in this case is robbing Peter to pay Wayne and Keith.

It is easy to show the absolute absurdity of the Labor Government's new accounting procedures, the ones that employ hundreds of accountants to watch money go around and around in ever decreasing circles and ensure that Queenslanders do not find out that their State is technically broke. Under the heading of "Intrapublic Accounts Transfers", we see that Queensland Rail is being paid from consolidated funds for its community service obligations, that is, those passenger lines and freight lines that provide a necessary service but do not necessarily make a profit, and then Queensland Rail transfers this money back to consolidated revenue. So the Treasurer giveth with one hand and taketh away with the other. I ask the Treasurer: how many accountants did it take to dream up that little exercise and how much is it costing us to watch money

being moved around on paper but with no practical benefit to the Queensland taxpayer?

The money available from raiding trust funds in Queensland is rapidly running out. The savings are being depleted at an ever-increasing rate. In the last four years, over \$1 billion has disappeared via these transfers. This cannot continue. The money is running out. We now spend \$2 billion a year more than we gain in revenue, and that is on top of the hundreds of millions that we are taking from our trust accounts. All of this money is being swallowed up by the most extravagant Government in Australia, a Government that took its cue from its Labor forebears in Western Australia, South Australia, Tasmania and Victoria. Its members saw what a great lifestyle they can have in Government for themselves and their ALP crony supporters and thought, "We'll get our noses and our hands into the troughs and we'll have everything we can see until the trough is empty." Unfortunately for Queenslanders, the trough is now empty and we are now surviving by fiddling the books.

I would like to mention three other aspects of my own electorate. It is absolutely disgraceful that the plan for a State high school at Jimboomba has been scrapped. The Jimboomba area has a population of 25 000. The Government has made a definite decision that it will now not build high schools in rural residential areas; it will only build schools in urban residential areas. High schools cost between \$15m and \$16m, so the Government has made a decision that an area such as Jimboomba, which is not urban residential but has a massive population in the northern part of Beaudesert Shire, will not have a high school. Now we see in the planning figures that Park Ridge State High School will accommodate 2 250 students, with all other kids from Jimboomba being shipped up to Loganlea, to Marsden and to Browns Plains to fill up those schools.

The second matter about which I am ashamed is the Beaudesert Hospital. In 1989, the National Party promised that the Beaudesert Hospital would be completely rebuilt. When Mr Comben was the shadow Minister for Health, he promised that a Labor Government would rebuild the hospital at Beaudesert. The former Minister for Health, Mr McElligott, promised that it would be put on the three-year plan. When it was part of the Brisbane South area, Logan Hospital, which was in my electorate at that time, came on line. Now that Beaudesert is included in the Gold Coast region, obviously areas such as Nerang and Helensvale will continue to beat

Beaudesert in the provision of hospital facilities. A definite promise of the National Party in 1989, confirmed by shadow Minister Comben and by former Minister McElligott, has not eventuated.

The third matter relates to the Jimboomba Bridge. I heard the member for Waterford speaking of the development of roads. In the 10 years since I have been in that area, I have seen the construction of the South East Freeway, the Kingston-Beenleigh road, the Mount Lindsay Highway, the Cunningham Highway and the Logan Motorway. The trouble with the Mount Lindsay Highway is that we started from Compton Road and went very quickly to Johnson Road and Vansittart Road. Since 1989, all the Government has done is work on the section from Vansittart Road to Middle Road, a distance of approximately 800 metres. Jimboomba Bridge is very narrow. The Minister has refused to build a new bridge, and two weeks ago a young fellow was killed there. The residents of Jimboomba are really upset. They know that a new bridge is required, but the Government does not have enough money to build one. A new bridge would cost \$800,000. What is more, there is no provision for the new bridge in this Budget.

Mr LIVINGSTONE (Ipswich West) (4.14 p.m.): It is a great honour to speak in support of this Budget, which has already been accepted by the people of Queensland as a very responsible Budget delivered in very harsh economic times. It amazes me to hear members opposite bleat, whinge and complain about the Budget. They know in their own minds that it is a great Budget. I would have thought that, instead of making fools out of themselves by trying to pick holes in the Budget, they would have been better off telling another untruth—that we stole their policies. Perhaps that may not have sounded quite so bad for them.

All the political writers agree that this is one of the best Budgets ever. Nothing is more sickening than hearing members opposite complaining about what a bad Budget it is. It is interesting to reflect on what great managers members opposite were when they were in Government.

Mr Cooper: They may have been very good political writers, but they were not very good financial writers.

Mr LIVINGSTONE: The honourable member talks about financial writers. We should think back to when he was the Premier before we came into Government in 1989. Prior to our election, there was no record of

the rent that was being paid for Government buildings in Brisbane and no record of who was occupying them. When we came to office and asked about those figures, we found that they simply did not exist. Similarly, maintenance costs were not recorded and there was no maintenance assessment on programs in place. As to cars—the previous Government had no plan. It did not know how many cars it owned, who drove them or where they were. So bad was its plan that there was no registration of the number of vehicles kept. When we came into Government and checked the department, it thought that it owned approximately 10 000 cars. An accurate assessment revealed that we were paying registration on 15 000 cars. Yet the honourable member claims to have been a great manager. He was the Premier at the time.

I would like to comment on just a few of the many items in this Budget. One of the very important items is the record spending of \$477m on the Queensland Police Service, which represents an increase of 5.5 per cent on last year's Budget, and a commitment to another 120 police on the beat this year. That commitment has been welcomed by the residents of Ipswich West and, indeed, the whole West Moreton area, including the electorate of the honourable member opposite who interjected previously. The people of Ipswich and the surrounding region are very happy with the number of police provided and the expenditure that was allocated in the Budget. That certainly did not happen under the previous National Party Government. Under the previous Government, the resources in Ipswich at the police station near my electorate office were so bad that I made my office available for photocopying and sending out faxes. I am talking about a station in the city in 1989. That station was one of the oldest in the State. It did not even have hot water. Since this Government has been in office, we have spent over \$140,000 refurbishing that station into a very modern Juvenile Aid Bureau.

It amazes me to listen to members opposite interject and criticise this Government's Budget on law and order. We are not going to let members opposite forget that, when they were in Government, Queensland had the lowest police per population ratio of any police service in Australia. This is the area in which inadequate spending over the years had the most impact, leaving areas such as Ipswich with an understaffed police service and an escalating crime rate. This Government recognises the

problem of inadequate police numbers. Since we came to office, my region already has received an increase of 64 police. That is a great improvement on the position when the National Party was in Government. There is no doubt that Ipswich will get its fair share of the 120 additional police in this year's Budget.

After years of neglect by the previous National and Liberal Party Governments, the rebuilding of our hospital system in Queensland has commenced. A record \$2.28 billion allocation has been made this financial year, an increase of \$187m. It is the fourth record Budget and contains the most far-reaching Capital Works Program that this State has ever seen. I am pleased to say that Ipswich has not been left out, as it used to be under the previous National Party Government. I might add that, for the entire four years that we have been in Government, that increase has been approximately \$400m, or a 20 per cent increase.

This year's record Health budget includes funding of \$2.1m as part of its doubled capital works component for health capital works projects and medical equipment purchases in Ipswich. The expenditure is part of the Goss Government's \$1.5 billion, 10-year hospital rebuilding and modernising program which is being largely funded by the tobacco licensing fee.

Funding of approximately \$1.5m has been allocated for the development of the Ipswich Community Health Centre at the West Moreton Regional Health Authority's Ipswich Plaza premises. As well, \$600,000 has been allocated for diagnostic and therapeutic equipment for the Ipswich Hospital. Ipswich is one of a network of 11 community health care centres being built throughout the State at a total cost of almost \$20m. That is in line with the Government's commitment to provide more medical services at the local level rather than providing all health-care services through hospitals. The specific priorities identified in the program's first year follow a detailed Statewide assessment of existing public hospital capital stock and the needs of growing areas, with future projects to be decided following further investigation.

The Hospital Rebuilding Program has a fourfold focus: redeveloping existing hospitals which have been allowed to run down over many years; building new hospitals in areas of need; re-equipping the public hospital system; and developing a community health and primary health care focus. This plan is a new beginning for public hospital services in Queensland. This program recognises the run-

down state of Queensland's public hospital system's infrastructure and sets out the framework for addressing that situation in a coordinated way based on community need.

The revitalised capital stock and hospital equipment will complement the Government's first-term achievements in providing more and better services. The funding in this Budget is the fulfilment of a commitment to an election promise made by this Government to restore the State's public hospital system. This program will build on work already done to redress decades of neglect and poor planning which left the State public hospital system in a dilapidated condition. The overriding direction of the hospital modernising and rebuilding program is to revamp run-down facilities and provide new facilities where they are needed.

One of this Government's major promises during the last election campaign was to continue improving education in this State. In my first speech in this House, I spoke of the lack of facilities in Ipswich West. We are slowly addressing those problems in Ipswich West, and this Budget goes a long way towards rectifying the mismanagement of the previous National Party Government.

Mr Bennett: Good representation.

Mr LIVINGSTONE: It certainly is. I agree totally. Under the previous National Party Government, education in Queensland was seriously underfunded. The Goss Government has continued making education its top priority with another real increase in the level of funding for Queensland's students. This Education budget of \$2.35 billion is the largest amount of money ever spent on education in the history of Queensland. This is the fourth increase in as many years. It ensures that Queensland's students receive a high standard of education. That is something of which members on this side of the House can be very proud.

This Budget provides \$9.2m in support of the expansion of computers and computer-based learning in schools. Funds provided in the Budget will be used to assist in meeting the Government's \$40m pre-election commitment to have one computer for every 10 students. Under this program, \$3.4m has been allocated for maintaining and upgrading computers in secondary schools; \$4m is part of a five-year program to ensure that the ratio of students to computers in primary schools matches that in secondary schools; and \$1.8m is provided for upgrading existing computers in primary schools. This program will be funded by the tobacco licence fee. In addition, more than \$22.1m has been

provided for school textbook allowances. This is a massive increase compared to the funding provided by the previous National Party Government.

This Government recognises the increasing need for additional support for students with disabilities. This Budget provides an extra \$3m for additional support for students with special needs. This funding will provide increased teacher and teacher aide support, together with improved facilities and equipment. Also, the expenditure in this Budget for capital works at special schools is \$5.5m, of which Ipswich will get its fair share. That is something that it never got under the previous National Party Government.

The Ipswich West Special School is earmarked for major redevelopment. In the past couple of years, we have spent close to \$1m at that school. One must remember that, when we came to office, the facilities at that school were nothing short of appalling. Children had to stand in the rain to wash their hands. I am talking about children with special needs. They had to stand in the rain because there were no undercover facilities. Not only did they have to stand in the rain, but they also had to stand in a drain with water running over their feet while they were washing their hands. This Government has now rectified that problem.

Mr Cooper: Were you the representative?

Mr LIVINGSTONE: I was not the representative when the facilities were poor. That was under the previous Government. But following my representation and that of David Hamill, those problems that the previous Government created at that school were eliminated.

This Government's foreign languages program, which is the most comprehensive in Australia, will continue to expand this financial year. A total of \$19m has been allocated for that. This will allow us to employ approximately 70 new foreign language teachers.

One of the many success stories of this Government has been the \$60m School Refurbishment Program. This year, \$37.6m has been allocated for that. This is part of the \$150m Jobs Plan, with over 60 per cent of State schools in Queensland benefiting from the special maintenance program. I am very happy to say that many schools in my electorate will benefit from that.

The member for Mundingburra spoke of the lack of facilities in his area when he became the local member. It was previously a

National Party electorate. It must be remembered that, when the National Party was in Government, its policy was that it did not spend money in safe National Party electorates. It treated them the same as it did Labor Party electorates. One has only to look at my own new electorate of Ipswich West. I inherited half of a previous National Party electorate. I refer to the school at Ashwell. When I visited that school for the first time after gaining my new electorate, I was amazed to find that the principal, who had been there for approximately 13 years, had never once had a member of the previous Government visit the school. That school had had its bicentennial the year before. That shows how well the school was looked after by National Party members. That particular principal had been there for 13 years and had never seen a member of the previous Government.

The Rosewood State High School is another school that will do very well under the refurbishment program. A tremendous amount of work needs to be done there and should have been done many years ago. The Ipswich State High School is another school that was neglected. Some of its classrooms had not been painted for 17 years. One classroom had 17 windows welded shut simply because the catches were so worn. In a place such as Ipswich where the temperature reaches 40 degrees in the summer months, one can imagine how good that was for the students! Members opposite should hang their heads in shame for treating people like that.

This Government recognises the vital role that non-State schools play in delivering quality educational services to thousands of Queensland students. The allocation to non-Government schools in this Budget is in excess of \$120m, which includes per capita payments and textbook and student allowances. This Labor Government has also reformed the way in which funds are distributed to the non-State school sector. Under the new arrangements, funding will provide greater stability, certainty and accountability. The needs-based funding formula introduced by this Government ensures that a greater share of the funds will go to schools that need them most. A classic example of that would be the small parish schools, which were put at a great disadvantage in the past because they were not in a position to service the debt. The new formula should help them to a very large degree.

In the area of higher education—a total of 2 300 new State-funded university places have been created by this Government since 1989. A total of \$5.4m has been allocated in this Budget to support the 1 500 students who commenced higher education studies in 1990 and the 800 who started in 1991. In addition, \$1.3m has been set aside for the open learning network to provide rural students with opportunities to undertake tertiary studies. It offers decentralised delivery of course material using teleconferencing and other remote learning technology.

In this Budget, Ipswich has been one of those areas that have been fortunate enough to do reasonably well. The electrification of the rail line to Rosewood is in the final stages. Over \$11m has been provided towards that. I give special thanks to David Hamill for his effort in getting that off the ground. Prior to 1989, the National Party claimed that it was going to electrify the line to Rosewood. But when we came to Government and looked at the Budget, lo and behold, there was not a cent there for that purpose. Whereas the previous Government spoke about electrifying that line, it honestly had no intentions of doing that, because no money was provided for that in its Budget.

As to urban renewal—this Budget makes provision for work to commence in the major urban areas of Leichhardt and Wulkuraka in Ipswich. For many years, those areas contained a very large proportion of Housing Commission homes. It is with regret that I point out that, in the past, there were hundreds of Housing Commission homes next door to one another, street after street. Absolutely no maintenance has been done on them for many years. A lot of the homes in the area are up to 40 years of age, and it is fair to say that their occupants are living under pretty harsh conditions.

This Government is spending approximately \$20,000 on upgrading each house, particularly the kitchens and the bathrooms. Just about every room in those houses is being upgraded. We are putting in landscaping so that when people drive down the street, they will notice that each house has a different form of landscaping and different fences. All the houses will look different, so residents will not have to bear the stigma of living in a Housing Commission neighbourhood, as often happens when many Housing Commission homes are built next door to one another. The hope is that as these houses are upgraded, the Government will be in a position to sell some of them and purchase houses in new areas. At the

moment, it is impossible to sell any of the homes. Nobody is interested in them because they are in such poor condition. Certainly, Terry Mackenroth should be congratulated on the work and effort that he has put in to trying to get this project off the ground. I acknowledge the great contribution that he has made to the project.

This Budget is a very good Budget for Queensland. It is a very good Budget for Ipswich, and I support it.

Mr COOPER (Crows Nest) (4.31 p.m.): I am only too happy to take part in the Budget debate today because I think that we can certainly make some constructive comments although, certainly, we can be destructive. I have heard all the bleatings from Government members about what happened when the National Party was in Government. I do not care how far back they want to go. If they want to dwell on those sorts of matters, I can go back to when the Labor Party was previously in Government, and ask them how many high schools it built in Queensland. It built none. That Labor Government was in office for 23 years, and it was not worth a cracker. From 1957 to 1989, much was done for the education system. No-one can deny that. The National Party Government even started school bus runs. It started to build the schools and the roads after the Labor Party had been in office and had done nothing. Queensland was then the cinderella State. It was the joke of the Commonwealth, and the National Party Government had a lot of work to do in rebuilding the State—rebuilding the ports, the mines, and the roads, and virtually having to build the electricity, education and health systems from scratch because the previous Labor Party Government had let the lot go. It was not worth a cracker.

Mr Bredhauer interjected.

Mr COOPER: Compared with the other States, Queensland was a joke. The National Party Government rebuilt the State so that as Queenslanders we could hold up our heads and be proud of what we had done. It was the only State in the black. For years, for as long as a country mile, it was the only State with balanced Budgets. It was a successful reign for the National Party, so Government members should not go on with their endless destructive comments but should look at where we go from here and how we can improve things. Thank heavens, Queensland is a wealthy State. It is a successful State—far more than any of the others—so I suggest that we stop putting ourselves down by

indulging in fighting about the past and look instead at what this Budget has really done.

The Government has certainly spent some money. There is no doubt that it has increased its spending right across-the-board, but the increases have been higher in some areas than in others. The Government has spent more in the fields of education and health, but I think that the true test of a Budget is to see whether those services are actually getting through to the people, and what the people think of those services. One only has to look at the education system, the health system, or the law and order system. As to the law and order system—the crime rate is going through the roof. As to the rural sector—the DPI has been cut, the Water Resources Commission has been cut, and the productive sectors have been hit hard by this Budget and previous Budgets under the Labor Government. That is the test as to whether those Budgets are successful.

Government members have read out various bleatings from certain newspaper journalists and the like who have said, "What a great Budget it is." Opposition members have referred to the editorial in the *Age* newspaper of 25 September 1985, which was the day of the fourth Cain Budget. That editorial is worth reading. I found it intriguing. It was the day of the fourth Cain Budget or, one could say, the fourth De Lacy Budget. I want to place on the record what the editorial stated. It stated—

"It is a striking departure from tradition which makes the fourth"—

Cain/De Lacy Budget—

". . . so remarkable . . . there are no shocks . . . The Cain Government is entitled to feel pleased with this Budget."

The same as Government members. The editorial states further—

"It has generally managed the economy well in the past three years . . . and this Budget testifies to its moderation and competence."

That editorial epitomises the sort of message that Opposition members are trying to send. We can see quite plainly—all the signs are there—that this Budget is just one further example of the financial con that the Government has played upon this State.

As I have said, the proof is in the delivery of services to the people, not the wanton and wasteful spending. My friend the member for Waterford said, "This is a typical, traditional Budget." His chest swelled out; he felt as proud as punch. I thought, "Yes, he is right—high tax, high spending—wanton, wasteful

spending." That is what it is. Government members say that it is great to spend money. They love it. They feed their habit. They have to go out and get more, raise more taxes, put their hands in people's pockets and tax them more so that they can feed their spending habit. Keating has done it for 10 years. We have had to suffer it from this Government for four years, and that is four years too long. The member for Waterford is exactly right—it is a typical, traditional Labor Budget.

I would rather not listen to the platitudes of some of these so-called political commentators in the media—and not all of them are bad; some are reasonably capable of some investigative journalism. However, too many of them just accept something at face value. What we have been looking for and what we need is some incisiveness. We need to have some people who are prepared to give honest critiques and to scratch under the surface. That is when things are exposed to be nothing but sleight of hand. There are too many sleights of hand, and this is where the danger can arise. We are going down that road of sycophantic journalists—it has happened with this Budget and it has happened with previous Budgets—and we do not want a continuation of that lack of incisiveness and lack of intelligence. We need to have critiques of the Budget, so that people can benefit from them rather than have journalists feeding them material they have accepted at face value. No doubt, it will lead the Government into a false sense of security. It will lead the Government into kidding itself that everything in the garden is rosy. It is not.

The very thing that should drive that comment home to Government members is the level of unemployment. It is hardly mentioned at all in the Budget. Surely, the unemployment problem must come home to Government members when they say that they have had four magnificent Budgets—stacks of spending, and stacks of taxing—yet the unemployment level is still going through the roof. The other day, even the Treasurer scratched his head and said, "I do not know what went wrong. I cannot understand the figures." The figure is now 11.2 per cent, which is third highest in the Commonwealth. That amounts to 172 100 people out of work. For the 1 740 days that the Premier has been in office, every day, 45 people have gone on the dole. That is 45 more today, 45 tomorrow and 45 the next day. Despite all of the days that the Premier has been in office, unemployment is still a problem. It does not seem to bother the Government. Why is it, then, if the Government's Budgets are so good and the

massive capital spending is so great, that the number of unemployed is still going through the roof? It should bother the Government because not only is unemployment going through the roof but also in the four years that the Government has been in office, it has taxed families an extra \$1,700 in order to feed its habit. Yet the unemployment rate is going through the roof. Government members call the Budget a typical, traditional Labor Budget. I call it a "junkie, feed your habit" Budget. That is exactly what it is.

As for education—I am quite happy to take my area as an example. The Government can tell that it has major problems when it listens to the people, be they teachers, principals, parents, citizens or students. When, because of their concern, students virtually run after the Premier in a mall to ask him some questions, that is an indication of a Government that has got problems. I think it was the first time I had ever seen students racing to more or less attack a Premier saying, "What are you doing to our education system?" These students are terribly concerned about our education system.

Even in a bush town such as Pittsworth, for the first time in history parents, teachers and students are marching in the streets. That type of thing never happened in the past, but this Government has made it happen. The members of this Labor Government are pretty clever in the way they use the Budget cons and the tricks of sleight of hand. They have tried to con the people, but they have been unsuccessful because the people know very well that service provided through the education system is slipping. If the members of this Government took any notice of and listened to the parents, teachers and students, they would actually see the despair and hopelessness in their faces.

In many western areas, local parliamentary representatives have been trying to persuade teachers to stay on, in spite of the fact that members of this Government have filled their lives with hopelessness and frustration. They have been forced into conducting demonstrations in the streets. The Government has let the system deteriorate to such an extent that the service provided at the receiver end—in spite of all the money that is being spent—is not improving. This Government is indulging in wasteful, wanton spending in the usual bureaucratic way. It adopts the attitude of chucking money at a problem and reckons that that will do the job.

People are still concerned about their schools being under threat of closure. People in the west are aware that, in spite of the assurances that have been given in relation to schools not being closed down, the threat still exists. I will refer to that later in greater detail. The people have been told that clustering is not on the agenda but I say that it is; it has only been temporarily taken off while everybody settles down. When people least expect it, this Government will sock them with clustering. I know very well that that is what will happen. Instead of representative government, we are experiencing government by arrogant bureaucrats who are trying to impose changes on the education system against the will of the people. The bureaucrats think that is a good idea because they are embittered and they have chips on their shoulders. For some reason, they have been put down, and they now see their chance of imposing their will and whim on the education system. As far as I am concerned, they, too, are engaging in a very, very cruel con.

A great deal was said about the cuts amounting to \$115m. The Premier returned from the Premiers Conference and announced the reduction of \$115m, but this was yet another cruel con because nothing like that amount had to be made up in funding at all—not in a \$10 billion Budget. The Premier knew very well that he was using that as an excuse to make some radical, unwanted changes to the education system, but now he has seen what happens when the people fight back and say that they are not going to cop what he is trying to dish out. I can assure him and other members of the Labor Government that they will be copping more of the same.

The member for Ipswich West told us about the great improvements in law and order. He mentioned the figure of 5.4 per cent as an increase in funding, but the figure is really approximately 3.8 per cent with inflation running at 2.5 per cent—barely a 1 per cent increase. That is the priority given by this Government to law and order. Members of the Government know that in every area one can think of, crime is out of control. Country towns that have never previously experienced high levels of crime—places such as Oakey—are now experiencing armed hold-ups of women at 8.30 at night in service stations. Of course, that type of offence occurs frequently in Brisbane, but this Government's attitude towards law enforcement is pushing crime out into the country areas.

Mr Beattie: Where were you on the night of 3 August?

Mr COOPER: The person was wearing a balaclava, so it could well have been the member for Brisbane Central—if he knew the way to Oakey! You would not know where Oakey was and you would have got lost on the way.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Palaszczuk): Order! I ask the honourable member to address his remarks through the Chair.

Mr BEATTIE: I rise to a point of order. I find the honourable member's remarks offensive. It is quite obvious that he is the one with the beady eyes, and I ask for those remarks to be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to withdraw those remarks.

Mr COOPER: I will withdraw, but I think you heard the member say that I have beady eyes.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member has asked for a withdrawal.

Mr COOPER: Will the member for Brisbane Central withdraw his remarks?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Crows Nest has withdrawn those remarks. He may continue his speech.

Mr COOPER: Mr Deputy Speaker, let us keep this argument even.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member will return to the content of his speech.

Mr COOPER: All right.

Mr Beattie: I can see those beady eyes. You were there.

Mr COOPER: The member for Brisbane Central should behave himself. He will have his turn later. I wish to discuss further the issue of law and order because although it has been said that the funding has increased, the increases have been only marginal. Mr Deputy Speaker, I do tend to attract interjections like a magnet. I do not mind talking to Government members one little bit.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

Mr COOPER: The increase in the Police budget is not major—maybe 1 per cent, if we are lucky. Without a significant increase, I do not believe that police officers will be able to improve on the service delivery of the past, given the fact that the budget is a treading-water budget. This is what concerns me.

One of the wider community's major problems is law and order enforcement. With high rates of unemployment and an education and health system that have gone off the rails, the public safety factor is important. People want to feel that they can walk the streets safely, day or night, and they want to feel safe in their own homes. Under present conditions, police cannot guarantee to improve on their ability to provide for public safety. This is not the fault of police officers. The fact is that there has been a twisting or bending of priorities, and nowhere is this more evident than in the corporate services expenditure—the bureaucratic area. That area of the budget increased by 7.8 per cent, whereas operational support decreased by \$1.2m. So much for the priority of public safety in the area of law and order! As far as the Capital Works Programs are concerned, law and order does not exist. That is another indication that this is a sleight of hand, con Budget.

Let me take for example the Bundaberg watch-house, which has design work due for commencement in 1992-93. In the 1993-94 Budget, I see that it is about to be commenced all over again. In fact, it has not even been started. This is the type of sleight of hand that is taking place in the Budget. At Doomadgee, the replacement station and watch-house was due to be commenced and all the design work, etc., was due to be carried out in 1992-93; yet, again, design and documentation is mentioned in this year's Budget, so the process will happen all over again. There is also to be a commencement of the design and construction of the Wynnum Police Station, but in 1993-94 more design and construction is provided for. All the stuff that this Government calls capital works and which is supposed to have happened has not happened. Deprivation to the tune of tens of millions of dollars has been wrought on the system by this Government.

The Stock Squad is in need of increased funding from the Police budget. Insufficient emphasis is being placed on the offence of the stealing of stock right across this State and right at this very moment. I point out that cattle duffing is exactly the same type of stealing as robbing a corner store. There is no difference, yet some judges believe that there is a romantic element in an offence that belongs more to the Ned Kelly era and that it can be condoned with a bit of a chuckle. I specifically mention the case that was heard recently in Dalby concerning stealing that occurred at Taroom. The judge let the offender off, in spite of the fact that the Stock

Squad had been chasing him for 14 months. The Stock Squad had this fellow cold and had applied significant resources to his apprehension. They brought him before the courts and the judge said that he was to be let off with a \$1,000 surety and no conviction was recorded. It was more or less a case of the fellow walking out the door scot-free. All of the work and the resources of the Stock Squad that went into the investigation for 14 months produced an unsatisfactory result, and that is typical of what is happening across the State. As regards the Police budget, there has to be a realistic revamping of the Stock Squad's allocation so that its operations can be properly coordinated across the State. The need for resources to investigate stock matters should be given just as much attention as those that are used to deal with crime in the streets. I intend to develop my argument in relation to this matter during the debate on the Police Estimates.

A great deal has been heard about the Queensland Ambulance Service, and a great deal more will be heard in the future. The information is coming from the patients who are the recipients of the so-called services and the ambulance officers. The officers are certainly not our way politically, but they are very dedicated and professional people. They are dedicated servants of the people and they desperately want to continue to give their services to the people. They cannot understand why services are cut, thereby preventing them from delivering the services that they always used to provide. An examination of the budgetary allocation for ambulance services reveals that in 1992-93, the estimate of expenditure was \$115.4m. The budgeted amount was actually underspent by \$5m, and actual expenditure came in at \$110m. In spite of that, the Ambulance Service is on its knees and is crying out for resources. The service is also having its staff numbers cut.

Already, we have heard that the staff at the Gold Coast will be cut from 108 to 98. That means that the operational on-road service will be cut from approximately 78 to 66. That, of course, places enormous stress and strain on those officers in a region that is volatile, very upwardly mobile and growing. That region also has an increasing incidence of crime and road accidents, where ambulance officers are needed. The Ambulance Service should be on top of the tree, with all of the top services, yet its budget is being endlessly cut.

Mr Santoro: He says that it is going okay.

Mr COOPER: The Minister keeps saying that we have the world's best service. The ambulance union will tell people that response times have increased from an average of 7 minutes under the National Party Government to 15 minutes under the Labor Party Government. That is a fight that they can have. Although the Minister says that it is the world's best service, how on earth can it be the world's best service when response times have doubled?

There was an amount of \$44.5m in reserves. That is the Minister's money and mine. He put money into that; we all did. One member threw off and rubbished the raffles, the chocolate wheels and the donations in cash and kind. Those activities meant that a close rapport existed between the community and the Ambulance Service. There was nothing wrong with it at all. Those activities raised \$44.5m over generations. In two years, the Labor Government spent the lot and then blamed Noel Gillard and a few others for that wanton waste of money. We have seen also a massive increase in fees to non-subscribers in particular, and I will develop that point further in the Estimates debate.

Time expired.

Mr ROBERTSON (Sunnybank) (4.53 p.m.): It is always a pleasure to follow the member for Crows Nest, accepting as I do the responsibility to bring sense and rational debate back into the House. One of my colleagues said to me that there is nothing worse than listening to a bleeding heart National. I say: since when did those people get a heart?

Nearly 12 months ago to the day, I was elected as the member for Sunnybank. Members will recall that, shortly after the State election, the third Goss Labor Budget was presented to Parliament. That Budget continued to significantly improve the quality of State services to the community. Importantly, the 1993-94 Budget delivers on the promises made by Labor to the people of Queensland at the 1992 election. Unlike the member for Broadwater, I can find much in the Budget about which to speak in the House today.

Queensland has now had the opportunity to study the fourth State Budget presented by the Labor Government. Clearly, the Budget has received wide public support and acclaim for maintaining the high standards set in the three preceding Budgets. A measure of the success of the fourth Goss Labor Budget is that members of the Opposition have failed miserably to make any inroads in the

community with their criticisms. I am sure that it will not be long until the Opposition retreats into its time-honoured defence of claiming that Labor still lives off the back of Queensland's sound financial position that was inherited from the Nationals in 1989.

But that claim is starting to wear pretty thin in the community, because the community realises that a balanced Budget and low levels of debt are easy to attain year after year if a Government does not provide adequate services. That is what sets the Labor Government apart from the Opposition in terms of its sound financial record. The Labor Government has consistently delivered financially responsible Budgets while, at the same time, improving the range and quality of services to the community.

I have said in previous speeches in this House that we hear a lot of complaining and whingeing from members of the Opposition on a wide range of issues. Of course, as we know, the principal role of an Opposition is to scrutinise the actions of a Government. But where members of the Opposition fail dismally in this House and in the broader community is their inability to advocate viable alternatives. At no stage during the 12 months that I have sat in Parliament have I heard members of the Opposition come clean and tell the community exactly what they would do or what their alternative policies are.

In the context of the Budget, members of the Opposition continue to bemoan the fact that expenditure on a wide range of Government services continues to increase, yet they claim that, if they were in power, the size of government would be reduced and, in the same breath, that service delivery would improve. Given that Government services are, by their nature, labour intensive, the Opposition has yet to convince the community that it offers a viable, workable alternative. From what I have heard from Opposition members in this debate so far, they are no closer to that goal.

Those fundamental weaknesses in the arguments put forward by Opposition members serve to highlight the soundness of the direction in which the Goss Labor Government is heading in terms of its budgetary strategies and its ongoing commitment to improved service delivery. Let us consider for a moment what is meant by improved service delivery. Service delivery is about putting the resources on the ground to allow Government departments and agencies to perform the tasks and provide the services required by the community.

That is why one of the key initiatives in the Budget—the record \$3.4 billion Capital Works Program—is so important not only from the point of employment generation—although that is an essential strategy—but also from the point of rebuilding Queensland's economic and social infrastructure that was neglected for so long by former Governments. For example, the record Capital Works Program in Queensland Railways totalling \$635m in the 1993-94 financial year should be, and has been, widely applauded. Previous commitments by the Labor Government to upgrade rail services have already resulted in positive benefits in the Sunnybank electorate.

In my electorate of Sunnybank, the Rail Station Refurbishment Program has resulted in a number of stations receiving long-overdue facelifts. Notably, Kuraby and Altandi Railway Stations—two of the busiest rail stations in Sunnybank—look like new, thanks to the refurbishment program. Sunnybank Railway Station itself now has a secure motor vehicle lock-up at its Park-n-Ride facility. The installation of new fencing along the track from Fruit Grove to Runcorn stations not only has improved the amenity of the surrounding area but also provides an essential safety barrier to stop people wandering onto the tracks along that section of rail line.

During the year, funding was also provided to assist with essential improvements to the Beenleigh Road/Bonemill Road railway intersection, which was the scene of a tragic motor accident late last year. Together with the Brisbane City Council and funds from the Federal Government's Black Spot Program, safety at that intersection is being enhanced with the installation of traffic lights and other improvements at the rail crossing. Sunnybank has already been the beneficiary of Labor's accelerated Capital Works Program in previous years, with the opening last November of the new State Archives building at Runcorn.

