

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 29 AUGUST 1985

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 29 AUGUST 1985

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

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

Third-party Insurance Premiums

From Mr Wilson (503 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will revoke recent increases in third-party insurance and ensure future increases are determined after public hearing.

[Similar petitions were received from Mr Prest (501 signatories), Mr Braddy (502 signatories), Mr McElligott (467 signatories), Mr McLean (500 signatories), Mr Veivers (446 signatories), Mr Vaughan (516 signatories), Mr Goss (534 signatories) and Mr Eaton (491 signatories).]

Petitions received.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN having given notice of a motion—

Mr **WARBURTON**: I rise to a point of order. The Premier and Treasurer has given notice of a motion, which will appear on the Business Paper tomorrow. Is that privilege extended to me also at this stage, or do I have to wait for "any other business"? Is that privilege extended to me?

Mr **SPEAKER**: Order! The privilege of doing so will be extended to the honourable member when I call for "any other business"

PAPER

The following paper was laid on the table—

Order in Council under the Irrigation Act 1922-1983 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**Aussat Satellite; Q-Net**

Hon. L. W. POWELL (Isis—Minister for Education) (11.3 a.m.), by leave: I draw the attention of honourable members to a range of exciting initiatives within the Education portfolio to utilise the tremendous potential of the Aussat satellite. I am proud to say that Queensland schools, colleges and universities have planned an impressive array of trials of the educational potential of the satellite and its associated high-technology equipment. These trials will form a large part of the more comprehensive State Government pilot use of the satellite known as Q-Net which, of course, is in the capable hands of my colleague the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern).

Because the Queensland Government is the only State Government to lease a transponder, our educational institutions and students will have an unparalleled opportunity to lead Australia into a new era. While the other State education systems are still thinking about how they will respond to the availability of the satellite, Queensland, through foresight, planning and a high level of co-operation between all sections of the education portfolio, has acted to provide outstanding educational services to Queenslanders, particularly those living in remote areas.

Queensland will be responsible for implementing Australia's first trials of educational applications of satellite technology. The best known of these trials is the Mount Isa

School of the Air distance education trial for 1986. A Year 6 class of eight students will be linked with their teacher in Mount Isa and will also view a regular television program transmitted from the Brisbane studios of the Department of Education. In addition, the satellite network will carry computer data between the students and their teacher.

Other trials planned involve almost every level of the educational spectrum. Among them is the Education Department's Technical and Further Education Division's planned use of the satellite to encourage further study and to present structured TAFE programs leading to some form of certification. The Department of Education's extensive film library also plans to transmit entire programs direct to schools.

The Darling Downs and Capricornia Colleges of Advanced Education intend transferring, to the satellite for trial, existing land-based communications systems, such as telephone tutorials, for their off-campus students.

The James Cook University in Townsville and the University of Queensland also have planned a wide variety of trials, one of which will involve the exchange of information between computers at the University of Queensland Prentice Computer Centre and computers at the Townsville campus. The University of Queensland will also focus on professional development and support as well as extend services for its external students.

The Aussat satellite is one of the most exciting developments in distance education in the world. The people of Queensland can be justifiably proud of the leadership and initiative shown by their State Government. My department has prepared a document outlining the many trials of the educational potential of the satellite. For the information of honourable members, I lay upon the table of the House the document *Education and the Satellite*.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the document on the table.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I rise to a point of order. Does the Minister intend moving that his statement be noted so that the matter may be debated? He has claimed that it is a project totally funded by the Queensland Government. Quite frankly, it exists because of the Commonwealth Labor Government policy.

Mr POWELL: Mr Speaker, I see no sense in that at all.

Industrial Action by Liquor Trades Union

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs) (11.8 a.m.), by leave: I was appalled to read in this morning's press about the unruly action being taken by the Liquor Trades Union against a number of hotels and motels in Queensland. This is nothing short of industrial thuggery by power-hungry union officials who have little respect for the members whom they supposedly represent. What right does a union executive have to dictate to members on whether they should or should not work? After all, the unions claim that they operate in a democratic manner. Surely that gives each member the right to decide on his or her right to work.

The Queensland Government will not stand by and allow this union, or any other union, to employ such ruthless tactics, which will only lead to further hardship for the innocent workers who chose to exercise their right to work and their freedom of choice. The Government will actively support the businesses affected by such bans and encourage the employers to take legal action under the Industrial (Commercial Practices) Act and the Trade Practices Act. It is the Government's opinion that they are taking part in a secondary boycott. Meetings have already been held to take the necessary action.

The public of Queensland have just about had all they can take from the militant sections of the union movement, and this can be clearly demonstrated by the poor turnout in last week's so-called mass demonstration in support of those SEQEB workers who

walked out of their jobs and ignored their responsibilities in an essential service. When the entire union movement in Queensland can muster support from only about 20 000 of its 450 000 members—about 5 per cent—it goes to show that the issue is dead. Further, I have been reliably informed that even ETU members themselves of their own accord refused to take part in last week's stop-work meetings and remained on the job. In the words of *Monty Python*, "This is an ex-dispute."

Review of Fire Services by Internal Operational Audit Service

Hon. M. J. TENNI (Barron River—Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services) (11.11 a.m.), by leave: I refer to the statement yesterday by the honourable member for Townsville West (Mr Smith) on alleged shortcomings of the fire services in this State. In the unlikely event that his allegations will gain some credence outside the small group of greedy union officials who supplied his information out of self-interest, I wish to place certain facts before the House.

It is true that the Government is engaged in a review of the efficiency and effectiveness of the fire brigade service in this State. I am personally directing this review on behalf of the tax-payers and the public of this State, and, to remove any possibility of allegations of witch-hunting, the review is being conducted by the Internal Operational Audit Service, over whom I have no jurisdiction.

Mr De Lacy: Tell them about the Federal Government hand-out.

Mr TENNI: If the honourable member will wait a minute, he will hear all about that.

The honourable member for Townsville West claims that the number of full-time professional fire-fighters has been cut drastically. This is not correct. In fact, the number has increased each year for many years and this growth will continue. For the information of the honourable member for Townsville West, I point out that in the Estimates this year I have applied for another 24.

The honourable member talks of a petition presented on behalf of 6 000 professional fire-fighters. Is the honourable member aware that there are under 1 900 full-time firemen in this State?

The honourable member talks of low morale. I talk to more firemen about their problems and aspirations than any other person in Queensland, and I refute that assertion. Perhaps if the honourable member's sources within the union would get out more and talk to their members, as I do, they would discover that the overwhelming feeling amongst the men is that the current review is long overdue. Or do these officials have other motives?

The condition of all equipment used by firemen is a matter of concern to me, and I note the honourable member's comments in regard to appliances used by the Metropolitan Fire Brigade. I caution him, however, about accepting information from union officials without independently checking out that information. The responsibility for maintenance of this equipment rests with the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board. Discharge of this responsibility has been the subject of a report to me by the Internal Operational Audit Service. As a result, I have requested an inspection of appliances by the Government Motor Garage, and I am awaiting the result of that inspection. I am informed that all fire appliances carry a current roadworthiness certificate.

It is also my intention to request that the brigade review its maintenance schedules to ensure that normal wear and tear is dealt with more effectively. I believe it is a false economy to rely on the purchase of new vehicles as a substitute for effective maintenance.

I thank the honourable member for his mock concern in shifting the responsibility for the state of our fire services from me to the Government generally. Once again, the honourable member has not got his facts right, as it is now over two years that I have been the Minister responsible. Perhaps the union officials on whom he relies for information think that my time in office has been more like 20 years.

The time is long overdue when the Australian Labor Party should put its sincerity about fire protection in this State on the line. I am yet to hear from one member of the Opposition about the miserable contribution that the Federal Government makes to the running of our urban fire services.

I remind this House that this year the State Government will make a direct contribution of \$8,387,200 to the fire budget to cover State Government property. The Federal Government is expected to put in the paltry sum of \$566,000 maximum to cover Commonwealth property in Queensland.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr GOSS (Salisbury) (11.15 a.m.), by leave: I wish to correct the misrepresentation of a statement that I made that appeared in one media outlet over the week-end to the effect that I said that Mr Hinze had attended meetings of the board of the TAB at least twice to ask for the licence. Because of the seriousness of this matter I want to correct that account so that what I said is clearly understood. What I did was invite Mr Hinze to deny the allegation passed to me by my source, which was to the effect that he had been to a board meeting at least twice and argued that his family company should not be punished because he is a Minister and should therefore be granted the licence. Let the record show that the Minister has not been prepared to deny that allegation in Parliament.

With a view to any doubt being resolved, I give notice that I am now exploring avenues—and I invite the Government to consider this carefully—of obtaining a statement on oath, by subpoena, declaration or other means, from board members. If the Government will not act in relation to this Minister after all that has happened, the people of Queensland will know that it is because they are all in it up to their armpits.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

Questions submitted on notice were answered as follows—

1. **Totalisator Administration Board Agencies and Subagencies**

Mr WARBURTON asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing—

With reference to his answer to my question on 28 August in which he seemed to admit that, during the chairmanship of either Sir Edward Lyons or Mr Ian Callinan, probably that of Sir Edward Lyons, he did in fact approve some of the agencies that were recommended by the Totalisator Administration Board—

(1) Is it not fair for me to suggest to him that he was very knowledgeable about his responsibilities under the Racing and Betting Act because he had in fact approved some of the agencies?

(2) How does that suggestion sit with the statement that he has been reported as making that, when the Junefair application was made, he had no knowledge of the fact that he had to give final approval to the establishment of the agency?

(3) By admitting that he was aware of the provisions of the Act, does that not make his later statement somewhat ridiculous?

Answer—

(1 to 3) I have always been aware of my responsibilities as Minister under the Racing and Betting Act. As my reply yesterday showed, I did, in fact, approve some of the agencies. Others I did not approve, as the board, under the then chairman of the TAB, did not refer those to me. I could only fulfil my responsibilities under the Racing and Betting Act if the board, under that chairman, referred to me matters requiring my ministerial attention. When and where those matters were referred, they were dealt with appropriately.

My concerns about this lack of referral by the former chairman of the TAB were communicated to the TAB on a number of occasions. For example, at one of the board meetings to which the honourable member has just referred—

Mr Goss: So you did go to board meetings?

Mr HINZE: Listen! There would not be anything wrong with the Minister for Racing having discussions with his own board. If the honourable member wants to stretch his imagination, he can go right ahead and stretch it, but he would have to be stupid if he did.

Mr Burns: It depends on what you asked them.

Mr HINZE: Well, OK. They either came to my room at the TAB or I went to theirs. There is nothing wrong with that. I am not hiding anything there.

Answer (continued)—

For example, the TAB board minutes of 9 April 1984 record my wish—it is recorded—that I be informed of the opening and closing of TAB agencies. Despite that official request for appropriate referral of matters concerning the opening and closing of agencies, which required my ministerial attention, no change of policy by the then chairman was initiated. The current chairman of the TAB has demonstrated a completely different attitude. All matters now requiring my ministerial attention are referred so that the provisions of the Racing and Betting Act are complied with.

2. Totalisator Administration Board Agencies and Subagencies

Mr **WARBURTON** asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing—

With reference to the alleged anomalies that have appeared in relation to approvals by the Totalisator Administration Board of TAB licences—

(1) What action does he intend to take to rectify this sorry mess?

(2) Will he immediately investigate and inform this House of the reason why so many board recommendations were not submitted to him for final approval as required by law?

Answer—

(1 & 2) See answer to question No. 1.

Mr BURNS: Questions 3 and 4 standing in my name to the Minister have been transposed. Question 4 should be first, followed by question 3.

Mr SPEAKER: Will the Minister please answer question 4 first, as there has been a mistake?

Mr HINZE: I have the answer to question 3; I have the answers combined. Could I answer both questions together?

Mr SPEAKER: Yes.

3. Totalisator Administration Board Agencies and Subagencies

Mr **BURNS** asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing—

With reference to his answer to the earlier question as to whether or not he personally told or attempted to influence the TAB not to proceed with the Frith application—

Did he at any time use any intermediary or agent to tell the chairman, general manager or other member of the board not to proceed with the Frith application?

Answer—

The TAB memorandum tabled in this House yesterday by the honourable member for Salisbury indicates that, but the matter should be placed in context and in sequence.

The Chief Executive Officer of the Racing Branch of the Department of Local Government communicated to the general manager of the TAB my wish that no TAB operations commence in the Oxenford area at that time. That time was, of course, early 1981, as that memorandum states—a full two and a half years before my family company, Junefair, was thought of. Junefair Pty Ltd purchased the Oxenford Tavern at a public auction on 3 August 1983, after spirited bidding in an open forum.