I am particularly pleased to see that the 1993-94 Budget commits \$151m this year as part of the total \$1.1 billion to be spent on the expansion of the commuter rail system, including the phased introduction from 1995 of the 140 kilometre per hour Gold Coast rail service from Brisbane to Robina. Another \$217m will be spent this year on other railway projects, including construction of the standard railway link alongside the existing passenger rail route from Hemmant to Acacia Ridge, providing an uninterrupted freight service from the port of Brisbane to southern centres.

The 1993-94 Budget also allocates a further \$37.6m to the special School Refurbishment Maintenance Program, which has been funded by the tobacco licence fee. In the past, schools in Sunnybank have benefited greatly from that program. Like railway stations in my electorate, maintenance programs in local schools were long overdue. At this moment, one of the oldest schools in Sunnybank, Runcorn State School, is receiving a well-earned coat of paint and other minor maintenance works. Warrigal Road State School, Runcorn Heights State School and Sunnybank State School, among others, have also benefited from that program.

Whether it be a coat of paint, landscaping, new partitions, upgraded playground equipment or other basic maintenance works, not only have the students at the schools been provided with better facilities but also the scheme has generated important employment opportunities for those in need of a job. The School Refurbishment Program has been very popular with staff, students and parents alike by getting work done at schools which, in the past, often drove the P & Cs to dip into their own funds just to get basic maintenance work done.

I mentioned earlier that the Budget delivers on the promises made by Labor at the 1992 election. The funding of programs such as the Computers in Schools Program and the Helping P & Cs with the Basics Program are evidence of the State Government's commitment to its election promises. In 1993-94, \$9.2m will be spent in support of the expansion of computers and computer-based learning in schools. The importance of providing computers and computer-operation education in schools cannot be emphasised enough.

Computers have become a way of life in Australia, yet we must recognise that not all students have access to them at home. We cannot allow children whose families cannot afford home computers to miss out on learning basic computer skills by failing to provide equipment in our schools. The importance of computers in schools was brought home to me recently when I was asked to judge assignments from students in the citizenship education class at Runcorn State High School following their visit to Parliament House. Six assignments were given to me to choose the best essays to receive two book prizes that I donated to the high school. I was astonished to discover that four out of the six assignments that I received

from those Year 10 students had been prepared on home computers.

What that exercise demonstrated to me was that we must not allow students who do not have access to computers at home to miss out on the skills necessary to enter and compete not just at school but also in the workforce in years to come. Clearly, the Government recognises the importance of that point by allocating the first instalment of its promised pre-election commitment to the \$40m five-year Computers in Schools Program in the 1993-94 Budget.

Law enforcement remains an important issue in the Sunnybank electorate. It is pleasing to see that the Government is committed to further increasing police numbers on the ground by 120 officers this year, bringing total police strength up to 6 300 officers Statewide. I was interested to note from the program statement on property security that the rate of property crime remained virtually unchanged between 1990-91 and 1991-92. However, it is estimated that there has been a slight decrease in the 1992-93 period. It is hoped that, by this Government's continuing commitment to programs such as Neighbourhood Watch and the Home Security Program, reductions in the rate of property crime will continue in the future. The Program Statements note that there are now almost 600 Neighbourhood Watch programs throughout the State. In fact, a new Neighbourhood Watch group commenced only two weeks ago in the Banoon area of Sunnybank. This brings the total number of Neighbourhood Watch groups in Sunnybank to eight. However, there are still many areas in the electorate that are not covered by a Neighbourhood Watch group.

The allocation of \$500,000 this year for the new Neighbourhood Safety Audit Program should be applauded. Again, the pre-election commitment to introduce that program has been delivered. A number of community groups in Sunnybank have already expressed an interest in participating in that program. The allocation of \$1.4m to the Police Beat project demonstrates that this Government takes crime prevention seriously. This project—known also as shop-front policing—which puts police on the beat in shopping centres, has clearly been successful in reducing crimes such as vandalism, shoplifting, car theft and juvenile crime. Recently, I met with local police officers from Southern District Regional Headquarters who confirmed the success of that program at Garden City Shopping Centre and were looking forward to an expansion of that

program in this year's Budget. The additional \$1.4m provided in this year's Budget will assist in the expansion of that program, allowing police to increase their presence at major shopping centres such as those in Sunnybank.

Importantly, the commitment by this Government to economic growth and employment creation in the 1993-94 Budget has not come at the expense of the environment. The record \$142.6m budget for the Department of the Environment and Heritage represents an increase of 10 per cent on the previous year. It is clear from the Budget that this Labor Government remains committed to the expansion of the national park estate. The allocation of \$4.6m for national park acquisitions this year brings the Government one step closer to the target of 4 per cent of the State being reserved for national parks. However, the Budget is notable not just for the acquisition of more land for national parks but also for its commitment to local environmental issues which affect our day-to-day lives, particularly in south-east Queensland.

For example, this Budget commits \$500,000 to establish a new Recycling Industry Incentive Scheme. That recycling scheme will be allocated funds totalling \$2.5m over three years to provide assistance to industries which either use recycled materials or produce equipment for the recycling industry. In addition, \$200,000 has been committed to recycling grants for the next three years for continued support of recycling programs in local authorities. Also, \$80,000 has been set aside to develop a computerised waste exchange register to allow industry and local authorities to register waste commodities with the aim of providing other industries with essential information so that they may access other industries' waste for their own production streams.

Finally, \$40,000 has been allocated for the Tyre Industry Council to develop and administer a code of practice for waste tyre disposal, allowing for self-regulation of the industry. That is part of a three-year funding program which will greatly assist in avoiding a repeat of the major tyre fires that occurred in suburbs close to Sunnybank over the past couple of years—fires which are not only difficult to extinguish but also create significant environmental and health problems.

The Queensland Green Home Project is another praiseworthy initiative, one about which I hope I will have the opportunity to talk further in the Estimates debate. These are just

some of the many positive environmental initiatives contained in the 1993-94 Budget. They should demonstrate to green groups just how fair dinkum this Government is about protecting our environment. Significantly, a perusal of the Budget papers show that environmental programs announced in the 1993-94 Budget will provide for 700 new jobs—demonstrating yet again that economic growth and the environment need not be mutually exclusive.

This Budget has been described by the Treasurer as a Labor Budget with a capital "L". The positive reactions by the community and the acclaim by the media to this Budget demonstrates that this Government has kept faith with the people who gave Labor the mandate in 1992 for a second term of office in Queensland. Significantly, as the Treasurer has already stated, the election commitments made in 1992 have been met in full and on time. From the Opposition's point of view, that is what really hurts.

Mr SANTORO (Clayfield—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (5.06 p.m.): While the Federal Labor Government is having conspicuous difficulty in selling its current Budget to the Australian community, the Goss Labor Government in Queensland is effecting a self-righteous and self-satisfied stance towards its fourth State Budget. Behind the self-seeking rhetoric of Treasurer Keith De Lacy's Budget Speech and his deference to what he calls "enduring principles of fiscal discipline" is the reality of Queensland's economic and social circumstances. The realities of those circumstances—with which this Budget must deal—include—

- (1) Unemployment stands at 11.2 per cent.
- (2) Youth unemployment stands at 32 per cent—those are only the official statistics, and the unofficial statistics certainly indicate a lot of hidden unemployment.
- (3) In schools, overall teacher numbers are expected to decline this year—as conceded by the Treasurer in his Budget Speech—promoting concern about class size and related issues.
- (4) Public concern about Queensland's hospital system is reaching crisis proportions.
- (5) The hostile reaction to the Goss Government's decision to close 29 branch rail lines, or about one-third of the State's rail network.

Mr Stoneman: Shame!

Mr SANTORO: I take the interjection. It is a shame. It is a Labor disgrace. To continue—

Only outspoken community opposition and the Opposition in this place forced the Government into a “re-think”. The decision to close those rail lines, now under review, stands in curious contrast to Treasurer De Lacy’s comment in his Budget Speech that “running down the public infrastructure is merely another way of selling out future generations”.

- (6) Tertiary entrance places for school leavers continue to be in shamelessly inadequate supply. Queensland school leavers faced the worst State figures in Australia for tertiary offers in 1990 and 1991, and the second worst in 1992. The Treasurer stated in his Budget Speech that “education has always been the single highest priority area for the Goss Government”, but State Government funding of 1 500 commencing students in 1990 and 800 commencing students in 1991 shrank to zero in 1992. At a time when 45 per cent of qualified school leavers were not offered tertiary places in 1992—up from 35 per cent in 1991—supplementary State funding has evaporated when the need was greatest.

We may not have a good socioeconomic result for the unemployed, for the sick or for the school students and school leavers of Queensland, but we are told that we do have fiscal responsibility and a great Budget. In a few minutes, I will demonstrate that this situation is even worse than it first appears.

Bearing these harsh socioeconomic facts in mind, this is no time for complacency, timidity or self-congratulation. It is certainly no time for a fiscal sleight of hand. What is needed is action, imagination, full information and leadership. This Budget should be judged against its results—that is, against its prospects of achieving the results, the basic goals that Queenslanders reasonably look forward to. Fiscal responsibility should involve more than bookkeeping, and it must never lose sight of just what those in Government have done, and what they have not done, to advance those social and economic goals.

Government members who have already spoken in this debate have claimed that this is a true Labor Budget. It is hard to disagree with that claim for, as the speakers on this side

have said, it offers very little hope—like all Labor Budgets—to the 172 000 unemployed Queenslanders and to the thousands of small businesses struggling under the dead hand of Labor. Despite the low tax rhetoric, what this Budget does is extract increasing amounts of revenue from existing tax sources. At a time of population growth and of the social pressures mentioned, it also means a reduction in the services Queenslanders can expect to have delivered. That is what Queenslanders can expect from this Government, and that is in fact what Queenslanders are now getting.

Queenslanders are being hit hard with a Labor double-whammy—pay more and get less. A little creative accounting has kept the full extent of the details concealed from most observers. Queenslanders need to be aware of the growth of what might be called Clayton’s taxes—the new taxes Queenslanders have when they are not having new taxes. Under the impact of various corporatisation policies, services that were once tax-funded are now available to the user for a fee. Revenue accruing to Government from fines and forfeitures may be regarded as including a de facto tax element. Where do Queenslanders hear from this Government or from this Treasurer about the rapid growth in consolidated revenue accruing from fees, fines and forfeitures?

In 1983-84, taxation revenue in the Consolidated Fund accounted for 90.27 per cent of total taxes, fees and fines. In 1988-89, this figure stood slightly higher at 90.79 per cent. Under the Goss Labor Government, it then dropped dramatically to approximately 69 per cent in 1990-91, 1991-92 and 1992-93. Looked at from the other side of the coin, this means that total regulatory fees accounted for 7.48 per cent of total taxes, fees and fines in 1983-84 and for 6.90 per cent in 1988-89. Under the Goss Labor Government, this figure then shot up to 17.98 per cent in 1989-90, 29.28 per cent in 1990-91 and 30.58 per cent in 1992-93. From there it is estimated to rise further to 31.79 per cent in 1993-94.

Queenslanders should not allow the slogan that there are no new taxes to mislead them into thinking that the imposts imposed by the State Government are becoming more restrained or moderate or that Government services are becoming cheaper. Sometimes the charge that is paid to support those Government services is called a tax, but increasingly in this State it is called fees, fines and forfeitures. On what basis are the levels of these fees and fines determined? Have we now created a situation prone to excesses such that speeding fines and red-light

cameras, for example, will be looked at as a source of Budget revenue rather than as road safety devices? Are the levels of such fines willfully set above cost at de facto tax levels so as to finance the Government's "no new taxes" policy?

Growth in fees, fines and forfeitures from \$176.9m in 1988-89 to \$913.5m in 1991-92 and \$1,051.5m in 1992-93 is nothing less than spectacular. When is a tax not a tax? With fees, fines and forfeitures suddenly accounting for over 32 per cent of total taxes, fees and fines in 1992-93, and an estimated 33.5 per cent in 1993-94, instead of less than 10 per cent as recently as 1988-89, the meaning of the phrase "no new taxes" needs to be reappraised.

It is also rumoured that in Queensland the idea has been floated in the Treasury that the State Government should lease to the private sector the right to install and operate red-light cameras. Fees, fines and forfeitures may alter the incidence of the tax burden but they are in fact available as de facto taxes all the same. And at the same time as they have increased in proportion to importance, taxation revenue has itself increased in absolute terms—by 20 per cent in the last four years. Speakers on this side of the House have made constant reference to that statistic. "No new taxes" has meant anything but no growth in Government revenues. It has merely meant that we have had to look behind the rhetoric to find out what has been going on.

It may be good politics for the Goss Government to claim that it has introduced no new taxes, but it is more honest and ultimately more fiscally responsible to put the matter in its proper context beside the extraordinary growth we have seen in fees, fines and forfeitures. While the Goss Government is keen to tell us there are no new taxes, it is much less keen to tell us about the growth of its de facto taxes or about the grounds on which the level of those fees and fines are set.

In this context we face the rather incongruous prospect that, at the same time as the Queensland Government proceeds with a corporatisation policy and the ending of cross-subsidisation within such departments as Queensland Rail, it is entirely possible that we are already seeing the introduction of a new type of cross-subsidy in which those who pay fees and fines will cross-subsidise the Queensland taxpayer, as a backdoor means of financing the growth of expenditure despite the "no new taxes" policy.

There is more. Other changes appear in the accounts. Whereas the previous Budget

provided an estimate for 1992-93 of "total regulatory fees" accruing to consolidated revenue of \$923.4m, the current 1993-94 Budget represents this figure to have been \$881m. And that apparent reduction occurs despite the addition in the 1993-94 Budget of a "Port Authority Levy" item which actually yielded \$14.4m in 1992-93 but which was in fact not listed with "Other Regulatory Fees" in the previous 1992-93 Budget. Likewise, the "Credit Enhancement Fee" estimated in the previous Budget to yield \$42.6m in 1992-93 is not now with "Other Regulatory Fees" in the 1993-94 documents.

Mr De Lacy: We didn't introduce it. That's why it is not there.

Mr SANTORO: The Treasurer can reply when he is summing up. Meanwhile, the figures given for "Property Income", including dividends, now appear higher in the present Budget. Whereas the previous Budget gave an estimate for 1992-93 of "Total Property Income" at \$689,844, this figure is now given in the 1993-94 Budget as \$751,444. Once again we are given no explanation by the Treasurer.

Mr De Lacy: Do you know what that is? That is interest on superannuation invested. That's got nothing to do with what you are talking about.

Mr SANTORO: But those particular figures should be reflected within the Budget documents.

Mr De Lacy: We have 500 pages now. You are misinterpreting everything that I have said.

Mr SANTORO: I look forward to the Treasurer's reply. There is still more. Whereas the Treasurer states that the Budget outcome in 1992-93 saw a small surplus of \$1.2m accrue to Consolidated Fund revenues—I refer members to the 1993-94 Budget Overview at page 1—the fact is that in 1992-93, total revenue to the Consolidated Fund was \$9,792m, whereas total revenue to total trust and special funds was \$12,066m. In short, revenue to this Consolidated Fund is only about 45 per cent of the total revenue accruing to both funds.

To form a realistic idea about the size of government and about the impact of State expenditure on the delivery of services in specific areas, including education, health, transport and recreation, we need to consider the total impact of both funds taken together. A small surplus on the Consolidated Fund is less significant to the Queensland electorate than knowing what has happened to

expenditure levels, and to the efficiency of those expenditure levels in respect of the delivery of particular Government services. What this Budget in fact delivers, as members on this side of the House have said, is the joint prospect of increased taxes and fees and reduced services.

While the growth of tax revenues and of fees and fines is apparent for all to see, what is not there for all to see is the rate of growth—positive or negative—of total Government spending from both the Consolidated Fund and total trust and special funds. I put it to the Treasurer and to the House that, if one looks closely at those funds, one will find that there is a decline in spending on education and various other services when expenditures from the Consolidated Fund and from the total trust and special funds are combined. Queenslanders are getting reduced services in important areas, despite providing this Government with growing revenues.

As my colleagues who have spoken before me have said, too much has gone into administrative costs. Even performance indicators of efficiency can be distorted or misrepresented to disguise reductions in service quality. If fewer school teachers are left to deal with more children, opportunists might say that efficiency has increased, since each teacher caters for more kids—or each nurse for more patients—but the reality is that the quality of the service being delivered has simply fallen.

This Budget is not the exercise in fiscal responsibility that Treasurer De Lacy would have us believe. It is not even an exercise in full and free provision of relevant information. It sees revenues grow and service delivery fall. Prosperity is not to be found in bigger government and fatter bureaucracy, as members opposite have told us. What the Government can do is facilitate the growth of the private sector by minimising bureaucratic intervention and by maximising the flow of information. This Budget fails on both counts.

Much significance is attached by the Queensland Government not only to the goal of no new taxes but also to the goal of making Queensland a low tax/low debt State. Treasurer De Lacy notes that “other Governments around Australia, and indeed around the world, are slashing services, sacking public servants, under-funding infrastructure, selling off assets, increasing taxes and running up debts”. According to Mr De Lacy, “This is not what the people of

Queensland expect from the Goss Government.”

What the people of Queensland expect is certainly not that they face continuing double-digit unemployment levels, massive youth unemployment and enormous pressure on schools, hospitals and the availability of tertiary education places. In a cyclical downturn with 11 per cent unemployment and 32 per cent youth unemployment—and they are only the official figures, not the hidden unemployment—the 1993-94 Budget loudly proclaims the significance that it attaches to the Capital Works Program. On the basis of past results, however, we must doubt the efficacy of such a program.

These particular points have been made very effectively in many editorial comments, which members opposite have refused to mention during this debate. As recently as last Saturday, Mr Morley made mention of what the Opposition has been saying, that is, that this Government failed to achieve its job targets last year.

Mr De Lacy interjected.

Mr SANTORO: I am quoting the Government's own figures. It underspent its capital works allocations. It did not create the 39 000-plus full-time jobs that it said it would create. The Government's own figures show that it created only 8 000 jobs. Its own Budget forecast of a 10.1 per cent unemployment rate was blown out of the water.

Mr De Lacy: Through the Budget, that's what the forecast was.

Mr SANTORO: These are the Government's figures. The Government's forecast of a 10.1 per cent unemployment rate, which is contained within the Budget documents, was blown out of the water last Thursday. I have gone on record as saying that that will not be achievable, in common with the Treasurer's figures of last year.

In short, the unemployed are being offered false hope. They are being offered the “fiscal responsibility” of this Goss Government Budget, but there is little or no prospect of actual relief from horrendous unemployment levels or a chronic shortage of tertiary education places for Queensland school leavers.

Mr De Lacy: Last year's figures were all exceeded.

Mr SANTORO: I take that interjection from the Treasurer. I challenge him, in his reply, to prove his claim that all of the Budget figures and Estimates have been exceeded.

Mr De Lacy: Employment——

Mr SANTORO: I am not going to waste any more of my time. The challenge is before the Treasurer.

Mr Cooper: Don't forget to answer it.

Mr SANTORO: I take that interjection from Mr Cooper. For relief from unemployment and other social problems, we are left to await an improvement in our international terms of trade and the benefits that may be expected eventually to bring to export-led economies such as those of Queensland and Australia. The unemployed will be left to wait. School class sizes will be left to swell. School leavers will be left to compete for shamefully few tertiary education places. Public concern regarding the hospital system will be left to ferment.

In the short amount of time available to me, I shall turn to the issue of transport. Treasurer De Lacy states that \$1.5 billion will be spent in 1993-94 on the upgrading of transport infrastructure, of which \$635m will be invested in rail infrastructure in 1993-94. Behind these figures is the decision to close 28 branch rail lines in Queensland, or approximately one-third of Queensland's rail network. Lines that are no longer used or which are used only on an as-required basis are, in my view, legitimate candidates for consideration. What is at issue, however, is not so much the fact that some lines may be closed but the way the Government goes about deciding priorities.

Without paying even lip-service to its own Treasury Department's Draft Guidelines on Project Evaluation, which would have required estimates of the economic consequences for the State—not just financial consequences for Queensland Rail—the Goss Government simply announced the closure of these lines and then backtracked from it in the face of community opposition. Only after reaching its decision to close these lines did the Goss Government then feel pressured into setting up a task force to investigate whether the lines should in fact be closed. Community service obligations and what economists call externalities may be sufficient to warrant retention of at least some of those lines.

As is also made obvious by public outcry over the decision to cut out passenger services on the Pinkenba-Eagle Junction line, the Goss Government does not let us into the secret of how it decides its priorities and allocates those dollars that do appear in aggregate form in the Budget. For example, what is the cost recovery ratio on this service? What community service obligations or externalities are involved? It is understood

that, on QR figures, cost recovery on the suburban passenger community network is about 30 per cent on an all-in basis and about 60 per cent on a separable cost basis. Some of the 29 branch lines now under review in fact return a higher cost recovery ratio but, except for the Pinkenba line, we hear nothing about closure of the metropolitan passenger service. Nor are we ever told of cost recovery ratio on the rural road network. We are left to criticise only rail—and that selectively.

This Government is selective in the information that it provides to the public and this Parliament. Clearly, it is fiddling the figures. Again, I challenge the Treasurer to prove how his Estimates in last year's Budget, particularly in relation to employment, have been achieved. I challenge him, in his reply, to produce the figures. Then we will debate this matter further not only in this place but also outside. This Budget is nothing but a sham.

Time expired.

Mr HOLLIS (Redcliffe) (5.26 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to speak to this excellent fourth Budget of the Goss Labor Government.

Mr De Lacy: You would wonder what Budget these people have been analysing, wouldn't you?

Mr HOLLIS: One would wonder. I was interested to hear the member for Crows Nest interject earlier to the effect that no financial writer had supported this Budget. We know that is wrong. I wish to quote from the *Business Queensland* editorial of 6 September, which states—

“Though no doubt the Opposition will find faults in the budget of Premier Wayne Goss and his treasurer, Keith De Lacy, the Queensland budget even at this stage must be viewed as a sound and well thought-out document reflecting a fiscally prudent regime.

The role of the public service in budget formulations cannot be underestimated. Treasury officials, especially, have deservedly built a reputation of being drawn from the highest levels of the country's university graduates. They are an elite within an elite.”

That is recognition indeed of the dedicated public servants who assisted the Treasurer in framing this Budget.

Mr De Lacy: You can't call *Business Queensland* a friend of Treasury or this Government.

Mr HOLLIS: Not at all. The editorial actually goes on to say that it is not considered to be a friend of the Queensland Government. This is a good Budget that focuses on the areas in which we as Labor members are most interested, namely, health, education, welfare and police. This Budget has done a lot for people in my electorate in terms of what we have achieved and where we are going. In the four years that we have been in Government, I have seen only improvements.

I am pleased to see a further increase of 8.4 per cent in the Health budget to \$2.2 billion. Health services in Redcliffe are very important. Redcliffe has a fairly large hospital and a good community health service. It also has a private hospital and many other ancillary services such as Blue Nurses and St Vincent de Paul. In Redcliffe, we received 10 per cent of the capital equipment budget of the Health Department. That paid for the CT scanner we have long awaited for the past two years and some fluoro X-ray equipment. In that two-year period, the local medical association has waged a bitter war against the Health Minister and me, claiming that we are not interested in the people of Redcliffe. But we have managed to get that scanner, and we achieved 10 per cent of the health equipment budget.

Mr Vaughan: You did very well.

Mr HOLLIS: Yes, we did well. An article headed "\$2m for hospital" appeared on the front page of the *Redcliffe & Bayside Herald*. After stating my comments about what Redcliffe has obtained, the article continued—

"However, Redcliffe and Districts Local Medical Association vice-president Dr Alan Mahoney"—

who was the president last year—

"said the State Budget only confirmed that any development of further stages of Redcliffe Hospital was unlikely."

He went on to say, in effect, "We knew we were getting the CT scanner and the fluoro equipment, but it is not enough." What do these people want? Doctor Mahoney continually complains that I needle him about what is going on in the health area. He cannot have it both ways. He cannot have a Budget which delivers and then complain about it afterwards. He said that he believed that the Redcliffe Hospital would not have the second stage. Of course, when he says "the second stage", he means another monolith to accommodate more wards with more beds. Of course, being a medical man, one would have

thought that he would have been aware of the new focus on health, which is now not to keep people in hospital and avoid expanding the number of beds. Of course, if he had read the McKay report, he would have found that the Health Department is putting beds where the people are. So it is only natural that extra beds will go in the expanding areas towards the Sunshine Coast the South Coast. Doctor Mahoney should read the McKay report and understand the thrust of where beds will be allocated in the health area.

I was also pleased to read a side issue in the Budget which talked about \$1.5m being allocated towards a \$4.1m health promotion fund. That fund is mainly an education fund, which will do a lot for people. I think of my role in Redcliffe once a year as a coordinator of the Cancer Fund, which commences with a doorknock appeal on 10 October. At this stage of the year, I get many, many calls from people who have lost their loved ones in the last few months, or know people who are afflicted with cancer. It comes home to me that we should be doing something not only about treating cancer patients and providing beds but also providing education so that we can prevent this terrible disease affecting so many of our people. So it is gratifying to see that there are plans to establish this \$4.1m health promotion fund.

As to medical care and beds—the day surgery at Redcliffe has been an outstanding success. Its patient care over the past two years has increased by 15 per cent and 17 per cent respectively. This, of course, has reduced the need for beds, just as the Caboolture Hospital will reduce that need also. Of course, the people who go through day surgery have the benefit of being cared for at home. Another important aspect of the Budget is that the Government is still supporting organisations such as the Blue Nursing Service and St Vincent de Paul, which makes sure that our loved ones are cared for in their homes.

The Budget allocation to education again favoured Redcliffe very well. We are very fortunate in Redcliffe that, in the last four years, all schools have been painted. In fact, earlier this year the Humpybong infant and primary school wrote to me and asked me whether I could get the Minister for Administrative Services, Tom Burns, to come to Redcliffe so that they could say to him, "Thank you." They did not want anything; they just wanted to say "thank you" for the surroundings which the Government and the Administrative Services Department had provided under the school refurbishment plan.

It was gratifying to be able to take Mr Burns to the school and show him some of the results of that work. We are still continuing with the refurbishment program in Redcliffe. Approximately \$154,000 has been allocated in the Redcliffe electorate for this coming year which is in addition to the allocation for the normal maintenance of schools. It is a very worthwhile effort.

I was pleased also to read in the Budget about the independent schools. We often forget that we also represent those students who attend the independent schools in our areas. I am pleased also to say that when Labor came to office four years ago, there were many grumbles and groans from the independent schools about the lack of funding and the lack of money for capital works. When I talk about independent schools, I am talking about the De La Salle College, the Grace Lutheran College, Mueller College and the schools that teach the battlers. They charge low fees and educate people because they have a faith, and they want children to be educated in that faith. I was very pleased to see the increase in the Budget for independent schools.

Of course, in addition to the \$120.1m, which included the per capita allocation and the textbook allowance, there is an additional \$15.5m in capital works assistance. I want to refer to the independent schools in Redcliffe, because we have heard a lot in the State Budget about the clustering of the State schools and the difficulties that the Government has had with the QTU on that matter. In Redcliffe, we have a very, very, worthy group. As I said previously, we have De La Salle College and many other smaller Catholic schools. They have come together now under the banner of the Southern Cross College. They have decided that it is more economically viable to have one administration centre. So the other schools such as Our Lady of Lourdes, Our Lady Help of Christians, St Bernadette's, Soubirous College, Frawley College and De La Salle College are forming into one entity to give not only the best education to those students but also the best economic option for the parents as far as the cost of sending their children to school is concerned.

The other area which, of course, has been looked after very well in Redcliffe for the last year, and will also be looked after in the coming year, is housing. I was pleased to see in the Budget that we have an increase in spending on public housing. The funding of public rental housing will be \$287m in 1993-94. Of course, this area is very dear to me.

When I became the member for Redcliffe, there was very little in the way of public housing in Redcliffe—very little for those poor and disadvantaged people, particularly seniors. At that time in Redcliffe, we had a list which included between 500 and 600 seniors who were living in Redcliffe and who did not have the opportunities that other people had to obtain fair and decent accommodation, and a disposable income as well. So it was very important to me that the Government did something about that problem. Every week that I receive a message from the Housing Minister to tell me that more seniors units have been built, naturally I am very pleased.

As to seniors—in the last year or so, the Government has implemented some programs which have been of great assistance to them. The Home Assist Program will commence very shortly. It will give those people the opportunity to have certain works done at a low cost. It will provide maintenance, advice and services targeted at older home owners, private renters and people with disabilities. It is a very worthy project of this Government.

I know that there has been a lot of talk today about security. I refer to another Government program, and that is the Home Secure Program. Under that program, people will be advised and assisted in how to make their homes secure. Security and crime prevention really starts with us, to make sure that our own people and their houses are secure. If we do not do that, then it makes it a lot more difficult for the police to assist us.

It was interesting to hear the member for Crows Nest go on again about the police and the Budget. The Police Commissioner, on hearing the increase in the funding for police in the Budget, said, "I think that is very good."

Mr Cooper: He would say that.

Mr HOLLIS: I do not see why he would say anything else, because it is a very good Budget. The honourable member said that it does not mean one more police officer on the street. It does; it means another 120 police on the streets this year and 400 during this term of the Government. I want to talk particularly about what is happening in my area of Redcliffe in regard to police. When the Labor Party came to power in 1989, I remember attending a union meeting of between 40 and 50 police at the Redcliffe Police Station. They were very bitter, very angry and very anti-Government of all types—not just the Labor Government—anti all politicians.

We do not get that same feeling now in my electorate at all. In fact, whatever

honourable members may think about the police in their own electorates, I would like to commend the police in the electorate of Redcliffe because they have taken the idea of community policing to the extreme. In Redcliffe, people see a police presence all the time. They have been very active in the Adopt a Cop program, in the Neighbourhood Watch program and in other community programs. The inspector at Redcliffe Police Station, Neil Behm, has made a great point of being involved in community activities. I commend him for the fact that people now see the police in that area as friends—people who will assist—rather than as a threat. Inspector Behm has achieved his very worthy aim.

Mr Cooper: He is an excellent officer; I know him well.

Mr HOLLIS: He is an excellent officer. In this year's Budget, business has been accorded great significance and, particularly in the Redcliffe area, this Government has been well received by the business community. Why is this the case? The answer is that through the Small Business Corporation and the Redcliffe Peninsula Industrial Association this Government is doing something to assist business. The Government has provided assistance to RPIA in holding a business expo, and by providing data processing and advice from the Small Business Corporation. All of this activity costs money, but it is going to small business which, in turn, provides employment. Unemployment is an item of gravest concern in Redcliffe. The City Heart Association has also been given assistance with its Main Street Program, which was launched only recently by the Minister for Business, who pledged further assistance by the Government to the business community. The community can see that this Government has put its money and its representation where its mouth is. Members of the Government do not just go around bleating about things: we get in and take some action.

The Redcliffe area is well served by the Government. I will mention some of the facilities that are provided to a relatively small community of 50 000 people. We have a police station, law courts, an excellent hospital with fine staff, community health centres, a regional office of the Family Services Department, a regional office of the Department of Tourism, Sport and Racing and, as recently as a few days ago, a regional office of the Department of Housing and Local Government was opened. These facilities save many people in Redcliffe from the difficulties associated with gaining access to Government services. I would be the first to

admit that the area needs a better transportation system and more efficient ways of travelling from the peninsula to Brisbane City; but why anybody would want to leave such a very beautiful place as Redcliffe to come to the city, I do not know. However, by the Government's bringing the services to the people of Redcliffe, a lot of aged and disabled people are saved the trouble of having to make a trip to the city. I am very pleased that the area is so well served.

During my speech, I will endeavour to avoid repetition and concentrate instead on Budget areas that are different from those affecting many other members. I was interested to note that \$400,000 has been allocated for 1993-94 to establish a South East Asia secretariat and a Papua New Guinea secretariat within the trade and investment division of the Premier's Department. Those secretariats will provide information, advice and referral services to assist Queensland businesses to enter the growing South East Asian and Oceania markets. Last year, I was very fortunate to be part of a delegation to South East Asia. Although I can see many opportunities for Queensland's business people, as is the case in most areas, we need the wherewithal to access necessary information.

I have travelled to Papua New Guinea three times and I have established some very good relationships. Incidentally, it is Papua New Guinea's eighteenth anniversary of independence on Thursday and a reception, which I will attend, will be held at the Sheraton Hotel. It is very important to do something about obtaining access to the trade of developing nations that are our close neighbours. In the context of business, it should be remembered that all the people living in Papua New Guinea will eventually need the very items that we have in our houses.

Mr FitzGerald: Do you think that members of this Parliament should go up there on a regular basis?

Mr HOLLIS: Most certainly. I think it is very important to maintain very close relationships and goodwill in trade, and also to maintain a friendship that we will value in years to come. I have made a very strong point of establishing friendships with the people who live there, especially with the Minister for Works, Albert Karu, and his wife Mary. They have visited my home for barbecues, etc., and I am very pleased to be able to call that Minister from Papua New Guinea my friend.

Unfortunately, the people of Queensland only hear the worst about life in Papua New Guinea. We hear only about crimes of rape, murder and other violence. Although in Queensland similar crimes occur and are reported in our papers every day, no notice is taken; but when those offences occur in Papua New Guinea, people regard it as a major event. We never hear about the good things that are happening as far as the development of that nation is concerned, especially in relation to the education system, farming ventures and many other areas that I believe will make Papua New Guinea a very powerful nation. I hope, as we advance towards the next millennium, that it will also be a very friendly nation.

Because it benefits vast areas of the State, I support this Budget. In the last two weeks, I do not believe that I have received one adverse comment on the Budget. In fact, it was interesting for me to attend a celebration of a lawyer's retirement, which was also attended by Michael Lavarch, Dean Wells and senior business people of the Redcliffe community. All that the business people could say was that this Budget is excellent and will do a lot for Queensland. I am sure that it will, and I support it.

Mr STONEMAN (Burdekin) (5.45 p.m.): After listening to some of the rubbish that has been said by members opposite during this debate, one would have to wonder whether we are all living in the same State, whether we are all reading the same papers, and whether we are all talking to the same people. The previous speaker said he had not heard any derogatory remarks about the Budget, but surely that depends on what people read and where people are. In the Redcliffe Peninsula area, provided that one is selective about the functions one attends—as the honourable member for Redcliffe obviously is—one might hear some reasonable remarks about the Budget. However, an editorial in *Business Queensland* was headed "Government should question its management policy". I will not go into the detail of the editorial because there are many other matters I wish to mention to the House tonight. Let me simply say that it raises the spectre of Dr Peter Coaldrake, who by no stretch of the imagination could be described as a practical man. Towards the end of a fairly lengthy and deep consideration of the management processes brought about by Dr Coaldrake's theories, the editorial states—

"But the government needs to be aware that Coaldrake appears to be a proponent of management practices that,

in theory, are now under serious re-examination around the world."

Tonight, I wish to examine the Budget processes. I also wish to examine what the Budget really means and cut away the rhetoric from the substance. As my colleague the member for Crows Nest said, the problem we have in this State is getting information out to the community, which includes the business communities in the rural sector. Unfortunately, they are subject to a type of mind control and until an impact is made on business people by fiscal processes, they do not realise that they have been suckered. In the meantime, the Premier, the Treasurer and other honourable members come into this Parliament and engage in Dorothy Dixers.

Mr Beattie: Honourable members?

Mr STONEMAN: The member for Brisbane Central is trying to get to the seats on the Government side of the Chamber by asking Dorothy Dixers and quoting favourable comments from the press. I would have to say that in this State, as the member for Crows Nest said, the media have a lot of good points but also have an awesome responsibility to make sure that people are able to review and understand what is really happening in the processes of government. The only way that can be done is through a press structure that is fearless and straight down the middle. I suggest that honourable members should look seriously at the propriety of some of the operations of the \$80m Goss machine, which, along with certain sections of the press, hoodwinks the people in the short term. However, people are waking up. I hark back to the comments made earlier by the Leader of the Opposition.

I well remember the day when the Treasurer took me to task for suggesting that Queensland should embark on a capital works program. I remember the day because it was not long after that famous exposé of his when he showed this Chamber how Queensland was broke. I probably have a copy of the report, because I always carry it with me. On that occasion, the Treasurer said that I had a cargo cult mentality in suggesting that Queensland needed a capital works program. Of course, we need a capital works program, but it should be focused and be the type of program that generates a capacity to increase jobs further down the line. The present Capital Works Programs in this State are maintaining the status quo in some areas, but overall, full-time jobs for males in this State have diminished over the past four years. There are now 3 000 fewer males in full-time

employment in this State than there were in 1989.

Mr Randell: It should be spread equally and fairly throughout the State.

Mr STONEMAN: As the honourable member for Mirani says, it should be spent equally and fairly across the State.

I want to put some important matters before the House. Job growth should be underpinned by strong private investment. That is not occurring, and the low level of private investment is a major weakness in the Queensland economy. A number of indicators point to modest public investment, but none so well as those included in the State Labor Government's own *Queensland Economic Review*. One such indicator is commercial lending, the terminology of which is the value of new commercial lending by all lenders, which includes new fixed loans—excluding refinancing—plus new and increased credit limits.

The Treasurer's review stated—

"In Queensland, the value of commercial lending was 3.4% lower in the three months to May, than in the same period a year ago. New and increased credit facilities are 29.8% lower than a year ago, while new fixed loans are 23.5% higher."

The review stated further—

"Nationally, new commercial lending rose 24.5% in the three months to May, compared to levels of a year ago. New credit facilities are 32.1% higher than a year ago, while new fixed loans are 13.1% higher."

The review continued to say that commercial lending in Queensland has been falling since February 1993. The Treasurer's own document concluded with the comment—

"For the first time in over two years, the growth in national commercial lending commitments has exceeded Queensland's."

Another important indicator is business investment. As the review is a Treasury document, it is instructive to consider what it said. It stated—

"Business investment is an important component of final demand in any economy."

I agree. The review continued—

"Investment expenditure is necessary

to maintain and add value to the capital stock, increasing the productive capacity of the economy . . .

The ongoing extent of weakness in business investment growth is a key factor contributing to the modest pace of the currently emerging national economic recovery.

In Queensland, despite growth in real gross State product of almost double the national average over the past year, business investment has been relatively weak."

That same point was highlighted in an article in *Australian Business Monthly* titled "Queensland Report". It is worth noting what that article said and putting the facts before the House. At least some people will know the truth of the matter when they read *Hansard*. The article stated—

"Queensland needs more private investment. While it has weathered the recession well and is firmly positioned for future growth, private investment in the state over the past year has been lacklustre. And with government investment slowing down, economic growth is in the hands of the private sector.

Queensland Treasury figures show Queensland's share of Australian investment fell in the December quarter from 18.9% to 17.7%. Private fixed capital expenditure was up 2.9% over the year against a 9.3% rise nationally, although the Queensland growth was largely the result of housing investment—construction of which was 16.5% over the year."

I return to the root cause of some of those problems, and I say that that editorial is spot-on. The Government should question its management policy. It should question the fact that the theorists cannot alone hold sway. The problem with the Government in this State is that Government members must rely entirely on theoretical processes. They have no basic understanding of the way in which they should run the ship. It reminds me of the dog that ran out and chased all of the cars. One day, it caught a car and it did not know what to do with it. That is the problem that we face. Mr Deputy Speaker, I know that you are well aware of that.

It is important to dwell on the last part of that previously quoted sentence, which stated—

"Queensland growth was largely the result of housing investment."

Often, we have heard the Treasurer say that the housing sector will lead the Queensland economy out of the darkness, that we are on the way and that Queensland is leading Australia. How many times have members heard the Treasurer say that in response to a Dorothy Dixier from members such as the member for Brisbane Central? Time and time again, we are hear that. The article is worth quoting—

"Queensland growth was largely the result of housing investment."

In other words, at present, Queensland's economy is heavily reliant on the rather volatile housing investment. I say to Government members that that is a major concern in terms of the economic development of this State. According to the review, in contrast to investment in dwellings, the important investment in business—

". . . has performed poorly in relation to a national average, which, itself, is still extremely weak."

However, one does not read those things in the *Courier-Mail* and one does not hear those things from some other commentators. One does not read those things in short media statements by people who have only read the headline or undertaken the mind-control exercise and who say that it is a responsible Budget.

In Queensland, business investment for the first three quarters in 1992-93 compared with the same period in 1991-92 was down 2.7 per cent. When Queensland was supposed to be leading the rest of Australia out of the recession, business investment was down. For the same time frame, non-dwelling construction increased in Queensland by 0.5 per cent compared with a fall of 7.8 per cent nationally, whilst equipment investment in Queensland slumped by 11.7 per cent. There was a marginal rise in the national figure of 0.1 per cent. There is a huge difference between the national average and the Queensland average. Where do we hear those figures quoted? Those are Treasury documents. They are the Government's own figures. I know that many Government members will be ashamed of the reality of what I am saying. It must be striking fear into their hearts.

Recently, the State Government released its major development projects and proposals for 1993. Of the 90 projects listed, some 45 per cent were on the drawing board prior to

1989. Nearly half were on the drawing board prior to 1989. The latest Rider Hunt State development report warns that a record demand for hotel rooms in Queensland could result in tourism growth on the Gold Coast and Cairns grinding to a halt in two years when all of the hotels are full. Although reasons can be identified for the lack of development and investment in tourism and business, one common to all is the lack of investment. One can look at why the development grinds down but, at the end of the day, the problem is the lack of investment and the lack of investor confidence.

In turn, the blame for the lack of investment can be sheeted home to "the recession we had to have". Do honourable members remember "the recession we had to have"? The blame can also be sheeted home to the Federal Labor Government's monetary policy, coupled with the failure of the State Labor Government to have an aggressive pro-private development attitude to policy. That is a clear and resounding fact in the community. The State Labor Government's response is to tell private enterprise that the Government has created a low-tax environment in which businesses can flourish. The Government is constantly calling on the Queensland business community. Do honourable members remember the Premier telling the business community to get off its backside and to get out there, to invest and to chase export markets?

What incentive is there in the Budget? I ask Government members to show me a single incentive for an investor to have the confidence to create that type of optimism in his company operation and to tell his board and his management that there is a climate conducive to making a profit and let us go and get it. The Premier is running around desperately telling business to get off its backside. The fact of the matter is that you can lead a horse to water but you cannot make it drink. I know that that is an old rural truism that most Government members would not understand, but it is a fact—and that is Labor. The Labor Party has no understanding of business and industry.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr STONEMAN: Before the dinner adjournment, I was speaking about the fact that the Labor Party in Government has no understanding of business and industry. Mr Deputy Speaker, I realise that you would be well aware of that. The Labor Government's failure to maintain investment levels was again highlighted in the *Australian Financial Review*

Queensland survey. Before I quote from that survey, it is instructive to consider what the then Leader of the Opposition said in reply to the Treasurer's Budget Speech. He stated—

"I propose to outline the strategy that the Labor Government will pursue . . . to bring about sustained economic growth . . . that alone can deliver the jobs, investment and revenue in this State that is required to carry out these programs.

My Government will be one that recognises that profitability is the bottom line for the private sector and that, in the absence of profits, employment and investment cannot be generated."

That strategy has resulted in this State's highest unemployment rate—11.2 per cent. I reiterate my earlier comments that I believe that the press in this State has been derelict in its duty. The day after those unemployment figures were released, the *Courier-Mail* ran not a word about the highest unemployment rate in this State's history since records were kept—not a word, except for a little comment from Wallace Brown on the left-hand side of page 2. Instead, the *Courier-Mail* upbraided members of this House for partaking of some evil thing called superannuation. I suggest that that is the most blatant dereliction of duty and process that I have witnessed during my time as a member of this place.

This State's unemployment rate is 11.2 per cent. I pointed out earlier that there were 3 200 fewer males in full-time work in August 1993 compared with the number in full-time work in December 1989. These are Australian Bureau of Statistics figures; they are not figures that I have plucked out of the sky. Since December 1989, 42 600 jobs were created, but, of those jobs, the majority were part time. Labor's job record is abysmal. It has given us a record unemployment rate; it has decreased full-time jobs; and it has increased part-time jobs. That is signalled quite clearly by the fact that investment is rapidly drying up in this State. As I explained earlier, the other component of the then Opposition's economic development equation—investment—has recorded the same dismal result as its jobs strategy.

I turn to the *Australian Financial Review* Queensland survey, to which I referred a moment ago. It states—

"However, the major industrial expansion Labor envisaged has not occurred, investment in big ticket tourism projects has all but stopped, and the humming trade in holiday investment unit

sales of the late 1980s has slowed dramatically."

That trade was humming along in the eighties, and it has absolutely stopped. The survey continues—

"Major investment projects under way in Queensland are mainly developments motivated by some degree of government control, rather than those inspired by any climate of optimism.

. . .

The Government is relying heavily on the development of two hotels and two convention centres—flowing from its granting of two new casino licences for Brisbane and Cairns—as the symbols of continuing investment confidence in Queensland."

It is an indictment of this State Labor Government's economic strategy that the only cranes on the skyline are the ones it generates itself. Government members may laugh about the cranes in the sky, but the taxi drivers, the people in trains and the people around the city knew that, when there were cranes in the sky, when there were cement trucks on the streets and when there were semitrailers dumping off material, jobs were being created in this State. I am not saying that that can go on forever. I do not believe that we can have a continuing boom such as we had in the eighties. That would not be healthy. But at present we are experiencing an implosion in the job structure. The only crane in this city is in George Street. There is another one across the river and, if one has a good pair of binoculars, one could probably pick up one or two around the city. It is an absolute disgrace.

The latest Pulse survey states that business confidence still remains weak. On the critical issue of investment, Pulse states—

"The environment for investment was described by 41 per cent of respondents as 'poor' or 'very poor' compared with 20 per cent of companies who rated the environment for investment in Queensland as 'good' or 'very good'."

During the Estimates debate, I will focus on a number of specific issues that I could refer to now. The fact of the matter is that some companies are capable of investing. However, George Chapman, the Chairman of North Queensland Television, has stated with frustration—and the honourable member for Barron River would well know this—that people are not prepared to invest because the red tape, the lack of decision making and the lack

of support for the business community is so stifling. Mr Chapman has stated that people will not invest under those terms.

Time expired.

Mr PITT (Mulgrave) (7.36 p.m.): I am pleased to speak to Appropriation Bill (No. 2)——

Mr LINGARD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I call your attention to the state of the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Bredhauer): Order! There are enough members present. I call the member for Mulgrave.

Mr PITT: After that diversion, I am pleased to speak to Appropriation Bill (No. 2). I join other Government members in supporting the 1993-94 Budget that was introduced on 2 September. The fourth De Lacy Budget, in common with its predecessors, reinforces the widely held and accurate public perception that the finances of Queensland are in good hands indeed.

I turn to some of the outrageous criticisms that have been levelled by members opposite today. The first was that Queensland is a big-spending State. On that count, we are guilty. We are a big-spending State. Queensland is in a position to direct funds towards health, housing, police and education—the core business of any Government worth its salt. The Goss Government is in that position because of its responsible stewardship. The Treasurer has displayed financial discipline.

Mr LINGARD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I call your attention to the state of the House.

Mr CAMPBELL: I rise to a point of order. Mr Deputy Speaker, once the numbers have been called to your attention, you may continue without having to undertake further counts.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Mulgrave.

Mr PITT: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. As I said, the Treasurer has displayed financial discipline. He has overseen the reduction of the State debt, freeing funds from interest and redemption payments, allowing that money to be freed up and to be directed towards providing infrastructure and services to the benefit of the people of Queensland.

The second allegation that has been made today is that Queensland under Labor has seen a sharp increase in the number of public sector employees. Again, the Labor Government is guilty of increasing the number of public sector employees in this State. The Opposition, however, is damned by its own

efforts to score points. Under Liberal/National and National Party Governments, a few things occurred. Firstly, there were severe shortages in some of the crucial areas. We did not have enough police; nursing numbers were below those that were necessary; and teacher numbers were always a matter of concern. The second feature is that the ratios of those public servants to their clients——

Mr LINGARD: I rise to a point of order. I want to press this matter because, to be quite honest, there are not 16 members in the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member reads Standing Order 30, he will discover that once a quorum has been called and I am satisfied that there are sufficient members to form a quorum, I am entitled to call the member. I call the member for Mulgrave.

Mr LINGARD: I rise to a point of order. Mr Deputy Speaker, I accept that, but I have once again called your attention to the state of the House. This is the second——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am satisfied that there are sufficient people to form a quorum. I call the member for Mulgrave.

Mr LINGARD: Mr Deputy Speaker, there are not 16 people in the Chamber. I bring your attention to that fact, and you should observe that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member to resume his seat and advise him to read Standing Order 30. I call the member for Mulgrave.

Mr PITT: As I said, under the Liberal and National Party Governments the ratio of public servants to their clients was the worst in Australia. Now it is at least the national average or better. Surely in these times of high unemployment, the provision of jobs for people in previously undermanned public service areas should be applauded rather than criticised.

The third accusation is that the Goss Government has ignored the private sector in this State. It is not guilty on this count. The record capital works component in this year's Budget exceeds the previous high levels of the past two years. What the Opposition fails to understand is the benefit that that program brings to the private sector. Unlike the Opposition, the business community of Queensland is grateful that the Goss Government has channelled so much of its capital works portfolio into its sector. Clearly, this Budget is pro business and pro

employment, and the business community of Queensland has said so publicly.

The fourth criticism by those opposite is that somehow Queensland's good budgetary situation is a legacy of the previous conservative administration. This is simply not true. Queensland's economy in 1989 when Labor came to power was healthy. This was in spite of the previous National Party Government, not because of it. Treasury officials deserve the gratitude of Queenslanders for being able to keep the State's finances on the rails in spite of the mismanagement and the excesses of a former Government which made wastage and pork-barrelling into an art form. But let us also remember that the National Party, when it was in Government, was protected by the fact that commodity prices were buoyant. This has not been the case in recent years. The National Party Government did not have to contend with a series of natural disasters—cyclones, floods and then the longest drought in living memory—plus the effects of a worldwide recession.

Mr LINGARD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Once again, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. If the honourable member takes a point of order again on a matter on which I have already made a ruling, I will warn him under Standing Order 123A.

Mr LINGARD: You will look funny if you toss me out.

Mr PITT: Credit should be given where credit is due. The achievements in a budgetary sense of this Government and the Treasurer are especially noteworthy given the circumstances.

I draw the attention of members to the *Cairns Post* of Friday, 3 September. The headline reads "Budget bonus for Far North. Health, housing, road works and rail all big winners." I must point out that the *Cairns Post* is not known for its gratuitous support of the Labor Government in Queensland. The article goes on to state—

"Far North Queensland will reap a \$253 million capital works windfall from initiatives contained in yesterday's fourth Goss Government Budget.

State Treasurer Keith De Lacy—who is also the Member for Cairns—said from Brisbane last night expenditure per head of population in the Far North as a result of the Budget would be \$1399, compared to an average per capita

expenditure for the State as a whole of \$1148."

Some of the major items that that article pointed out as being of benefit to Queensland were \$29.6m to be spent in the health area; more public housing in far-north Queensland to the tune of \$32.2m; roadworks in the vicinity of \$15m; new rail infrastructure worth \$13m; and education being the big winner with an allocation of \$11.45m. As well, tourism, being our major industry, did not miss out. The Wet Tropics Management Agency received \$15.7m, which included \$9.4m from the Federal Government. That funding went towards research, planning, Aboriginal issues and additional field staff to make sure that the program functioned the way that it should.

The editorial of that day's paper was even more glowing. It stated—

"As well as being particularly good for the Far North—no surprise given Mr De Lacy is also the Member for Cairns—the Budget also looks good overall for Queensland."

Previous speakers from this side of the House have listed the sorts of comments that have come not from a narrow sector of observers but from all quarters lauding the value of this 1993-94 Budget. The key to that editorial was the following statement—

"Critics of the State Government's performance in the health, education and social services tend to forget that—compared to other states—Queensland had been notoriously underfunded in those areas for years by the previous National Party governments.

Redressing this imbalance will take sustained spending in those disadvantages areas over quite a few more years than the four the Goss Government has so far been in power."

That is indicative of the fact that people understand that this Government will be in power for some years to come. The article continued—

"It won't happen overnight, no matter what groups like the teachers' union and the health lobby might think, because there will never be enough money in the kitty."

The article went on to say that the instant solutions that had been put up by various people in the form of increased taxation or loading the State up with a huge debt were way out in left field and not entertained by the Government, nor should they be. The article continued further—

“Despite State Opposition Leader Rob Borbidge’s less than credible claim that the level of spending in this year’s Budget is on a par with high-spending former Labor Premiers such as John Cain in Victoria and John Bannon in South Australia, what the Queensland Government has done is to boost spending overall quite substantially, without also increasing taxes and charges to an unacceptable level.”

The Treasurer should be congratulated on that. He has pulled off a coup in Queensland about which all other States would be green with envy as they watch it occur. I am sure that the Federal Government would wish that its Budget was as well received as the Queensland Budget.

We cannot always judge the quality of a Budget by capital works. I know that during the Estimates debate many members will extol the virtues of the departmental expenditure Estimates, and I am sure that each and every one of those is important. However, I will confine my comments tonight mainly to the capital works area. Since 1989, far-north Queensland has been a major beneficiary in that respect in successive Budgets brought down by the Treasurer. In that period, we have established an office of the Bureau of Regional Development in Cairns. That replaced the disgraced Cape York Enterprise Zone concept which was really all hot air and produced very little indeed. This Budget assists small business. This afternoon, the temporary—so I believe—Deputy Leader of the Coalition said that we did not understand what small business was about. I can assure the honourable member that small business understands what this Government is about. That is one of the reasons why it is coming on board to the extent that it is. The Queensland Small Business Corporation in Cairns will have a massive office upgrade. I am very pleased to see that the appointment of an additional business adviser will be made to that office.

As well, improvements will be made to the Woree and Portsmith industrial estates. In far-north Queensland, we have for a long time relied on sugar. I know that the member for Thuringowa said that I would mention sugar at some point in this speech, and I have done it. But lately, along with sugar and mining, we have had a propensity to rely upon our tourist industry. That is a case of putting a lot of eggs in a single basket. We must ensure that we diversify our economy as far as possible in far-north Queensland. Therefore, I support

anything that will bring light industry into the region.

Job creation will be expanded through the announcement this year of the construction of the Cairns casino. Of course, it will not cost the Government anything for that casino to be constructed. But the important thing, as I have indicated in speeches earlier this year, is that the construction of that casino will provide the wherewithal for a convention centre to be established in Cairns, which will have an impact not only on tourism but also on business. Both of those activities will create thousands of jobs during the construction stage and also during the ongoing maintenance and use of those facilities.

An amount of \$36m has been allocated for the convention centre. I understand that \$6m or \$7m will be spent in the near future to get the project under way, with the rest being provided later on. Two sites seem to have firmed in favouritism for the convention centre, that is, the pier site and the site of the fuel storage tank/farm at the end of Lake Street. Both sites would be suitable; both have their pluses and both have their minuses. I expect that, within the next couple of weeks, a decision will be made. Contrary to some claims being made in the local media from the Mayor of Cairns that not enough consultation is taking place, I point out to him that he and his council are major participants in that process; they are actually there making the decision. I do not know how much more consultation they can have than that process whereby they are in the group that will make the final recommendation.

Law and order has been a big winner. I know that the Treasurer has been very active in this respect in his role as the member for Cairns. Prior to the Goss Government coming to power, Cairns had probably the worst watch-house facilities not only in Queensland but also in Australia. They were an absolute disgrace. That problem has now been overcome. We had a police headquarters which barely passed for that. The officers worked in cramped conditions and quite often did not have sufficient resources to carry out their duties in the way in which we expect our law enforcement officers to do so. Now we are quite proud to have the best courthouse/watch-house/police complex in Queensland, which is as it should be, as Cairns is one of the most rapidly growing areas in the State. It is something that Cairns has needed for a long time. Hopefully, it will be the benchmark for other similar establishments as they come on stream in years to come.

A large number of additional police have been appointed to the Cairns area. Because that tourist area is developing rapidly, and because it has a large transient population, it is obvious that its law enforcement would need attention. I am particularly pleased to see that the numbers of police have been increased. I am also pleased that the institution of an Aboriginal and Islander liaison officer program has proved to be very successful, despite criticism from outside quarters that it would not work. It has brought the Aboriginal and Islander community together. It has also provided the general public with an understanding of the various issues faced by those people. I believe that, over recent months, there has been a better working relationship between the Police Service, the Aboriginal community and the community in general to bring about a safer inner-city area in Cairns.

In Mr Deputy Speaker's electorate, a number of additional police stations have been constructed in places such as Cooktown, Mosman, Mornington Island, Normanton and Weipa. In my own electorate, I am pleased to see the upgrade of the Edmonton Police Station. It is not a new station; it is an addition to the existing facilities. That part of the Cairns region is the fastest growing residential area in far-north Queensland. Obviously, the increase in police numbers and the better facilities were long overdue.

As to education—in Cairns, we have seen the securing of the campus of the James Cook University. There has been an accelerated timetable for the start of its operation in Cairns. That has come about through the application of funds from the sale of the Cairns Central State School. I am looking forward to seeing that university up and running. As the member for Barron River is aware, I have been a critic of that site. That issue is over now. We must get on with it. We have to get that university up and running so that it services the people of far-north Queensland as soon as possible. It is good to see that the State Government has been prepared to channel money in that direction to provide tertiary education for our growing population.

Extensions have been made to a number of schools. I will speak about education during the Estimates debate. However, I highlight that, this year and in recent years, places such as Babinda, Hambledon, Gordonvale and Woree have been beneficiaries of the Capital Works Program.

Recently, I had the pleasure of attending a showing at the Regional Art Gallery. On that night, the Treasurer was there to launch a particular showing. The State Government has supported the arts in far-north Queensland by making available the Public Curator's building, which is a historic building in Cairns. That building has true historic value, unlike some buildings that have recently been purported to have great historic value in connection with a casino. To the tune of \$1m, the Government has provided funds for the establishment of that art gallery. That is yet to be matched by funds from the local authorities. I urge them to get off their hands and get involved in that as soon as possible. Because they have been waiting, they are only delaying something which I believe the people of Cairns want and need if we are to truly realise our potential.

As to transport—the long-awaited Babinda bypass is almost completed. The last \$3.6m has been allocated to it. When the bypass is completed, it will be of great benefit to all concerned. In this Budget, the sum of \$4.1m has been set aside for the Cairns rail freight terminal. Most of that funding will go towards the construction of a bridge and connecting line over Chinaman Creek. I note that the final funding required to complete the construction of the bridge over the Mulgrave River to take it above flood level and to remove a problem curve has also been included in the Budget.

The Mourilyan port, the Cairns port and the airport have been beneficiaries from the Budget. It is important to understand that our exports, imports and, more particularly, our tourist visitors must have the right port facilities—whether they be seaports or airports—if we are to continue the level of controlled growth that we have seen over recent years.

I must not forget public housing, about which I am deeply concerned. Prior to Labor coming to Government, the Cairns electorate seemed to be the only beneficiary of public housing in far-north Queensland. There was method in the madness of the previous Government. People talk about pork-barrelling. That was pork-barrelling in reverse. All the public housing was placed in one electorate. The electorates of Mulgrave and Barron River, which were held by National Party members, did not get any public housing. As a matter of fact, after a 35-year wait, Babinda—a township in the Mulgrave electorate—had its first public accommodation built three years ago. We now have a couple of dozen public housing accommodation units in Babinda, with more to come.

In Cairns, there is the need to upgrade the Mooroolooloo/Murray Street Housing Commission complex. The member for Ipswich spoke about this in his contribution. He said that houses or units were stacked one against the other. It is no wonder that we are experiencing social problems in some of those areas. I understand that a good deal of money—in the order of \$800,000 or \$900,000—is going to be spent to try to make that area far more livable for the people who have accommodation there.

I promised the member for Thuringowa that I would speak about sugar. The Queensland Government Budget allocation will kick start a new scheme aimed at boosting the State's sugar industry. The Goss Government will join forces with the Federal Government to launch the sugar industry infrastructure development scheme, a project which has the backing of the State's producers. The State Government is kicking in \$20m to run the scheme over the next few years.

I believe that this has been an excellent Budget. It is a model for the rest of the States. I commend the Treasurer for the work that he has put into it and for the leadership that he has shown in bringing it into this House.

Time expired.

Mr GILMORE (Tablelands) (7.56 p.m.): I was very interested indeed to hear the member for Mulgrave mention pork barrels. If he would care to look at the Budget documents, I am quite sure that he would find that an immense pork barrel has been placed in the electorate of the member for Cairns, the Honourable Treasurer of Queensland. He has looked after himself pretty well in the past three Budgets. I do not think that anyone in this Parliament would deny that. I wonder why the backbench members of the Parliament put up with that, because fairly obviously the money that has gone into the Treasurer's electorate has been withdrawn from other members' electorates around the State.

Mr Pitt: I must say that I've done pretty well.

Mr GILMORE: I understand that the honourable member has done pretty well, except that he hardly spoke about his electorate in his speech. He spent most of the time talking about the electorate of Cairns. But that is the situation as it is. The Treasurer of this State has been rolling out the pork barrel to help himself. But that is all right. That is now history. The pork barrel jibe will be levied at this Government and this Treasurer for a long time to come.

The member for Mulgrave also mentioned housing. I shall begin on that note in respect of the Tablelands electorate. As a member of Parliament, I have never had a problem with public housing being built in my electorate. In fact, I have an extraordinarily good history in respect of requests for public housing to be built in my electorate. As a member of the National Party, I have probably achieved more public housing for my electorate than has any other member. I will tell honourable members why. It does not matter to me what colour a person is or how he or she votes; it is my view that everybody in this State is entitled to decent housing. I have carried that as a torch since my election to this place nearly seven years ago. So all the jibes from members on the other side of the Parliament about public housing and National Party members' attitudes to it do not apply to me, I promise them.

I would like to begin by talking in some small way about an overview of the electorate of Tablelands and the problems that we confront there—problems that have not been addressed by this Budget. The honourable member for Mount Isa need not loiter any longer in the Chamber, because tonight I am going to spend 20 minutes talking about my electorate. In November, when I get my opportunity to speak during the Estimates debate, then he should be in the Parliament.

Mr De Lacy: I'm really worried about that!

Mr GILMORE: The Treasurer might not be worried now, but he will be worried then. The Tablelands electorate is suffering from a particular kind of economic depression. Unemployment levels in Atherton range from about 10 per cent or 11 per cent, which is around about the State average—

Mr De Lacy: How did Atherton go in the football?

Mr GILMORE: Atherton did very well in the football, thank you very much. Mareeba has about 24 per cent to 26 per cent unemployment, which is average. There is some question about youth unemployment in Mareeba. Ravenshoe suffers a particular kind of depression. Estimates of unemployment levels in that town vary upwards of 50 per cent and sometimes higher. There are some very good historical reasons for that which I shall address at some length during the forthcoming debate on the Wet Tropics World Heritage Protection and Management Bill.

I am the member for the tobacco industry in Queensland, and over the last couple of Budgets—not the last couple; the last one was a bit of a disaster for the tobacco industry,

but for the one before—the Treasurer had a fair sort of a belly-ache because I did not praise him for not raising the tobacco tax. I say to him tonight—and I hope that he is listening—“Thank you for not raising the tobacco tax above 75 per cent to the 100 per cent that other States apparently consider to be the appropriate level for the licensing fee for State taxes on the tobacco industry.” So he can get that out of his whinge basket.

However, the tobacco industry is on its knees; there is no question or doubt about that. I think that the industry is dead. It is just a matter of time before we carry out the corpse and bury it. That has been brought about to no small extent by the State and Federal taxes that have been levied, by the attacks that have been made on the industry by the health and smoking lobby and by the effect that advertising bans have had on the sale of the product. As a member of Parliament, I find it very difficult to preside over an industry that is in decline.

One of the things that I was told when I first became a member of Parliament was that when I eventually choose to hand on my electorate to somebody else, I must hand it on in a better condition than it was in when I got it. I regret to say that I am presiding over the end of the tobacco industry. But it is not at my hand, it is at the hand of this Treasurer and the Labor Government in Canberra. Forever, they will carry the stigma of having destroyed an industry that has been extremely viable, which has provided well for many of the people in my area and which could continue to provide well for the people in my area provided that this country chose to smoke Australian tobacco rather than imported tobacco.

I have grave concerns about the economy of the Dimbulah and Mareeba area because of the decline in the tobacco industry and the failure of many people—scientists and others—to develop alternative industries. I reject out of hand the continual public posturing by the Minister for Primary Industries about the wonderful work that he and his department are doing in developing alternative industries in that area. It is a fraud. He is a failure. Nothing has come out of his posturing, and nor shall it unless those industries are developed by farmers, as has been the tradition in Queensland agriculture.

The Minister for Primary Industries has done everything possible to destroy the maize industry by the structure of organised marketing, and so it goes. The rice industry in my electorate has been destroyed by this

Government because of the charges that it placed upon water, which was an integral part of that industry. In recent times, the Minister for Primary Industries has also done an immense amount of posturing about the role that he played in the development of a new chicken farming and processing industry in the tablelands region. Let me tell honourable members the truth of the matter. The Minister had nothing whatsoever to do with the development of that chicken processing industry. The genesis of that idea came from a gentleman called Jim Petritch who was, at that time, the Manager of the Maize Marketing Board in Atherton.

He worked in close contact with a lady called Karen Isily, who is a very important operative in the Department of Small Business and Industry in Cairns. I pay tribute to the role that that lady has played in developing the opportunity for the tablelands region to have a chicken growing and processing industry. I also pay tribute to the company that has been involved. I believe that this small industry will become a very important part of the matrix of industries in the tablelands region. As the tobacco industry winds down, we will have to have a number of industries to replace it, simply because it takes a lot of mangoes, chickens or anything else to make up for the \$50m industry that we have lost.

On the bright side, I pay tribute to the Minister for Primary industries—and do not tell me that I am not fair—for the expansions in the sugar industry that have been brought about by this Government. They have been welcome indeed. They have allowed the Mossman mill, and now the Mulgrave mill and the South Johnstone mill to move into the tablelands area. However, there are some down sides to that, and I will cover those shortly when I speak about the transport matters in my electorate.