To try to suggest any sinister motive indicating a potential conflict of interest in early 1981 involving the Friths' application and my family company's subsequent application is clearly absurd. I can only state categorically that, at the time of the events under discussion, I had no way of establishing a hotel at Oxenford, either with or without a TAB agency.

My wishes in early 1981 with respect to the TAB operations in the Oxenford area were prompted by other, what I believe to be, perfectly legitimate reasons. I did not believe at that time that there was need for an agency in the area. I have some knowledge of the area; I have lived there all my life.

Mr Goss: And extensive property interests.

Mr HINZE: I must refer to the interjection. I have extensive property interests, brought about by damned hard work by my family. The honourable member can live at Salisbury all his life. He will end up with nothing and he will want to share it with the world.

Mr Burns: We won't be giving ourselves a TAB licence, either.

Mr HINZE: Well, the honourable member would not want——

Mr Goss interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Salisbury has said enough.

Answer (continued)—

To try to suggest any sinister motive indicating a potential conflict of interest in early 1981 involving the Friths' application and my family company's subsequent application is clearly absurd. I can only state categorically that, at the time of the events under discussion, I had no way of establishing a hotel at Oxenford, either with or without a TAB agency.

My wishes in early 1981 with respect to the TAB operations in the Oxenford area were prompted by other perfectly legitimate reasons. I did not believe at the time that there was need for an agency in the area. My personal knowledge of the area was the basis for that belief.

Furthermore, I do not consider it unreasonable, and certainly not a matter of political interference, for the Minister ultimately responsible for the administration of racing throughout the State, including the approval of the siting of TAB agencies, to convey to the organisation responsible for the issue of TAB agency licences his views about the establishment of agencies. This particularly applies to an area about which he has an intimate knowledge. I took that action in early 1981 in an endeavour to ensure that an agency in that area was not established prematurely and to control, what I had a reasonable belief to be, an attempt to trade for personal profit a TAB agency.

I had been given information at that time about the Friths. There is a history showing that they bought and sold properties at Labrador. They bought and sold the

agency, the one to which the honourable member is now referring, the one for which application has been made. That has already been sold, by lease.

Mr Goss: So what?

Mr HINZE: OK, that is what the honourable member says. Apparently he believes that it is legitimate to buy and sell agencies. Frankly, I do not think that this House agrees with that.

Answer (continued)—

I had been informed at that time that the Friths had their newsagency up for sale and that they were endeavouring to enhance the sale value of the property by obtaining a TAB licence.

I have nothing against the Friths; I want to make that quite clear. Yesterday, when somebody called on Mrs Frith and asked, "Did you make application for a TAB licence in the post office?", she said, "Yes, of course I did. But I have got no chance; I am only doing this to keep the pot boiling." Next, she said, "Have a look at the joint. It is only ten by eight. You could not swing a decent sized cat in the room." That is the post office. Telecom, of course, comes under the control of one of the Opposition's colleagues, a Federal Labor Minister. Opposition members should find out whether Telecom ever grants an agency to a post office.

Mr Burns: You're a gentleman, you are, attacking an old lady.

Mr HINZE: I am not attacking a little old lady. The honourable member knows the whole sequence of these events as well as I do.

Answer (continued)—

The records show the TAB itself independently agreed with my view and did not believe in early 1981 that an agency was required in that area. Indeed, the TAB did not believe until February 1985 that there was justification for a TAB agency in the area. It was a matter for the board itself to determine the needs of the TAB and this the board did after a comprehensive survey of the area was undertaken following a board decision in January 1985.

It should be remembered that the chairman of the TAB during this whole period was the former chairman (Sir Edward Lyons). Under Sir Edward's chairmanship and administration, the TAB made its own decisions about the need for agencies. Under the new chairman, that will continue to be its role, with appropriate referral to me as required by the Racing and Betting Act.

I stress that it is the board that makes these decisions, not officers of the organisation. The allegations brought against me depend entirely upon statements made in internal TAB memorandums by officers of the TAB, one of whom grossly exceeded his level of responsibility and authority by pre-empting the proper function of the board.

Until the honourable member for Salisbury tabled the memorandum yesterday, I was unaware of its existence. I was rather amused about the whole affair when the honourable member for Salisbury said, "Resign, resign, resign!" Even that was not original. He thieved it from Peacock who said that to the honourable member's mate Hawke. That is where he got it from.

But let us go to the famous document that the honourable member produced. He held it up and said, "This is one that I have been waiting for." I say to the House now that that was the document that I was waiting for. I could not nail it on him until he tabled it yesterday. The initials on the top of the document are "E.H.L." Who put them there? What do they stand for? Where did he get it from? I know that the honourable member returned the original, and I also know that the copies have been destroyed.

The other day, when I tabled the documents, I asked the honourable member—because he is a law man—to be at least honest. A serious charge has been laid against

me. I asked the honourable member, "Will you please apologise and withdraw your statements while I prove to the House that I have not misled the House and that there is no conflict of interest?" I say now quite categorically that I cannot produce those documents because, at the instruction of the former TAB chairman, they have been destroyed.

Mr Goss: Why didn't Mr Harriott tell you he signed it?

Government Members: Resign!

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Goss: Answer this question——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is on his feet giving an answer.

Mr Goss: Does Mr Harriott deny——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Salisbury that he cannot insist on making the Minister answer as the honourable member wishes. The honourable member will let the Minister answer the question that has been put to him and perhaps we will see what can be done later on.

Mr HINZE: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your protection from this unruly mob.

Answer (continued)——

I am informed by the chairman of the TAB that this document does not appear on any official TAB file. Following my inquiry to him, the chairman informed me yesterday by letter of the reason for this.

My letter, dated yesterday, to the chairman reads——

"The Member for Salisbury, Mr Wayne Goss——"

I do not know whether he has any letters after his name——

"today tabled in State Parliament, a Memorandum from the General Manager of the T.A.B., Mr C. Harriott, to the then Chairman of the Board, Sir Edward Lyons. A copy is attached.

Could you please ascertain, as a matter of urgency, if a copy of this Memorandum appears on Board files. I would be grateful if you could advise also if any reply from the then Chairman to this Memorandum appears on Board files. If a document in reply exists, I would appreciate a copy.

Should the attached Memorandum not appear on Board files, I would appreciate, also as a matter of urgency, some explanation for this omission.

Your written advice is required so that I might respond to Questions in Parliament tomorrow (Thursday, 29 August, 1985)."

Mr Callinan's reply, in full, also dated yesterday, reads——

"I have asked the General Manager of the Board, Mr Harriott, to furnish me with a copy of the File of the Board relating to the possible provision of an Agency or Sub-agency in the Oxenford district. You today wrote to me asking me to ascertain as a matter of urgency, if a copy of a Memorandum which you furnished to me appears on the Board Files. The Memorandum which you enclosed in your letter was dated the Eighteenth day of April 1984, was apparently signed by Mr Harriott, and was addressed to the Chairman of the Board at that time.

Among other things the Memorandum states that it was after a visit by Mr and Mrs Frith to see the Minister (early 1981) that Mr Wade told Mr Harriott that the Minister did not want the Board to proceed with any plans to commence operations in the Oxenford area at that time. I merely refer to part of the Memorandum to ensure that I have identified it correctly.

I could not find a copy of such a Memorandum anywhere on the relevant file. I asked Mr Harriott, the General Manager, to check the file, and he has informed me that there is no such Memorandum upon it. Moreover I am able to advise you that there is no document in reply to the Memorandum. You will appreciate that the period to which the Memorandum relates precedes my appointment as Chairman of the Board. I have no personal knowledge therefore of anything that was done at that time, but I have of course made enquiries of, and have been informed by, Mr Harriott, that he did in fact write such a Memorandum but did not receive any reply to it from the Chairman at the time.

I specifically questioned Mr Harriott on the contents of the Memorandum whether to the best of his recollection it accurately stated the facts so far as he was aware of them. He informed me that the Memorandum is accurate.

You asked for an explanation why the Memorandum does not appear on Board files? Mr Harriott informs me that he cannot recollect why in particular this Memorandum, or a copy of it, is not on the Board Files, but he does say that on some occasions when he wrote Memoranda to the Chairman at that time, the Chairman asked him to destroy any copies of them—”

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HINZE: I think the honourable member should listen.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have asked the member for Lytton not to try to push words into the Minister's mouth. I warn the honourable member.

Mr HINZE: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for stopping that naughty boy. He is becoming nasty. I will have to go back over it again.

Answer (continued)—

“You asked for an explanation why the Memorandum does not appear on Board files? Mr Harriott informs me that he cannot recollect why in particular this Memorandum, or a copy of it, is not on the Board Files, but he does say that on some occasions when he wrote Memoranda to the Chairman at that time, the Chairman asked him to destroy any copies of them. Mr Harriott has no specific recollection of having destroyed a copy of this, the relevant Memorandum.”

I pose the question: Why would anybody want to destroy any copies?

The honourable member for Salisbury knew that when he read it, but he did not read the part that provided the key. He deliberately left it out. However, I will read it for him.

Mr Goss interjected.

Mr HINZE: The honourable member read the part that satisfied him.

Answer (continued)—

I refer honourable members to the last paragraph of that memorandum, which contains the following words from Harriott—

“I am sure that I would not have taken this action without a direction from you.”

Mr Goss interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Answer (continued)—

That, of course, indicates that the general manager, on his own admission, believes that when the acting operations manager of the TAB wrote on a memorandum dated 7

July 1982, also tabled in this House by the honourable member for Salisbury, the words, "G.M. says not to go ahead", the acting operations manager was acting on a direction of the general manager, who, in turn, was acting on a direction of the then chairman.

Mr Goss interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Goss: Let us have the board members before the Bar of the House.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Salisbury under Standing Order No. 123A for his persistent interjections. I warned him twice before. I do not intend to warn him again.

Mr HINZE: What a fool the honourable member must feel. First, he waited for one week. He told the House that the document was the one that he was waiting for. He has exposed to the world where he obtained his information. It could come from only one source. It is the only original in existence. All the copies have been destroyed.

The honourable member for Salisbury, by tabling that memorandum yesterday, was providing the answer to his own allegations of political interference. If there was any interference in blocking the Frith's application, it was by the then chairman. The memorandum tabled yesterday cannot be interpreted in any other way.

Inasmuch as only the original of the memorandum tabled yesterday by the honourable member for Salisbury appears to have existed, honourable members should be able to draw the reasonable conclusion as to where the honourable member for Salisbury has been obtaining his information. Why did he not come out and tell honourable members where he obtained it? Why is he not honest? He blamed me for being dishonest. Why does he not sing it out from the rooftops? I challenge the member for Salisbury: Does he not have the intestinal fortitude to tell us where he obtained his documents?

Mr GOSS: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, I have not responded to that challenge because of your previous warning and out of respect for your warning. As I have been warned under Standing Order No. 123A, I ask: Does that warning still apply and prevent me from responding to the Minister's challenge?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! As far as I am concerned, I have been very lenient with all honourable members.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Not on this side of the House, you haven't.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr R. J. Gibbs: What about that side?

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr R. J. Gibbs: That's what I expected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Wolston under Standing Order No. 123A. As I said earlier, I have been lenient with the honourable member for Salisbury, simply because he asked the question; he laid the charges. I believe that he should have that right to a certain extent. In this Chamber, I will continue to extend that leniency to honourable members if they ask a question. However, I believe that the honourable member has been too persistent. I said before and I say again: the Minister should be heard in silence. There are other avenues to which the honourable member can resort to reply to the Minister, if necessary. However, he is holding up the business of the House. I have warned the honourable member under Standing Order 123A. I will not take any more persistent interjections from him.

Answer (continued)—

The memorandum tabled yesterday, which was dated 18 April 1984, outlined the sequence of events to that date. It clearly shows my only involvement as Minister by way of an intermediary was in early 1981, which was, I repeat again, two and a half years before the purchase of the Oxenford Tavern. I repeat also that at that time the company was not even formed.

Mr GOSS: I rise to a point of order. In response to the Minister's challenge, I seek leave to make a personal explanation on the matters that he mentioned concerning me.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr GOSS (Salisbury) (11.40 a.m.), by leave: The Minister said that I did not present to the House what he regards as the most important part of the document, that is, the last paragraph. Not only did I table the whole document—including that paragraph—but I also made reference to it in my speech. I believe that it is up to the general manager, the chairman or the Minister to actually respond to that.

Regarding the Minister's admission that that direction was given in 1981—let the record show that it was after Mr and Mrs Frith saw him. Mr and Mrs Frith were not told; and in that deceit, in that instruction that was hidden from Mr and Mrs Frith, lies the badge of guilt.

Mr HINZE: The honourable member for Salisbury has been exposed for what he is—a sham!

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

4. Totalisator Administration Board Agencies and Subagencies

Mr BURNS asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing—

Did he, at any time during his period as Minister for Racing, personally tell or attempt to influence the chairman of the Totalisator Administration Board, the general manager, or any member of the board, not to proceed with a TAB agency in the Oxenford area?

Answer—

It is my honest belief that at no time did I personally tell or attempt to influence the chairman of the TAB, the general manager of the TAB or any member of the TAB board not to proceed with a TAB agency in the Oxenford area.

5. Sugar Industry Report

Mr CASEY asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

With reference to the fact that he has now had almost two weeks to study the report of the 100-day working committee into the sugar industry, as the main thrust of both the terms of reference to the committee and their report revolves around the need to restructure the sugar industry which is solely under the legislative control of the Government of Queensland, as the committee was Queensland controlled, Queensland chaired and all about a Queensland industry, and as time is fast running out for many Queensland cane-growers—

What action has he taken to date, other than misguidedly bleating about the Commonwealth Government, towards examining sugar industry legislation to see what sort of restructuring can be undertaken in order to implement the Savage committee recommendations in that area, thus allowing the Commonwealth to get on with its commitment to provide short-term funds for the industry which will save livelihoods both within the industry and Queensland sugar towns?

Answer—

I have deliberately refrained from commenting on or criticising the Savage report, because the Government believes that it is vital that industry reaction be obtained before entering into discussions with the Commonwealth Government.

The honourable member's question implies that we should immediately implement the working party's recommendations so that the Commonwealth can get on with its commitment to provide funds to rescue farmers and millers whose viability is at risk. That comment suggests to me that the honourable member has not bothered to read the report. The fact is that, if by chance the price for No. 1 Pool sugar averaged \$220 per tonne in the 1985 season, not one cent of price support money would be allocated by the Commonwealth Government to growers. Even if the 1985 price falls below the \$220 per tonne, it would not be until July 1986 that Commonwealth funds would be provided to bring the price up to the \$220.

While on the subject of the level of price support—I have noted that the recommended price support level of \$220 per tonne in 1985 covers cash operating costs, including growers' own labour, of only 43 per cent of growers and 60 per cent of production. The recommended levels of \$215 per tonne for 1986 and \$210 per tonne for 1987 cover only 37 per cent of growers (51 per cent of production) and 34 per cent of growers (49 per cent of production) respectively. I realise that the industry is concerned about the adequacy of these levels, and the Government will be looking for a specific response from it on that matter when it conveys its views to us.

The honourable member has emphasised that the industry is Queensland-based and under Queensland's legislative control. I emphasise that although the industry is one of the State's great rural industries, it should not be overlooked that it makes a major contribution to the national economy that indirectly benefits Australia as a whole. As an indication of that, I cite the value of raw sugar exports in recent years. In 1981-82, they were worth close to \$800m and in 1983-84 the value was \$636m. This represents a major contribution to Australia's export income at a time when the balance of trade is not running in Australia's favour. I point out also that an industry study has shown that over \$4 billion worth of national output was associated with the sugar industry and the other businesses that depend on the sugar industry.

When it comes to taxation of the returns earned by the industry and by related businesses, it is, of course, the Commonwealth Government which is the recipient of these taxation receipts. Quite apart from the massive revenues that the Commonwealth Government derives from income taxation of farmers, millers and related business firms, the Commonwealth gets \$80m per annum from excise and sales tax on spirit sales alone. In spite of that, the Commonwealth expects Queensland to contribute 50 per cent of the cost of price support when it put very little demand on the New South Wales and South Australian Governments at the time when the steel and car industries were being rescued.

Mr De Lacy: Where is the other \$620m coming from?

Mr TURNER: Doesn't the honourable member want to hear the answer? Does it hurt?

Mr De Lacy: I just want you to justify the figures you are throwing about.

Mr TURNER: I cannot help it if the honourable member's shoes are pinching. He should listen to the answer.

Answer (continued)—

BHP was assisted to the extent of \$358m and the car industry in South Australia received approximately \$150m in assistance.

Before specific action on the working party's report can be contemplated, I consider it essential that the industry's response to the report be obtained. I remind the honourable

member that the recommendations of the working party are far-reaching in their scope. It is quite unrealistic to expect a quick response from the industry. Both millers and growers need time to consider the full implications of the proposed changes thoroughly. I understand that the Queensland Cane Growers Council is holding its annual general meeting in Brisbane between 2 and 6 September.

I am prepared to meet my Federal counterpart, Mr John Kerin, at any time and, as he will be in Brisbane on 3 September, I will hold discussions with him on that date.

Mr Kruger interjected.

Mr TURNER: Does the honourable member know sugar-cane from shallots?

Answer (continued)—

Further meetings are likely to be required. Mr Kerin himself has agreed that informed comment should be obtained from the industry. Before we hold further meetings, that is precisely what we will be doing.

Mr SPEAKER: I call the honourable member for Woodridge.

Mr CASEY: Mr Speaker, I ask question No. 5. The Minister has not yet answered it. The question referred to the Government's program for restructuring the sugar industry. The Minister's answer did not mention a word about it. He walked right away from it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Did the honourable member for Mackay rise on a point of order?

Mr CASEY: I asked the question standing in my name. It has not yet been answered.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

6. Unemployed Youth Problems, Logan City

Mr D'ARCY asked the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs—

With reference to the fact that it is estimated that there are 150 to 200 homeless youths living in the streets of Logan city, that there is an alarming level of youth unemployment and that a special effort is needed to provide emergency accommodation, youth counselling and recreational activities, and as this is the International Youth Year—

(1) Will his department set up a special investigation of the youth problems in Logan city and quickly implement its findings?

(2) Will he also outline what has been done by his department to date, particularly in the area of grants that may have been made available to organisations within Logan city to help with some of these problems?

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen: Mr Casey stood up at the wrong time.

Mr MUNTZ: I guarantee that the member for Mackay will stand up next time *God Save The Queen* is played. After next Wednesday, he will know all about it.

Answer—

(1 & 2) I am aware of the situation in Logan city. There is no need for a special investigation into youth problems in the area as suggested by the honourable member. Much of the blame for the current situation can be attributed to the Federal Government's economic policies, high taxation and lack of concern for the family.

My officers advise that the number of homeless youth quoted by the honourable member is an exaggeration. Although a considerable number of youths in the area have left their parental homes, departmental officers are actively working with them either to reunite them with their families or to find suitable alternative accommodation for them.

In addition, we are working closely with non-government organisations in the area which are providing services for youth and, in particular, with the Logan City Youth and Family Service.

Other positive steps being taken by the department to alleviate the situation include—

Grants to community organisations providing accommodation and related support services for homeless youth. A grant of \$58,300 was made to the Logan City Youth and Family Service to employ two youth workers. Part of the grant was allocated specifically to place homeless youth with families within the Logan community. The Commonwealth Government refused to fund this latter program.

A grant to the Logan City Youth Activity Committee to assist homeless, unemployed and alienated youth.

The establishment of a YESS centre at Beenleigh. This centre, together with the one at Salisbury, is paying particular attention to the Logan area in providing employment assistance to disadvantaged youth.

A Youth Unemployment Program is being undertaken in the Beenleigh/Logan area. The program provides practical assistance and support to participants to improve their self-confidence and self-esteem, and seeks to enhance their opportunities of finding employment.

The appointment of a recreation adviser to assist with the provision of recreation services in the Logan area.

I add that the Department of Children's Services has two offices located in the Logan city area, with a total of 15 professional staff.

I emphasise again, however, that the problems of youth homelessness and high unemployment can only be overcome by an economic upturn and the return of business confidence. This, of course, means a change of Government in Canberra.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Sir Edward Lyons; Membership of Secondary Mortgage Market Board

Mr Warburton: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I point out that he has consistently refused to remove Sir Edward Lyons from his position on Queensland's Secondary Mortgage Market Board, no doubt because of the Premier and Treasurer's close association with that man. In view of answers by the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) to questions today in which he, as one of the Government's Ministers, said that Sir Edward Lyons kept Totalisator Administration Board subagency approvals from him and that Sir Edward Lyons did not comply with the provisions of the Racing and Betting Act, and as the Minister as much as said that Sir Edward Lyons is a crook, I put it to the Premier and Treasurer that he must do something about one of them—either Mr Hinze or Sir Edward Lyons. I now ask: When will the Premier and Treasurer, in the interests of propriety, remove Sir Edward Lyons from his position on the Secondary Mortgage Market Board?

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen: I certainly do not intend to allow the Leader of the Opposition to be judge and jury on this or any other question, and that includes questions about Sir Edward Lyons. I have indicated clearly to the House that Sir Edward Lyons is staying on the Secondary Mortgage Market Board.

If the Leader of the Opposition does not believe me, I will reiterate that point, right here and now. Sir Edward Lyons would be worth a thousand of the Opposition members or colleagues of the Leader of the Opposition, or the Leader of the Opposition himself. Although time is running out, if the honourable member wants me to, I will elaborate. However, the Leader of the Opposition may be satisfied with that answer because that sets forth exactly what the situation is.

Mr Warburton: You are the one who has to live with it.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member seems to have great difficulty in living with it and with the other question.

Totalisator Administration Board Agencies and Subagencies

Mr WARBURTON: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to the involvement of the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) in the matter of the Oxenford Totalisator Administration Board subagency licence and I point out that, despite the evidence—and I repeat “evidence”—which implicates Mr Hinze in impropriety, the Premier and Treasurer has demonstrated extreme reluctance to take action against that Minister. I put it to the Premier and Treasurer that, in the circumstances, surely the least that could have been done by the Premier and Treasurer would be to relieve the Minister of responsibilities until the whole matter is resolved. However, in view of the Premier and Treasurer’s lame excuse about waiting to hear what the Minister had to say today, which is a clear abrogation of the Premier and Treasurer’s duty as leader of the Queensland Government, and as the Premier and Treasurer has now heard the Minister’s answers to questions this morning, I now ask: What is the Premier and Treasurer going to do about it?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Leader of the Opposition and members of the Opposition have very little to hang their hats on in the field of politics generally, irrespective of what the matter is about. The Australian Labor Party has a long, sad and sorry record within its own ranks on the effect of policy and attitude on the State of Queensland and the nation.

Of course, now the Opposition thinks it has a glimmer of hope arising from an issue that it has sought to generate and build up. All I wish to say to the Leader of the Opposition is that he is not going to direct me or cause me or the Queensland Government to take any particular course of action that the Opposition might wish me or the Government to take. All of the matters that he refers to are judged fairly and squarely by the Government and by the Cabinet, and the Opposition is not going to force any issue on the Government.

Mr Warburton: Is it right that both of them know too much about too many?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I would hate to apply that principle to what the honourable member knows about politics.

Bill of Rights

Mr NEAL: I ask the Premier and Treasurer: Has the attention of the Premier and Treasurer been drawn to a report that appeared in Monday’s *The Courier-Mail* in which it is stated that Senator Gareth Evans, when delivering the H.B. Evatt Memorial Lecture to the United Nations Association of Australia, again called for the introduction of an Australian Bill of Rights? As Australia is signatory to thousands of United Nations treaties and conventions, I now ask: Would not such a Bill of Rights, in accordance with stated Australian Labor Party policy, be used by a centralist Canberra Government to further erode the power of the States? Would such a Bill of Rights safeguard the rights of Australian citizens or would it merely give Canberra more power over the lives of Australians?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Bill of Rights is one of the amazingly dangerous pieces of legislation that the Australian Labor Party—backed by Labor people in this State—has sought to introduce in Canberra.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: What is in it?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: That would fill a book. Unelected members of the public, selected by the Labor Party, would dictate above Governments and above courts, what people may do and may not do.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You don't know what's in it. You haven't even read it.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member for Wolston seems to have something wrong with him since he came out of gaol. He can no longer control himself in the House, just as he could not control himself out of the House.

The Bill of Rights is an exceedingly dangerous piece of legislation; it takes away rights. It is a "Bill of Wrongs". I was the one who first read out in the House a statement relative to what was in the Bill of Rights.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: It brings you to heel; that is what you are concerned about.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Is the honourable member finished?

As to the Bill of Rights—I reiterate that I was the one who led the whole of Australia in the fight against it. That caused the Federal Government to withdraw it. It was virtually forced to withdraw it, and it is being withdrawn. The left wing, of which the honourable member for Wolston is a supporter and member, is again trying to initiate the Bill in the House of Representatives in Canberra. I can only repeat that it is one of the most dangerous pieces of legislation to confront any nation. Under it, people will have their rights and their opportunities taken from them. It takes power from the courts and the Parliament and gives full responsibility to a group of people——

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Explain it to me.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: It is all made up of left-wing fellows such as the honourable member for Wolston. It is as simple as that, if the honourable member wants it in a nutshell.