The dairy industry has been held down by this Minister. He has brought into this place legislative change that the industry has indeed had difficulty in acclimatising to, particularly in regard to the distribution of milk. Also, this Government has failed to provide satisfactory access to power supplies of the three-phase type so that people can upgrade their irrigation equipment and their milking equipment. The mining industry in the electorate has been very severely depressed by this Government because of the changes that it has made and the structures that it has put in place to destroy small mining. All that we have in the electorate of Tablelands at the present time as a legacy of this Government

are closed mines and mines that are running at smaller and smaller profit margins.

Another industry, which is a burgeoning industry and which I hope will make some headway in the very near future, is the tea-tree oil industry. That is being developed by farmers—the way that industries always are developed in this State—regardless of the posturing of the Minister. He has had nothing to do with this. In fact, my efforts over the last six years to get the Department of Primary Industries to actually involve itself in some research into the tea-tree oil industry have been a total failure. The Minister and his department have refused to assist. We now have an industry that is being developed, and I believe that it may, in the future, become an important industry in the Atherton Tableland area.

Some years ago, I argued very strongly in this place and in the public arena for research to be carried out into an opium poppy industry for the Atherton Tableland area to eventually take over from the tobacco industry. The Minister made such a fool of himself in public at that time that he has refused to allow the Department of Primary Industries to indulge in any type of research whatsoever to develop that industry. It is an \$80m industry in Tasmania today. It is a crop that is small, light and of high value and it is non-perishable. That is exactly the type of industry that we require in the remote areas of Queensland. The Minister should swallow his pride and get on with research into that industry, just in case there is a future for that type of pharmaceutical industry in far-north Queensland.

I turn now to some specific matters which concern the electorate of Tablelands. In the Budget, insufficient money is made available for roads in the electorate of Tablelands. The Kennedy Highway has been ignored entirely in this Budget. The road from Atherton to Ravenshoe past the crater and up through Longlands Gap is an absolute disgrace. This Government has done nothing towards the development of that road. It is the bottleneck between the road train and B-double routes, which is causing immense difficulty and imposing extreme costs on the transport industry of far-north Queensland. That section of road must be upgraded as a matter of course, and quickly. The section of that road from Ravenshoe to Mount Garnet is even worse. It is a narrow, single-lane strip of bitumen which is creating immense danger to children travelling in school buses and the travelling public at large. The transport industry is losing a lot of money because of busted tyres and other damage to vehicles.

In regard to the Palmerston Highway, particularly that section from Malanda to Millaa Millaa—it is time that this Government got down to the business of pre-emptive planning and is able to change its priorities as a matter of course when there is a new industry in the offing. This Government is so staid in its structures that it simply cannot change when there is a very obvious change in the offing. The South Johnstone mill is looking at producing approximately 300 000 tonnes of sugar in the tablelands area in the next four years. Any person can do the sums. That will result in 30 000 single vehicle movements along the Palmerston Highway in any six-month period during the sugar industry harvest time. That is in addition to the existing traffic that is on that road—the tourist traffic, the milk industry traffic and other local traffic.

It is the main highway to the tablelands area and it is central to the economy of the region. The section of the highway from Malanda to Millaa Millaa is falling apart as quickly as a person can look at it. This Government has set aside no funds whatsoever for that road, and as soon as sugar is transported along that road, it will collapse and be untrafficable, which will be uneconomic for far-north Queensland. If I have time when I get to the subject of railways, I will say a little more about that.

Motorists on the Palmerston Highway and the Kennedy Highway also have a major problem with dairy cattle crossing the road. Not three months ago, this problem was emphatically brought to notice when a semitrailer drove through a herd of dairy cattle and killed 24 cattle on the side of the road, threw one of the cattle on to the bonnet of a parked car and almost killed the wife of the farmer. For more than 12 months, I have been arguing with the Minister for Transport to have the department accept the responsibility for half of the cost of the installation of cattle creeps on the Palmerston Highway and the Kennedy Highway, but I have got nothing out of it—absolutely nothing. No money has been set aside in this Budget for that particular project. We can no longer accept that the Government has no priority in respect of cattle creeps and that the Government is not responsible for the provision of the necessary funds for them.

In terms of rail transportation to the tablelands area, all we have been given is the closure of railway lines. Certainly, at present the Deputy Premier has a task force that is running around the country saying, "We might save some and we might close some", but it does not matter one way or the other. Let me tell members that the Deputy Premier visited

my electorate in company with a Deputy Speaker. He had a meeting in my electorate from which I was specifically excluded and which, I must say, offended me somewhat. I wrote to the Deputy Premier and expressed my extreme concern about such a biased political attitude in relation to a serious problem in my electorate. I must say that I received an apology, for which I thank him. I hope and trust that never again will such a ridiculous thing happen from the man we call Tom Burns in this Parliament. Not the Deputy Premier—this is Tom Burns about whom I am talking, and I thought better of him.

I wish to refer to future strategies for railways in my electorate. I have already referred to the sugar industry. Over the next four years, there is the prospect of shifting something in the order of 300 000 to 400 000 tonnes of sugar from my electorate. It could all travel by rail on the three foot six inch gauge which is currently being considered for closure. With the appropriate scheduling of trains, there would be no problem at all in transporting sugar from Tolga to the South Johnstone mill within seven hours. That is not a problem to the operators; it is a problem for the Railways Department, and it is time that Queensland Rail smartened itself up and got around to the serious business of providing a service to the industries and to the people of far-north Queensland.

West of Chillagoe, a mine is about to open which has the capacity to produce 300 000 tonnes of perlite per annum. For the benefit of honourable members who do not know, I point out that perlite is the silvery substance that is found in potting mix in the garden and in pot plants. It is estimated that this mine will produce an industry worth \$750m a year in my electorate. What has Queensland Rail done? Instead of setting aside the line, upgrading it and making sure that the industry gets off the ground, it has closed the line, which is quite a ridiculous situation.

Mr Speaker, I welcome you to the chair and point out that I understand the Deputy Premier is considering keeping open the Forsyth line for a short period so that some passenger and freight traffic can be developed on that line. Today, I gave some documents to my colleague the Opposition spokesman on Transport, the member for Gregory, which he will table in this Parliament. Those documents show that Queensland Rail has limited the traffic on that line to 56 passengers. There is no way possible that revenue from the line will increase while the prevailing culture continues. There is the

possibility of carrying volumes of coal, lime and other substances on that line, but all the Government is prepared to do is close down the line.

I could go on for another 20 minutes and talk about health, education, TAFE and other matters that are very important indeed in my electorate. I could mention matters that have been ignored by this Government in its Budget. This Government has made a mockery of the process of budgeting in this State and has shown that this Government is the queen of all the pork-barrelling Governments that this State has ever had. Quite clearly, for the last three Budgets, this Government has ignored those electorates that have been represented in this Parliament by National Party members. I am quite sure that while the Labor Party graces the Government benches, members of this Government will continue with their pork-barrelling exercise to feather their own nests.

Debate, on motion of Ms Spence, adjourned.

POLITICAL DONATION

Mr PITT (Mulgrave) (8.16 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That this Parliament notes the following statement by the Criminal Justice Commission on 8 September 1993:

‘The 7.30 Report last night on ABC TV featured an item concerning the payment of \$5,000 in November 1989 to Mr Terry Mackenroth MLA then a member of the Opposition shortly prior to the State election held that year.

Reference was made to excerpts from telephone conversations allegedly had between a businessman and Mr Mackenroth concerning the making of this payment.

The Premier Mr Goss raised this matter with the then Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission, Sir Max Bingham, in 1990 as was obviously appropriate in the circumstances.’ ”

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member to resume his seat. It may be opportune for me to mention that today I gave an indication that I would rule on two documents that were tabled. One was tabled by Mr Borbidge and the other was tabled by Mrs Sheldon. I find the document tabled by Mr Borbidge to be in

order, but the document tabled by Mrs Sheldon not to be in order because it pertains to matters about a citizen which are before the criminal jurisdiction. Tonight, during this debate, that is all that will be out of order, but I suggest that at the moment we do not mention fully the names of people who are before the courts. Because the matter of the tapes is relevant, members can refer to the tapes, but I would appreciate it if members did not try to read the transcripts into *Hansard*. Apart from that, the actions of members and people of that ilk are for the House to discuss and debate, and rightly so. I thought I would set right the parameters, and I now call on the member for Mulgrave to continue.

Mr Borbidge: Mr Speaker, can I have a copy of the motion?

Mr SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr PITT: I will continue with the motion, which reads—

“ The commission later investigated Mr Mackenroth’s involvement in the receipt of these moneys and determined in December last year that the allegation that such payment was corruptly received by Mr Mackenroth could not be substantiated.

In reaching this view the commission obtained the assistance of independent Queen’s Counsel.’ ”

Over the past year and a half, we have sat in this Parliament and watched the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mrs Sheldon, attempt to smear the reputation of the honourable member for Chatsworth, Mr Terry Mackenroth. This has been done by asking questions and making assertions which are obviously untrue. We now have a statement from the Criminal Justice Commission which says that it has fully investigated the matter and the claims cannot be substantiated. However, the Leader of the Liberal Party and some members of the media have not been content with the Criminal Justice Commission’s statement and the documentation, a copy of the receipt issued for the \$5,000 donation, and also a copy of the bank deposit slip which were produced by the member for Chatsworth on the first day that Mrs Sheldon raised this matter in the Parliament. Instead, these people wanted to immerse themselves in conspiracy theories which in some way implied that there had been a cover-up. These elaborate conspiracy theories were shown last Tuesday night on the *7.30 Report*.

What we saw last Tuesday on the *7.30 Report* was a journalist and researcher who

got hold of a piece of information and believed that the information led to a particular conclusion. They then got hold of further information which they fabricated to suit their story. Tonight, I wish to point out the inaccuracies of last Tuesday’s *7.30 Report* by simply looking at the public record, examining relevant public documents and comparing them with the transcript of the *7.30 Report*.

Firstly, the show started off by implying that a telephone conversation between Terry Mackenroth and a businessman had been taped. That inaccuracy in the program certainly set the tone for the remainder of the show. The show featured a person placing what one would assume was a bug on telephone equipment. That was totally incorrect. The *7.30 Report* should have stated that the information that it had was from a listening device placed in an office which could reveal only one side of the telephone conversation—a very important omission.

In the segment put to air, the show obtained the services of an actor to act out the conversation between a businessman and the Minister. To add a sinister overtone to the conversation, the program showed the actor in a darkened room. The conversation that the *7.30 Report* ran was taken from a transcript tabled in the Federal Parliament. A comparison of the transcript in Federal *Hansard* with that of the *7.30 Report* shows that the *7.30 Report* put to air a conversation taken from six different parts of the Federal *Hansard* transcript. Those were run together to make it appear as though it were a continuous conversation.

The reporter then stated—

“A couple of days later Mackenroth was being pressed harder than ever.”

The *7.30 Report* then had the actor speaking on the telephone again. The transcripts tabled in the Federal Parliament show that there was only ever one conversation between Mackenroth and the businessman. Therefore, the assertion that there was another conversation a couple of days later is totally inaccurate and deliberately misleading. Added to that, a close look at the transcript of the *7.30 Report* showed that it even used the same sentence from one conversation and tried to portray it as having been said on two different days.

The show then went on to use a section of the transcript that asked, “Did Mr Mackenroth write a receipt?” The *7.30 Report* showed a section that said, “No.” The transcript stated, “No, well, I don’t know.” That meaning is vastly different. The *7.30 Report*

then elaborated on a speech that Terry Mackenroth made in the Parliament in 1989. In its report, it stated that the person that the debate was about—

“had a lone voice supporting him—Terry Mackenroth.”

The show then went on to say that no-one else in Parliament agreed with him.

A check of the parliamentary records of that debate quite clearly shows that those statements were incorrect. A check of the debate reveals that, as well as Mr Mackenroth, two other members—Mr Underwood, and a National Party member, Mr Menzel—spoke in support of that person. The assertion that Terry Mackenroth was a lone voice and that no-one else in the Parliament agreed is completely shot down when one looks at the statement by the then Premier, Mike Ahern. He said—

“The plain facts are that the Labor Party was divided 14-13 on the matter at its caucus meeting.”

There was confirmation of that fact later in the debate by Mr Underwood, who stated—

“I am honest enough to say that I was one of the 13 members about whom the Premier spoke.”

Quite obviously, the statements by the *7.30 Report* were, once again, incorrect and showed deliberate malice combined with extremely poor research. The program then went on to show a simulated court proceeding in which a Crown prosecutor asked a police officer was he aware whether a copy of a report that he prepared on 25 July 1989 ever found its way into the hands of Mr Mackenroth. The show then stated—

“Within days Terry Mackenroth was using exact details from that supposedly confidential report . . . in Parliament.”

The debate to which the program referred in which Terry Mackenroth had used that information in Parliament was held on 7 June—seven weeks prior to the supposed report even being prepared. The show then claimed that Mackenroth had published a letter that he had sent to Noel Newnham. That is completely wrong, and the ABC's own records will show that the letter was released publicly by Noel Newnham at a press conference. The show also claimed that the transcripts reached the Parliament via the Supreme Court. That was not possible, as the relevant transcript to which the show referred was ruled inadmissible in the Supreme Court and therefore never became a public

document. The transcript obviously found its way to the Parliament via another means.

Over the past year, we have seen an Opposition go out of its way to vilify a man who, as the motion that I have read shows, containing as it does a statement from the Criminal Justice Commission, quite clearly was not the person whom it purported him to be. He has been blamed. He has been accused and vilified unnecessarily.

Mr LIVINGSTONE (Ipswich West) (8.25 p.m.): I second the motion moved by the honourable member for Mulgrave and, in doing so, I am reminded of an old proverb that there are none so blind as those who will not see. Last week, on the *7.30 Report*, the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mrs Sheldon, stated that the member for Chatsworth should make available his financial records in relation to a political donation that he received. Today, in the Parliament, she repeated that statement.

I would like to quote from a letter that the Minister for Housing, Local Government and Planning had delivered to Mrs Sheldon today. It stated—

“Dear Mrs Sheldon

I refer to statements you made on ABC TV last week and in the Parliament today that I should make available financial records in relation to a political donation I received in 1989.

I wish to advise that I am prepared to make this information available for you to view between 5.00 pm and 6.00 pm today (14 September). If you wish to take up this offer could you kindly contact my Secretary, Robyn Healy on telephone 22 67220.”

Mr Mackenroth also sent a similar letter to Mr Borbidge, the Leader of the Opposition. The letter stated—

“Dear Mr Borbidge

I refer to statements made on ABC TV last week and in the Parliament today by the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mrs Joan Sheldon that I should make available financial records in relation to a political donation I received in 1989.

I wish to advise that I am prepared to make this information available for you to view between 5.00 pm and 6.00 pm today (14 September).”

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am having great difficulty in hearing the member for Ipswich West.

Mr LIVINGSTONE: The letter continued—

“If you wish to take up this offer could you kindly contact my Secretary, Robyn Healy on telephone 22 67220.”

I seek leave to table both of those letters.

Leave granted.

Mr LIVINGSTONE: The Minister for Housing, Mr Mackenroth, has informed me that neither Mr Borbidge nor Mrs Sheldon responded to those letters. Clearly, they are not interested in seeing what was sighted by the Criminal Justice Commission when it cleared Mr Mackenroth of any wrongdoing. I believe that any decent person would have availed himself or herself of the opportunity to view that evidence, particularly after the fuss that Mrs Sheldon has made over the issue.

Clearly, Mr Borbidge and Mrs Sheldon are not interested in the truth but are interested merely in promoting their conspiracy theories, at which they excel. It is a disgrace that those people have used the Parliament to denigrate the character of the Minister for Housing.

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise—Leader of the Opposition) (8.28 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

“That the following words be added to the motion—

‘that the Parliament also notes the inconsistencies of the Premier in his public statements concerning his involvement in this matter.’ ”

I want to say at the outset that the Leader of the Liberal Party and I will not be involved in convenient backroom deals on a matter that, quite rightly, should be canvassed in the public interest in this place. It gives me some pleasure to join in a debate today on a topic that could and should have been fully aired in this place over a year ago. It still deserves to be discussed. The Premier did not want it aired in this place last year, and he did not want it aired on the *7.30 Report* last week. They are the most cogent reasons to examine the matter, not because Terry Mackenroth received a political donation from some dubious source.

I note, however, with appropriate irony that, in this case, we are dealing with a legitimate political donation. That may well be, but is it not interesting how the worm has turned? A few years ago, Government members—the members who now defend themselves—in the face of the facts that we are dealing with today would have been shouting about brown paper bags. A senior

Minister in the Government gets a brown paper bag with \$5,000 cash in it, and suddenly it is a fully documented and legitimate political donation. I just note the irony; the turning of events; the full circle.

The fact is that the Premier—and really the Premier alone—has turned the Mackenroth donation affair into one of the signature issues for this Government. This is now an issue of not just Mr Mackenroth’s credibility but also the Premier’s credibility. There can be no question at all that Noel Newnham did the right thing. He did his duty in going to the Premier after the Federal Police sent him transcripts of telephone discussions detailing a bid by dubious characters to provide the member for Chatsworth with \$5,000 in cash in the lead-up to the 1989 election campaign.

Mr Newnham also did the right thing—and clearly the commonsense thing—in going to the Premier without letting his Minister know exactly why he was going. Obviously, he would have been silly to have acted otherwise. Yet all the Premier wanted to do, as soon as he got his chance in this place, was to twist the knife already sticking out of Noel Newnham’s back. The Premier now wants to play down the fact that he used 7 May last year to indulge in deliberate character assassination of Noel Newnham. He now wants to play down the fact that he carried through a snide attack on a serving senior public servant under parliamentary privilege in an expunged debate.

It is very important to remember now that, as the Premier was about to embark on that attack, he said—

“I am going to have to be very careful about this. I am going to have to be very careful.”

Honourable members should keep that in mind. The Premier emphasised that he was going to be very careful with his facts when he addressed this matter. He then went on to deliberately seek to paint a picture of Mr Newnham having gone “behind the Minister’s back” at a time when the Minister had—and I quote the Premier again—“left the State and gone overseas”. In other words, the Premier, who said not once but twice that he was going to be very careful in his response to questions from the member for Caloundra—in order to be factual—not only clearly wanted to establish that Noel Newnham had gone behind the Minister’s back but also sought to create the impression that Mr Newnham’s behaviour was cowardly. He implied that the commissioner had waited until the Minister

was overseas. That is how much the Premier wanted to discredit the Police Commissioner.

What is the truth? The truth is that the Minister was not overseas. The truth is that the commissioner did not go behind the Minister's back. In fact, the commissioner even told the Minister that he was going to see the Premier in relation to an issue of his—the Premier's—personal safety. That is perfectly proper behaviour by a man who could not, in any reasonable sense, given what he had before him, do more for the Minister. In fact, it could be argued that he need not have—perhaps should not have—mentioned his visit to the Premier at all under those particular circumstances.

The attack on the then Commissioner of Police was not the only fast and loose treatment of the truth by the Premier who, let us remind ourselves again, said that he was going to be "very careful" in what he had to say on this matter. That was only the beginning; the tip of the iceberg. After the commissioner visited the Premier and discussed with him the implications of the phone taps—without names—the Premier made inquiries and found out that the person being referred to was the member for Chatsworth. Then what did he do—at least, what did he say he did? In Parliament on 7 May, he gave the clear impression that he put the facts, or the relevant facts, before the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission. The Premier stated—

"I laid the facts before him, and Sir Max Bingham advised me that—in his view—the member concerned had acted with complete propriety."

The Premier—the very careful Premier—gave the impression that Sir Max was placed by him in full command of all the facts; that Sir Max properly considered those facts and declared that there was no problem.

The Premier was even more sanctimonious about his accountability on the matter on the *7.30 Report* last week. On the *7.30 Report*, what was a "discussion" with Sir Max, according to the Premier's parliamentary statements, became a full-blown referral to the CJC, with all that those words have come to mean in Queensland. When most people hear that a topic has been referred to the CJC, they think of an official investigation. In fact, the only reasonable conclusion that can be drawn is that the Premier quite deliberately overstated the case, both in Parliament and especially on the *7.30 Report*, in relation to his contact with Sir Max.

Consider Sir Max Bingham's very different recollection. According to Sir Max, the matter was not referred to him for investigation by the Premier, as the Premier would quite deliberately have us believe. Even the discussion which took place, according to Sir Max, was informal. No documentation concerning the donation was put before him. Sir Max told the *7.30 Report* that the Premier said simply—and somewhat coyly, I would have thought, in the circumstances—

". . . that one of his Ministers had received a substantial donation, it had been the subject of a receipt, it had been banked properly through the Labor Party's processes, and the Minister had declared it in his parliamentary papers. He thought that I ought to be aware of it. Did I have any concerns. I said that it seemed to me, on those facts—on those facts—to have been properly dealt with."

The interviewer then said—

"Were you given any documentary evidence at all, receipts, bank statements, anything that would back up what the Premier was telling you?"

Sir Max replied—

"Oh, no."

Specifically, Sir Max stated later in the interview—

"The questions raised by those telephone taps had not emerged."

What a discrepancy! On the one hand, we have the Premier making the Chairman of the CJC fully cognisant of all the relevant facts. On the other hand, we have Sir Max saying that it was an informal discussion in which he was not made aware of the most crucial and the most elementary aspects.

Let us look closely at this, because the Premier compounded the discrepancy between himself and Sir Max on this point again in the Parliament this morning. The Premier said that he did talk about the phone taps. He also said that he did not present the transcripts of them to Sir Max because they had only been shown to him with the names removed, but had then been taken away by Mr Newnham after the commissioner's visit. That is not how Sir Max recalls the matter. Sir Max's version is quite different. In the *7.30 Report* interview, Sir Max said—

"The questions raised by those telephone taps had not emerged."

I emphasise "had not emerged". He also said—and I quote him directly again from a transcript of the interview—

"If I'd been conscious of the background, ramifications, the sort of flavour of the transaction, I would have taken a totally different view about it."

He would have taken a totally different view if the facts had been properly laid before him. Of course he would have! Sir Max also said—and I quote him directly again—in response to a question as to whether he wished the Premier had given him all the information—

"Oh, in retrospect, I expect, both the Premier and I do. But, you know, that's hindsight."

According to Sir Max, all the facts were not laid before him.

It also needs to be said that the Premier—who has never missed an opportunity to give Noel Newnham a backhander—will never miss an opportunity to do the same to Sir Max. Whether it is Pamela Bornhorst, Peter Wear, Noel Newnham, David Blizzard, Pat Gillespie, Sir Max Bingham or any other of a host of good Queenslanders past and present, people fail to genuflect to this Government at their own risk. Sir Max, for his trouble, copped it again this morning. Sir Max, the Premier implied, had all the power in the world to expand his investigation at the time, if he judged that necessary.

On two key points, the Premier has got it wrong—so deliberately and deceitfully wrong, I suggest, that he has brought the problem upon himself. The problem is simply this: if the Premier and the member for Chatsworth have nothing to hide, why did the Premier seek deliberately to mislead this Parliament and the *7.30 Report* into believing what the evidence of the former Criminal Justice Commission Chairman's statements suggests are untruths? If the donation to the Minister for Local Government was all above board and dealt with properly from the beginning, why would the Premier be upset with the Police Commissioner's actions? If the Premier is genuinely and absolutely sanctimonious, as he claims, why did he not simply thank the Police Commissioner for his professionalism and genuinely and immediately refer the matter to the CJC? Why would the Premier seek to misrepresent Mr Newnham's actions and his contact with the CJC? What is he trying to hide? In light of his behaviour, it is a perfectly reasonable—even an inevitable—question, and it is being asked because the Premier has been behaving like a guilty man.

I am prepared to accept that it is likely—even highly probable—that the donation to Mr Mackenroth was proper and that we are not

dealing here with an issue of corruption on that point. There is some evidence that the people who provided that money hoped to gain from the donation. There was a suggestion, we understand, after the donation was made, that Mr Mackenroth take a pro-active role in ensuring a return to highly paid public employment for one of the men involved in that donation.

The Premier maintained in this place earlier today that the member for Chatsworth had declared the donation as part of his register of pecuniary interests. He had to maintain that today because he maintained it in Parliament more than a year ago. Normal Queenslanders would believe that that would mean the information would be accessible via the Register of Pecuniary Interests held by the Clerk of the Parliament. I remind the Premier what he said in the debate that has been expunged. He was talking about members' pecuniary interests, not Ministers. He stated—

"You mentioned pecuniary interests—someone did—that's one. That's one, that I would expect such a donation to be declared."

He went on to say—

"I was able to confirm that in fact the—er—there had been a declaration of the donation by the member"—

not the Minister—

"in his declaration of pecuniary interests . . ."

As the *7.30 Report* discovered, and as the document tabled in this House this morning shows, there was no registration of the donation. Of course, everybody but the Premier has got it wrong. According to the Premier, this is because there was no formal register of pecuniary interests in this place until some time late in 1990, and that, in the interim, because he did not think he could wait for EARC's report on the issue, he had instituted a separate register for Ministers. Allegedly, the donation is recorded there.

I say to the Premier tonight: if that is the case, it is simple; produce that document. This places the degree of accountability of this Government in a different light, because in April 1989 the Ahern Government passed a resolution for the establishment of a register of pecuniary interests, to be held by the Clerk, and to be open to scrutiny. Now, it is reasonable that a donation made in late 1989 does not appear on the register of the previous Government. But why does it not appear on the public register in 1990? It did not appear because that register died with the

Ahern Government. There was a 12-month interregnum under the accountable Goss Government when there was no requirement for the registration by members of pecuniary interests.

Mr Littleproud: There has been some finetuning.

Mr BORBIDGE: As my friend reminds me, there was some finetuning. When there was a requirement, the donation still did not appear, despite the fact that both the Ahern and the Goss models for disclosure included a category specifically for any matters which the member might think could place him or her in a position of a conflict of interest. He said that one of the things that he did tell Sir Max Bingham was that the Minister had absented himself from certain Cabinet deliberations out of respect for the convention that he should do so in matters where there was a potential conflict of interest.

So again we have more evidence suggesting that the Premier is a dissembler on this whole affair. The Minister made a private declaration on certain matters to the Premier where the information was not publicly available, but he excluded that same information from a public register where the very circumstances of the donation, by the Premier's own admission, created a circumstance where it should have been recorded.

I say to the Premier again tonight: produce that pecuniary interest document. How convenient! No wonder some people are concerned about a cover-up. Who could blame them? On all the central issues of this whole affair—the contact with the Police Commissioner, the contact with the Criminal Justice Commission, the contact with Sir Max Bingham and the issue of declaration—the Premier has been, at best, a dissembler. And make no mistake, Mr Speaker, that is the real issue here. It is not about whether Terry Mackenroth received a \$5,000 political donation, or even that he received a political donation from certain quarters; it is about how the Premier handled that donation when it was brought to his attention on the basis of evidence that should have caused him to take some totally unequivocal actions, and to take them quickly.

He should have accepted that the Police Commissioner acted in good faith, and in fact did his duty. The Premier did not. He should then have referred the matter specifically, officially to the CJC. The Premier did not. He should have provided the Criminal Justice Commission with everything he knew about

the matter to ensure a proper investigation was carried out. He did not. He should then have been honest with the Parliament and with the media when he was questioned on this matter. The Premier was not. He should have been honest in relation to the issue of the alleged registration of this donation. The Premier was not.

That is the real motivation behind the unprecedented action of expunging a debate from *Hansard*, because the Premier deliberately had misled the Parliament. And the Premier did not want it on the public record. This Government—this political party that preaches accountability—has been caught out telling untruths in a debate that became so embarrassing for it that it had to expunge it from the public record. The Premier has been caught out on several occasions in respect of this matter. He quite rightly said on the *7.30 Report* last week, "It is important that the people of Queensland can trust or believe in their Premier." I say to the Premier tonight: he has some answers, because the discrepancies between his comments to the Parliament, his comments on the *7.30 Report*, his comments elsewhere and those of other key players are in clear contradiction. This is more than a debate tonight about Mr Mackenroth and a \$5,000 donation—or, as the Labor Party in Opposition used to call it, a \$5,000 brown paper bag. This is a question tonight of the very integrity, the very credibility of the Premier himself.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I require a seconder for the amendment.

Mrs SHELDON (Caloundra—Leader of the Liberal Party) (8.47 p.m.): I second the amendment. Members of this Government have a history of only carrying out investigations when it suits them and only taking notice of those investigations when it suits them. I am sure we all remember the Cooke inquiry into trade union corruption and how this Government ignored key recommendations which may have hurt its union mates. Then we see the Joh jury inquiry headed by Bill Carter, QC, which was pursued vigorously by this Government, probably more for political than altruistic reasons. Well, the time has come for a full, independent investigation into the entire affair surrounding the Mackenroth tapes. Today I am calling on the Attorney-General to launch a Joh jury style inquiry chaired by an eminent person such as Mr Carter, QC, into the Mackenroth tapes affair.

Mr Foley: Another three QCs.

Mrs SHELDON: Surely Mr Foley, being a civil libertarian, would agree that, if an inquiry can be carried out into the Joh jury, an inquiry can be carried out into this affair which surrounds and is based on public interest. What we are talking about here are serious allegations of a monumental cover-up by this Government which started in the Premier's office and included the expunging of my questions, the Premier's answers and the entire debate in relation to the payment of that \$5,000 to Mr Mackenroth. What we are talking about here is the entire probity of this State Government.

Mr Welford: Do you understand anything about sub judice?

Mrs SHELDON: I would imagine that the QC, whose report was tabled today, knows a lot more about sub judice than would a hack lawyer such as the honourable member. The question has to be asked whether this Mackenroth tapes affair is only one aspect of a deepening malaise within this Government, where the so-called clean skins are now arrogantly doing whatever they want and publicly executing or demeaning anyone who opposes them. I believe that the need for this inquiry is paramount and that the terms of reference for such an inquiry should include: why were my questions to Parliament, the Premier's answers and the entire debate expunged from *Hansard*, which is, to my knowledge, unprecedented? What are the facts surrounding the handing over of \$5,000 in cash to Mr Mackenroth prior to the 1989 election? Was this \$5,000 receipted and banked by Mr Mackenroth? On what date was the receipt written, the bank deposit written and the bank entry made?

Mr Livingstone: You had the opportunity to look at these documents today.

Mrs SHELDON: I had the opportunity to get a secret viewing of some unnamed documents in Mr Mackenroth's room. These are matters of public interest. If, in fact, the documents exist, the public has the right to know. The way to do that is to table them in this House. Did the Premier mislead the House in his comments on this so-called donation?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mrs SHELDON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Did the Premier intentionally mislead the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission over the donation? Why did the Premier not inform the CJC Chairman of the existence of the Federal Police tapes? Why was the State Government's expunging of material from the

Parliament and other related matters part of an orchestrated cover-up? Was there any official misconduct or criminal offence committed by any current member of the ALP Government over this issue? What relationship does this entire affair have with the eventual dismissal of former Police Commissioner Noel Newnham?

Mrs Woodgate: None.

Mrs SHELDON: The member says, "None." And pigs may fly! These are all very important issues and questions that must be answered.

We have heard much from the Premier and from the Local Government Minister about receipts, bank deposit forms and parliamentary papers. But where are they? Today, the Local Government Minister offered for both myself and, he says, the Leader of the Opposition to view some documents in his parliamentary office prior to this debate. We declined this invitation because we wondered just what that private viewing would achieve. What could we prove about the attempts by the Government to cover up this issue by looking at some undefined official records? These documents must be made public. They are documents in the public interest. The public has a right to know. The place to document them is in the people's House—in the Parliament. No doubt Mr Mackenroth is going to do that later, is he? Just to establish his credibility, will we see those documents?

Mr Mackenroth: Will you table all your records?

Mrs SHELDON: My records are in the pecuniary interests register for everyone to see. Mr Mackenroth's are not.

Mr Mackenroth: All your donations?

Mrs SHELDON: All my donations were listed, as the member well knows. The Liberal Party—and, I assume, the Labor Party—listed every donation to its campaign committee in the last State election under, I understand, Federal law. But it possibly has not done that, either.

The fact is that we want those documents made public so that everyone in the community can see them. That is the only way that this subject will be properly canvassed. That is the only way that we will be able to know for sure just what went on, or at least gain an insight into some of the events which took place prior to the 1989 State election and in May last year.

The question must be asked: just what has the Government to hide? Why is it willing only to give the leaders of the coalition a brief

viewing of those documents? Why cannot copies be made available? The question that can be asked about this entire affair is: why is the Government being so secretive about this if it is all aboveboard? In fact, if it was all aboveboard in 1990, why was the cover-up started in the first place?

It is obvious from the Federal Police transcript that no receipt was given to the giver of the donation when he handed the money over to the member for Chatsworth. Now, the member for Chatsworth claims that he has a receipt, although he refuses to table it in this House. Attempts by me and others to raise these issues over the past 15 months in this House have been ruled sub judice by the Speaker. But it is no longer sub judice, because any court cases that may be outstanding are before judges—not juries—and cannot be affected by any public comment.

This entire affair has cast a serious shadow over the operations of this State Government in the post-Fitzgerald era. Remember, this was going to be the squeaky-clean Government and the squeaky-clean Premier. I think that some of the squeak and some of the clean have disappeared. This is not just limited to the member for Chatsworth but, as I said, it also involved the Premier himself. All Queensland knows that these two men are good friends, and all Queensland knows of the hatred held by Mr Mackenroth for former Police Commissioner Noel Newnham.