Transfer of Qintex Company Headquarters to Brisbane

Mr NEAL: In asking the Premier and Treasurer a question without notice, I refer to the gloom-and-doom statements by the Opposition, and ask him whether he has noted the announcement that a major investment group involved in the pastoral, industrial, television and tourism industries, namely, Qintex, with assets of about \$200m, has wisely decided to shift its national headquarters from Melbourne to Brisbane because this State has much greater potential for growth than elsewhere. Does the Premier agree that the decision by that company, following upon the recent announcement by the CSR group that it will shift a major portion of its operations headquarters to Brisbane, highlights the soundness of the Government's private enterprise policy?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: In spite of what Opposition members do, or try to do, about preventing private enterprise from generating jobs in this State, people continue to transfer their interests and activities to Queensland. Very large organisations such as the ones referred to by the honourable member have come here, in spite of the Labor Opposition, because they know that the Queensland Government is a private enterprise Government. It is wonderful to think that organisations that were born or established in other States are now prepared to move here lock, stock and barrel.

Mr Skase called on me and told me that seven company groups will employ about 1 000 people when they come here very shortly. If Opposition members condemn or criticise those groups, they are not interested in jobs. The transfer of those companies indicates that business has confidence in this government and its members. Business is fleeing from the socialists, all of whom are much like the honourable member for Wolston, who has just spent some time in gaol.

Works Department Sackings

Mr BURNS: I ask the Minister for Works and Housing: Is it a fact that, tomorrow, 400 Works Department employees who have been engaged on construction and reconstruction in the George Street State Government precinct, some of whom have worked for the Government for 34 years, will be sacked? How does that tie in with the

story related by the Premier and with the \$600m special works program specifically designed to keep those people in work?

Mr WHARTON: It is incredible where the honourable member gets his information and the way in which he cites certain things in this Chamber. How do we know whether they are true or not?

Mr Burns: You know.

Mr WHARTON: I would say that at this time I have not been informed that they have been dismissed. I do not know whether they have been. We will see whether the honourable member's statement is correct. The Government has spent more than \$160m and it has created much more employment throughout the State. The honourable member knows that. It seems that he does not like that. The Government has done all of these things.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr WHARTON: That is all right. They may be going off and they may not be, but the work is being done.

At 12 noon,

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 17, the House proceeded with the debate on the Address in Reply.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Resumption of Debate—Third and Fourth Allotted Days

Debate resumed from 27 August (see p. 267) on Mr Henderson's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr FITZGERALD (Lockyer) (12 noon): It is with pleasure that I join in the debate on the Address in Reply to the Opening Speech made by the Governor to this Parliament. In doing so, on behalf of my constituents in the electorate of Lockyer, I pledge allegiance to the Queen and to her successors. I assure Her Majesty that the people in Lockyer have great respect for her and will continue to stand at all times when her anthem is played, as well as when the Australian national anthem is played, particularly in public, as an indication to all people, particularly young people, that to honour our Queen is actually to honour our way of government and to demonstrate that we treasure our way of government. We recognise the Queen as the constitutional head and monarch of Queensland and of Australia.

I also congratulate Sir Walter Campbell on being appointed to the high position of Governor of Queensland and extend to him and to Lady Campbell my best wishes as they carry out their duties.

Yesterday, I referred to the damage that was being done to our way of life by the intransigent attitude adopted by some unions in Australia. I referred to the similarities between the action taken by the Electrical Trades Union in Queensland, in which it tried to take on the people of Queensland, but lost, and the action taken by the Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union in an attempt to take on the whole of the primary industries in Australia by organising and encouraging pickets at the Mudginberri abattoirs in the Northern Territory. Unfortunately, as I said yesterday, it appears that the Federal Government is not doing anything to try to resolve that problem in the Northern Territory.

They are the major industrial issues at present, but I shall refer to a number of other matters. In particular, I shall refer to some of the problems facing the farming community in the Lockyer area. All of those problems are connected with the present industrial climate and what is happening in other parts of the world.

It has been mentioned in other debates that Queensland is facing a serious economic problem, that is, the disastrously low prices that have been received for sugar on the international market. A great deal of criticism has been directed at the Queensland Government for the way in which it has handled the problem facing the sugar industry.

Nobody has come up with any solution to the problem. The industry does not know whether the price will rise in the long term. If the price rises and the world market stabilises in the next couple of years, the problems in the industry will be completely over. The industry will be able to stay at its present size and trade its way out of the overdrafts that most sections have run up.

A major change has occurred in the use of the commodity on the world scene, and if consumption does not climb back up to its previous levels and cane sugar cannot regain its place on the breakfast and dinner tables of the world, the industry will have very serious problems, and it would be false economy to maintain the industry at the level at which it has the capacity to produce enormous quantities of sugar.

As other honourable members have pointed out, the basic cause of the trouble has been the relative decline in the percentage of cane sugar, compared with the quantity of beet sugar, on the world markets. Beet sugar competes with cane sugar on those markets. The promotion of beet sugar as a subsidised industry is totally unfair to the traditional sugar-cane producing countries. It is improper for any country to deliberately subsidise a product that will disrupt the world markets and cause hardship.

This is the trend that has been occurring for some time in the European Economic Community. Subsidies have been given to farming communities, production has gradually built up, and, in the long term, surpluses have been generated, flooding the world markets to the detriment of countries such as Australia.

An article on this subject appeared in the magazine titled *Foreign Agriculture* in March 1982, and the facts are still relevant. Headed "EEC Agricultural Surpluses—A Growing Factor in World Markets", the report stated—

"For the Community's agriculture, 1980 was a year of both success and failure. Production continued its upward momentum, while farmers' income declined. The output of most commodities reached record levels in 1980, increasing about 3.3 percent in volume, well above the long-term trend of 2 percent. The value of production rose by about 9 percent.

Successful production in European agriculture is no guarantee of economic improvement for the Community's farmers or consumers. Because of an 11 percent increase in the cost of non-farm inputs, real farm incomes dropped 7 percent in 1980. The 'terms of trade' in agriculture have steadily deteriorated since 1972, and real farm incomes have stagnated since 1973."

I assure the House that, although those figures related to 1980, the trend has continued at an alarming rate. The primary producers in those countries are not better off than they were, but the effect on the world market has been nothing short of catastrophic.

Between 1973 and 1980, in the EEC countries, export subsidies have been increased four and a half times, totalling \$8 billion or approximately one-half of the EEC's agricultural expenditure. As all honourable members are aware, agricultural subsidies in Australia are at a minimum. Most items are not subsidised at all, yet the nation's secondary industries receive much greater subsidies. Australia is a nation that relies on primary producers. Because our population is so limited and we cannot indulge in the subsidy policy of the EEC, it is essential that our primary products are produced efficiently so that we can supply the world markets.

Mr Randell: Do you see the EEC policies as a danger to our beef industry in the future?

Mr FITZGERALD: I will allude to that later when I refer to some figures that show how beef production, as well as sugar production, has increased.

I say to the honourable member for Mirani that what is happening is that, in primary industry after primary industry, wherever the EEC can get its toe in, it is gradually increasing its production. Because of those countries' enormous capability to produce such great quantities, the EEC can disrupt the world marketing scene.

Mr Randell: Do you think the Federal Government should do more?

Mr FITZGERALD: I shall cover that. I had not intended to denigrate the Federal Government, but the honourable member for Mirani knows as well as I do that, whenever major beef negotiations have to take place with a country such as Japan, the United States of America sends along Vice-president Bush and, although I do not know whom Australia sends along, it certainly is not the Prime Minister. I do not even know whether it is the Minister responsible for trade. Certainly the Federal Government sends over one of its very junior members to negotiate on Australia's behalf. The representatives of countries such as Japan take great notice of "face" when negotiations are taking place. When Australia sends a very junior Minister to the negotiations and the United States of America sends its vice-president, the result cannot be very beneficial to Australia.

Mr Randell: The Federal Government is not very interested in rural industries.

Mr FITZGERALD: The Federal Government takes notice of rural people only when it believes that that can help it to win a few seats at the next Federal election. I do not think even that will save the Federal Government.

The EEC has become a net exporter of all the major temperate zone products, with the exception of oil-seed. It is a major exporter of dairy products, all red meats, except lamb, and grain. The net export status for grain was finally reached in 1980-81. Ten years before that the EEC had net imports of 22 million tonnes of grain. Some trade sources are now predicting that, by 1985-86, the European Economic Community will export close to 20 million tonnes of soft wheat, which equates to 20 per cent of the world wheat trade.

Those figures indicate the changing trade patterns throughout the world. All honourable members should be aware of that and should seek the assistance of the Federal Government to rectify some of the problems. The Federal Government should be made aware of these facts so that other measures can be taken to ensure that the Australian way of life is protected. There is no doubt about it—if primary industry in Australia suffers and is no longer able to compete in the market-place, the standard of living of all Australians will decline.

Australia has very, very few secondary industries that can compete economically on the world scene. Although some can, Australia's major industries cannot; they have to be protected by tariff barriers. If most of the secondary industry products were subjected to open trading on the world scene, they would be annihilated.

I wish to quote from some figures I have had prepared for me that compare production in the EEC with the Australian figures. The source of the statistics I shall quote are the *Year Book Australia* 1983, 1984 and 1985, the *Commission of European Communities. Agricultural Situation* 1982 and 1984, and *Eurostat* for animal production figures and crop production. I note that the Australian figures are for financial years ending 30 June and the European figures are for calendar years.

Australia is considered to be one of the world's major exporters of wheat. Australians have always believed that to be so, because they know that, with a small population and a large wheat production, a large percentage of the nation's wheat has to be exported. However, I wish to point out that, in 1983, Australia exported a total of 8 022 000 tonnes whilst, in the same year, the EEC exported 12 120 000 tonnes. In that year Australia's exports of wheat were two-thirds of those from the EEC countries.

In 1984, Australian wheat production was 22 064 000 tonnes, whereas France produced 32 885 000 tonnes. That gives honourable members some idea of Australia's relative position. The United Kingdom—that small group of islands across the English Channel from the EEC—produced 14 990 000 tonnes of wheat in 1984. Total EEC production was 76 316 000 tonnes. In Australia, 1984 was a big year for wheat production. Compared with EEC countries, Australia is still a minor wheat-producer. However, certain wheats that are exported from Australia have a place in the world market. I refer to the prime hard wheats that are grown in Queensland and in the northern and western parts of New South Wales.

Barley-producers know that Australia is not a large barley-producing country. Although some barley is produced in Queensland, the southern States produce most of Australia's barley. The last year for which figures are available for barley exports from Australia and the EEC countries is 1983. In that year, Australia exported 834 000 tonnes of barley. Barley exports in 1983 were lower than exports in 1982 and 1984. In 1982, 1 577 000 tonnes of barley was exported. In 1984, the figure was 3 122 000 tonnes. In 1983, EEC countries exported 3 747 000 tonnes of barley.

In 1984, Australia produced 4 937 000 tonnes of barley, whereas France produced 11 543 000 tonnes and the United Kingdom produced 10 830 000 tonnes. The total EEC barley production was 43 905 000 tonnes. That was more than 10 times the Australian production in that year. In 1983, EEC production of barley was more than 18 times Australian production.

In 1983, the EEC countries produced 12 305 000 tonnes of sugar. Australia produced 3 256 000 tonnes. The EEC countries produced nearly four times the amount of sugar produced in Australia in 1983. In 1983, the EEC countries exported almost twice the amount of sugar exported by Australia. In 1983 the EEC countries exported 4 799 000 tonnes, whereas Australia exported 2 422 000 tonnes. That has enormous impact on the world market. Not many years ago Australia had a sugar market in England. Sugar was exported to England and to European countries. Now, the EEC countries are large exporters. They produce about twice as much sugar as Australia for export.

As to meat production—there is an enormous threat——

Mr Palaszczuk interjected.

Mr FITZGERALD: If the honourable member sits in his usual place, I might take his interjection.

There is an enormous threat to the meat industry in Australia. It is likely that a trade war on many commodities will take place between the United States of America and the EEC countries. I am very concerned about what might happen in the beef industry.

Mr De Lacy: That's right; you've got to blame the Federal Government.

Mr FITZGERALD: The honourable member for Cairns has reminded me that the Americans are taking their meat exports very seriously. The Vice-president of the United States was sent to Japan to see whether a meat deal could be negotiated with the Japanese. Whom did Australia send over? The honourable member might like to answer that question at a later date. That is how seriously the Federal Government takes Australia's meat trade with Japan.

In 1983, EEC countries produced for export 500 000 tonnes of beef and veal, whereas Australia produced 827 000 tonnes for export.

Pig meat-producers in Australia have faced enormous competition from not only the EEC countries but also eastern European countries. In 1983 the EEC countries produced for export 367 000 tonnes of pig meat, whereas Australia produced 2 000 tonnes. The EEC countries are enormous producers of pig meat.

The EEC countries produce very little sheep meat for export. In fact, in 1983 those countries produced only 5 000 tonnes of sheep and goat meat for export, whereas Australia produced 238 000 tonnes of sheep and lamb meat.

Honourable members have witnessed the decline of the dairy industry in Australia. Basically, that has occurred because of the competition that industry faces from the European countries. In 1983 the EEC countries produced for export 334 000 tonnes of butter; Australia produced only 16 000 tonnes. Australia has an enormous cheese export capability. In 1983 the EEC countries exported 405 000 tonnes of cheese, whereas Australia produced only 54 000 tonnes.

Australia is under threat. Australia is not able to subsidise its primary industries to any extent. I believe that it would be totally unwise and indeed impossible for Australia, with a comparatively low population of 15 million, to compete against those countries that have enormous populations and the capacity to produce vast quantities of almost every product that they can grow in their temperate climates and export selectively throughout the world, to Australia's detriment.

The ramifications of the enormous capacity of the EEC countries are felt even by industries other than the export industry. I refer particularly to the vegetable industry in the Lockyer Valley. Competition faced by the sugar industry from European sugar-beet—which, I am told, is heavily subsidised—is placing Queensland in a perilous position. I believe that all honourable members recognise that fact.

Because of the competition that sugar-producers are facing, they are now seeking alternative crops. They are trying to find a way out of their problems.

I realise that the sugar industry has problems, but I counsel sugar-producers to consider carefully growing any alternative crop. Of course, when Bob Hawke visited the sugar areas, he solved the problems of sugar-producers with one phrase. He said, "Grow vegetables." I have never heard a more ridiculous solution to their problems. What has happened in some sugar-producing areas——

Mr Campbell: What do you think sugar-growers should diversify into and grow?

Mr FITZGERALD: I will take the interjection of the honourable member for Bundaberg.

Mr Campbell: Why didn't you help develop markets for them overseas?

Mr FITZGERALD: I will take the interjection of the honourable member for Bundaberg. First of all, he asked me, "Why shouldn't sugar-producers diversify?" Second, he asked, "Why haven't you developed markets overseas?" I will now elaborate on those two points. The honourable member for Bundaberg is helping me with my speech.

The Bundaberg area has diversified to a certain extent into vegetable production. It is an excellent area in which to grow many varieties of vegetables, and some farmers have done so quite successfully. The vegetable-producing areas—in particular, the Lockyer Valley—do not worry about competition. It has always been a free enterprise industry. The vegetable-growers have not had the protection of a controlled industry. They have stood on their own two feet and faced competition from anyone wanting to enter the market-place.

However, the warning is there. With a population of only 15 million, Australia has only a limited domestic market. If people believe that they can make a profit from vegetable production, they had better examine the records and see the number of years in which there has been a downturn in price. I warn those who contemplate the move not to expect to produce large quantities of, say, potatoes in the belief that they will receive a favourable price. Over the last couple of years the price of that commodity has been disastrous.

Mr Milliner: Mr FitzGerald—

Mr FITZGERALD: I ask the member for Everton to wait until I have finished answering the interjection of the member for Bundaberg.

Commodity after commodity suffers a period of depressed prices. When and if the sugar industry has solved its problems the Lockyer Valley will still be producing high-quality vegetables available for supply to the rest of Australia during that part of the year when the Lockyer Valley has a climatic advantage. A large number of cane-growers would have had to borrow money to finance vegetable production. Many will go bankrupt.

As an illustration of what I am saying, I refer to the period during the beef slump. Many in the beef cattle industry commenced farming operations. Some of them tried vegetable production. How many are still in it? Very few. They have had to revert to beef production. I recall that one of the crops grown by them was cabbages. Any property that could grow anything had a patch of cabbages on it. Throughout the beef slump, the price for cabbages was disastrous.

The honourable member for Bundaberg asked what the Government is doing about exports. I will tell him what is happening. There is enormous potential for exporting crops from Australia to countries in South East Asia. Producers in the Lockyer Valley are exporting Chinese cabbages, broccoli and other products to South East Asia. However, I ask the honourable member for Bundaberg to appeal to his colleagues in Canberra to stiffen their spines and correct the industrial climate that is stifling the export of vegetable crops from Australia. I have previously spoken in the House about the problems experienced on the waterfront. I refer particularly to the position at Mudginberri in the Northern Territory. The court has ruled on a system of killing. The workers in the abattoir want to kill the meat. They should be allowed to do so. The court has granted them the right to do so. What has happened? The ACTU called the wharfies out on strike. No wonder we have a poor record as a reliable exporter.

I give another example of the problems we face with exports. Because of what has happened in New South Wales, a number of overseas countries will not accept prime hard wheat delivered from New South Wales ports. That is disastrous for the Australian wheat industry. Industrial problems such as those experienced in New South Wales give Australia a reputation as an unreliable trader.

I ask the member for Bundaberg to appeal to his colleagues in the Federal Government to rectify the matter. If we do not become known as a reliable exporter, it will not be just the wheat industry and the sugar industry that will suffer. There will be no potential to develop an export market for vegetables. The opportunities in that export market are limited to specific crops. Only the entrepreneurs would be willing to ship their product to South East Asia. Many technical developments are taking place that will greatly assist the export initiatives that have been taken. Discussions are presently being held.

Because of the competition we are facing from the European Common Market, Australia must continue to chase new markets. Exports from the EEC are heavily subsidised. In my opinion, the competition from them is unfair. I do not blame the EEC for being concerned about food production. The Europeans have a siege mentality. History records how often they have suffered food shortages as a result of blockades. Whenever there is a war, the Europeans are short of food. A reading of history allows us to understand why they believe that it is to their benefit to have surplus production, which is available for export. Those nations are not conscious of the fact that their export policies are damaging other countries, especially small countries such as Australia. I believe that the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is being recognised in spirit by one country only, and that country happens to be Australia.

I believe that, unless Australia stands up to the other countries and points out the inconsistencies that have occurred despite the GATT agreement, it will be a dead

agreement. The quicker that Australia accepts that GATT is nothing more than a carcass, the quicker Australia will be able to renegotiate its position with other trading nations.

It has been a great pleasure for me to join in the Address in Reply debate. As I said previously, when people pledge their loyalty to the Crown and to Her Majesty the Queen, they recognise the part that the monarchy plays in the Constitution. I give the assurance on behalf of my constituents that the Australian flag epitomises the feeling of the people in my electorate of Lockyer and the feeling of all of the people of Queensland.

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (12.31 p.m.): Today, I wish to talk about the risk of organised crime infiltrating casino operations in Queensland. In speaking about this matter, I first refer back to *Hansard* of 9 November 1982, and quote from a speech by the greatest impostor ever to sit in this Parliament, and that is the former Deputy Premier and Treasurer (Dr Llew Edwards).

Whilst introducing the Casino Control Bill on that day, Dr Edwards said—

“Applicants were told that the Queensland legislation would be based on legislation enacted by the State of New Jersey, which is a legislative model that has been acclaimed by experts around the world as being the best casino control legislation yet formulated. That United States Legislation was passed in June 1977 and it has governed the establishment and control of 10 casinos to date.”

Dr Edwards then went on to say—

“Having compared legislation in the various jurisdictions throughout the world and on being satisfied that New Jersey offered the best model, the Government has conducted hours of discussion with Tasmanian and Northern Territory officers, with senior officials of the Nevada, Bahamas and New Jersey casino control groups and with leading casino industry representatives throughout the world to ensure that our adoption of that legislation was properly carried forward.”

Later in his speech Dr Edwards said—

“It is essential that casino operations or any part of them are not in any way controlled or influenced by criminal or even undesirable persons. This is the fundamental aim of the whole licensing concept.”

The final quote that I would like to repeat from Dr Edwards’s speech is this—

“We simply have to face up to the fact that casinos, by their very nature, could attract the undesirable or criminally inclined who want to own, usually by hidden means, the whole or part of an establishment, or manage it, or be employed by it, or be a client of it, or conduct their activity in proximity to it, unless strong counteracting measures are taken and maintained.”

From those extracts from Dr Edwards’s speech, one could believe that Queensland’s casinos would have the best-controlled and cleanest operation in the world. However, recent events have proven Dr Edwards to be a fraud and his Cabinet colleagues of that time to have been either incompetent or a party to Dr Edwards’s deception.

I believe the granting of an operator’s licence for Jupiters Casino on the Gold Coast to Conrad International to be one of the greatest scandals of this decade. Conrad International is a wholly owned subsidiary of Hilton Hotels USA. This company is in no way involved with the Hilton Hotel chain in Australia.

Hilton Hotels USA was recently refused a licence to operate a casino in New Jersey because it employed a number of people with organised crime associations. At first glance, one would believe that the Queensland Cabinet made a mistake or had the wool pulled over its eyes in granting a licence to Conrad International, especially when one goes back to Dr Edwards’s statements and assurances that our legislation would be the best in the world and would be modelled on the New Jersey legislation. But, no, this is not the case, as can be seen in the statement made in the usual gung-ho fashion by the

Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer (Mr Gunn) in the *Melbourne Age* on Friday, 2 August, 1985. Mr Gunn was quoted as saying—

“There had been nothing in the form of new evidence or information arising from the New Jersey hearing which Queensland authorities had not been aware of when they made their 1983 decision to allow Hilton to manage and operate the Gold Coast casino.”

The Government cannot have it both ways. It could not truthfully tell us in 1982 that its legislation would be the best in the world, based on the New Jersey legislation, and then state that it was aware in 1983 of the information that was made available to the New Jersey authorities and led the New Jersey authorities to refuse a casino application by Hilton Hotels USA.

If the Government is honest and above reproach, it will immediately suspend the licence of Conrad International pending a full parliamentary inquiry, because it is only by a full, open inquiry that the cloud over Jupiter can be lifted. If a full, open inquiry is not held, the public of Queensland can only believe that, at the least, the Government rushed in head first to make its decision to grant the licence on the basis of its need to have construction started prior to the 1983 State election or that, at the worst, organised crime is already operating and that bribes have been paid to secure the licence.

I ask members that, in deciding at which end of the scale the Government erred, they consider the following points. The Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer, in his statement of 2 August 1985, said—

“There was nothing new which Queensland authorities had not been aware of when they made their 1983 decision.”

Later, the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer said—

“Queensland had to make its decision at that time, even though we knew the New Jersey investigations on Hilton USA were about 90 per cent complete.”

If the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer was referring to the hearing before the New Jersey authorities, he must have been clairvoyant, because the hearing started in July 1984, or 12 months after the Queensland Government granted a licence to Conrad International.

The threat of infiltration by organised crime into Queensland casinos should not be treated with the contempt with which it has been treated over the past couple of weeks by the Premier and Treasurer and the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer.

The decision of the New Jersey Gaming Commission to refuse a licence to Hilton Hotels USA should be ringing alarm bells for the Queensland Government, but, instead the Premier and Treasurer and the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer are blandly stating that everything is all right. In making such statements, they have contradicted one another and made claims that can easily be proven to be untrue. I intend to do that later in my speech.

The Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer handled this story initially because the Premier and Treasurer was overseas. In his usual arrogant way, he stated that the Government was aware of all the claims and that everything would be all right. If ever a person could play the main role in the fairy-tale *The Emperor's New Clothes*, it would be the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer. I can just visualise his telephoning the Hilton organisation, asking about these claims, being told that there is nothing in them, and then blandly going about saying, “I have investigated the matter, and everything is fine.”

Let the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer deny that, on or about Saturday, 3 August 1985, he sent a telex to Hilton Hotels USA advising that company to make no comment to the media, and that he would handle the matter.

I mentioned earlier that the Premier and Treasurer and the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer had contradicted one another. In examining those contradictions one must accept either that the Premier and Treasurer is guilty of misleading this Parliament or that, if he is not guilty of misleading Parliament, the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer and, before him, Sir Llewellyn Edwards, did not make the complete report on Hilton Hotels available to Cabinet or, more importantly, to the Premier and Treasurer.

My reason for claiming that can be found in the answer to a question without notice that I directed to the Premier and Treasurer last Thursday on links that Hilton Hotels had with organised crime. Part of the Premier's answer to that question was in these terms—

“Immediately the organisation became aware of the problem, it cleaned up the whole matter. The people were taken out, or put out, and the organisation is again 100 per cent. That is what our investigators have informed us.”