We have seen some serious manoeuvres by this Government over the past four years. We have seen the summary public character executions of Mr Newnham, Sir Max Bingham, former Deputy Police Commissioner Dave Blizzard, Jill Bolen and former CJC Commissioner Janet Irwin. It becomes quite an impressive list after a while, does it not? If one speaks out of line, and one is in the Government's employ, one faces the axe. In fact, even if one is not employed by the State Government, one faces the axe. Just ask Pamela Bornhorst.

What we are talking about here is not just \$5,000. What we are talking about here is the entire probity of this State Labor Government, which those backbenchers are now willingly supporting. One day, they will rue it. They were elected to be cleanskins, yet it seems that they may be anything but. It is time that the people of Queensland found out the truth. There are many mysteries surrounding the Premier's involvement in the Mackenroth tapes affair.

As I raised earlier today in this place, the timing and what the Premier told the Chairman of the CJC Commission in early 1990 raises serious issues about his involvement. Not only did he mislead Sir Max by failing to reveal the existence of the tapes and the transcripts to Sir Max at their meeting, but his record of what happened after former Police Commissioner Noel Newnham brought the transcripts to his attention is also, at best, flaky. He said that the transcripts he was shown had the names of all three men named blocked out. Yet he said that he found out himself which of his Ministers had been named. How was he able to find out that the named Minister was, in fact, Mr Mackenroth when, in response to my question on 7 May, Mr Goss said that the Minister was overseas at the time? The fact is that the Minister was not overseas. The Premier found out who the named Minister was by asking Mr Mackenroth himself. How else would he know?

Mr MACKENROTH: I rise to a point of order. That is incorrect and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mrs SHELDON: Would the member like to prove how it is incorrect?

Mr MACKENROTH: I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mrs SHELDON: Not until the member proves how.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member to withdraw.

Mrs SHELDON: Why should I withdraw something that may well be true?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member will withdraw.

Mrs SHELDON: Mr Speaker, I would like your ruling on what it is that I should withdraw.

Mr MACKENROTH: The member stated that the Premier had asked me something in relation to whether I was the person named in those tapes. That is incorrect and untrue, and I ask that it be unequivocally withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member will withdraw it.

Mrs SHELDON: Is that true?

Mr MACKENROTH: Mr Speaker, it is untrue, and I ask that it be withdrawn unequivocally.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member to withdraw unequivocally.

Mrs SHELDON: I will follow your ruling, Mr Speaker.

Mr Mackenroth: Withdraw. Say you will withdraw.

Mrs SHELDON: I will follow the Speaker's ruling, which is a bit more than Mr Mackenroth does.

Mr MACKENROTH: The member has not withdrawn. I want her to withdraw that statement.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Say, "I withdraw", Mrs Sheldon.

Mrs SHELDON: I will withdraw, Mr Speaker. Yet still the Premier did not pass any of this on to Sir Max Bingham at their meeting. As I stated earlier, Sir Max would have treated the entire matter differently had he known of the existence of the tape. Sir Max, speaking late last week on the *7.30 Report*, stated—

"The questions raised by those telephone tapes had not emerged."

He went on to say—

"If I'd been conscious of the background, ramifications, the sort of flavour of the transaction, I would have taken a totally different view about it."

So there, Mr Speaker, you have it. The Premier, by not showing the transcripts of the tapes to Sir Max, or even revealing their existence—if he did not have the transcripts, which the Premier said he did not—put off any serious investigation of the issue by the CJC. Members might recall that, this morning, the Premier said that he had only seen the transcripts; he did not have a copy. The Premier has been very fond of saying that, as soon as he was told about the tapes by Commissioner Newnham, he "called in the CJC." This is also blatantly wrong. It is more than just misleading. It is plain wrong. The Premier did not call in the CJC at all. He had the equivalent of a fireside chat with the Chairman of the CJC, at which chat he failed to convey all the information necessary for Sir Max to make an informed opinion on the affair. The CJC did not investigate the matters until after I had asked my question in this House on 7 May last year.

Mr W. K. GOSS: I rise to a point of order. It is untrue and offensive to say that I failed to convey to Sir Max Bingham all the facts at my disposal. I did. I therefore seek the withdrawal of that untrue and offensive claim.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask Mrs Sheldon to withdraw.

Mrs SHELDON: Mr Speaker, if I could

just clarify something that the Premier said in the House this morning?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am on my feet. The honourable member will resume her seat. I clearly asked her to withdraw.

Mrs SHELDON: I withdraw. Obviously, the Premier is saying Sir Max is lying.

Mr W. K. GOSS: I rise to a point of order. I find that comment untrue and offensive.

Mrs SHELDON: Make up your mind. Which do not you want?

Mr W. K. GOSS: My point of order is this: it is untrue and offensive for the member to assert that I have claimed Sir Max Bingham is lying. I have not claimed that. I have simply said that I provided Sir Max Bingham with the information that was within my knowledge. I seek the withdrawal of the assertion that I have called Sir Max Bingham a liar.

Mr SPEAKER: I ask the Deputy Leader of the Coalition to withdraw.

Mrs SHELDON: I withdraw. This morning, in this House, the Premier stated that he indeed had seen the tapes. He did not have them in his possession because they were taken back, but on the *7.30 Report* Sir Max Bingham said, "No reference whatsoever had been made by those tapes." I rest my case. In fact, despite the Government's best efforts, this affair has still managed to raise more questions than answers over the last 15 months since I first raised this issue in this place.

On 7 May last year, the State Government took the almost unprecedented step of expunging from *Hansard* two questions asked by me, and the Premier's answers. What is worse, this Government then continued its abuse of Parliament by also expunging the ensuing debate from *Hansard*. The Government did this by citing advice from the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions, Michael Rozenes, QC, such advice which, unfortunately, was based on only half the information. The fact is that Mr Rozenes was given only half the story by the Attorney-General and consequently was unable to give a truly informed opinion.

Mr Welford: That's not true.

Mrs SHELDON: So the member is doubting what Mr Rozenes told the Leader of the Opposition and me, is he? He has inside detailed knowledge? Why does he not just get back into his hole and keep quiet? The Government misled Mr Rozenes over the content of my questions to the Premier on 7 May last year.

Mr WELLS: I rise to a point of order. I find the proposition that I misled Mr Rozenes untrue and offensive, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader of the Coalition to withdraw.

Mrs SHELDON: I withdraw. Are not they a sensitive little mob of petals? The fact is that Mr Rozenes, in a phone conversation with the Leader of the Opposition and me, said he had no knowledge of what was in the questions and the Premier's answers; he had no knowledge that the matter had been debated in the Senate and was then in *Hansard*; and further, he had no knowledge that after these questions were expunged from the House, immediately after, the Minister, Mr Mackenroth, went out and held a press conference in which most of this was canvassed and in which he flagged some sort of—

Mr MACKENROTH: I rise to a point of order. It is incorrect to say that I held a press conference before these matters were expunged from the Parliament.

Mrs SHELDON: No, I did not say that.

Mr MACKENROTH: I am sorry, after it was expunged from the Parliament. The facts are that I held the press conference before—before, not after. So I ask the member to withdraw.

Mrs SHELDON: No, the press conference was held after the questions and the answers were expunged, but not the debate.

Mr MACKENROTH: Before the matter was expunged from the Parliament is incorrect, and I ask for it to be withdrawn. I think that we have to understand one thing: the member has to speak the truth.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader of the Coalition to withdraw.

Mrs SHELDON: I will withdraw, whatever it is I am supposed to withdraw, but the facts are—

Mr SPEAKER: Unequivocally. The honourable member may then continue with the debate. Time is running out. It may be convenient for me to just stand here for the next three minutes looking at the press galley. However, I do not want to do that. I ask the honourable member to withdraw unequivocally.

Mrs SHELDON: I withdraw. I would like the exact time that the Minister made his press conference, and dated. It is funny, is it not, how the Minister said this only after the questions were debated in this House and

expunged? He had a media conference and then so did I, one after the other, after the questions and answers were expunged. In fact, on 7 May last year, the State Government took the almost unprecedented step of expunging from *Hansard* two questions asked by me and the Premier's answer. What is worse is that this Government then continued its abuse of Parliament by also expunging the ensuing debate from *Hansard*. The Government did this by citing advice from the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions, Michael Rozenes, advice which was, unfortunately, as I said, based on only half the information.

An honourable member: Not complete.

Mrs SHELDON: It certainly was not complete. It was sort of half-truths. I also wish to speak again about the misleading of Parliament on 7 May last year. In his reply to my second question, the Premier stated—

“I made inquiries and I found, I was able to confirm that in fact, there had been a declaration of the donation by the member”—

not by the Minister, by the member—

“in his declaration of pecuniary interests.”

What can that be but the member's pecuniary interests declarations? As I said earlier, no such declaration exists in the member's pecuniary interests tabled in March 1991, so the Premier again misled the House. Could it be that these occasions when the Premier misled the House on 7 May are the real reasons why the questions, answers and subsequent debate were expunged? I contend that this is exactly why the Government panicked and expunged the material from the House. My two questions on that day did not make any reference to the ongoing court case, or to the persons involved. In fact, it was the Premier who made the connection and it was the Premier who was caught out.

I now return to the fateful day when, after being given the transcripts of the tapes in which Mr Mackenroth was implicated, the Premier called the CJC Chairman, Sir Max Bingham, over to his office for that informal discussion. Sir Max said, as I have said before, he thought that he was there for an informal chat, while the Premier is beating up this meeting as calling in the CJC.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member's time has expired.

Mr MACKENROTH: I move—

“That the member be further heard.”

Mrs SHELDON: I believe that it is time someone else was heard. How about the Minister? On the speaking list, I did not notice the name of Mr Mackenroth or Mr Goss. The Opposition would be very happy to give Mr Mackenroth and Mr Goss the time to debate the issue.

Mr MACKENROTH: I move—

“That the member be further heard.”

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am obliged to put the motion.

Time, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, extended.

Mrs SHELDON: I will happily continue, thank you.

A Government member interjected.

Mrs SHELDON: I think that your time is running out, mate, and fast.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! A motion has just been passed that the Deputy Leader of the Coalition be further heard. Let us continue.

Mrs SHELDON: In fact, I will quote what the Premier said on the *7.30 Report*, just to make sure everyone here realises that he did know exactly what was going on before he spoke to Sir Max.

A Government member: You said that already.

Mrs SHELDON: No, I have not. These pages have yet to be read. Do members want to hear this or not?

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

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

Mrs SHELDON: The Premier said—

“My responsibility in the matter is, once these matters were drawn to my attention by the Police Commissioner, what should I do? Now, I didn’t cover up for somebody who was a ministerial colleague, indeed somebody who was a friend, what I said was I have no choice in this matter other than to call in the CJC.”

So we see from the Premier’s own mouth exactly what happened. The Premier was alerted to the tapes by the Police Commissioner and then called in Sir Max and failed to reveal the existence of the tapes to the Chairman of the CJC. As I have said, this is negligence in the extreme by the Premier. These are very serious accusations, but there can be no other reason for the Premier’s actions on that day, and the reasons for this cover-up have become abundantly clear. In fact, far from calling in the CJC, the Premier

ensured that no CJC investigation would take place. The Premier misled the head of the CJC about the facts surrounding the donation.

Mr W. K. GOSS: I rise to a point of order. It is untrue and offensive to say that I misled the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission. I seek a withdrawal.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader of the Coalition to withdraw.

Mrs SHELDON: I do withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Unequivocally.

Mrs SHELDON: I withdraw unequivocally, but I just wonder why the Leader of the House, Mr Mackenroth, asked whether I would like to continue. Obviously, it was just so that members could keep rising on points of order and asking me to withdraw. They must want a bit of exercise.

Mr W. K. GOSS: Stick to the truth and you will have no problem.

Mrs SHELDON: When the Premier sticks to the truth, he will have no problem. The Premier misled the head of the CJC about the true facts surrounding the donation and was a conspirator in the cover-up. I believe, and the facts support me—

Mr W. K. GOSS: Mr Speaker, I have sought the withdrawal of untrue and offensive references to conspiracies and cover-ups before. You have ruled accordingly. The member is showing contempt for the Chair. I again seek a withdrawal of those two terms.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I think we should use proper parliamentary language. If a member is finding a term offensive, it becomes mundane for the word to be reused. I ask the Deputy Leader of the Coalition to withdraw the words “cover-up” and “conspiracy”. I ask her to withdraw them.

Mrs SHELDON: I withdraw the words.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Borbidge: You can always expunge the whole debate like you did last time.

Mrs SHELDON: I think that is what the Premier is working on; would the Leader of the Opposition not say so?

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs SHELDON: The CJC did not undertake a detailed investigation until later, as I said. It did not do so until I raised the matter in the State Parliament in May this year. My approaches to the CJC were met with no remembrance of any report being made to any PCJC, so I wonder in just what

detail this report was investigated. Why was not the PCJC reported to? Indeed, in a matter of such extreme importance, why was not the report given to the House? So far, none of that has come to light and I would very much like it to do so. A media statement by the CJC which was released on 8 September this year stated—

“The commission is awaiting the outcome of the Supreme Court trial of (word deleted) before determining”——

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs SHELDON: This was the CJC media release.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! A member cannot do something that is out of order in the House through the words of somebody else. I ask for that word to be withdrawn and for it to be deleted from *Hansard*, and for the name not to be used.

Mrs SHELDON: Very well. I will withdraw the name.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the member that she cannot bring anything that is out of order into the House through the words of another person. That is in the Standing Orders.

Mrs SHELDON: But this is in a public document.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! That does not matter. It is as simple as that.

Mr BORBIDGE: I rise to a point of order. I seek guidance from you, Mr Speaker. Quite rightly, you gave some rulings at the commencement of this debate. It is very difficult for the Opposition to debate a matter that relates to the possible propriety and conduct of the Government when senior Ministers of that Government are demanding the withdrawal of what is the basis of the Opposition's concern.

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

Mrs SHELDON: This is becoming a very one-sided debate. The media statement by the CJC released on 8 September this year stated—

“The commission is awaiting the outcome of the Supreme Court trial of”——
a certain person——

“before determining whether it should investigate further the motives of the person making the payment or persons associated with him.”

So the CJC has left the book open on this sordid affair and has not cleared the Minister,

as one media outlet stated and as, indeed, did the Premier. The actual words used in the media release were “any claim could not be substantiated”. Far from clearing Mr Mackenroth, the statement quite clearly indicates that more investigations may be necessary.

I have a great deal of respect for Sir Max Bingham and believe to this day that he carried out a very difficult job with dignity and honesty. The fact is—and he admitted it himself last week—Sir Max was perhaps naive in his dealing with the Premier on that day over this donation to Mr Mackenroth. Last Thursday, Sir Max said on the *7.30 Report*—

“Now, perhaps I was a bit naive about that.”

There is now no doubt that a detailed investigation should have been carried out at the time. However, it was not, and the Premier's role in that must be seriously questioned, because the evidence which has come to light indicates that the Premier was complicit in attempting to stop or, at least, delay any CJC investigation into these matters. I have already tabled or read out in some detail the terms of reference that I believe should be part of such a public inquiry. At this stage, I do not think that it is necessary to repeat them.

Mr LINGARD (Beaudesert—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (9.16 p.m.): The *7.30 Report* of the other night clearly showed that Sir Max Bingham believed that the Premier had deceived him. Every day in the media, we see further examples of deception by the Premier. I personally appreciate the position in which Sir Max Bingham has been put. In January 1990, I experienced—as did Sir Max Bingham—the deception in which the Premier clearly involves himself. At least with the three previous National Party Premiers of this State, a “yes” was a “yes” and a “no” was a “no”. However, when I asked for a “yes” or a “no” answer when I sought approval to go on a CPA trip, which was the same as the one from which the present Speaker has just returned, the Premier would not give me a definite answer of “yes” or “no”, so I had to cancel the trip. Before the planned trip, the Premier said “yes”, so I went and then the Premier worded a subsequent letter indicating that his approval did not count. It was clear deception and dishonesty of exactly the same nature as that in which he has now engaged.

In the last part of December 1989, we saw a dirty and corrupt period of Government. We saw it also in January 1990 and again in February 1990. We saw break-ins at the State

Archives, the shredding of documents from the State Archives, Ministers handing out \$27,000 in unauthorised payments, and now cover-ups of donations to a Government Minister. Worst of all, we have a Premier who cannot say a definite "yes" or a definite "no". Everything has to be clouded in legalistic jargon so that, when put to the test, the Premier can slide out of it. Ever since 8 December 1989, we have seen nothing other than deceit and covering-up by the Premier and his Government. The Premier has used any means necessary to ensure that the truth about his Government does not escape.

The facts will show that this Goss Labor Government has done more than any other Government in Queensland's history to hide and cover up corruption. In the past, I have said something that I will repeat: deception and dishonesty is the Achilles heel of this Goss Government.

Mr Ardill interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LINGARD: This incident now continues the litany of deceit, cover-ups and mistruths in which this Government has engaged over the past three and a half years. As I have told this Parliament in great detail, in February 1990 the Goss Government deliberately set itself on a course—

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Southport! First of all, he should interject from his own seat. Secondly, he should not interject at all.

Mr LINGARD: As I was saying, this Goss Government deliberately set itself upon a course of wantonly destroying evidence by any means at its disposal and of destroying the rights of Queensland citizens to protect its mates and itself. At that time, I referred to the destruction of the Heiner documents. However, the Opposition knows that the events surrounding the shredding of the Heiner documents are a political embarrassment for the Government. Over the last seven days we have seen on the *7.30 Report* the spectacle— I repeat "spectacle"—of the Premier of this State trying to explain the activities of his mate Terry Mackenroth in accepting political donations.

It was Terry Mackenroth who, on 7 June 1989, raised in this House his support for Mr A. He told the House that he had known Mr A personally since 1974 and that he regarded him as a friend. Mr Mackenroth spoke about the close relationship between his own children and those of Mr A. He admitted—

quite plausibly, I might add—that he rented his electorate office from a company of which Mr A and Mr B were the owners.

I have no problem with a person genuinely supporting a friend when that person comes under attack in this House. What concerns me is if a member of this House has a relationship with a person that could cast doubts on the ability of a Government Minister to behave impartially and honestly when dealing with either that friend or associates of that friend. Let us recall the events—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I remind the member for Beaudesert about my earlier ruling on the parameters of the debate. He is sailing a bit close to the wind.

Mr LINGARD: Let us recall the events surrounding the \$5,000 that Terry Mackenroth was given by Mr B. Mr A and Mr B were shareholders in Company C. They were also brothers-in-law. Mr A had been brought before the Bar of the Parliament—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I just warned the member for Beaudesert. Order! I ask Hansard to remove those names and talk about "persons".

Mr LINGARD: That person had lost his position as a (words deleted). He had incurred legal fees of some \$400,000—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I find that in contempt of my ruling. I ask Hansard to reword that. If that continues, I will ask the member to resume his seat. I warn the honourable member.

Mr LINGARD: What I am saying is obviously related to the \$5,000, because I am proving that that person certainly did want a change of Government in Queensland in December 1989. He wanted three things. He wanted reinstatement. He wanted reimbursement by the Labor Party of his legal fees, and he wanted to ensure that his superannuation entitlements were secure. What do we find? We find that, just before the 1989 election, Mr B—

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LINGARD: You must have Mr B in it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! It would be easier for all involved if we were not to use names with regard to that matter.

Mr LINGARD: So the two people, who were brothers-in-law and business partners, contacted Terry Mackenroth and offered him a large amount of money, allegedly for his political campaign. I say "a large amount of money", because the exact amount seems to

vary from \$5,000 to as high as \$50,000, depending on whom one wants to talk to.

Mr MACKENROTH: I rise to a point of order. There has never, ever been any suggestion that the amount of money was anything other than \$5,000. The member just raised \$50,000, and I want that withdrawn. It is completely untrue.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask for it to be withdrawn.

Mr MACKENROTH: I ask for it to be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Beaudesert to withdraw.

Mr LINGARD: Are you asking me to withdraw?

Mr SPEAKER: Yes, I am.

Mr LINGARD: Yes, I withdraw. Certainly, the money was more than \$5,000, as I have mentioned. Obviously, if—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. I ask the member to withdraw unequivocally. He cannot withdraw and then repeat the allegation. I warn the member for Beaudesert. I ask him to withdraw.

Mr LINGARD: Mr Speaker, I await your ruling. How do I prove that it was more than \$5,000?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I asked the honourable member to withdraw. I now warn him under Standing Order 124 to withdraw, otherwise I will name him.

Mr LINGARD: Mr Speaker—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am on my feet. The honourable member will resume his seat. Order! Honourable members, if any member finds something untrue and offensive or either of those and seeks its withdrawal, I will ask for a withdrawal under Standing Orders. I will not allow members to debate that fact at all. I ask the honourable member to withdraw unequivocally. It is as simple as that. I warn the honourable member under Standing Order 124 if he does not withdraw.

Mr BORBIDGE: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, I take it from your ruling that, in this debate tonight, members cannot raise matters that have been printed in the Brisbane media, in particular the *Sunday Mail*, and that, Mr Speaker, if your ruling is applied, the *Sunday Mail* has and can print information that the Parliament of Queensland cannot debate tonight.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! That is absolutely

true. If newspapers or members of the media—

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Southport under Standing Order 123A. I will not debate the matter, but I will make this point in the interests of the House. Although a newspaper and a television channel have broken the sub judice convention or have stated matters that may put them in contempt, I am here as the Speaker and I will uphold the judicial right of members. There is a trial pending for a citizen of this State. I will not allow this House to break that convention and I will not allow anything to be said that prejudices that trial.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition under Standing Order 123A. Order! The debate is degenerating.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask for a withdrawal from the member for Lockyer. That is a reflection on the Chair. I ask him to withdraw it unequivocally.

Mr FITZGERALD: I withdraw. I mean no reflection whatsoever on the Chair, and I apologise.

Mr LINGARD: With respect to the \$5,000—a point of my argument has always been that more money could have been involved because of the people involved and because of what was happening with some of those people in terms of the restoration of their jobs.

I am saying that that is a reason why those donations occurred. It was very important for those people to regain their positions, and it was very important for them to support the ALP. It was very important for them to support Terry Mackenroth. Whether the amount of money was \$5,000, or more, as has been suggested, there is no doubt that there is a reason for that amount of money to be quite large when one considers the amount of money that those people had lost, that a brother-in-law had lost and that a brother-in-law of that brother-in-law wanted to get back.

Unbeknown to Mr Mackenroth and his mate, the brother-in-law, the Commonwealth police were taping the phone because they suspected that person of tax evasion. Upon taping the conversation between Mr B and Mackenroth in which Mackenroth was offered money, the Commonwealth police immediately sent that tape to the Queensland

Commissioner of Police, Mr Noel Newnham. Obviously, Mr Newnham could not go to Mr Mackenroth with that evidence and had no choice other than to take it directly to the Premier, Wayne Goss.

According to Mr Goss on the *7.30 Report*, Mr Newnham handed him a transcript of the phone tap with the names deleted. Again, according to Mr Goss, he was not told that what had occurred was wrong and he was not told who was being taped. He had to find that out for himself. The moment he did, he called in the Criminal Justice Commission because, as he said to the people of Queensland in his best holier-than-thou manner, he does not care who engages in improper conduct or corruption; he will not tolerate it. Of course, he will tolerate it with Mr Stuart Tait, and he will tolerate it when he and his entire Cabinet commit an illegal act.

Again, according to Mr Goss, when the transcripts were given to him, he immediately called in the Criminal Justice Commission, and Sir Max Bingham looked at it. Firstly, I ask: why did the Premier go to the CJC when he was not told who were the persons on the transcript of the tape and he had not been told that anything that had occurred was wrong? The amazing thing is that, in this Parliament on 7 May 1992, the Premier openly admitted that he knew that it was Mr Mackenroth to whom the tapes referred—after, of course, telling untruths to the Parliament concerning whether Mr Newnham had ever raised the matter at all.

Mr Goss has stated publicly what action he took on that matter, yet we find that what he said publicly on the *7.30 Report* is not the truth. He never referred to the CJC the acceptance of money by Mackenroth. What he did do—as Sir Max Bingham has publicly confirmed and as is confirmed in private correspondence between the Premier and Sir Max—was to call in Sir Max for a friendly chat, during which he asked, “If a member of my Government receives a donation, receipts it and banks it, is that okay?” Sir Max naturally replied, “Yes.” At no stage did the Premier, who finds corruption so abhorrent, ever show Sir Max the Commonwealth police transcripts showing that people under investigation by the Commonwealth police were giving donations to Terry Mackenroth and that the tapes indicated that Mr B was attempting to (word deleted) Mackenroth. The Premier stated on the *7.30 Report*—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask that the words referring to Mr B and another word be deleted.

Mr LINGARD: It is going to look funny in *Hansard*. They will be playing hopscotch.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I find that comment offensive. I have set the parameters for this debate, and the only reason we are having difficulties is because some members of this House are not going to play the game within those parameters. I warn the honourable member that the next time that I find he is offending against those parameters, I will sit him down. This is the honourable member's final warning.

Mr LINGARD: The Premier stated on the *7.30 Report* that there was nothing hide. What he should have said was that there was nothing left to hide because Mr Goss had done all the hiding that was necessary. If the Commonwealth police had not kept copies of the tapes, I have no doubt that Mr Goss and his Cabinet would have engaged in another piece of illegal shredding. The Premier also stated that when the matter was raised in Parliament in May 1992, he again raised with the Criminal Justice Commission the question of the alleged bribe. Again, that is not true. The Premier did not raise it with the CJC for investigation a second time. He simply wrote to Sir Max to recall the events surrounding their first friendly chat on this issue. The Premier has told untruths publicly on two occasions with regard to the facts of this matter and his involvement in them; yet he expects us and the people of Queensland to believe that he is concerned about corruption. Of course he is! He would like nothing better than to cover it up and, if that involves him in lying, destroying evidence or ensuring that people are not charged, he will go to any lengths to do it.

Mr W. K. GOSS: I rise to a point of order. References to “lying” and “destroying evidence” are unparliamentary, untrue and offensive, and I seek their withdrawal. The member well knows that he is in breach of the—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member to withdraw those words.

Mr LINGARD: I replace those words with “untruths” and I withdraw. Whether Terry Mackenroth accepted \$5,000 or \$50,000 and whether it was a bribe or not, it is only one aspect of a sorry saga that commenced on the night of 2 December 1989 when Queenslanders elected a Government for which corruption has no bounds. The Premier and his Ministers will go to extraordinary lengths to deceive the people and will pervert the course of justice whenever necessary.

Mr BEANLAND (Indooroopilly) (9.33 p.m.): I participate in this debate having listened to the members who now occupy the Government benches prior to their being elected to office in 1989. I ask members who were here then to cast their minds back to that period. At that time, the Fitzgerald inquiry was under way. Day after day, Government members—and the Attorney-General may smile, because he was one of the offenders—stood up in this House and smeared innocent members of this place. The Attorney-General knows it; the Premier knows it—and he is smiling, too; and Mr Mackenroth and others know it. Day after day, I sat here and heard those smears in my first term in this Parliament. Government members hopped over the counters and crossed the board—anything to make a point. Smears were cast far and wide. Day after day, innocent members copped it from those people who now occupy the ministerial benches. Today, when we seek to apply the same standards, what do we see? Government members run away from the issue and from this debate. The sensitivity of this issue is amazing. Government members can only speak rhetoric. The inconsistencies scream out. They have been enunciated this evening time and time again.

When I perused the speaking list for this debate, I noticed that the mover and the seconder of the motion were listed, and they spoke for a very short period on this motion. Then the Opposition speakers were listed. However, the name of the Premier does not appear on the speaking list; neither does that of Mr Mackenroth, the Attorney-General or other senior Ministers. I call on the Premier to participate in this debate. I think that is only fair. If there is to be a debate, the Premier ought to participate in it. Instead, the Premier is popping up every five seconds, taking points of order, and saying, "That is not right. I am offended by that remark. I ask that it be withdrawn."

Mr Borbidge: He wouldn't even move the motion.

Mr BEANLAND: As the honourable the Leader of the Opposition said, the Premier would not even move the motion.

Mrs Sheldon: Tell me, Mr Beanland: did he wimp out on that?

Mr BEANLAND: He more than wimped out on it; he put his tail between his legs and we have not heard a word from him, except points of order. I call on the Premier to stand up at the end of the speeches by the Opposition members who are on the list—or

after me, if he wishes—and participate in this debate. I have lost track of the number of versions that have been placed on record about the various aspects of this matter. There is no point in the Leader of Government Business, the member for Chatsworth, shaking his head one way or the other. He is not listed to speak, either. I call on him to speak in this debate and not to run away from the issue. We want to get another version on the *Hansard* record. We want to see how that version fits with all the other versions that have been presented on the *7.30 Report*, in the various newspaper reports and in the various other outlets. We know all about the *7.30 Report*.

Mr Littleproud: Get the Attorney-General up, too.

Mr BEANLAND: I have called on the Attorney-General to participate in this debate.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr BEANLAND: He might be their secret weapon, as the Leader of the Opposition said.

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr BEANLAND: He has not told much of anything to date, and he could tell the other half. Mr Rozenes, QC, the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions, has indicated both to the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Coalition that the Attorney-General has not told Mr Rozenes about all of these matters. The Attorney-General should stand up in the Chamber tonight and tell the rest of the story. Let us have it on the record.

During this debate, one point has become clear. The Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions, Mr Michael Rozenes, QC, is wrong; Mr Noel Newnham is wrong; Sir Max Bingham—that is a new one tonight; we are onto the smear campaign now—is definitely wrong—

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr BEANLAND: I am coming to Pamela Bornhorst. Pamela Bornhorst is not only wrong and gone; she has also been shafted, and the blood is all over the hands of this Government. There is a great deal of sensitivity about this issue. Time and time again during this debate, the inconsistencies have been highlighted.

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Southport!

Mr BEANLAND: Yet we have not seen the Premier rise to speak in this debate. He should have moved the motion and been

followed by the Leader of Government Business. They should have put their case forward. Instead, they are not listed to speak at all. I call on the Premier to rise to the challenge. When I sit down, he will have an opportunity to participate. I am sure that he will accept the challenge and show the people of Queensland that he has yet another version. *Blue Hills* was nothing compared with this matter.

Mr Veivers: Gwen Meredith.

Mr BEANLAND: I thank the member for Southport. *Blue Hills*, by Gwen Meredith, was not in the race. This would put *Blue Hills* to shame any day of the week.

Mr Borbidge: "Gwen" Goss.

Mr BEANLAND: As the Leader of the Opposition said, "Gwen" Goss, except that that is an insult to that wonderful person, Gwen Meredith. Nevertheless, the various versions that are being advanced would put *Blue Hills* to shame. Episode 3 599 is upon us this evening.

This evening, we are debating a very sensitive issue for this Government. Yet one of the principles on which this Government was elected was open and accountable Government. It is marvellous how the issue turns the full circle so quickly, how sensitive members of the Government become and how quickly they run from cover and from all these inconsistencies. At the end of the day, it seems to me that the line of attack is to take points of order one after the other. That is all we have heard.

Recently on the 7.30 *Report*, honourable members witnessed that wonderful tantrum by the Premier. Unfortunately, I did not see the program and had to view it the next day. However, I had difficulty watching it because people who had never phoned me before were calling to say, "What is the Premier hiding? What was that tantrum by the Premier? We cannot believe that a person who holds the high office of Premier in this State could put on such a schoolboy tantrum." The Premier just sits there and smiles about it. What a disgraceful performance it was! He believes that he has nothing to hide. It shows that there is a problem with his credibility on this issue and with his inconsistency.

Mr Veivers: It smells.

Mr BEANLAND: There is a little bit of smell about the whole thing. I am sure that the Premier will rise and tell us all about it shortly. To date, we have heard a lot of untruths, incorrect statements, misleading statements and so on. It is incredible that all

the people who the Premier claims are putting up these untruthful aspects of this affair are or were senior people in high places in this State. It is incredible that those people could be so wrong. The Premier's memory seems to be so much better than theirs and his position seems to be so much more accurate than theirs. I do not believe that, in fairness to those people, all of them can be so wrong. Perhaps the problem is that so many of them are so correct and there is a little bit of untruth and incorrectness elsewhere.

Of course, we should not forget that, as soon as the Deputy Leader of the Coalition called for a full inquiry along the lines of the Carter inquiry into the Joh jury, the member for Yeronga, Mr Foley, interjected and stated, "More money for the barristers and the solicitors." However, when the Government was running all those inquiries, Mr Foley did not say a word. As soon as the Deputy Leader of the Coalition called for an inquiry, again it was marvellous how quickly they ran for cover. All she was calling for was a full, open and independent inquiry along the lines that this Government likes to run against its opponents time after time. As soon as the chickens come home to roost, what do they want to do? They want to run away with their tails between their legs.

Time and time again, honourable members have seen Sir Max Bingham on television saying how he now wishes, in hindsight, that all the facts were laid before him. Of course, all the facts were not laid before him, and that is quite clear. Perhaps all the facts will be laid before us this evening. There are major differences on that and a host of other key points on which the Government has the opportunity now to put up or shut up.

I presume that, this evening, documents will be tabled either by the Leader of the House, the honourable member for Chatsworth, or by the Premier. We have heard a lot about these documents. It seemed to be indicated today, even though they are not on the list of speakers, that we were going to have some documents tabled this evening. So far, we have seen nothing. A large number of members on this side of the Chamber have already spoken in the debate. If those documents were to be forthcoming and could stand the test of scrutiny, one would have thought that they would have been tabled by this stage. I again call on the Premier to ensure that those documents are tabled.

I wish to mention a couple of other matters. One matter that the Premier might

explain to us when he rises to speak—I am sure that he will answer my challenge to do that—is about the donation of \$5,000.

Mr Veivers: Is it 5 or 50?

Mr BEANLAND: I do not know whether it is \$5,000 or \$50,000. I understand that it is \$5,000. I say that because I am not sure of the circle of events. We are told that these funds were a campaign fund donation, yet they were listed on the members' pecuniary interests register. I presume that it was not a personal donation but a donation to campaign funds, which would have gone to Labor Party campaign funds. I am not sure how it was listed on the pecuniary interests register. I presumed that members would register personal funds on a pecuniary interests register. I am not sure why it was necessary for the member to list a donation to campaign funds.

Mr Lingard: Maybe it was rent from the office.

Mr BEANLAND: It could very well have been rent. I do not know what it was. This evening, the member has an opportunity to inform the House why it had to be listed, and whether it was a personal donation or a campaign fund donation.

Mr Borbidge: The Premier could have been misleading the Parliament.

Mr BEANLAND: The Premier could have been misleading the Parliament. I am not sure what he was on about, because he has had so many versions of these events that it has been a bit like *Blue Hills*. This evening, he has the opportunity to clear everything up, and I am sure that he will rise and speak in due course. He has the opportunity to clear up what the funds were all about, where they were travelling from and to, where they ended up, and which \$5,000 it was. Was there more than one \$5,000 deposit to the campaign fund of the member for Chatsworth? I am not sure. There could have been a whole series of campaign fund donations of \$5,000. Let the member clear it up. To date, all we have had are inconsistencies and various versions of the events.

Tonight, members opposite have, they believe, created the opportunity to have a debate. I contend that it has not been a debate. A range of issues have been raised on this side of the House, and all we have seen Government members do is run away from the real issues and not answer the points or table in the House the relevant documents to clear up the points that have been raised. It will not be cleared up unless we have some

more documents tabled as to what Mr Newnham told the Premier and what information the Premier gave, or what the details of the discussion with Sir Max Bingham were. We find now that there is a vast discrepancy between those two issues.

We know what happens in this State to people who oppose the Government. They are subjected to smear and abuse. We have seen that happening on many occasions over a period. Right from the day that the Government took office, we found good people in this State being smeared and abused and being chased from their office. Moreover, many of them have had to leave the State or look elsewhere for work.

I would like to see less of the slipperiness of the Government and less of the deceit that has been going on in this issue and more truth on the table. Let us hear from the Premier. Let him table the documents to clear up a whole range of issues. Let us hear from the member for Chatsworth, who is at the centre of these accusations and this whole issue. Let those matters be properly aired and the items placed on the table of this Parliament for the people of this State to see so that no longer will there be the inconsistencies that we have seen to date and no longer will we have to put up with the tantrums of the Premier night after night on the *7.30 Report* or through some other news outlet simply because he cannot get his own way.

Mr FITZGERALD (Lockyer) (9.50 p.m.): Tonight, members are speaking to a motion that was moved by the Government Whip and seconded by the Government Deputy Whip in this House. I also wish to speak to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition and seconded by the Deputy Leader of the Coalition. The motion before the House that was moved by the Government Whip notes a statement by the Criminal Justice Commission of 8 September 1993. It refers to a \$5,000 donation to Mr Mackenroth, a then member of the Opposition, prior to the State election held that year. Reference is made to excerpts from telephone conversations allegedly had between a businessman and Mr Mackenroth concerning the making of this payment. Clearly, if we are talking about a telephone conversation that was allegedly made, I presume that we can talk about that conversation.

Mr Speaker, I note your ruling with respect to "a businessman". You have indicated that you do not want members to name the businessman. He is not named in

the motion. I would like to refer to him as "Mr B" so that I do not get confused with "a businessman" and another businessman in my speech. For "businessman" members can read "Mr B".

The House also notes the inconsistency of the Premier in his public statements concerning his involvement in this matter. It is unfortunate that we do not have the exact transcripts and a video in the Chamber so that we could see episodes of the *7.30 Report* for the past month, with the Premier saying one thing on one occasion and another thing on another occasion. If we could play one off against the other and then show the answers to questions in this House at the same time, I do not think that we would have to withdraw anything. We could just put up the facts one after the other. If we did some clever cutting and just put them in slice by slice—without selective editing; just clip by clip—we would then see the inconsistency of the Premier, because he has made some glaringly inconsistent statements.

The Premier's credibility is questioned. That is what the Opposition is questioning—not whether a businessman by the name of Mr B made a donation of \$5,000 in cash to the member for Chatsworth. Let us face it, he probably needed it in his campaign and would not know how to say "No" to that donation. He obviously decided to accept it. I have no qualms about that. But the Premier has told this House and the *7.30 Report*, that is, the public in general—and he said that his credibility has been questioned—that the member did declare that in the register of pecuniary interests. We have had explained to us today in this House that it was his ministerial pecuniary interests, not his pecuniary interests as a member of this Parliament. Why on earth would a donation that has been given to a member's campaign fund—and the member did not touch any money—be declared in a members' register of pecuniary interests?

Mr De Lacy: What we call an excess of caution. We all do it.

Mr FITZGERALD: An excess of caution? They all do it? Has the Treasurer ever received a donation?

Mr De Lacy: If I received a big donation—

Mr FITZGERALD: What would the Treasurer consider to be a big donation?

Mr De Lacy: Anything over \$1,000.

Mr Borbidge: When you accept it, your campaign fund accepts it.

Mr FITZGERALD: When the Treasurer's campaign fund accepts a donation which he considers to be large—

Mr De Lacy: When it goes into my campaign fund.

Mr FITZGERALD: It should be included in the members' register of pecuniary interests. I understood the Treasurer to say, "We all do that."

Mr De Lacy: No, I said I do.

Mr FITZGERALD: And he believes that all his colleagues should do so?

Mr De Lacy: I don't know.

Mr FITZGERALD: The Treasurer does not know. He is sitting in Cabinet with that gentleman beside him and he does not know whether or not he should put it in.

Mr De Lacy: I said it was an excess of caution. That is the reason I would put it in.

Mr FITZGERALD: I enjoyed the interjections. Accepting interjections makes for a good debate. I wanted to take those interjections. The question is: why would the member for Chatsworth put that in the register of pecuniary interests? Of course, he did not. It was a \$5,000 donation, but it is not a pecuniary interest. The Treasurer said that he would put in the register anything over \$1,000. But Mr Mackenroth obviously has a different standard of propriety from that of the Treasurer. In the Treasurer's own words, Mr Mackenroth has a different standard of propriety from his own. The Treasurer would put in \$1,000, but Mr Mackenroth would not put in \$5,000. The entry for the year for the member for Chatsworth shows clearly that it is not there. That is on the record. That is a fact.

Members know about the question that was asked on 7 May 1992 and which was expunged from *Hansard*. Later that day, the debate was expunged from *Hansard*. We know what question was asked, and we know what Mr Goss said. He said—

"I found—I was able to confirm that in fact the—er—there had been a declaration of the donation by the member in his declaration of pecuniary interests—that furthermore the matter had not been placed in the member's own funds."

Mr Goss' credibility is on the line. He said that it had not been put in the member's own fund. Did he conduct an inquiry into the matter and have all of the member's bank accounts searched? The Premier gave an assurance in the House that the money had not been placed in the member's own fund. I might be

a suspicious person, but I would like to see Mr Carter or someone of similar stature go through all the records. The honourable member could make a declaration to the effect that, "I did not touch the money. It never came into my hands. It was cash. I asked him to drop it off to my campaign director." The Premier gave an assurance to the House in an answer which was expunged from the record.

Mr W. K. Goss: You said you wanted an inquiry. We have had Bingham, O'Regan and an independent QC give the same opinion. Is that enough?

Mr FITZGERALD: We are debating a substantive motion in the House tonight. The Premier said—

“. . . furthermore the matter had not been placed in the member's own funds.”

How can the Premier make that statement?

Mr W. K. Goss: The interjection was that we had Bingham, O'Regan and an independent QC say that there was no impropriety. Isn't that enough?

Mr FITZGERALD: They did not say that money had not been banked in funds. The Premier made the statement on 7 May 1992.

Mr W. K. Goss: But in addition to those three QCs, we had a formal investigation by the CJC. Isn't that enough?

Mr FITZGERALD: That is not what Sir Max says now. I do not accept that.

Mr W. K. Goss: Not Sir Max—in addition to Sir Max.

Mr FITZGERALD: The Premier's statements on television followed by Sir Max appearing on television do not convince me that the Premier is clean. I have to call it as I see it.

Mr Borbidge: You've contradicted yourself.

Mr FITZGERALD: The Premier has either deliberately or inadvertently misled the public of Queensland and this House by saying that it is in the members' register of pecuniary interests.

Mr Borbidge: After he says he will be very careful about it.

Mr FITZGERALD: He predicated the statement with that. I have a problem with that.

The other issue is: did Mr Mackenroth take the cash himself? Nobody likes handling cash. If anybody gives a donation to a member's campaign, that member says, "Drop it off to the treasurer of the campaign." Surely

most of us do that. We do not take cash. When did he receive the cash? I believe that the public has a right to know that. When was it banked? Did it lie in a drawer for a number of weeks or a matter of hours before it was banked and a receipt issued? If the member took it in a brown paper bag—and "brown paper bag" has connotations, but it was cash—what time of the day and on what day did he actually receive that cash? Was it cash? We have heard that it was cash. Was it cash? Did he sit on it for a couple of weeks? Did he put it in the campaign fund only after Newnham advised him that there were tapes around?

Mr Mackenroth: That is what you believe, isn't it?

Mr FITZGERALD: No, I am asking these questions. Did he then bank it in the campaign account?

Mr W. K. Goss interjected.

Mr FITZGERALD: I accept the member's statement that it was banked and receipted. I want to know the timing of that.

A Government member: You could have read that.

Mr FITZGERALD: I am not allowed to read what is in the paper. The *Sunday Mail* is censored here. There was an article in the *Sunday Mail* about the tapes, but we could not have a debate on the alleged tapes—and that is what we are debating tonight—because it was expunged. The ruling was that it was sub judice, so it was all expunged. However, because that case concerning businessman "B" is over, we can now debate the issue. The *Courier-Mail* has run a story on it; it was not sub judice. An article in the *Sunday Mail* of 13 June 1993, on page 5, states—

"Convicted Brisbane businessman"—

Mr B—

"asked Local Government Minister Terry Mackenroth how much money he needed before giving him a \$5,000 donation, according to bugged conversations recorded by the Federal Police."

This article is by Pat Gillespie.

Mr Mackenroth: That's the *Sunday Mail*, not the *Courier-Mail*.

Mr FITZGERALD: It is the *Sunday Mail*. The article states that Mr B was convicted of offering a bribe to two tax officers. The article outlines a telephone conversation of Mr B speaking to Mr Mackenroth on the telephone on 14 November 1989. The article outlines the following telephone conversation—

"Listen. . .I've got a letter here from Walshy, from Walshy, from Brian Walsh. Now I don't like Brian Walsh. For you I'd do anything. I'll walk this earth with no shoes, all right? If you want me to. I'll do anything for you, all right?"

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The matter of the transcript is a matter in the pending trial of a citizen of this State—another citizen, not Mr B. I have given a direction that I do not want the transcript read into *Hansard*. I have given that direction, and I am going to insist on it.

Mr FITZGERALD: I refer the *Hansard* readers to page 5 of the *Sunday Mail* on 13 June 1993, where allegations are made that a conversation took place between a businessman and Mr Mackenroth. That is the subject of the debate tonight. The motion before the House clearly refers to this alleged tape.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the member for Lockyer that the debate on the motion and the amendment can take place quite easily without having to read the transcripts. I do not believe that it adds anything to the debate. I suggest that we live within those parameters.

Mr FITZGERALD: Mr Speaker, I accept your ruling and I will not quote the articles; but, with your leave, I will refer to the issues that were raised, because that is the substance of the motion before the House. On my understanding of that report in the *Courier-Mail* and the *Sunday Mail*, the businessman was rather concerned that the member for Chatsworth was nervous about taking cash. There was another person recorded in that conversation with the businessman—not the member for Chatsworth—who indicated in his view that the member for Chatsworth would not issue a receipt. The House has been assured that a receipt was issued. I accept that.

Obviously, that money was given on the clear understanding by that other person and the businessman that a receipt would not be issued. One could hardly wonder why members of this Chamber are suspicious when the Premier is making inconsistent statements with regard to a member's pecuniary interests, and the conversation between Sir Max Bingham and the Premier. Was it formal, or was it informal? Was it a chat between a brand new Premier—

Mr W. K. Goss: It was lounge suits.

Mr FITZGERALD: It was lounge suits; bow ties were not on. Was it an informal conversation with a new Premier seeking

advice because a problem had landed on his lap? Was the then Police Minister overseas when the commissioner came to see the Premier? There seemed to be quite a deal of confusion about that. His memory seems to be a bit poor in that area. Did the commissioner go behind the Minister's back? I believe that what Noel Newnham did on that occasion—to go to the Premier—was quite correct. Of course, if one has a hot potato, one passes it back straightaway and says, "It is your problem now. What should we do?" Any sensible person who is in a quandary will go straight to the Premier to make sure that everything is proper.

Mr W. K. Goss: No.

Mr FITZGERALD: The Premier is saying, "No." He does not believe that Newnham acted correctly.

Mr W. K. Goss: The proper thing to do is to go to the Criminal Justice Commission, which is what I had to do. Noel Newnham didn't do that.

Mr Borbidge: You didn't go. You just called Max in for cover.

Mr FITZGERALD: For an informal chat? We want to know whether it was an informal chat or whether it was a formal reference.

Mr W. K. Goss: No, I didn't. I called him in.

Mr FITZGERALD: We are getting different versions from everyone. We are getting another version. The CJC head was summoned to the Premier's office, not in a bow tie. We are having difficulty debating the issue. We do understand that there is a problem with Mr Premier. There is no problem with Mackenroth receiving a \$5,000 donation. The problem is that the Premier is trying to squirm around and say that it was in a member's pecuniary interest when it was not. It was an informal chat. The Premier called the CJC Chairman in and he formally referred it to the CJC. He did not give him any written advice whatsoever. He did not seek to hand him any written advice. He did not ask Newnham for any written advice. The Premier did not have all the information, so he referred it. Now he knows what Sir Max Bingham says on TV. Sir Max was rather chided, I think were the words he used, by other commissioners for not pursuing the matter fully.

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Southport has been warned for the last time.

Mr FITZGERALD: Sir Max Bingham was chided by other members of the commission,

and maybe in hindsight—and this is my recollection of what he said—he could have taken another direction. I suggest that he should have taken another direction. Of course, the Premier comes up with this great defence of the actions taken by Sir Max Bingham in giving him a clean bill of health and in giving his Minister a clean bill of health and says that he was a former Liberal member from Tasmania. Straightaway, he is looking for that defensive mechanism. Every time the Premier gets to defend that issue, he touts the fact that Sir Max was a former Liberal deputy leader, or Liberal Attorney-General in Tasmania. It becomes a great defence for him.

An Opposition member: It was a slur.

Mr W. K. Goss: No, you made out that it was a slur.

Mr FITZGERALD: One wonders why the Premier is so defensive. He does not have to face up to Pamela Bornhorst any more. He wimped out of that. So far, he has wimped out of the debate. I suppose he wants to come in late and show his masterly stroke. He wimped out of questions on 7 May 1992. When one reads the answers to the questions that were expunged, one sees that the Premier wimped out of those, too. He wimped out of the second question. He has wimped out of the questions again. This debate is not about the motion that was moved by the Government Whip and seconded by the Deputy Whip; it is about the amendment that has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition. As the Premier rightly said on the *7.30 Report*, his credibility is at stake. His credibility is at stake. We do not believe that he has been shown in a very good light.

Time expired.

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH
(Chatsworth—Minister for Housing, Local Government and Planning) (10.10 p.m.): Mr Speaker—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs Sheldon: At long last.

Mr MACKENROTH: It is at long last that I am pleased I can do it. Tonight, I want to say that I really wish this debate could have been held on 7 May 1992. On that day, the Government took certain action because it believed that it was the correct and proper thing to do in relation to a court case. I support the decision that was made on that day. In having supported that decision, let me say that for the past 15 months I have had to cop innuendoes from people such as the

member for Caloundra. During the election campaign last year, I had to cop her party distributing to the homes in my electorate—the homes of kids who go to school with my daughter—photographs of me pictured behind bars. I have also had to put up with matters that I believe were incorrectly read into Federal *Hansard* and distributed throughout my electorate.

Mr Stoneman interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Burdekin!

Mr MACKENROTH: During all this time, I believed that the correct and proper course was not to raise it but to wait until the right time. I said nothing.

Tonight, the Government has given members the opportunity to debate this issue. Before doing so, because the member for Caloundra stated on television last week and in Parliament today that I should produce the records so that she could see them, I wrote to her.

Mrs Sheldon: So the public could see.

Mr MACKENROTH: I wrote to the Leader of the Liberal Party, and tomorrow I will take up with my staff what happened to the letter. I suggest that it would not have been their fault if she did not receive it. If the Leader of the National Party did not receive it, it must still be within his office.

Mr Borbidge: I have subsequently been advised that it was delivered to another office. It was not delivered to my office.

Mr MACKENROTH: The letter was delivered. I accept what is said by Mr Borbidge. Mrs Sheldon has acknowledged that she received the letter but has suggested that in some way I was trying to do a backroom deal.

Mr Borbidge: She never got it.

Mr MACKENROTH: Mr Borbidge suggested that. There was no suggestion whatsoever of any backroom deal. It was a genuine offer that I made during question time today. I said that I would have the records—which I have held in security because of their importance to me—released today so that members of the Opposition could see them. In a genuine way, I wrote to the Leader of the Liberal Party to ask her if she wished to see them and to say that she could come and have a look at them.

Mr Veivers: Why weren't they tabled? Table them!

Mr MACKENROTH: The member should wait until I get to the end of my speech.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Southport!

Mr MACKENROTH: Let me look at what has happened in relation to this matter. In 1989, my campaign workers wrote to a number of people asking for donations to my campaign. The person referred to tonight is a person with whom I went to primary school. I do not believe that any suggestion has been made that it is wrong to go to primary school with someone. That person responded to the letter seeking a donation, and we all know now that the donation that was given to my campaign in November 1989 was——

Mr FitzGerald: It was a letter, not a telephone conversation recorded illegally.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MACKENROTH: There was no recording of the conversation between me and any other person. There was a recording of one side of a conversation through a bug that was placed by the police inside an office. I think it is very important for members to understand that.

Mr FitzGerald: You never discussed the issue at all?

Mr MACKENROTH: No. I received a telephone call from some person who made arrangements to come to my office to give me a campaign donation. In the course of normal business, that was receipted, banked and handled in a proper manner.

Mr FitzGerald: Was it cash or cheque?

Mr MACKENROTH: It was cash. On 7 May 1992, the matter was raised by the member for Caloundra in this Parliament. When she raised it, yes, I held a press conference. I held that press conference before material was expunged from the record of the Parliament. At that press conference, I produced a copy of the receipt and a copy of the bank deposit book.

Mr Beanland: How much was the receipt for?

Mr MACKENROTH: The receipt was for \$5,000, which is the amount that was given to me. We have referred to the receipt, and I now show members a copy of the receipt that I showed on television. I seek leave to table this receipt, which is ALP receipt No. Q21692.

Leave granted.

Mr MACKENROTH: That is the receipt for the donation that I received in November 1989. But, of course, people think that there is something sinister in that particular document. I will table also a copy of a duplicate deposit

slip for the Chatsworth ALP Campaign Account which shows a sum of \$5,120——

Mr Littleproud: How do we know it is the same \$5,000?

Mr MACKENROTH: There is nothing sinister about that. Mr B, who gave me the \$5,000, is not the only person who gave me a campaign donation. There was another cash donation.

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MACKENROTH: The amount shown on the deposit slip is for a cash amount of \$5,120 and total receipts banked that day were \$6,170. I seek leave to table that document.

Leave granted.

Mr MACKENROTH: Mr Speaker——

Mr Beanland: Which \$5,000 donation is that one?

Mr MACKENROTH: There is only one. The member should not try to be smart.

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MACKENROTH: For 15 months, members opposite have carried on about the evidence and documentation. When I now produce it and provide it, they want to start on some other weird matter, and I do not even know what they are talking about. To back up both of the documents that I have tabled, I seek leave to table a copy of the Chatsworth ALP Campaign Account bank statement which also shows that the money was banked in November 1989.

Leave granted.

Mr MACKENROTH: I point out that that money was banked, firstly, before the election in 1989 and, secondly, some three months before Noel Newnham went to see the Premier. Much has also been made tonight in this Parliament about pecuniary interests. I believe the Premier has already explained that the pecuniary interests register to which he referred was the pecuniary interests register that is held by him and which is compiled by Cabinet.

Mr Borbidge: That is not what he said earlier.

Mr MACKENROTH: It is the pecuniary interests register to which he referred. I will table a copy of the document tonight. I might add, however, that doing so adds absolutely nothing to any of this debate because the documents that I have already tabled—the

bank statement and the bank deposit book—show that in fact the money was handled in a proper way and was banked in a proper way.

Question 13 refers to political donations received and it also states that one needs to refer to the declaration to fill it out. The declaration asks for details of any donations received to our campaigns of amounts greater than \$1,000, and the donation by the individual is shown on this particular document.

Tonight, honourable members have been talking about two individuals. When a matter about one of those people came before Cabinet, I informed Cabinet that I believed that I should absent myself from any discussion or decision on that matter. I did that, which at that time was the correct and proper thing to do. I might add another point. I cannot remember when this occurred, but it was certainly during the time when I was the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. The Commissioner of Police asked me for advice and guidance on a matter on which he needed a decision by the Government. That matter was whether the Queensland Government would enter into a case in the High Court in relation to some of the matters that honourable members are discussing tonight, including whether the bug that had been placed had been placed legally or not.

When that matter was raised with me by the Police Commissioner, I informed him that I believed that it would not be correct for me to provide him with any advice on those individuals and that therefore it would be improper for me to give him any advice. I then suggested to him that I should phone the Attorney-General and ask the Attorney-General to deal directly with the Police Commissioner. I made that phone call from my office and explained to the Attorney-General that I did not believe that I should be involved in any decision. I asked the Attorney-General to deal directly with the Police Commissioner. I never asked the Attorney-General at that time what transpired in relation to that conversation, and I never asked the Police Commissioner what transpired.

However, the records show that the Queensland Government was represented at that court case, which involved argument on whether or not information had been illegally or legally obtained—information of which I knew that I was a part. If I were in any way trying to cover up for myself or felt that I had done anything improper, would I have suggested that the Police Commissioner

obtain independent advice from the Attorney-General—advice that the Queensland Government should go ahead and take that sort of action? Are those the operations of someone who is in some sinister way trying to cover up? I suggest that it was the proper course of action, and it is the way in which I have always behaved as a Minister.

Mr Borbidge: Did you put the money into the campaign fund yourself?

Mr MACKENROTH: Yes, that's correct. I banked the money into the—

Mrs Sheldon: Why? Didn't you have a treasurer on your campaign committee?

Mr MACKENROTH: There is nothing sinister in that.

Mrs Sheldon: It's not the normal process.

Mr MACKENROTH: I have produced the evidence for honourable members tonight. I believe that the evidence shows that everything has been done properly. Honourable members should not start putting new sinister connotations onto things. Let us simply look at the matter. Much has been said about the Premier, following the Police Commissioner's raising matters with him, raising matters with the Chairman of the CJC. I suggest that the correct and proper thing to do would have been for the Police Commissioner, if he became aware of something that he believed was wrong, to have reported that to the Criminal Justice Commission. The Criminal Justice Act requires not only a Police Commissioner or a police officer but also any official in Government to report those matters to the Criminal Justice Commission. The Police Commissioner should have done that.

I later found out that he did—the day after I resigned from Cabinet. The Police Commissioner wrote to the Criminal Justice Commission, made an official complaint in relation to those tapes and provided a copy of the tapes to the Criminal Justice Commission. That was to Sir Max Bingham on 12 December 1991. I understand that the opinion of a QC was then obtained and I was subsequently questioned by the Criminal Justice Commission. I provided the documents that I have provided tonight and I made a statement to the Criminal Justice Commission. On 24 December 1992, the commission provided me with a letter, which I will table, that shows that I had done nothing wrong and that the formal investigation by the Criminal Justice Commission found that. I seek leave to table that document.

Leave granted.

Mr MACKENROTH: Further to that, and following the 7.30 Report last week, the Criminal Justice Commission has now released a further statement—and I seek leave to table that—which once again says that the allegations that such payment was corruptly received by Mr Mackenroth could not be substantiated. Mrs Sheldon goes to great pains to say, “What does that mean?” Quite obviously, it means that what I have done is correct and proper.

I have had to cop a lot. It does not particularly worry me as an individual, but it certainly worries me as a family man that my wife and children have had to cop the rubbish that some members of the coalition have put out over the past 15 months. I am talking about the type of rubbish that the parties of members opposite put out in my electorate during the last election campaign. On 7 May 1992, the Premier said that, when those matters had been dealt with completely by the courts, we would have a debate. We are having the debate before the matters have been finalised in the courts. For that reason, members have not mentioned some names tonight.

I believe that what I have produced and tabled tonight shows quite clearly that I have done everything in the proper manner. The matters that I raised about the way in which I behaved as a Cabinet Minister when any matters came before me about the individuals named on those tapes show that I acted correctly and properly. I believe that some members of the Opposition owe me an apology, which I will never, ever get.

Question—That the words proposed to be added be so added—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 34—Beanland, Borbidge, Connor, Cooper, Davidson, Elliott, FitzGerald, Gamin, Gilmore, Goss J. N., Grice, Healy, Hobbs, Horan, Johnson, Lester, Lingard, Littleproud, McCauley, Mitchell, Quinn, Randell, Rowell, Santoro, Sheldon, Simpson, Slack, Stephan, Stoneman, Turner, Veivers, Watson
Tellers: Springborg, Laming

NOES, 48—Ardill, Barton, Beattie, Bennett, Bird, Braddy, Bredhauer, Briskey, Budd, Burns, Campbell, Casey, Clark, D’Arcy, Davies, De Lacy, Dollin, Edmond, Elder, Fenlon, Foley, Gibbs, Goss W. K., Hayward, Hollis, Mackenroth, McElligott, McGrady, Milliner, Nunn, Nuttall, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Purcell, Robertson, Robson, Rose, Spence, Sullivan J. H., Sullivan T. B., Szczerbanik, Vaughan, Warner, Welford, Wells, Woodgate
Tellers: Pitt, Livingstone

Resolved in the **negative**.

Question—That the motion be agreed to—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 48—Ardill, Barton, Beattie, Bennett, Bird, Braddy, Bredhauer, Briskey, Budd, Burns, Campbell, Casey, Clark, D’Arcy, Davies, De Lacy, Dollin, Edmond, Elder, Fenlon, Foley, Gibbs, Goss W. K., Hayward, Hollis, Mackenroth, McElligott, McGrady, Milliner, Nunn, Nuttall, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Purcell, Robertson, Robson, Rose, Spence, Sullivan J. H., Sullivan T. B., Szczerbanik, Vaughan, Warner, Welford, Wells, Woodgate
Tellers: Pitt, Livingstone

NOES, 34—Beanland, Borbidge, Connor, Cooper, Davidson, Elliott, FitzGerald, Gamin, Gilmore, Goss J. N., Grice, Healy, Hobbs, Horan, Johnson, Lester, Lingard, Littleproud, McCauley, Mitchell, Quinn, Randell, Rowell, Santoro, Sheldon, Simpson, Slack, Stephan, Stoneman, Turner, Veivers, Watson
Tellers: Springborg, Laming

Resolved in the **affirmative**.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members, I am aware of some difficulties with *Hansard* with regard to the speech by the member for Beaudesert. I ask that the House agree—and I cannot do it by direction—to substitute for the names that were mentioned “A” and “B” so that at least we will have a *Hansard* that is readable. Is the House agreeable?

Honourable members: Aye.

Mr SPEAKER: I so direct that that happen.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Ms SPENCE (Mount Gravatt) (10.40 p.m.): On behalf of the people of the Mount Gravatt electorate, I am pleased to participate in this annual Budget debate, which is one of the most important functions of this Parliament.

This is the Goss Government’s fourth Budget, and again this Government has delivered on its election promises and enhanced Queensland’s position in the national and international arena. The people of Queensland expect their Government to manage their economy in a responsible and disciplined manner; aid sustainable economic recovery—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Palaszczuk): Order! The House will come to order.

Ms SPENCE:—create jobs—jobs now and jobs for the future; and to use its funds to bring about social reform.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members, I have called the House to order. Those honourable members

who are on their feet, if they are leaving the Chamber, should do so; otherwise, they should resume their seats. It is unfair to the member who is trying to deliver her speech. I call the member for Mount Gravatt.

Ms SPENCE: The enduring principles of fiscal discipline and social responsibility have become the hallmark of the Goss Government. We have overcome Commonwealth funding cutbacks, a national recession and the impact of drought to deliver a Budget which not only maintains services but also provides for major improvements.

Faced with similar challenges, other Governments in Australia have slashed services, sacked public servants, sold off assets, increased taxes or run up debts. This Government has taken none of these measures because it has managed this State's resources prudently.

Queensland's unique position has in fact been attained because of this Government's firm commitment to borrow only for economic purposes, not for social purposes. We are not prepared to let our children and our grandchildren pay for the spending we do today. Access Economics forecasts that the combined net debt of the other States by 1995-96 will be around \$90 billion, while Queensland's will be zero.

Queensland's record of financial management performance is without equal in Australia, and this has been recognised by leading economists and financiers both here and overseas. But what about jobs? It is my experience that employment is the first priority for most people. When I talk to my constituents, it is clear that they regard their own employment prospects and the prospects for their children as a responsibility of Government.

Obviously, we cannot shield ourselves completely from the national unemployment problem, particularly with the expected arrival of more than 1 000 interstate migrants every week. Nevertheless, this Government plans to continue consolidating Queensland's position as the job creation capital of Australia.

In order to provide a major stimulus to employment generation, the Government plans to spend \$3.4 billion this year on capital works. This is expected to create around 43 000 full-time jobs, principally in the private sector. This spending on capital works during periods of subdued activity provides one of the best single ways for State Governments to stimulate the private sector and directly create jobs. As well, we will be providing the essential

infrastructure for future growth and future generations.

As Chairperson of the Parliamentary Public Works Committee, I have had the opportunity to inspect many schools, TAFE colleges, health facilities, police stations, court houses, public housing and Government buildings that this Government has constructed in the past three years. There is no doubt that we can be proud of the facilities we are building for future generations. In regional Queensland particularly, these Government projects provide much needed employment opportunities and expand the local economy.

Some of the bigger projects in the next year include the \$170m Brisbane Convention and Exhibition Centre, the \$36m Cairns Convention Centre, the \$1.5 billion 10-year Hospital Rebuilding Program, over \$1.5 billion allocated for transport infrastructure works, including \$690m for roadworks, \$635m for rail, and \$186m for development of the State's seaports. Nearly \$500m is allocated for housing projects, \$330m for the Burdekin irrigation project, \$60m for the Teemburra dam and, finally, \$144m for State schools and \$50.5m for TAFE facilities.

Through this massive capital works expenditure, this Government has displayed its recognition of the need to maintain the State's infrastructure at a level and quality appropriate to the State's needs into the next century.

In 1993-94, the \$150m Jobs Plan is expected to assist a total of 25 000 people through employment or training. This includes funds to 22 group training companies around the State to assist in the employment of more than 3 000 apprentices and trainees. The Government will also subsidise 350 apprenticeships and traineeships in the State public sector and local authorities. This will build on the 635 positions provided last year. The self-employment venture scheme, which provides interest-free loans and business advice to unemployed people with viable business propositions, will place approximately 410 people into employment. As well, the \$2.2m for the Housing Industry Trade Training Scheme will provide jobs for 240 apprentices. There is \$4.2m for the Youth Conservation Corps, \$3m for jobs for the environment and \$47m for the School Refurbishment and Safe Bikeway Programs.

This Government's commitment to more employment and more long-term jobs is here in this Budget. It is the top priority. The Capital Works Program, the \$150m Jobs Plan, the

payroll tax incentive plan, and the large 9.4 per cent increase in TAFE funding are all aimed at providing real opportunities for employment or training for Queenslanders.

I turn now to education, an area which has always been the single highest priority area for the Goss Government. As a parent and former teacher, I know that nothing underlines the community responsibilities and obligations to a fair go for our children more than a decent education.

This year \$2.35 billion has been allocated to the Education budget. This represents an increase of 4.3 per cent, or \$97m on last year's Budget. This is the fourth increase in as many years and ensures that Queensland's students receive the basic skills needed for modern life within a system which is well funded and resourced.