I stress the first part of that answer, namely, “Immediately the organisation became aware of the problem . . .”. What is the problem that we are talking about? Is it the allegation of links between Hilton officials and organised crime?

The Premier and Treasurer would have us believe that, to use his words, “this great organisation on the other side of the world” acted in a decisive way immediately after it became aware of these allegations.

But the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer would have us believe another story, and I quote from the *Melbourne Age* of Friday, 2 August 1985—

“He said thorough investigations by Queensland's Casino Control Division and State police, in conjunction with Interpol and the New Jersey Department of Gaming and Enforcement had indicated possible areas of concern surrounding two staff associated with Hilton's United States operation.

Mr Gunn said that, in endorsing Hilton USA's continuing involvement in Jupiters hotel-casino, the State Government had decided that at no stage should one of the men (Korshak) be allowed to become involved in any Queensland operation.

Referring to Mr Lewin, Mr Gunn said that such a person would be excluded under Queensland's scheme of employee licensing in the unlikely event that he was put forward for involvement in the Australian operation. He added that ‘this concern’ did not reflect adversely on Hilton as a corporation.”

In that statement the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer was referring to the 1983 investigation by the Queensland Government. So there we have him saying that the Queensland Government was aware of Korshak and Lewin in 1983, and still it went ahead and gave the licence to Conrad International.

Now, let us examine and put into reality the statement of the Premier and Treasurer that “immediately the organisation became aware of the problem, it cleaned up the whole matter. The people were taken out or put out, and the organisation is again 100 per cent.” If the Premier and Treasurer believes that, he is not doing his job and must live in fantasyland. The very reason the organisation was not granted a licence in New Jersey was its failure to act when confronted with a problem.

Firstly, I will deal with Henri Lewin, vice-president of Hilton USA, who was named in the New Jersey hearings as having links with organised crime.

Contrary to what the Premier and Treasurer told us last Thursday, Mr Lewin is still the vice-president of Hilton USA and runs the Las Vegas Hilton. He has not been put out or taken out; he is still there as vice-president of the parent company of the operator of our casino. Contrary to what the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer says about whether Lewin will be licensed in Queensland, he is vice-president of the parent company of the operator of our casino.

The second person with whom I will deal is Sidney Korshak, a person who is acknowledged as the key link between organised crime and big business. To prove that the statement of the Premier and Treasurer is incorrect, I quote from the statement by Commissioner Noel Jacobson of the New Jersey Casino Control Commission, when he handed down his decision on the Hilton Hotels application for a casino. I ask honourable members to remember the statement of the Premier and Treasurer that, immediately the organisation became aware of the position, it acted. The commissioner said—

“In my judgment the 13-year-long relationship of the Hilton Hotels Corporation with Sidney Korshak is the fatal link upon which I primarily base the conclusion that this applicant has not established its suitability for licensure in New Jersey.”

In September 1971, Hilton retained Sidney Korshak as outside counsel, an association which lasted until March 1984 when it was finally terminated under conditions that, themselves, raise questions of suitability.

Throughout that 13-year period during which Mr Korshak received over \$700,000 in fees and expenses, the publicity and notoriety about his unsavory reputation and associations with organised crime figures repeatedly swirled round his and Hilton's head.

In 1943, Willie Bioff, a mobster who had been masquerading as a trade union official, testified in a court proceeding that he had been introduced to Korshak in a Chicago hotel in 1939 or 1940 by Charlie Gioe, an associate of Al Capone, who identified Korshak as “their man”

In 1978, the first report of the California Organised Crime Control Commission, presented by Attorney-General Evelle J. Younger, stated—

“Korshak is an active labor lawyer, an attorney for Chicago organised crime figures and the key link between organised crime and big business, according to many law enforcement agencies and news articles. His name has been linked with organised crime for more than 30 years and he has been the subject of several federal organised crime investigations. A United States Justice Department official has described Korshak as a ‘senior advisor’ to organised crime groups in California, Chicago, Las Vegas and New York. He has associated with nationally-known organised crime figures such as Anthony Accardo, Sam Giancana, Gus Alex, and Morris Dalitz. His involvement with organised crime was confirmed in testimony before the Organised Crime Control Commission.”

In 1984, Korshak was identified in a report of the Permanent Senate Subcommittee on Investigations as an “organised crime associate and labor relations consultant”.

In 1981, Korshak was identified by Aladena “Jimmy, the Weasel” Fratianno—a member of La Cosa Nostra turned informant, and now in the Federal Witness Protection Program—as an associate of the Chicago mob for 30 years.

The information about and descriptions of Korshak as a mob-related attorney were not unknown within the Hilton corporate structure. Timothy Applegate, Hilton's general counsel, knew as early as 1969 of the Securities and Exchange Commission's complaint against Korshak for stock fraud. John Cullerton, Hilton's labor relations executive, knew of Korshak's negative reputation at the time Korshak was first retained by Hilton.

In 1976, *The New York Times* published an investigative series of four front-page articles reporting on Korshak's links to organised crime. Excerpts from this series include a number of allegations.

The New York Times of 27 June 1976 reported—

“To scores of Federal, state and local law enforcement officials, Mr Korshak is the most important link between organised crime and legitimate business. They describe him as a behind-the-scene ‘fixer’ who has been instrumental in helping criminal elements gain power in union affairs and infiltrate the leisure and entertainment industries.

On the basis of their files on Mr. Korshak, Federal officials contend that he has been involved in such activities as bribery, kickbacks, extortion, fraud, and labor racketeering, and that he has at times given illegal advice to members of organised crime.

A well-informed Justice Department official has described Mr. Korshak as 'a senior intermediary for and senior advisor to' organised crime groups in California, Chicago, Las Vegas and New York."

The report made by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations stated—

"Sydney Korshak began his career defending members of the Capone Mob in Chicago in the 1930's. Joel Goldblatt, president of a chain of department stores that had been targeted by union organisers, became Korshak's first respectable business client in 1946. Allegedly, numerous union officials were demanding payoffs in return for labor peace. Korshak acted as an intermediary between Goldblatt and the union. In the years that followed, Korshak's career and reputation grew as a successful attorney/consultant for large corporations involved in labor strife or negotiations. Federal officials have long viewed Korshak as a 'fixer' who helps unions organise his client companies in return for the opportunity to orchestrate strikes and manipulate union officials."

The New York Times of 30 June 1976 reported as follows—

"Officials said in recent interviews that the Federal Bureau of Investigation was accumulating evidence on Mr. Korshak's alleged involvement in a labor racketeering scheme in Southern California. A Justice Department official said that the inquiry deals with allegations that Mr. Korshak received a management payoff in the early 1970's as part of a scheme to guarantee labor peace in a jurisdictional dispute between two unions. After Mr. Korshak's intervention, the official said, one of the unions—with close ties to Mr. Korshak—received favourable treatment and was permitted to represent workers normally represented by other trade unions."

The New York Times of 28 June 1976 stated—

"In Las Vegas and elsewhere, the immense power and authority of Sidney R. Korshak are rooted in his mutually beneficial relationships with labor leaders. He has long been identified by Federal and local police officials as perhaps the most important 'fixer' of labor-management affairs, an expert in helping unions organise his client companies—and sometimes paying off their leaders—in exchange for the opportunity to orchestrate strikes and manipulate union officials."

The four-part series dealing with Korshak's unsavoury reputation and tainted associations were not contained in an anonymous letter. They were published in *The New York Times*, generally regarded as one of the most influential newspapers in the world. The investigative report quoted Justice Department Officials, Federal, State and local enforcement officials, Federal and local police officials, and FBI officials.

The allegations contained in the reports were of the most serious nature, namely, that Korshak was the link between organised crime and the business world, that he engaged in bribery to subvert the trust and confidence of working men and women in their unions, that he made a mockery of the legitimate aims of the trade union movement and that, for a price, he would sell out the interests of union members who depended upon their collective bargaining contracts to provide protection against exploitation.

And how did Mr Korshak respond to such scurrilous allegations? Did he mount a vigorous challenge? Did he descend upon *The New York Times* irately demanding a retraction and apology? Did he launch a \$50m dollar libel suit? No, he did not. He did nothing.

In fact, Hilton Corporation executives responded to the information contained in the article with a corresponding equanimity. Mr Barron Hilton telephoned Korshak to offer sympathy for the bad publicity. Mr Applegate conducted a perfunctory investigation and concluded that there was no hard evidence against Korshak. In fact, the Hilton

Corporation executives paid less heed to *The New York Times* series than they did subsequently to an anonymous letter, although their response in that matter was itself not exemplary.

The allegations about Korshak's tainted associations continued. In 1981, the Nevada Gaming Board expressed concern about Las Vegas casinos dealing with Mr Korshak. In its response, the Hilton Corporation again revealed its lack of interest or concern.

In 1983, the New Jersey Appellate Division's opinion on the Playboy appeal came to the attention of Hilton's officials. In that opinion, the court criticised the three commissioners who voted to license Hefner because they found "nothing sinister or improper in the one-time retention of Sidney Korshak" by Hefner. The court stated—

"Hefner paid Korshak \$50,000 seemingly simply for the purpose of having Korshak explain Hefner's position to Wasserman and to arrange a meeting with Wasserman, not Universal's attorneys, to discuss a possible settlement of the lawsuit. However, Korshak's mission failed. He apparently kept the \$50,000, a high price for simply trying to arrange a meeting and deliver a message. No Commissioner drew the inference that this was a venal influence-peddling scheme, although Hefner testified that he engaged Korshak's services only because he thought Korshak could influence Wasserman."

How did Hilton officials respond to that opinion? A copy of the opinion was forwarded to Korshak with an accompanying letter lamenting what is characterised as "an unbelievable attack on a member of the bar" Hilton clung to its relationship with Korshak until March 1984, long after everyone was fully aware of Mr Korshak's reputation and associations, and after warnings had been issued by both the Nevada Gaming Board and the Appellate Division of the New Jersey Superior Court.

In the "Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law", submitted to the Commission for Reports' renewal hearings just completed the day before yesterday, Director O'Brien commented on the law applicable to casino licence applications as follows—

"Another crucial factor in evaluating character is the associations which the applicant maintains and has engaged in the past. One of the surest indicia of character and future associations can be derived from prior relationships."

Further on, Director O'Brien continued—

"Where notice of an associate's adverse reputation or character has been provided, in fact, by the governmental agency which regulates the applicant and notwithstanding, is disregarded, such conduct evidences callous and flagrant indifference to regulatory concerns and desires designed for public protection, a conscious willingness to deal with questionable persons, and a clear preference for private over public interests. Where the governmental agency regulating its operation has counseled disassociation and the relationship nonetheless continues, or even worse expands, applicant's character and reputation for honesty and integrity become fatally flawed. The deliberate initiation, cultivation and maintenance of such suspect associations, especially in the face of articulated or patently obvious concerns of regulators for avoidance of such associations, plainly evidence lack of good character in the context of a casino licensing hearing."

I could not agree more with Director O'Brien.

If the one-time retention of Sidney Korshak—for a fee of \$50,000—buttressed the New Jersey Appellate Court's opinion that Hugh Hefner had not demonstrated his good character, honesty and integrity, what light does the Hilton's 13-year-long relationship with Korshak—for aggregate fees in excess of \$700,000—shed on Hilton's good character, honesty and integrity?

Hilton asserted that its association with Korshak was perfectly innocent and pointed to the legal work performed by Donald Peters, Jr. and David Mendelsohn under the retainer agreement on behalf of the Korshak law firm. Neither Peters nor Mendelsohn

was a member of the Korshak law firm. They were hired by Korshak as independent contractors. Hilton officials repeatedly praised the work of Peters and Mendelsohn in the field of labour law, and cited this reason as to why they continued to retain Korshak.

Had Hilton dropped its retainer agreement with Korshak, it could have easily continued to utilise the services of Peters and Mendelsohn, inasmuch as both men were engaged in the private practice of law outside the Korshak firm. Rather, Hilton continued the retainer payments to Korshak for sums, ranging as high as \$65,000 a year, for few identifiable legal services. Not until March 1984 did Hilton sever its relationship with Korshak, and the circumstances surrounding that reluctant rupture are equally illuminating.

Two different reasons have been offered by Hilton to explain the formal break, each coming at a different time during this licensing process. The first and obvious reason is that Hilton officials came to the realisation that the relationship with Korshak was jeopardising licensure in New Jersey.

Statements made by Barron Hilton and Applegate at the hearing corroborate this conclusion. As a consequence, it is a logical assumption that if Hilton was not seeking a casino licence in New Jersey, the services of Mr Korshak by Hilton would continue, and would still be defended.