I am disappointed that the Opposition has failed to recognise our commitment to rectifying its past neglect of the State's education system to bring Queensland's education funding into line with national standards.

New initiatives include \$3m for the management of programs for students with disabilities. The integration of these special-needs students into normal State schools has been an enormously successful program over the past decade, despite the inadequate funding. In the Mount Gravatt electorate we have Mount Gravatt State School with a special unit for over 30 visually impaired students, the largest in the State, and Macgregor State School with 10 or so physically or intellectually impaired students. When I visit both of these schools I am always impressed by the absolute dedication of all the teachers towards making this integration successful and the total acceptance of the schools' pupils with the special-needs pupils in their midst. I trust this additional \$3m will make this program operate more efficiently for these schools.

This Budget provides \$12.5m to implement the initiative "Helping P and C's with the Basics", which will ensure every school is equipped with an agreed list of basic equipment. I have already had a school principal convey to me his hope that his school can purchase a photocopier which they have never owned.

Whilst the emphasis in previous Budgets has been on increased teacher numbers and wages, the main items in this year's Budget are better resources and programs to benefit local students and our schools. Important classroom programs that will be expanded

include computers in schools, \$9.2m, literacy and numeracy, \$5.3m, and Languages Other Than English, \$19m.

I would like to mention the allocation for a hydrotherapy pool at the Mount Gravatt West Special School. Today, a report on the future of special education services in the Metropolitan East region was tabled by the Education Minister in the House. That report recommends enhancements to some special schools which are not only closer to where students live but also more modern and better equipped. The Mount Gravatt West Special School is included in those recommendations for enhancement.

Finally I am pleased to report that assistance for creche and kindergarten units has grown by almost 8 per cent to \$16m, including support for an additional 34 units. Having worked closely with many of the kindergarten units in the Mount Gravatt area, I am acutely aware of the need for more places in kindergarten units and the ever increasing need to increase funding in this area.

The Government will also implement its "Better Child Care Strategy" with an allocation of \$18.6m over three years to create more child-care places. The strategy will provide 8 900 new child-care places over three years, the establishment of a Child Care Information Service to provide easy access to all forms of child-care and related services, and cooperating with Queensland employers to increase the availability of work-based child care.

This Budget will allow the Goss Government to expand its significant social justice initiatives such as these additional child-care places, and extending the Seniors Card to all long-term social security beneficiaries 60 years and over, and adding ambulance subscription discounts to the list of available concessions.

I am also pleased to report to my electorate that the Mount Gravatt area has been given an allocation to commence a Home Assist Program which will provide maintenance, advice and services targeted to older home owners, private renters and people with disabilities. We will also be given funding for the new Home Safety Program for a range of home safety and security support services for older home owners and people with disabilities. Already there is great interest in these schemes, which I hope will soon be up and running, and I am very optimistic about the help that will be given to the elderly and the disabled in my electorate. A just society must look after the needs and

requirements of its people. This Government recognises that and is careful to give every section of our society the services it requires.

Another social justice initiative in this Budget is the \$2.33m funding package to implement the Prevention of Violence Against Women Strategy. This money will be spent on prevention strategies and support services to combat the unacceptably high incidence of domestic violence in Queensland. Pages 37 to 40 of the Women's Budget Statements 1993-94 produced by the Women's Policy Unit in the Office of the Cabinet give a detailed explanation of the Government's strategies to prevent violence against women, and I would commend that report to all members.

Extra police on the beat, more community policing, neighbourhood-based programs, helping people with safety and security—these are the fundamentals of the Queensland Government's law enforcement policies. This year's Police budget of \$477m—an increase of 5.5 per cent—will ensure that the Goss Government's commitment to law, order and the reform process is maintained. I am pleased to learn that the Government will make policing during peak crime periods between Thursday night and Sunday morning a priority by adding an extra 120 police on the beat this year.

I am interested to learn that \$500,000 has been committed to the Neighbourhood Safety Audit Program. This program will commence in my electorate this October when I will hold a public meeting to help interested persons reduce crime and improve personal safety in their neighbourhoods.

I know that a lot of doom and gloom is spread by many people—especially the Opposition—regarding the issue of law and order, and I can understand that people get anxious about personal safety. However, I am very optimistic about policing in the 1990s. The Queensland Police Service has moved back to grassroots policing in partnership with the community to prevent crime, maintain order and meet the needs of the community. Funding of \$21m has been allocated to community-based programs for personal public safety information campaigns, Safety House schemes, Neighbourhood Watch, community consultative committees, Rural Watch and the Step-Ahead anti-violence program. As well, more than \$1.4m has been allocated to the Police Beat project, which will lead to more police on the beat in shopping centres—a program which has seen a significant reduction in vandalism, shoplifting and juvenile crime.

In the area of public housing, the Government has announced that it will spend more than \$500,000 on public housing in Mount Gravatt. I am always pleased to get more public housing in my electorate as the waiting lists are long and there is a desperate need for this housing. This Government recognises this need, and I am particularly impressed that the type of housing built by the Government is not only appropriate, affordable and well located but offers a wide choice to cater for changing lifestyles. Gone are the days of constructing box-like public housing. Most people would find it hard to pick Housing Commission houses from other homes as they now blend so well into the neighbourhood.

In the area of health, the Budget reveals this Government's unstinting commitment to the free hospital system. The Hanlon Labor Government started the free hospital system in this State. The Goss Labor Government has, for the fourth consecutive time, presented a record Health budget. The funding increase of 8.4 per cent comes at a time when other States are slashing Health budgets and health facilities.

I note that much of the health expenditure will be spent on the Capital Works Program, building new hospitals and health centres and refurbishing hospitals throughout the State. While speaking of hospitals, I would like to spend a minute setting the matter straight in relation to my own local hospital, the QEII. A lot of misinformation has been spread about the future of the QEII Hospital, and one of the major culprits has been the Opposition Health spokesperson, who continually attempts to upset people with his mistruths about what is or is not going to happen to the QEII Hospital. The facts are that the QEII Hospital will remain open and its services expanded as it will operate in conjunction with the PA Hospital in providing a wide range of elective and non-elective surgery and other services.

In conclusion, I would like to say that this Budget will be good for Queensland. It will be good for the people of the Mount Gravatt electorate. It has the support of the majority of people in this State. I take this opportunity to congratulate the Treasurer on this Budget and on his stewardship of the State's economy.

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Western Downs) (10.56 p.m.): In considering this 1993 Budget of Queensland and the general economic malaise of Australia, I am reminded of an old saying: without care you can go from sandshoes to sandshoes in three generations.

Mr Bredhauer: It must be a really old saying, that one.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: As old as the sandshoes, I suppose. It reminds me of the generation before my own, when people grew up in the Depression days. They really battled and, under all sorts of hardship, finally progressed and prospered. There are ample examples of how the next generation not only benefited from the hard work of that generation but were not prudent enough in the way that they organised their management of things. They did not have the right sort of balance between income and expenditure to the extent that the advantage was lost, the next generation did not inherit anything at all and they were back to the sandshoes.

People would have to acknowledge that, in the past 10 years, Australia has been in a difficult time. I believe that it is all because of an overall trend in the Budgets being put together for the past 10 years whereby those Budgets tend to give people services that they desire without due regard to the taxpayer's ability to fund those services. It is always easy to identify a want from something that should be given. A lot of emphasis is placed on that. We, as a nation, have been remiss in not always paying enough attention to making sure that we can afford what we are giving and paying enough attention to the productive sector.

The member for Mount Gravatt insisted that this Budget is phrased with the right sort of balance. I would have to agree with some of the statements made earlier today by my colleagues on this side of the House who spoke about some of the Budgets of Labor Governments of old in the other States of Australia and the great damage done to those States. I concede that, to date, this Labor Government has not gone that far. I also agree with some of my colleagues that the signs are there. I urge caution on the part of the Government to make sure that, in its social justice programs, it does not end up with a situation in which it is catering for wants and desires without due regard for the capacity to fund those sorts of things.

The real danger is that we have an economy or a Budget driven by welfare at the expense of the productive sector. How was this 1993 Budget organised? How was it achieved? There have been changes in the funding priorities—cuts in some areas and increases in others. There have also been increases in revenue. Within the funding priorities, various members on the

Government side have already talked about increased funding for health, education and police, and they are very proud of that. There is ample evidence to show that enormous amounts of money have gone into those three sectors. The graphs in the Budget papers show just how large a slice those service industries take of the overall receipts of the Government.

I think that there is valid argument against and valid criticism of the way in which the Budget has been framed. Looking at past Budgets, too much of those valuable dollars has been eaten up by the bureaucracy and there has not been the proper driving of the value out of the dollar. Government members have claimed not only here today but also through the newspapers since the Budget has been released that this is a true Labor Budget—a true Labor Budget for the true believers. However, I see in it the trend in all socialist Governments to meddle more and more in the private lives of people and in the affairs of business. It is all part of their plan for a redistribution of wealth. I urge caution that it is being done at a rate that is damaging the productive sector.

During my address, I wanted to comment on the ways in which I see the Budget affecting the electors of Western Downs. That is really how I assess it, because they are the people who I represent. With regard to welfare services, I have some criticism in that although \$600,000 has been allocated to the promotion of the Year of the Family, only \$100,000 will go to community organisations. The other \$500,000, I expect, will be used by the Department of Family Services to promote, supposedly, the Year of the Family, but I imagine that a fair amount of that money will be spent on the promotion of the Government and that department.

Mr De Lacy: What have you got against families?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: Nothing. The Treasurer should let me finish my point. In the same Budget papers, only \$700,000 is allocated for rural families in crisis. There is a real crisis out there. An amount of only \$370,000 was given to church and welfare organisations to help them provide facilities to supply the very necessary welfare services. I think that the balance of the welfare budget is out of kilter. The Year of the Family is a worthy cause, but the balance is wrong.

The next matter that I want to talk about is sporting facilities. One of the matters that has been discussed in my electorate at the present time is the takings from poker

machines. There was a promise that the poker machines were going to provide a bonanza for all of the sporting bodies throughout Queensland that wanted facilities. The reality is that there is not much going on out there. Very little money is going through to rural Queensland. The people are coming to us and saying, "Our local club, our golf club, our RSL club is nothing but a milking cow." They hear statements from the Treasurer and the Minister for Sport about pouring big amounts of money into facilities in the city and no money is going into sporting facilities in the country.

Mr Bredhauer: Rubbish!

Mr LITTLEPROUD: It is not rubbish. I keep track of what is going on in my electorate. There is a real need for some public guidelines on the distribution of funds to ensure that most of the funds are given back to the district where they are raised. At least 80 per cent of the funds raised in Western Downs should be spent on organisations in Western Downs. At present, it seems to be all distributed on a needs basis. The Government gives it where it wants to give it. That is open to all sorts of pork-barrelling.

Mr Bredhauer: Imagine the poor buggers in Normanton if we only gave them back what they get in proceeds from the paper. Do you realise the absurdity of what you're saying?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: It is not absurd at all because the people in Roma, Chinchilla, Miles and Dalby are giving away something like \$200,000 a month and they are getting nothing back. So there is nothing absurd about that whatsoever. As to the railway workers—the line maintenance men have nothing to look forward to in this Budget—just closed lines and lost opportunities.

Mr Bredhauer interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Palaszczuk): Order!

Mr LITTLEPROUD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I thank you. There is a bit of a rabble opposite. What has happened in the last two or three years to those people who carry out the line maintenance work for Queensland Rail is that there has been a reorganisation of where they work. Men and their families who live in small towns where real estate is cheap have, in fact, seen their work depots relocated to the larger towns. It sounds good—better services—but the reality is that they are going from a house that is almost worthless—\$30,000 or \$40,000—to the same sort of house that would cost \$80,000 or \$90,000. They are \$50,000 worse off, if they still have a job. Now

they face this year the possibility of closing branch lines and redundancies, and a man with those sorts of skills does not find it very easy to find another job. So they are not really looking forward to the announcement that is going to be made in October about the future of so many of these railway lines. Even if those men work on a main line, they know that the closing of the branch line will in fact reduce their own chance of employment on the main line.

As for the travelling staff, following the rationalisation of railway services, we now know that some of the travelling crews in places such as Chinchilla, Roma and Dalby will become redundant. They are not particularly happy about that. They accept that there has to be some rationalisation, but because they are the people who are caught up in it, they know their future is not very bright. The same situation applies to the station staff and administration staff because it has been projected that if the Quilpie and Cunnamulla lines close, something like seven administrative jobs in Roma and four or five administrative jobs in Chinchilla will be lost.

I want to now talk about how I see this Budget affects the shopkeepers, the service industries and the business houses in my electorate of Western Downs. People come to me complaining that State Government revenue is based mostly on charges before tax is paid. If that is the case, we have to be careful, because as the Treasurer would be aware, at the present time many people are in a negative income situation. With charges being imposed before tax, obviously they have got to meet those charges whether they make a profit or not. These are very, very, difficult years. The figures to back up their arguments are there in the Budget papers and in documentation handed down recently by the Government, and I have stated before that, over the past four years, the revenue from Government charges and licensing fees climbed from \$200m to over \$800m. When I relate those sorts of figures to the business people in my electorate, they realise pretty quickly that that is generally reflected in the sorts of pre-tax charges and pre-income tax charges that they are paying.

Mr De Lacy: You know that that is just plain wrong. The only reason that there is that big increase is that there are things such as registration that used to be in trust funds. They are now in the Consolidated Fund.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: The Treasurer should go out and convince those people in small business. They will tell him how costs of

operating businesses have increased. The Treasurer can transfer the money all over the place, but these people can identify that the add-on charges before they even start making a bob have increased remarkably.

There is also comment coming from my constituents that there is not really enough incentive in this Budget for small business to create employment. They recognise that most of the businesses in a rural electorate are, in fact, small businesses and, if they are given the chance to employ just one or two more people, with the multiplier effect throughout the State we can overcome some of our problems.

Mr De Lacy: They don't pay payroll tax.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: They do not. That is right.

Mr De Lacy: What other taxes do they pay?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: Government charges.

Mr De Lacy: Like what?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I have just told the Treasurer about the increased registration fees for businesses. It looks like the increase in petrol excise imposed by the Federal Government is an add-on that has to be part and parcel of business

Mr De Lacy: I thought you were talking about our Budget.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: Yes, but the Treasurer has room to manoeuvre, and the small business people say that there is a lack of incentive for them. These people also are often looked upon as being able to provide credit in the district, and they would like to see access to the interest subsidies that are currently available to rural producers. I talked a minute ago about the sorts of Government imposts that are annoying people. The people in the building industry are coming along to me with all sorts of complaints about the Queensland Building Authority gold card. I have written to the responsible Minister pointing out to him the fact that there have been instances of people who have been tradesmen for 15, 20 or 25 years and now they have been given only an interim gold pass and told that they have to do some sort of upgrading, even though they have been running their own business for quite a number of years, or they are tradesmen and they have just started their own businesses. I agree with them that someone needs to look at that, because it is a lack of incentive for them.

With regard to schools in the electorate, there is concern that teachers in high schools

in the electorate will be forced to move. It is part and parcel of something like 180 staff positions that would be lost in the high schools across the State, and people are concerned about the loss of subject offerings. There is also the threat of clustering, which has been raised once and received a severe battering, but is still a threat. The other big concern that I have—and I keep raising it when I can—is, of course, the fact that there is no real funding for TAFE facilities in Dalby, a town of 10,000 in a district of 16,000 that has only the most meagre facilities for TAFE students. The Minister makes a lot of noise about the extra funding that has gone into TAFEs across the State. I am concerned that a place such as Dalby, which is one of Queensland's largest provincial towns, does not have its own TAFE facility.

It is interesting that this Budget made a lot of noise about some of the capital works projects, which usually involve schools, etc., that will be provided in my electorate. Mention has been made of an arts block at Chinchilla, but it had already been announced and commenced. There had been talk of a new administration block at the Dalby High School which was sorely needed. I was pushing for it even before I was the Minister for Education, and it was built before the Budget came down. It is yet to be opened, but it has already been built, which shows that the Government is fudging matters a little bit. I am pleased that funds have been allocated for the Roma College of the South West, which will be a TAFE facility combined with a high school. In spite of the fact that it had been announced four or five months ago, it still appeared in the Budget papers and it, too, is part of the fudging process.

I was most disappointed, however, that having written to the Minister for Police quite some time ago advising him of the appalling conditions at the Roma Police Station—which puts the lie to accusations of pork-barrelling by the previous Government—and having asked him to review his capital works projects from the point of view of Roma being a police district, no mention has been made of improvements in the Budget papers, which saddens me. After all, the district badly needs a new police station.

My perusal of the Budget papers shows that the only roads funding for my electorate for the year will be applied to the Injune-Rolleston road, which is a north-south road connecting the Townsville area to Melbourne by the shortest route. Approximately 60 kilometres of that road is unsealed presently

and I understand that an allocation of \$25m has been made for those roadworks. I point out that 30 kilometres of the road has already been developed. I do not know whether the \$25m is for the sealing of the 30-kilometre stretch that has already been formed, or whether it will be used for another 30 kilometres which would finally seal the road. I would certainly hope that it is the latter, but road funding reflects the outcome of the Federal Budget. It was appalling to see how much the Federal Government had reduced the amount of funding for roads throughout Australia and I suppose it is only to be expected that that would have some impact on the Queensland scene.

Each of approximately five local authorities in my electorate is complaining about the compulsory use of the Queensland Treasury Corporation and payment of the performance dividend. The Government must understand that many of these local authorities are the biggest businesses in the town and that they like to use the local banks to help support the commercial centre. Because they have been directed by Treasury to use the QTC and take business away from their own towns, they have become unhappy. In some cases, they claim to be able to obtain a better deal from some of the commercial banks.

Another new practice of which I have heard in relation to transport and local government is what has been described as the big bang projects. I understand that, because it is a more efficient use of capital to use on-site resources to do the job, the Transport Department will have only those projects that are worth \$2m or more at a time. The trouble is that many of the rural shires do not have the capacity to undertake a \$2m job and they have been told that they will probably have to subcontract part of the work. As a result, one may well find that the work force will be travelling from, say, Dalby to places such as Pittsworth or Roma to take part in a big bang project. People involved in local government know about the costs involved and they also know whether such a project would or would not be efficient. They say that, to their minds, such an idea is preposterous.

During my speech, I have not spoken about primary producers, so in the last few minutes remaining to me I will remind honourable members again that people in inland regions are really grateful for the efforts of coastal folk who have organised fodder drives, entertained the people and generally have improved the sense of wellbeing of

country folk by helping them out as much as possible. In fact, some of the fodder drives were worth as much as \$50,000. However, the situation is drastic.

I acknowledge that more money has been allocated in this Budget for the RAS, interest subsidies and similar forms of assistance. It is understandable that people who are doing it tough financially have formed the opinion that although they made profits and paid taxes over the years, they are virtually forgotten now that they are suffering losses. That is not always the truth of the situation because it is not always possible for the State to prop people up over long periods, especially when huge amounts of money are involved.

While acknowledging that something has been done in drought-stricken areas, I warn the Government—particularly the Treasurer—of reports that are coming to me from organisations such as Lifeline, groups that have been organising the fodder drives and church organisations. They are really worried about the failure of small business and rural industry. They are worried about family break-ups and displaced persons because when people lose their farms and have to relocate in the city, they do not have appropriate survival skills and do not know their way around to access the services. Apparently, those people are in some sort of state of nervous trauma. There is therefore a need to make sure that sufficient funds are made available to help them.

I mentioned earlier assistance of \$700,000 for rural families in crisis. I ask the Government to consider that amount because the need for funding could well become worse, especially for people involved in the beef industry who have had to de-stock almost completely. They can see that it will be three or four years before they derive a decent income, and they do not have enough cattle to generate much income. The income that they manage to obtain has to be used to buy more stock so that, in turn, they can gradually build up their income. For a number of years, they will be receiving a low income, and there will be a great need for even more compassion to be shown by the Government.

Overall, the people who live in the Western Downs electorate appreciate that times are tough. They are not blaming the Government for their worries; they realise that the cause is mostly the weather. Although my constituents and I do not see any great benefits in the Budget for the electorate, we are nevertheless thankful for the bit of

assistance that is being given to people who are doing it tough in the rural industry.

Mrs ROSE: (Currumbin) (11.16 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to speak to Appropriation Bill (No. 2), which is an integral part of the 1993-94 State Budget. The Goss Government has now successfully presented its fourth Budget, proving that sensible economic management and financial accountability can be implemented without depriving Queenslanders of the basics. There has been no decrease—in fact, a healthy increase—in Queensland Government programs which have been designed to improve our social infrastructure. On the Gold Coast, the 1993-94 Budget brings us more of the basics. Members opposite have accused the Queensland Government of being a big spender, yet they are strangely silent when it comes to this Government's record of spending the money where it needs to be spent, that is, on improving the basic social and business infrastructure in Queensland, without sending our State into uncontrollable debt.

The Goss Government has been successful in that area and the 1993-94 Budget proves that it will continue this success. Managing the economy of a State like ours is not an easy task. The SEQ 2001 report "Creating our Future", which was released this year, predicts that the population in the south-east corner of Queensland alone will be in excess of three million by the year 2011. Clearly, intense population growth in many parts of our State must have a large influence on the way our Treasurer moulds the Budget, and he has been fulfilling that requirement more than ably.

In rapidly growing areas such as the Gold Coast, the Government must look to provide constant improvements to the basics in conjunction with its more extensive programs. For example, while the southern Gold Coast will benefit immensely from new and innovative schemes such as the Neighbourhood Safety Audit Program, there is a compelling requirement for Budget increases in the provision of basic services such as health and education. These are the basics that need to be constantly upgraded in a fast-growing community such as the southern Gold Coast so that the development of its social infrastructure keeps pace with its population growth. When the Treasurer framed the 1993-94 Budget, he obviously had in mind an improvement in these areas. To that end, he has addressed one of my major concerns as a member representing an electorate where the pressure caused by

population growth has increased markedly in the last few years. It was largely these considerations which led to the 1993-94 Budget being well received on the Gold Coast—and for good reason. On 8 September 1993, in the *Gold Coast Bulletin*, the Mayor of the Gold Coast, Alderman Lex Bell, stated—

"It was right and proper to acknowledge that the Gold Coast community would benefit from the Budget initiatives."

The 1993-94 Budget initiatives for the Gold Coast display this Government's implicit understanding of the region's needs. Since last year's Budget, all of my Cabinet colleagues—particularly the Treasurer—have consulted with me and with community and business leaders on the Gold Coast in order to establish an understanding of our local priorities.

Listening to regional communities is important if the Government is to tailor a Budget to their specific needs. The Government has displayed a holistic approach to Education budget allocations. Putting students first not only means increasing the size of the budget, which the Queensland Government will do by 4.3 per cent, or \$97m, in the 1993-94 period; it also means dealing with the specifics of funding allocation to improve the infrastructure on which individual schools rely to be modern and effective providers of education. Among the schools to benefit on the southern Gold Coast will be the new Elanora State High School, which will receive a new general classrooms block and staff amenities block, costing \$900,000, in the 1993-94 period.

Another one of the basics that the Budget delivers for Gold Coasters is in the area of health. In common with education, the Health budget is designed to address specific needs. The health requirements on the Gold Coast are typical of any regional area with a rapidly growing population. Waiting times must be reduced, and hospital facilities must be upgraded. The 1993-94 Budget brings the Gold Coast \$9.5m of special additional funding to achieve those things. That allocation is designed specifically to address the effect that rapid population growth has had on the provision of public health services on the Gold Coast. Reducing waiting times is central to that process. The special additional funding will target waiting lists in treatment areas such as paediatrics, obstetrics, optical, dental, dialysis and orthopaedics.

At the Gold Coast Hospital, a \$13.5m allocation of funding for capital works projects

and medical equipment purchases will see the redevelopment of two operating theatres, airconditioning on floors 4 to 9 and the theatres and kitchen, and the purchase of \$1m worth of new diagnostic equipment. I congratulate the Government on the substantial boost to public health facilities on the Gold Coast brought about by the 1993-94 Budget.

Not only is our community one of the fastest growing in the whole State, which makes the continued upgrading of health facilities essential, but we also have a high population of elderly residents and young families. I understand that the southern Gold Coast has the second-highest population of people over the age of 60 in the whole State, second to Hervey Bay. Our region is also one of the most popular destinations for young families migrating from other parts of Queensland and from other States. The availability of adequate health care is extremely important for those two sections of the community. In allocating funds to improve public health facilities on the Gold Coast, the Queensland Government has shown an understanding of three of our region's most important concerns—care for the elderly, care for young families and children and pressures brought about by rapid population growth.

Having addressed the continued development of the social infrastructure that a growing community requires, in the 1993-94 Budget, the Queensland Government has also set about consolidating and maintaining our commitment to employment growth through the Jobs Plan. The record \$3.4 billion Capital Works Program will play its part in helping to generate jobs, because 80 per cent of those works will be carried out by private contractors. On the southern Gold Coast, that means continued works at schools such as the Elanora State High School, which will help to generate employment in the private sector. Also helping employment to grow is the extension of the Jobs Plan payroll tax rebate for young unemployed Queenslanders.

I have been encouraging southern Gold Coast companies to take advantage of the extension of that scheme for the 1993-94 period. A full payroll tax rebate on new employees between the ages of 15 and 24 who have been unemployed for more than nine months is a good incentive for local companies to help reduce the number of young Queenslanders out of work. Those measures, combined with \$2m of continued funding for the Self-employment Venture Scheme—or SEVS—represent the Goss

Government's commitment to job creation in Queensland. On the Gold Coast, those schemes are being utilised and are working well.

In a growing region such as the southern Gold Coast, there will be an increasing need for affordable housing for low-income families and pensioners. I am pleased to say that the Currumbin electorate has been allocated \$1.7m by the State Government for the provision of public housing in the 1993-94 period. In a community with skyrocketing population growth, there is a greater chance that some people—people with low incomes in particular—will fall through the housing net. The challenge is to provide public housing for those people and avoid the eventual hardship of temporary or long-term homelessness. The 1993-94 allocation for public housing in the Currumbin electorate is pleasing and once again shows this Government's understanding of the problems that growing regional areas such as the southern Gold Coast face.

Earlier, I touched upon the fact that the southern Gold Coast has a high number of elderly residents. It is comforting for those people to know that a priority for Department of Housing, Local Government and Planning expenditure in the 1993-94 period will be to improve existing public housing to increase safety and security for the elderly and the frail. Also in the area of safety and security, the southern Gold Coast will receive a share of the \$500,000 of Statewide funding for the Neighbourhood Safety Audit Program to help reduce crime and improve personal safety.

I do not believe that I have let any opportunity go by in this place to emphasise just how important the tourism industry is to the Gold Coast and, of course, my home turf, the southern Gold Coast. The 1993-94 Budget demonstrates this Government's recognition of the importance of that industry and its worth to the whole State. This comes in the form of a permanent additional grant of \$5.7m a year for the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. That grant comes with a proviso that it be utilised to build marketing and promotional programs funded from the previous temporary loan arrangements.

Our undertaking to provide consistency in funding to the QTTC will allow it to develop even better programs designed to assist the Queensland tourism industry. The development of a Tourism Development Bureau within the Department of Tourism, Sport and Racing displays a firm commitment by the Government to put some time and money back into an industry that is keeping

many parts of our State financially viable. The Gold Coast falls into that category.

The Tourism Development Bureau will aid the Government by undertaking comprehensive industry research and by developing effective tourism policy. Recently, the New South Wales Government brought down its Budget in which tourism was also a large component. As stated on page 1 of the 7 September edition of the *Sydney Morning Herald*, one of the New South Wales Government's primary objectives in funding the New South Wales Tourism Commission was to—

“Grab a greater share of tourism away from other States, in particular, from Queensland.”

This indicates to me a number of problems for New South Wales, and of course a misguided policy in relation to the tourism promotion of our part of Australia's east coast. The Queensland Government's 1993-94 Budget allocation to tourism, as outlined by the *Program Statements* document, emphasises that there will be a continuing focus on the international marketing of Queensland, including an international launch of the QTTC Sunlover holidays into Singapore and New Zealand. These initiatives, on top of those that I have already mentioned, which are designed to facilitate better tourism policy—including assistance with marketing and promotion—represent a sensible and balanced approach to this vital industry by the Queensland Government.

Unfortunately, the New South Wales Government sees a need to grab a share of tourists away from other States, particularly Queensland. This is in stark contrast to our strategy of increasing the size of the tourism market rather than fighting over it. Attracting international tourists is one way of doing that. The far-northern New South Wales/Gold Coast region is, for all intents and purposes, one tourism region. It is only an imaginary line—the State border—which divides us. Tourism operators in Tweed Heads rely on the same tourists and the same tourism dollars as do those in Coolangatta. By budgeting to assist the tourism industry to increase the size of the market rather than squabbling over the existing number of tourists, we are helping the tourism industry in the whole Tweed/Gold Coast region. In the 1993-94 Budget, the Queensland Government has done this.

It is in the interests of the tourism industry in the Tweed/Gold Coast region that I call on the New South Wales Government to concentrate on finding more international

tourists rather than attempting to poach the tourists who come to Queensland. In the end, if New South Wales does not meet these obligations, the Currumbin electorate, the southern Gold Coast and northern New South Wales will suffer. Tourists who come to our region are not stopped by the border. Both States share the income generated by these tourists. A trip to the Currumbin Sanctuary can be easily followed by a drive to Byron Bay and vice versa. I cannot see how the New South Wales Government is going to grab a share of tourists away from Queensland effectively, when one of its most lucrative tourist destinations—far-northern New South Wales—is intrinsically tied up with the tourism industry on the Gold Coast and relies heavily on the Coolangatta Airport, which lies on the southern Gold Coast.

Our tourism strategy, as typified by the 1993-94 Budget, fits in with the broader well-being of the south-east Queensland and northern New South Wales tourism industry. The tourism industry in the Tweed district cannot afford to compete with that of the Gold Coast. I am sure that it does not want to. Although we are in different States, we are in the same region, which is a popular tourism destination, and as a result we share the same tourists. The additional international tourists who come to the Gold Coast as a result of the Queensland Government initiatives put in place in this Budget and through the efforts of our tourism industry will benefit the Tweed region, too. It would benefit the lower Gold Coast/Tweed region immensely if the New South Wales Government concentrated less on interstate rivalry and more on what is good for the Tweed/Gold Coast tourism industry as a whole.

I would also like to briefly mention the \$151m Brisbane-Robina railway development. My colleague the member for Albert, John Szczerbanik, has already touched upon that issue. I would simply like to say that this development will have a great impact on the Gold Coast, and most Gold Coasters await its completion with eager anticipation.

In closing, I want to say only this: the 1993-94 Budget is the result of a recognition of our region's needs and priorities. We have been allocated a healthy share of beneficial programs in the areas that I have already mentioned, but, above all, we have received the improvements to the basics that every growing community needs. It is for these reasons that I support this Bill.

Mr BEANLAND (Indooroopilly)
(11.35 p.m.): The Treasurer has described his

fourth Budget as a "big 'L' Labor Budget". That statement is probably the most factual in all the Budget documents. In fact, I am sure that his mate Paul Keating would call it a Budget for the true believers. The fourth Budget of the Goss Government contains the worst features of the Labor Budgets that Australians have come to expect and fear—hidden new taxes and tax increases; increased spending on the bureaucracy and not on the delivery of basic services; plenty of rhetoric about our tragic unemployment problems, but very little of substance being done about it; and no incentive for the private sector to lead this State out of the recession and into a brighter future for all Queenslanders.

The real difference between this Government when it came to office in 1989 and the Liberal Governments in the southern States when they came to office is that the disastrous Labor Governments, when they were thrown out of office, left their States bankrupt. Honourable members should consider Cain and Kirner, Burke and Lawrence, and Wran in New South Wales. I am sure that they will soon be followed by the Bannon/Arnold Governments of South Australia. In what shape would this Government be now if it was left with a mountain of debt of \$80,000m, as the Liberal/National Government has been left with in Victoria?

I should warn all Queenslanders that Premier Goss is on the record as saying in 1989 that he wants to do for Queensland what John Cain has done for Victoria. That is not a pretty picture for Queenslanders to look forward to. Were it not for the fortunate inheritance left to the Queensland Government by the former Government, the type of mismanagement that the people of Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia suffered under Labor would now be confronting Queenslanders. This State is fortunate that, whatever its other faults, the last National Party Government and the National/Liberal coalitions before it were good economic managers. The Treasurer has never given credit where it is due. Even the most ardent critics of the last Government concede that the former Government left this State's finances and economy in good shape. Tragically, that inheritance is rapidly being eroded—as the teachers, hospital workers, police officers and railway workers of this State will confirm. The Premier and the Treasurer are always referring to how well Queensland is doing compared with the rest of Australia. However, an increasing array of economic and

social statistics are now starting to tell a very different story.

Just seven days after the Budget was presented, Queensland recorded its worst unemployment level and the biggest jump in the number of jobless of any State. Various measures of growth are beginning to show Queensland trailing behind Western Australia, which has recovered spectacularly since the election of the Court Government six months ago. Even indicators such as retail sales have us trailing Victoria.