When Hilton felt compelled to terminate Korshak's retainer, it was remorse, not reform, which pervaded the atmosphere. In his letter to Korshak, announcing the formal break, Mr Applegate wrote—

“I appreciate very much your understanding regarding the action we feel we're forced to take in dissolving the long-standing relationship between you and Hilton Hotels Corporation. As I stated in our telephone conversation . . . we very much regret this situation. We feel, however, that we cannot risk jeopardising in any way the huge investment we have committed to New Jersey.”

Barron Hilton testified that he shared the sentiments expressed in Applegate's letter. In addition to this letter, Hilton expressed its warm regard for Korshak by paying him a \$50,000 fee even though he was only retained for three months that year. Hilton had not entered into a written retainer agreement with Korshak for 1984, and there is evidence in the record which exposes the possibility that Korshak might have been paid as much as \$100,000 in fees for services rendered in 1984.

There is now before honourable members a second, more curious reason why Hilton is rationalising its break with Korshak. The remorse with which Hilton and Applegate originally bade farewell to Korshak has now been assuaged by patriotism. Both Mr Hilton and Mr Applegate have testified that, had they known that Korshak was planning to take the Fifth Amendment before a hearing of the Permanent Senate Subcommittee on Investigations hearing in 1983, they would have fired him on the spot. What a curious scenario! For 13 years, the Hilton Corporation either ignored or disregarded every shred of information about Korshak's tainted operations and associations as absolutely meaningless.

Now, more than a year later, in a burst of righteousness, Hilton can justify a retroactive firing simply because Korshak would seek to avail himself of a constitutional privilege.

Every private citizen is entitled to draw any inferences he pleases from the invocation of the Fifth Amendment. A regulator is entitled to draw an adverse inference about a corporation that apparently did not get religion until it was pounding on the Pearly Gates of licensure.

The applicant has labelled its association with Korshak as isolated and innocuous. The Division of Gaming Enforcement in its summation in this case stated that the termination of Korshak cleanses the stain of the 13-year relationship.

I disagree with both statements. I regard the Hilton-Korshak relationship as continuing and contagious. I do not believe the stain has been cleansed.

Director O'Brien perhaps said it best of all when he stated—

“‘ severance of prior deleterious relationships at a time of intense public scrutiny must be carefully and cautiously viewed by the Commission. Disassociation under these circumstances offers little assurance that such relationships will not be revived after public and regulatory concern is diverted elsewhere.’

Because of the evidence in the record regarding the relationship between the Hilton Hotels Corporation and Sidney Korshak, as well as several other issues, raised by the Division in this proceeding, I find that Hilton has not demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence its honesty, good character and integrity as required by the Casino Control Act.”

That is why the motion was opposed.

Those findings by Commissioner Jacobson completely destroy the Premier and Treasurer's argument that Hilton Hotels USA acted immediately it became aware of a problem. Organised crime is a contagious disease which given one spark will spread like a bush fire until it is out of control.

Governments need to be very alert to the threat of organised crime, and let us not fool ourselves: organised crime is already alive and growing at an alarming rate in Queensland. The Queensland Police Force and other police forces throughout Australia will readily agree that Queensland's Gold Coast is the winter playground for southern criminals and that those Mr Bigs of organised crime are untouchable.

When someone talks about organised crime, he is not talking about gun-toting bank-robbers or 1930s style Chicago mobsters who will sit round the foyer of Jupiters Casino smoking cigars. What he is talking about are apparently legitimate businessmen. These people will not try and rob the casino or use loaded dice or marked decks of cards. They will use the casino to launder money obtained by illegal means.

The United States Law Enforcement Assistance Administration recently described gambling as “the most serious form of organised crime” because it “supplies the financial grease that lubricates the machinery of other operations such as the importation of narcotics, the penetration of legitimate business and the corruption of officials”

As I stated earlier in my speech, the alarm bells are ringing. It is not good enough simply to bury one's head in the sand, as the Queensland Government has. The time for decisive action is now. The Queensland Government must immediately suspend the licence of Conrad International and hold a full parliamentary inquiry. If it does not, the people of Queensland can never have faith that organised crime is not associated with Jupiters Casino.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

Debate interrupted.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Allegations by Member for Lytton about Department of Works Work-force

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Minister for Works and Housing) (2.15 p.m.), by leave: At the end of question-time in the House this morning, the honourable member for Lytton (Mr Burns) made a fantastic claim that the Department of Works was about to sack 400 of its work-force. That is a serious claim, a shocking claim, and it was the first time I had heard any such claim made. Of course, we on this side of the Chamber are used to irresponsible claims coming from the Opposition, and Mr Burns's claim today fits this category.

Let me put the record straight. Let me answer this alarmist statement right now. The Works Department is not sacking 400 people. It is not even sacking 40 people. In fact, it is not sacking anyone at all.

What is happening is that eight people, who have been working with the department on a temporary basis, are due to complete their period of work with the department at the end of this month, and this is understood by the persons concerned. They are not part of the department's permanent work-force. They are, as I said, temporary employees.

The honourable member really should get the facts right before making what he sees as headline-grabbing utterances.

He mentioned the State Government's Capital Works Program. I am pleased he did, because I will tell him now that the State Government, through its regular Capital Works Program and its Special Major Capital Works Program initiatives, is generating new jobs for thousands of Queenslanders.

Let me spell out some of the projects approved under the Special Major Capital Works Program up to the end of June this year. In that time, 15 new and replacement State primary, special and secondary schools were approved for construction. Six new State Government office buildings are now under construction throughout the State, including three in the metropolitan area.

I sometimes think that the members on the other side of the Chamber must walk about with their eyes closed. When the honourable member for Lytton and any of his colleagues walk down to Parliament House, I would advise them to look at the new \$39m building in Mary Street or the new \$9m building on the corner of George Street and Mary Street. Or perhaps they should see the new Mapping and Surveying Department's building complex at Woolloongabba. All of these are buildings that have been made possible through the Special Major Capital Works Program that the Opposition so constantly criticises.

I could go on talking about the many other projects being funded through the regular programs and Special Major Capital Works Program undertaken by the State Works Department. I think, however, that it is sufficient to say today that Mr Burns's statement about the sacking of 400 people is a ridiculous one, is baseless, and contrasts with the true picture of job creation by this Government's Capital Works Program.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Resumption of Debate

Mr ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (2.18 p.m.): I take this opportunity to pledge my loyalty and that of the electors of Cunningham to Her Majesty the Queen and her newly appointed representative in Queensland, the Governor, Sir Walter Campbell.

Mr Davis: Are you Australian or what?

Mr ELLIOTT: I cannot speak for the honourable member for Brisbane Central, but I pride myself on being Australian. The fairly voluble honourable member for Brisbane Central, who is always talking while someone else is speaking, asked me what am I. I answer that by saying that if a person has pride in his family, his home, his district, his State, he has pride in his country. If he does not have pride in those things, obviously he cannot be a proud Australian, and I believe it is very, very important that people understand that.

I will say a few words about the newly appointed Governor. Along with many other honourable members, I have, during the last few years, had the privilege and pleasure of attending many functions which the Governor, then Chief Justice, attended and of speaking with him at length. I have found him to be a man with a keen sense of humour and jovial attitude to all. Because of his background and the experience that he brings to the job, I believe that he will be an outstanding ambassador for Her Majesty the Queen.

Mr Davis: An outstanding figurehead.

Mr ELLIOTT: I see nothing wrong with having a figurehead. Many of the world's democracies do not have a person in such an exalted position for people to look up to. With the shenanigans that go on in this place, we could not expect people to look up to the Parliament or to hope that their children would emulate the behaviour in this place at times.

Mr Davis: They certainly would not want to emulate you National Party blokes.

Mr ELLIOTT: It is very important that the people have someone to look up to. That is why I am a great supporter of the monarchy.

Mr Davis: You aren't really.

Mr ELLIOTT: Of course I am. It is very important. Society can only gain from having someone who sets an outstanding example and can be looked up to. I support the system wholeheartedly.

Mr Davis: Mr Elliott——

Mr ELLIOTT: No, I have taken enough interjections from the member.

Mr Davis: One question and then I will shut up.

Mr ELLIOTT: Very well, one more.

Mr Davis: Do you support Australia's national anthem?

Mr ELLIOTT: Yes. I also support *God Save The Queen*. They are both relevant. It depends on the circumstances. I would never sit when *Advance Australia Fair* was played. It depends on the decision made. I respect either anthem. If the Canadian national anthem was played, would the member for Brisbane Central remain seated?

Mr Davis: I would not.

Mr ELLIOTT: I should hope not. It would be gross bad manners.

I am extremely pleased that Sir Walter Campbell and Lady Campbell now occupy their high position. I wish them well. Because of his keen sense of humor and his attitude to people in general, Sir Walter will receive tremendous support throughout the length and breadth of the State. Obviously, that will benefit our State, and particularly our young people. Our previous Governor mixed in any company—that is very important—and his style endeared him to a tremendous number of Queenslanders. I look forward to Sir Walter doing the same.

I congratulate the Government on once again balancing its Budget. Unlike Canberra, Queensland for many years has brought down balanced Budgets. The member for Nundah (Sir William Knox) knows how important it is for the State to keep its economic house in order. As with a business or a family, if the State spends beyond its means it will end up in trouble. Australia's deficit is very disquieting indeed. Australia's total indebtedness overseas, both Government and non-government, is alarming.

Mr De Lacy: Does the Queensland Government borrow overseas?

Mr ELLIOTT: Of course it does.

It is frightening that the nation's entire rural output is required to meet the interest and redemption payments on those loans. Is it any wonder that there are those who talk about our country in the same vein as Argentina and other countries with similar economies?

Mr Davis: Are you denigrating this country again?

Mr ELLIOTT: I am not denigrating anything. As the elected representative for Cunningham, I am pointing out the concern of those people about the level of Government

spending. I am pleased to see that, at least in this State, the Government is not continually looking for new taxes to impose on the people. Unlike the other States of the Commonwealth, Queensland does not impose a petrol tax.

Mr Davis: It is your policy to have one.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is incorrect. The honourable member for Brisbane Central is misleading the House again, Mr Deputy Speaker. If the honourable member listens for a second, I will tell him what my policy was. When I was chairman of the National Party's committee on transport, I wanted to abolish registration as it now applies and implement through a levy on fuel the principle that underlies registration. That is completely different from the proposition suggested by the honourable member for Brisbane Central. The honourable member is implying that I wanted to implement a new tax, as his colleagues in other States have done, by levying an absolute tax on fuel. That fuel-tax system does not have anything to do with registration. In fact, when I was chairman of the committee on transport, vehicle-owners in other States were paying the highest registration fees.

It is very important that the Queensland Government continue its policy of not instituting new taxes and using every possible means to avoid doing so. If one examines the membership of the committee that has been formed, one looks forward with great interest to the results of the committee's deliberations. Its members are working their way through all of the Acts and regulations and will recommend to the Government the repeal of legislation and the abolition of regulations that have become unnecessary.

As a businessman and farmer, I know that there is nothing more stifling for business than the bureaucracy. When starting a business or expanding a business, nothing is worse than running up against bureaucratic procedures that stifle initiative and incentive. In future years, the committee should examine every statute on the book and every regulation that attaches to the Acts in an effort to streamline regulation by governmental authorities. The committee should abolish the Acts that are no longer relevant and knock out of the ring regulations that are not 100 per cent necessary for today's society and for the operations of business in the present commercial world.

I commend the Premier and Treasurer, who has been responsible for establishing the committee to which I have referred.

I look forward to meeting the people who comprise that committee, one of whom is Mr Keith Williams the entrepreneur that the Opposition hates with a vengeance. Unlike Opposition members, who hate to see anyone make a profit, I take my hat off to Keith Williams. I will never forget what he said when he saw his resort complex on Hamilton Island ablaze. He said, "Never mind. We will go back and we will rebuild the complex." That is the kind of attitude that should be encouraged in business people. Keith Williams is a man who is prepared to get in and do things, and, of course, the Opposition does not like that sort of person because it is just possible that he will make a profit. The Opposition thinks that "profit" is a dirty word.

Mr Booth: They want to redistribute it.

Mr ELLIOTT: The honourable member for Warwick is dead right. The Australian Labor Party wants to redistribute the wealth of this nation. It does not want to see anyone make money. All it wants to do is take everything away from those who have made money and redistribute it to people who are not prepared to do anything, people who do not have enough initiative to get off their backsides and do something for themselves.

I am delighted to see Mr Keith Williams being appointed a member of the committee, and I look forward with great interest to the recommendations made by that committee. I reiterate that there is far too much regulation of business activity.