The Goss Government's answer to unemployment is to blame migration from southern States. That claim reeks of hypocrisy. Who has led the way in recruiting well-paid southerners into our bureaucracy—Mexicans, as they are called in many places. This Goss Labor Government has adopted that course. In the bloated bureaucracy that the people of Queensland have to fund, the outstanding feature is the number of recruits or refugees from southern States holding senior positions, such as departmental heads, senior advisers and so on. If the Government is adopting a policy of recruiting southerners, it can hardly complain when non-Government workers follow its lead. It is beyond dispute that population growth is just one of the factors causing high unemployment. We have had a higher population growth rate than the other States for many years, yet our level of unemployment until recently has consistently been lower than that of the other States.

The biggest factor impacting on unemployment today is a lack of private sector investment and confidence. Private investment has dropped from \$11.3 billion in 1989 to \$10.6 billion in 1992-93. It has decreased by some \$700m under this Government in the last four years. This Budget, despite the Premier's many promises, ignores the most serious of all problems completely. If anything, this Budget adds to the problems facing the private sector because of the new and hidden increases in taxes that it imposes.

Labor's treatment of small business is highlighted by its hypocrisy. The imposition of payroll tax on the fringe benefits of employees is another tax on business. There is an increase in the most unjust of all taxes, payroll tax—a tax on employment, a tax on jobs. Again, small business will be hit particularly hard. This is another of the Goss Labor Government's taxes.

For the first time, the family home no longer benefits from concessional stamp duty charges, regardless of the value of the home.

Now that the concession has been limited, we will find that it will gradually be phased out all together. Of course, home buyers are some of those most hardest hit—savagely stung by this year's State Budget. There are at least five new taxes in the State Budget, of which three will ruthlessly hit the home buyer. Labor has announced that existing stamp duty concessions for the acquisition of land for the purpose of building a principal place of residence will be removed for future land purchases. Additional stamp duty concessions on the first principal place of residence will be restricted to properties valued up to \$160,000. That is the new limit. For the principal place of residence, the existing stamp duty concessional rate of 1 per cent will be limited to the first \$250,000 of value of the property.

Modest homes could not be described in Labor's emotional rhetorical terms as mansions. That is what we are talking about here—a lot of modest homes. Recently, I was pleased to hear that one or two Labor Ministers were having a whinge about how this would impinge on perhaps more than 50 per cent of the modest homes in their electorates. That will be the case in my electorate, and I am sure it will be the case in the electorates of most other members. The use of this emotive term "mansions" is typical of what we can expect from the Treasurer. All areas will be affected by the imposition of stamp duty on land for the purpose of building a new home. This will particularly hit new subdivisions, new home buyers and young newly married people. Young people planning and saving for their future will be hard hit by this callous, ruthless Goss Labor Government.

Clearly, these three new taxes will apply across-the-board. The REIQ has provided figures which reveal that the average house price in Queensland in 1977 was \$30,000. In 1984, it more than doubled to \$62,000. By 1991, it had doubled again to \$123,000. If the figure increases at its current rate, it could be over \$250,000 at the turn of the century. A first home buyers' principal place of residence purchased for \$160,000 to \$200,000 will incur an increase of \$400 in stamp duty. Second and subsequent buyers who purchase a principal place of residence will have to pay an additional \$625 for a home worth up to \$275,000. If it costs \$300,000, the additional cost will be \$1,250—quite a huge sum of money. A vacant block of land worth \$60,000 will incur an additional cost of \$700.

Of course, that does not include the changes to land tax which will certainly affect those new subdivisions. The Government has not only broadened land tax; it will catch in a

broader net the number of people who are currently having a phasing-in process with land taxes. That will impinge again on new home buyers.

Talking about biting the hand that feeds you—we find that in three years, housing has jumped from 33 per cent of all private investment to 43 per cent and is now being hit by new extra taxes and duties, as well. That is what we get from this Government time and time again. Yet the Treasurer says that it is not a new tax. He says that it is broadening the base of the tax. I am sure that the Treasurer knows—if he does not, he is not up to it, as most of us believe—that, if there is no tax on an item and the Government imposes one and the person has to pay it, it is certainly a brand spanking new tax. I am sure that that is what people are being confronted with here—brand spanking new taxes.

I turn to the area of housing activity. If housing activity is taken out of the economic growth figures, the recent record would give this Government no comfort at all. However, as with all other Labor Governments, this Government believes that jobs and growth will come from a bigger, more costly bureaucracy, not a stronger private sector. Just as those other Labor Governments were proved wrong, this Government will be proved wrong, as well. The policies of the Federal Labor Government will ensure that it is, even if this Budget through some miracle does not do so. The Federal Government's fringe benefit taxes in areas such as accommodation and travel hit this State hardest of all. They will hit our tourism industry and they will certainly damage the convention/conference area.

The Treasurer takes pride in the Brisbane and Cairns convention centres, the funding of which begins with this Budget. At the same time as he is funding these centres—worthy projects in themselves—the Labor Government in Canberra is driving the conference and convention sectors off shore to New Zealand, Fiji and Singapore where they can escape the fringe benefit tax imposts of the Federal Labor Government. In fact, the Treasurer and the Minister for Tourism should be lobbying the Greens and Democrats in Canberra to support David Jull, the shadow Tourism Minister, in the fight to block the fringe benefit taxes in travel and accommodation, because those taxes affect this State more than any other. Unless the Federal Opposition succeeds in changing the Federal Budget in this way, the Brisbane and Cairns convention centres may end up being little more than monuments to Mr Keating's

incompetence and mismanagement, and this Government's indifference.

The Treasurer has been going around like a well-trained parrot talking about his "great" Budget. What is great about being at the end of a long queue waiting for life-saving surgery in public hospitals? What is great about standing at the Hendra Railway Station and finding that no trains run? What is great about finding that the trains that run through Sherwood, Graceville, Chelmer or Taringa during peak hours now provide less than half the previous services? What is great about a young couple having to pay stamp duty on their first home? What is great about parents finding that their children's class sizes are growing and the quality of education is diminishing?

Behind all the rhetoric, the well selected tables and graphs, these are the sad truths about this Budget. The quality and the availability of basic Government services get worse, not better, as a result of this Budget. There is no delivery of service within the Budget. If that is something of which Government members are proud, they are more out of touch with the real world than the Keating Government in Canberra is—the so-called true believers.

While unemployment grows to levels previously unknown in this State, the Treasurer and the Premier go around telling everyone how great things are. No doubt the Government will claim that business welcomes the Budget. I think it is closer to the truth to say that, like Mr Dawkins' recent effort, anything could be an improvement or a relief.

I will consider a number of these areas and comment on how the bureaucracy is increasing. We have all heard about the crises in health day after day. Under this Government, spending on health has increased by \$700m, or 44 per cent. But where has the money gone? It certainly has not gone into providing more nurses in the wards or at the bedside. The waiting lists are getting longer and, of course, the wards are closed over Easter for weeks at a time. In four years, the cost of administering the health system has increased by \$130m. Last year alone, it blew out by \$30m. Health administration takes up one-quarter of the total Health budget. This financial year, the cost for administration of the health system will increase to approximately \$423m.

Since this Government came to office, spending in the Education Department has increased by more than \$500m. Administration costs now consume 9.9 per

cent of the Education budget. They were 4 per cent at the change of Government. Of course, teacher numbers will fall by 98. There will be 454 fewer teachers in secondary schools, with larger class sizes. Of course, that allows less money for distance education. In the 1990-91 financial year, \$134m was spent on administration. In 1993-94, that figure has risen to \$232m—almost a \$100m increase. It has increased by more than 70 per cent in four years.

An extra 1 200 police were promised by the Government in its first term. Most of those ended up in the corporate service program, not on the beat. In the prevention and detention area, the number of police on the beat has decreased.

One finds that under this Government unemployment has increased to 11.2 per cent—with a 0.9 per cent increase in July alone. At present, 172 100 Queenslanders are unemployed—an increase of 77 300, or 81.5 per cent, since Labor came to power. Youth unemployment is up by 31.5 per cent—an increase of 13 per cent since Labor came to office. We find that only 42 600 jobs have been created since Labor came to power, and only 37 per cent of those are full-time jobs. Each and every day of this Goss Labor Government, every hour two people are added to the jobless queues. Thanks to the people on the other side of the Chamber, every hour that we sit in this place, two people are added to the jobless queues.

I turn now to job creation and capital expenditure. Last year, this Government promised \$3.3 billion in capital expenditure but spent only \$2.8 billion. It also promised to create 39 000 jobs. Even the Treasurer whinges and whines that he created only 8 000 full-time jobs. The Treasurer would not have a clue. This year, the Goss Labor Government says that it will spend \$3.4 billion on capital expenditure and create 43 600 jobs. Obviously, when one considers this Government's own admissions from the past financial year, it appears that that will be another fallacy because, in this Budget, jobs simply miss out. In fact, as to jobs, this Budget is a dud—just like the Treasurer.

As to State Government taxes, fines and fees—it now costs each and every Queensland \$417 extra to run this State. Since Labor came to power, that figure has increased to \$1,700 for every average family. Over those four years, there has been a huge increase. Taxes increased by \$317m in this State Budget—an increase of 10.3 per cent over the Budget Estimates of last year. Over

the coming year, we can expect some very steep hikes in taxes and charges from this Treasurer—some of those as hidden taxes and charges.

I turn now to the Brisbane City Council and the State Government's figures as to the city council debt. We hear a great deal from this Labor Government about the debt of the State and the debt at City Hall. According to this Government's own figures contained in statements tabled with the Treasurer's Annual Statement, the city debt has skyrocketed from \$777m to \$1,214m, representing an increase of some \$437m, or 56 per cent, in three years. That debt will have to be paid for not only by ourselves but also by our children and, no doubt, their children. This incredible blow-out is of major concern to all Brisbane residents as more and more of them find out how their dollars are being spent.

In the past few days, we have seen what I call the great money grab—the superannuation grab—by Labor aldermen. I appeal to the Minister for Local Government to refuse that proposal when it comes before this Parliament. I believe that this matter should be left to the people of Brisbane to decide at the next city council election. This will mean a windfall to Labor aldermen who fail to qualify under the present rules. Some of them were disendorsed recently. In fact, after having served only one term, under the new proposal three of those aldermen would receive a windfall of an additional \$20,000. Under the current system they would get some \$13,000. Under the new proposal they would receive \$33,000. They would get a windfall of two and a half times more. That is an utter disgrace. This should be left to the people of Brisbane to decide.

The Lord Mayor also gets a windfall of two and a half times more under this proposed system. It is no wonder that he is so keen on it! Currently, he would receive only \$22,000. Under the new proposal he would receive \$55,000, representing a windfall of \$33,000. The current scheme, of which the Lord Mayor is a member, is designed not to require topping up by ratepayers. Because the Brisbane City Council has only 27 aldermen, the scheme is difficult to run. Under the present guidelines, the scheme was designed to ensure that ratepayers would not be required to top it up. But once it is altered, particularly if it is drawn out at the early stages, that will affect the overall scheme. It will take some time—maybe not very much time—but vast sums of ratepayers' money will be required to top up the scheme and keep it viable. At the end of the day, ratepayers will

be pouring in thousands upon thousands of their dollars to make the scheme viable and to make it work. I call on the Minister to reject that proposal when it comes before the Parliament.

I could not help noticing that the Office of Cabinet is receiving a big increase in the Budget—75 staff and \$7.4m. We hear a lot of whingeing and whining from the Treasurer about lack of funds—

Time expired.

Debate, on motion of Mr Dollin, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

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

“That the House do now adjourn.”

Medusa Tapes; Former Superintendent Huey

Mr GRICE (Broadwater) (11.56 p.m.): In tune with the terms of debate today, I wonder if I could have perhaps a gag and a couple of withdrawals put in credit before I start.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Palaszczuk): Order! I consider that remark to be a reflection on the Chair and I ask the member to withdraw and apologise.

Mr GRICE: I withdraw and apologise unreservedly. It was certainly not meant as a reflection on the Chair. I have argued before for a royal commission into matters relating to former Superintendent John William Huey, who seems to have a hold on certain Labor Ministers. Huey resigned with full benefits after Senior Constable Gordon Harris and Detective Sergeant First-class John Reynolds charged him with fabricating evidence. Those detectives were demoted, transferred and humiliated. They were hounded by the Police Service and the CJC until they had to accept a secrecy contract as a condition of ending their police careers.

Recent events convince me of a close and sinister relationship between the Goss Labor Government and John William Huey. I ask members to listen to what former detective Gordon Harris said in the *Sunday Mail*—

“It was said that the day we charged Huey, the world down in George Street erupted. I then knew a lot of people were in cahoots to protect him because we got

told there was political interference and he had to be protected.

. . . as it unravelled down the line we realised there were politicians that owed favours, people being protected.”

Mr Beattie: You'd better name them.

Mr GRICE: I shall. John Reynolds stated—

“I'd like to point out that when Mr. Huey was Superintendent, or even before he was superintendent, any investigation that involved paedophiles and they found out about it, they would raid the blokes offices and seize all the files.”

Four years after Fitzgerald supposedly made the world a better place, we have frightening allegations made by experienced detectives. Their allegations have to be investigated properly. An honest, open and accountable Government would do that. But we are talking about the Goss Labor Government and a number of Ministers who have given their support to the perjurer and brick artist Huey. Ministers Mackenroth, Burns and Wells have supported Huey openly in this House, fighting to deflect questions and suppress the so-called Miller report. A royal commission could establish the facts behind allegations about Ministers and their relationships with Huey.

One of those allegations is detailed in a statement from former Detective Sergeant John Reynolds, who was hounded out of the force by this Goss Labor Government. He states—

“I was at a certain meeting when Mr. Mackenroth stood down and we were discussing who was to be our next Police Minister.

A man's name by the name of Deputy Premier Mr. Tom Burns came up, and I made the statement that he wouldn't want to get the job because he's nothing but a bloody crook too, because he committed false pretences which was investigated by Mr. Huey.

That was the statement I made in that executive meeting. Two days later, Gordon got a phone call to ring Tom Burns which he did.

We've got a tape of it, and I don't care who knows about it now and he threatened to sue Gordon and I, if he heard anything more like this and admitted on tape that it came from the particular executive meeting, but there's only one thing wrong. He had the wrong

person. It was me who made the comment, not Gordon.

Gordon's not even on the executive, so that will give you an idea of who's in bed with who.

It involved an insurance claim on a boat and trailer and car when it got stolen. Now we never had the opportunity to follow it right through. We were told verbally by other Police that the matter was given to Huey personally to deal with.

There was evidence of criminal offences. He wrote it off—said there was no evidence.

The day he spoke to Gordon, Mr. Burns actually claimed he had a certificate of clearance from the RACQ and insurance company.

He put in two insurance claims. The one on his car included the boat and trailer, and he put in a separate claim on the boat and trailer which he had with another insurance company. That was the complaint on the investigation.

Now that investigation was handed personally to Huey by then Deputy Commissioner Kerry McMahon I believe it was.”

The people of Queensland owe former Detective Sergeant Reynolds a lot for his courage in speaking out after all that has been done to him already.

The Labor Party is in power in Queensland, determining the way we all live our lives and how our children live theirs. I have a vital, legitimate interest in the propriety of this Government and its leader, Mr Goss, who came to power promising honesty, openness and accountability. I believe Medusa is evidence that Labor is covering up things which should be brought out in the open for public judgment.

Time expired.

Oodgeroo Noonuccal

Mr BRISKEY (Cleveland) (12.01 a.m.): I rise to speak about a most incredible woman, whom I first met in 1978. She is a poet, a writer, a teacher, an actress, an artist and an Aboriginal activist. I met her at her home, Moongalba, which means “sitting down place”. I will always remember meeting Oodgeroo of the tribe Noonuccal for the first time. In 1978, she was known as Kath Walker. I was with a group of students and Kath invited us to Moongalba to meet her and learn from her. She read to us and talked to us about

Aboriginal culture, about growing up on North Stradbroke Island, and about racial prejudice. She showed us how she and her ancestors had gathered food. She took us down to the shores in search of oysters. I was truly mesmerised by this woman. I recalled as a school student how we had read and discussed her poetry and that of another Australian poet, Judith Wright, who is a long-time friend of Kath's. I have been extremely fortunate to meet Kath on many occasions since our first encounter.

For the last four years, North Stradbroke Island has been within my electorate and Kath has therefore been a constituent of mine. I never tire of Kath telling me about the legends of her people, and the history of the tribes of Quandamooka, which we call Moreton Bay. Many would not be aware that the Noogy tribe lived on Moreton island and the Noonuccal tribe lived on North Stradbroke Island. The missionaries moved all the Noogies to North Stradbroke Island. Even though there has been a lot of intermarrying, Kath still knows who belongs to which tribe.

In this, the International Year of the World's Indigenous People, I want to record in this place a little of the life of this proud Aboriginal woman. Kath was born Kathleen Jean Mary Rusca on 3 November 1920 on North Stradbroke Island. She attended Dunwich State School until the age of 13, when she became a domestic servant in Brisbane. She served in the Australian Women's Army in World War II. Kath married Bruce Walker, and bore two sons, Dennis and Vivien. Her first volume of verse, *We are Going*, was published in 1964. Her second volume, *The Dawn is at Hand*, followed in 1966. Kath was Queensland State Secretary of the Federal Council for the Advancement of Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders, Secretary of the Queensland State Council for the Advancement of Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders, and a member of the Queensland Aboriginal Advancement League.

Kath was a member of the delegation which met with Prime Minister Menzies prior to the 1967 referendum which amended the Australian Constitution. The constitutional amendment received a 90 per cent "yes" vote to remove any ground for the belief that the Constitution discriminated against people of the Aboriginal race. Kath has served on many more boards and committees since then. She has been an Australian delegate to the World Council of Churches Consultation on Racism in London. She has been a guest lecturer at the University of South Pacific in Fiji. She was the official Australian envoy at the

International Writers' Conference in Malaysia. She was a guest of the Papua New Guinea Government at the PNG Festival of Arts. She was the senior adviser to the Second World Black Festival of Arts in Lagos, Nigeria.

As well as all this, Kath toured China in 1985 as a member of the Australian-China Council party. In 1986, Kath was a delegate to the international forum for a nuclear-free world for the survival of humanity held in Moscow. She also lectured in New Delhi. Kath has received many awards—the Jessie Litchfield Award, the Mary Gilmour Medal, the International Acting Award and the Fellowship of Australian Writers' Award. She was also awarded an MBE by the Queen for services rendered to the Australian community. Kath returned this award to the Queen in 1988.

Kath and her son, Kabul—or Vivien—were script writers and producers for the *Rainbow Serpent*, which was a major feature of the Australian pavilion at Expo 88. In that same year, she was awarded an Honorary Doctorate of Letters from Macquarie University and in 1989, the humanities faculty at Griffith University awarded her an Honorary Doctorate. Kath also had a collection of poetry published in China. The poetry in her book, *Kath Walker in China*, had its origins in a visit to China in 1984 by Kath as part of an Australia-China Council cultural delegation.

Oodgeroo Noonuccal is a most remarkable woman and, as I said earlier, a proud Aborigine. As she said in her poem *All One Race*—

"I'm international, never mine place;
I'm for humanity, all one race."

More strength to Kath Walker, the tribal sister to the paperbark tree and member of the Noonuccal tribe of North Stradbroke Island.

Gurulmundi Toxic Waste Dump

Mr LAMING (Mooloolah) (12.06 a.m.): I rise to speak in support of the honourable members for Burnett and Western Downs. It is my task now to bring to this House a summary of the main points of another report on the apparent shortcomings of the proposed toxic waste dump at Gurulmundi. The report to which I refer is titled *Gurulmundi Secure Landfill Bentonite Assessment* by Colin Charles Graham. He is a very experienced metallurgist, who has particular skills in bentonite clay, the predominant soil type at Gurulmundi. He claims—

"The Gurulmundi toxic waste emplacement is unlikely to prove secure for a number of reasons but principally

due to the potential reaction of emplaced materials with the Bentonite and the potential escape of contaminated water in a lateral direction.”

This general statement must, of course, be related to the situation which has evolved over the last couple of years. The final impact assessment study report on the proposed Gurulmundi secure landfill states that the Gurulmundi site was selected mainly because of the extensive occurrence of bentonite for encapsulation of the toxic waste and containment of any dangerous seepage or run-off from the site. It is stated that bentonite is used worldwide in this context but refers only to the methodology adopted in the USA.

Mr Graham goes into considerable detail in his report on the various chemical compositions of the varieties of bentonite clays and its varying properties. In fact, Australia and other countries need to import industrial bentonite from north-west USA for certain applications because of the superior properties of the sodium bentonite, despite the fact that Australia has extensive deposits of calcium bentonite. As a consequence, it is unwise to make broad assumptions about the lateral extensions of bentonite quality or the permanency of original properties if the environment is altered.

It is not difficult to see where the thread of Mr Graham's report is leading the attentive reader. It is obvious that toxic waste dumps are precisely the places where one would expect to find materials being introduced which could alter the ambient acidity. Honourable members will be relieved to hear that I will spare them the detail of the various tests that Mr Graham conducted on samples from the area, but the report supports the depth and breadth of these tests. However, from the set of standard test results shown in the summary of the report, it can be seen that the clay probably has a mixed-layer crystal structure and limited dispersibility, thus making the rheological properties poor and more vulnerable to changed environmental conditions.

Only one sample showed encouraging results and, as I believe this sample represented only a minor quantity in the pit, the general rheological properties, therefore, were mediocre to poor. All fluid loss results were excessive. This property and the gelling and viscosity properties are important for the water retention and sealing needed in this application.

The recompacted density and porosity tests were carried out because of the alleged

intention to mix and recompact all clays and other materials from the Gurulmundi excavation. As expected, careful compaction is able to achieve only three-quarters of the original strata density and considerable internal voidage has been created. This creates a path for percolation of various liquids and vastly enhances the probability of leakage from the emplacements. This water could be polluted.

In response to that concern, Mr Graham decided to investigate the influence of cement and fly ash placed adjacent to bentonite, as these materials were said to be the vehicle in which the toxic wastes were absorbed and solidified. He found that the Gurulmundi bentonite is susceptible to serious deterioration after only four days. This interaction has converted poor material to very poor material in a very short time. Mr Graham concludes that although the full detail of the current design of the Gurulmundi secure landfill was not available to him, some aspects associated with the project give cause for concern.

Aspects of the bentonite clay's quality have been dealt with, and the supposition that the Gurulmundi bentonite is satisfactory water-barrier material seems flawed for a number of reasons. There seems to be ample reason for concern about the original quality of materials used for both construction and the waste-column barrier and, furthermore, an anticipation of subsequent deterioration. Equally important is the retention of toxic waste within the confines of the landfill and the need to prevent the escape of low-density organic fluids in an upward direction which will eventually reach ground water.

It is essential for this Government to ensure that there is absolutely no risk to our ground water. I believe that this report seriously challenges some of the pre-existing opinions of bentonite clays in general and the Gurulmundi clays in particular. It appears that organic chemicals, in particular, are not contained properly by traditional clay liners. At the very least, I believe that this report demands attention, concern, and re-examination. It also provides an opportunity to reassess a potentially serious and irreversible situation before it is too late. I urge the Government to take that step.

Time expired.

Citizens Electoral Council

Mr BENNETT (Gladstone) (12.11 a.m.):
Since my election to this Parliament as the

member for Gladstone, I have received correspondence from all sections of our community. Some of the requests and comments have been sensible, but I must admit that some literature I received in early July termed "Is the Anti Defamation Commission Spying on You?"—an article by the Citizens Electoral Council—disturbed me greatly because of its anti-Semitic stance. I abhor racism in our community, and I believe that the article by the CEC should be brought to the attention of this Parliament. One of the gentlemen of the Citizens Electoral Council, Mr Seales, contacted my office subsequently, stating that he would be contacting all members of Parliament who have a moral conscience and urging them to take action against the Anti Defamation Commission.

For the benefit of honourable members and for the information of this House, I will outline the background of the Anti Defamation Commission. It is a Jewish service organisation which is devoted to a range of support and charitable activities for Jews and non-Jews. It has given much assistance to those in need in this country. The Anti Defamation Commission is funded by the B'nai B'rith members to monitor and combat racism, bigotry and anti-Semitism in Australia. It is this wholly open and legal activity which has aroused the hatred of the Citizens Electoral Council.

The Australian commission has collegial links with the US Anti-defamation League, but is a totally independent organisation. Its monitoring activities are centred on racist material, including the publications of the Australian League of Rights, local neo-Nazi organisations and the Citizens Electoral Councils, among others. Its exposure of the activities of those racist groups has earned it their hatred and has made it the target of the circulated document.

An article written by Mr David Greason, who is a former journalist with the *Age*, the *Sydney Morning Herald* and the *South China Morning Post*, under the heading "The LaRouchites: Desperate and Dateless?" contains valuable information. I will read a short extract from that article, which states—

"If it weren't grotesque, it would be laughable. An extreme right organisation in the US with a well documented record of anti-Semitism, spying on private citizens, criminal activity, violence and provocation, and led by a convicted felon, colludes with its Australian wing to accuse the local Jewish community of anti-Semitism, spying on private citizens,

criminal activity, violence and provocation. They issue an unsigned document so jam packed with sloppy errors, suppositions, fantasies, anti-Jewish bigotry and outright lies that it is difficult to believe that the authors are from this planet. Then they furiously deny that they are anti-Semitic.

Welcome to the weird and less than wonderful world of Lyndon LaRouche and his Australian co-thinkers in the Citizens Electoral Councils of Australia. For the past 20 years, American political activists of all persuasions, private individuals, Jewish community organisations and media outlets have had to endure the deliberate falsifications and criminal activities of Lyndon LaRouche and his nutty followers. They believe the Queen of England pushes drugs. They believe George Bush is a satanist paedophile. They believe Henry Kissinger is a KGB agent. Most ridiculous of all, they believe that their leader, Lyndon Hermyle LaRouche, is a Statesman and a Political Prisoner. Since 1989, when LaRouche began serving a 15 year prison sentence for mail fraud and tax evasion Americans have been granted a mild reprieve from the LaRouchites' hopelessly muddled paranoid rantings. Since 1989, however, the LaRouchites have turned their attention to Australia, and now we're in for it.

A 16 page document, entitled: *Is the Anti Defamation Commission Spying on You?* was recently sent to politicians, media outlets, trade unions, police stations and others by the CEC's. Following allegations in the US that a Jewish community organisation, the Anti Defamation League of B'nai B'rith has been trading in police information, LaRouche's Australian sympathisers have taken the matter one step further, accusing Australia's totally independent Anti Defamation Commission of B'nai B'rith of similar acts."

Another article written by Madonna King, which was published in the *Australian* and which quotes a member of this Parliament, Mr Perrett, states in part—

"The CEC's federal chairman, Maurice Hetherington, agrees that the Confederate Action Party has stolen many CEC followers.

Hetherington and John Koehler, who helped organise that initial Kingaroy meeting, are co-authors of the CEC's

bible, *Sovereign Australia: An Economic Development Program to Save Our Nation*, which is based on LaRouchian teachings."

Another article by Madonna King and Tim Stevens, "Nationals to woo far-Right extremists", reports moves within elements of the Queensland National Party to merge with the Liberal Party and also attract support from the CAP. Dr Paul Reynolds, Reader in Government at the University of Queensland, warned against the CAP.

Time expired.

Griffith University

Mrs GAMIN (Burleigh) (12.16 a.m.): In the Minister for Lands' recent response to requests for assistance in the expansion of the Gold Coast campus of Griffith University, he behaved in a very cavalier fashion. He will not move from his position of requiring \$3m-plus from Griffith to expand on to Crown land. At the request of the Gold Coast Albert Regional Development Committee, I made representations to the Minister. The committee is concerned about the capacity of the Gold Coast campus of Griffith University to expand to meet the area's increased education demands. In 1989, I was involved on the periphery of the discussions that led to the absorption of the former Gold Coast College of Advanced Education into the Griffith system. The college became a campus of Griffith University. Over the past four years, it has gone from strength to strength.

From the very beginning, the college made its growth potential very clear. Now, in 1993, it is just bursting at the seams. I will quote from the letter written to me on 27 July by the Chairman of the Gold Coast Albert Regional Development Committee, which states—

"On its current site at Labrador, the university offers places to some 3,000 students and could probably expand this to 5,000. By eliminating some of its traditional university facilities, this could possibly be expanded to 8,000. But the present size of the regional population means the university should today be looking at a student population of 12,000.

The university wants to expand the campus on to land on the other side of Smith Street, currently owned by the Department of Lands and earmarked for future residential development. Negotiations by the university to acquire

this land have seen a price of \$3 million placed on it by the Department of Lands. If the university had to purchase this land because of the inadequate initial land grant by the State Government, this would significantly delay the university's building program.

The regional development committee is anxious to give strong support to the university in its negotiations with the Lands Department to acquire land for expansion of the campus. We are writing to relevant Ministers and to local schools to put the university's case, and we urge you to lend your support to the campaign in whatever way possible."

I responded quickly to this request and, on 13 August, I wrote to both Ministers for Lands and Education. The latter Minister has so far only acknowledged the correspondence. I have yet to see his response. However, the Minister for Lands has written at great length telling me why he would prefer to see the land in question developed as residential blocks. The sum of \$3m probably would not be enough for the Minister, anyway. There is a saying around the traps that the Lands Dept has cash registers for eyeballs, and the Minister's letter bears this out.

I will quote from the Minister's letter of 25 August, which was no doubt drafted by his departmental officers. The letter states—

"Should the university acquire the site the Crown is entitled to seek a return of the full market value of the land parcel, plus a pro-rata contribution to infrastructure costs already expended by my department. Whilst a recent valuation of the site has not been undertaken, previous information indicates that a sum in excess of \$3 million would not be an unreasonable guide in considering the site's value, with an up-to-date valuation being a pre-requisite to enable consideration of the full financial implications of this matter."

The Minister goes on to say that, having weighed all the competing interests for the site, he is still prepared to offer the university the purchase of the 23 hectares in question, which will doubtless have a detrimental effect on his department's future residential development in the area. He says that he is not prepared to allocate the land to the university at no cost. It is just as I said—cash registers for eyeballs.

I ask: what is more important—the expansion of the Gold Coast campus to its full potential, or the Minister for Lands and his department continuing to act as developers by using up land for housing when it is so necessary for the expansion of the university? I look forward to the reply from the Minister for Education, but I would like to take a bet that his department does not have the guts to take on Lands. This is clearly a case for Minister-to-Minister negotiations and, if necessary, a Cabinet decision and directive. The future welfare of tertiary students in south-east Queensland should surely transcend the power plays of the Department of Lands.

Willawong and Gurulmundi Toxic Waste Dumps

Mr ARDILL (Archerfield) (12.20 a.m.): I expected to have quite a bit of refuting to do after the speech by the member for Mooloolah, but I have found very little to answer in what he had to say for the simple reason that the member for Mooloolah was sold a pup. The speech that he read out bears little resemblance to the facts in relation to Gurulmundi. The information that was provided was mainly a heap of gobbledegook and had no scientific basis in fact whatsoever. It has already been refuted, and I believe that the members of the National Party are well aware of the fact that it has been refuted.

The details that were given are not scientific details at all. They are a lot of words that have very little meaning. The bentonite that will be used as the agent to hold the pesticides, solvents and paints that come out of Willawong will not come out of the pit at all. It will certainly come from the area at Gurulmundi, and there are a number of bentonite deposits in the vicinity of Gurulmundi. It is not as stated by the member for Mooloolah, and I am sorry to hear him using words that obviously were not his and of which he has very little knowledge.

Members of the Opposition are very offhand about the people of Willawong and their rights. In seeking to delay the operation of the Gurulmundi toxic waste disposal site, they show their disdain for those people. They are pinning their hopes on an untried process. The ecologic process has not been proven. Not one plant has been built. It is still before the American Environmental Protection Agency authorities, and there is no guarantee that the process will successfully deal with the type of waste from Willawong.

Those industrial compounds are not the same as those now being processed in the

tests being conducted in the USA. The EPA tests are being carried out on polychlorinated biphenyls, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and dioxins, which are used in pesticides. The company's hand-out clearly indicates that. It would be at least 1996 before the ecologic process could be up and running, even if it were given approval right now.

What would be the situation at Willawong? As we all know, Willawong was declared to be at the end of its capacity 10 years ago, and the National Party did nothing about it. It knew for a previous decade before that that a severe problem existed there and did nothing about it. The situation cannot be allowed to continue one day longer than is absolutely necessary. Honourable members would agree with me.

We have heard a lot today about the possibility of toxic substances permeating ground water. In Brisbane, a huge underground water reservoir has been used by small crop farmers and fruit growers in the fertile red soil areas of south-east Queensland for most of this century. Willawong is in the middle of a huge sand deposit, which constitutes the lower section of Oxley Creek Valley and which has been commercially exploited for decades. When the situation at Willawong is considered, the claim that Gurulmundi is a permeable site is laughable. The Labor Government would not have considered Gurulmundi as the solid disposal site if there had been a remote chance of impregnating the Great Artesian Basin.

I have been to Gurulmundi and I have enjoyed the hospitality of local people. I am convinced that there is no risk within the bounds of evidence of possibilities. What will be encapsulated in the huge disposal area is the result of separation of materials such as paints, solvents and pesticides from liquids. It will then be encased in bentonite clay, dried out and conveyed in secure containers to the disposal site. It will be placed in the huge excavation at the highest point for kilometres around inside a pliable, secure liner in stable, clay-based soil. There is no opportunity for flooding of the site.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.26 a.m. (Wednesday).