Mr De Lacy: Is there too much regulation of the sugar industry?

Mr ELLIOTT: Yes, there is. That is one of the matters the committee has to look at, and that is one of the things it has been doing.

I do not profess for a minute to be an expert on the sugar industry; it is not my area at all. But I know enough about it to look into it. Obviously the committee has been working on it and looking into it. It has made certain recommendations. I suggest that it look at union operations in the industry. It would be a step in the right direction if the unions were amalgamated so that only one union was operating in the industry. That would probably prevent some of the demarcation disputes that arise. Surely Opposition members would support that.

I am delighted that the Queensland Government, unlike the Federal Government, is continuing to balance its Budget.

I shall now deal with the attitude of primary producers.

Mr Davis: Did you go down to the farmers' protest meeting?

Mr ELLIOTT: Of course I went down.

Mr Davis: I want you to remain in the House when I am speaking.

Mr ELLIOTT: Is that right? Does the honourable member intend to give me a touch-up? The honourable member asked me whether I attended the protest rally. I went with bells on. What is more, if another one is held in a fortnight's time, and if Parliament is not sitting, I will be down there again.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You were not arrested or bludgeoned by cops when you were down there, were you?

Mr ELLIOTT: No. Does the honourable member know why we were not arrested and bludgeoned by the police? It was because we behaved ourselves. We did not act in the same way as some of the colleagues of the honourable member for Wolston in the Electrical Trades Union act when they rush around thumping and standing over people. They went into my area to try to make men go out on strike although they knew full well that the men did not in any way support the strike and were not prepared to go on strike. If the honourable member had watched the rally in Canberra, he would know why no-one was arrested. The people were prepared to behave themselves.

Mr Veivers: Did you throw any cow dung?

Mr ELLIOTT: I did not, and I did not see anybody else do so. The rally was great. I support whole-heartedly all the organisations—

Mr R. J. Gibbs: It was probably stuck to your boots.

Mr ELLIOTT: I probably did have a bit of it stuck to my boots. Unlike the honourable member, I occasionally get my hands dirty. The first time the honourable member got his hands dirty was when he went into the cowyard at the prison. That is the first time he ever dirtied his hands.

All the organisations behind the rally in Canberra have my utmost support. It is very significant that they should adopt their present-day attitude.

At lunch-time today I had a very interesting discussion with a gentleman whom Opposition members would probably describe as a Pitt Street farmer. He is a very successful businessman. He paid cash for a farm. He had it for three or four years and sold it. Do honourable members opposite know why he sold it? All the time he owned it, although he was an efficient businessman making a lot of money in this city, he was unable to make a penny out of the farm. I emphasise that he had no debt structure on the property. His action is a fair comment on land matters today.

In the last year in which I was running my property myself before I came into Parliament, I made a substantial profit. I am not at all frightened to say that I did.

These days, when I pay labour to do even the job that I did myself, I find it increasingly difficult to make a profit on the land. Because of the policies of the Federal Government and the former Federal Government, costs——

Mr De Lacy: Are you paying income tax?

Mr ELLIOTT: Of course I am. Does the honourable member think that tax is not taken out of my salary to start with?

It is noteworthy that primary producers are concerned. Generally, farmers would never protest. They would be the last people one would expect to see out on the streets waving banners and adopting the attitude that they adopted in the recent Canberra rally. The reason they did that was that they are fed up to the back teeth with the attitude of the Federal Government. I whole-heartedly support them.

All of us in this Chamber have to take on board some of the comments that they made. Although most of the comments that they made at that rally were directed at the Federal Government, I do not think that any of us can afford to sit back and say that none of the comments applies to us. We must realise that the primary producers in this nation are in great difficulty. They are finding things increasingly difficult. You, Mr Deputy Speaker, as a member representing cane-growing areas, would know better than anyone the disastrous situation facing sugar-producers. It ill behoves us to sit back, rest on our laurels and think that we do not have to do anything to help those people.

I wish to congratulate an enterprise in my area. I refer to O'Phee Industries of Pittsworth. That company has gone to China and secured contracts with a Beijing trailer company.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: A communist country!

Mr ELLIOTT: What is wrong with that?

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You come in here and make these rotten allegations.

Mr ELLIOTT: What allegations? I challenge the honourable member to say what allegations I have made. I did not make any allegations.

Congratulations are in order for that company. It is a relatively small company. Many other companies should take a leaf out of its book. At present the trade opportunities in China are amazing. Anyone in business who has something to offer should be attending trade fairs and taking a leaf out of O'Phee's book. O'Phee Industries has reached an agreement with a Beijing trailer company. At present it is building trailers in Queensland and sending them to China. Eventually, O'Phee Industries will supervise the building of trailers under licence by a Beijing trailer company. I urge other companies to enter into similar agreements.

Like many other members, I have the flu and I am running out of voice. Once again, I pledge my loyalty to Her Majesty. I will listen with interest to what other members say.

Mr De LACY (Cairns) (2.38 p.m.): In the Address in Reply debate last year, I commented that the then Governor's Opening Speech was "terribly disappointing, extremely provocative and narrowly partisan" I said that the people who wrote the speech for the Governor did a grave disservice to the institution of the monarchy by reducing its representative in Queensland to the level of a second hand car salesman peddling cheap propaganda.

I welcome the new Governor, Sir Walter Campbell, and wish him all the best during his tenure of office in Queensland. His Opening Speech was not nearly as offensive as that of his predecessor last year, although there was some heavy irony in his lapse into the philosophical dimensions of government, when he said—

"For, in a free and democratic society, diversity is our strength; it allows us to live our lives in the pursuit of our own interests . . ."

While he said that, one hundred Queenslanders were being arrested outside Parliament House for doing just that. They perhaps mistakenly believed that they were in fact living in a free and democratic society in which diversity is our strength.

Mr Elliott interjected.

Mr De LACY: It is ironic that people such as the honourable member for Cunningham (Mr Elliott) supported, cheered and even joined the farmers' rally and demonstration in Canberra but, at the same time, are outraged at the fact that a couple of hundred people in Queensland chose to demonstrate outside Parliament House.

Mr Elliott: I welcome anyone who protests in an orderly fashion; I have nothing against that.

Mr De LACY: I suggest that the honourable member communicate those views to the Premier and Treasurer, because he does not let anyone demonstrate at any time in this State. In fact, I suggest that, because the honourable member holds those views, he continues to sit on the back bench.

Today I shall refer mainly to staff shortages in the Queensland hospital system. There has long been a chronic shortage, and it is now becoming acute. The Minister for Health (Mr Austin) presides over a disaster. Like that of all Government members, his response is, on the one hand, to blame Canberra and, on the other, to blame the nurses.

Last night I heard the president of the Queensland Nurses Union (Mr Roy Drabble) say on television that nothing the Minister says is new. He and the other Ministers are like gramophone needles sounding out the same scratchy, old tune. How the Minister can discredit the very people whom he needs to make the health system function—the nurses—is beyond me. Most people who have had the misfortune of being hospitalised in this State remember those wonderful people very fondly. It may only be coincidental, but the Minister for Health's renegade Liberal comrade (Mr Lane) adopts a similar attitude to railway workers.

Today I will expose a startling scandal of substantial proportions at the Cairns Base Hospital, which places in clear perspective the situation in this State and the shocking deterioration in our health services.

On 11 October 1983, the then Minister for Health (Angelo Bertoni)—did I hear someone ask, "Angelo who?"—opened the new \$24.7m wing at the Cairns Base Hospital. The story surrounding this opening is interesting. When Mr Bertoni came to open the new block at the hospital, it was not ready to be opened because it was not finished. Those honourable members who are perceptive would realise that 11 October 1983 was just 11 days prior to the State election and Mr Bertoni's visit was purely and simply an election stunt. The opening was performed with indecent haste and thousands of dollars was spent on superficial appearances to camouflage the fact that the hospital was not ready for opening and that it would not be ready to receive patients until the end of November. One floor of the block was prepared for public viewing, as was a nice, shiny, bronze plaque for the Minister to unveil that would inscribe his name for posterity. If ever there was a travesty of justice, that was it. It was an insult to the people of Cairns.

All of the fine-sounding promises that the Minister made on that occasion have turned sour for the people of Cairns. Mr Bertoni droned on long and hard in true National Party fashion about the fine achievements of the Government, listing all of the uses to which the new wing, including a coronary care unit, would be put. That was warmly welcomed by the people of Cairns because, as all honourable members know, heart disease or heart attack is the most common cause of sudden death in Australia, and I am sure that the position would not be any different in far-north Queensland. The coronary care unit was duly installed and equipped with sophisticated electronic cardiac-monitoring equipment at a cost to the tax-payer of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The only trouble is that once again the National Party became the victim of its own shortcomings. Those shortcomings, which manifest themselves in a million different ways throughout the State—particularly so in this case—are, firstly, inadequate planning and incompetent economic management and, secondly, an obsession with building monuments to its own ego at the expense of everything else, including maintenance and staffing.

Can honourable members believe that this coronary care unit remains just that—a monument? It has been fully equipped for 18 months, but it has never been used because it has never been staffed. All of the sophisticated equipment, which is worth hundreds of thousands of dollars, is now out of warranty, yet it has never been used.

In Cairns, heart patients are admitted into the intensive care ward, which has insufficient beds, inadequate facilities and, more importantly, an environment that is precisely the opposite to that needed by patients recovering from heart attacks. Can honourable members imagine what it is like when the accident cases are brought in on a Friday night, when critically ill patients require intensive, and often noisy, treatment? That is hardly conducive to the type of rest and relaxation required by heart attack patients.

The staffing situation in the Queensland hospital system is scandalous. What is happening at the Cairns Base Hospital is symptomatic of what is happening throughout the whole of the State. The standard of nursing care is deteriorating. Morale is at a dangerously low level.

Mrs Chapman interjected.

Mr De LACY: Resignations are at an epidemic level. The Minister's only response—I can hear it being regurgitated and parroted by members of the Government—is to criticise the Federal Government and the Queensland Nurses Union. My understanding is that health is a State responsibility. In that regard the Queensland Government is not facing up to its responsibilities.

I do not blame the nurses for the deterioration in the health system in Queensland; there are simply not enough of them. The pressures on them are enormous. During their training, great emphasis is placed on the need to provide emotional care for patients, but in Queensland the nurses are flat out carrying out the most basic of physical care. I can remember that, during the strike earlier this year, a nurse in Brisbane said that staff shortages were so acute that patients suffering from terminal illnesses were not given the psychological and emotional support they needed and deserved and that those patients were left to cry alone.

One hears from the media that the problems with nursing are not confined to Queensland, that the problems exist throughout Australia. I tell honourable members that one of the nurse-educators who left the Cairns Base Hospital for New South Wales at the beginning of the year has written back saying that she cannot believe the difference. She said that nurses might be complaining about staff shortages in New South Wales, but since she went down there she has never had it so good.

Mrs Chapman: That is because down there they are getting all the money from the Federal Government that should have come up here.

Mr De LACY: I can hear it again. The only solution to all the problems in Queensland lies in blaming the Federal Government. I suggest to the members of the Government that what they need to do is address themselves to the problem in Queensland.

Another nurse has told me that, after 25 years of nursing, she intends to resign. She said that she wants to leave while she can still get angry about things; she does not want to wait until she does not care any more.

I wrote to the Minister for Health and explained to him that although the coronary care unit in Cairns was 18 months old it still had not been opened. His courteous reply was that it had nothing to do with him, that it was the hospitals board that "allocated positions according to perceived priorities".

Mr Campbell: A sell-out!

Mr De LACY: Yes, and it is nonsense, also.

I regret to say that hospital boards in this State are fast being perceived as a joke. That is happening because they have no real power to make real decisions any more and also because they are a repository for National Party hacks. Jobs for the boys and girls! It seems that the only useful role they retain in this day and age is assisting the Government in its buck-passing exercises.

I put it to the House that, especially on the issue of the coronary care unit in Cairns, the Minister's whole credibility is on the line. The coronary care unit needs to be staffed. It needs to be made operational in the interests of the medical care of the people of far-north Queensland and also in the interests of the tax-payers of Queensland.

For the remainder of my speech I would like to concentrate principally on some economic issues that have been raised in this Address in Reply debate and to take up a few points made by the economic giants on the other side of the House. I think it is fair to say that they bring a new intellectual dimension to the study of economics.

I will cite a few examples. Unfortunately, the honourable member for Mirani (Mr Randell) is not in the Chamber. Yesterday, he said—

"Experts from the Main Roads Department have calculated that the real dollar cut-back in Federal grants in 1985-86 for Queensland amounts to almost \$4m."

He referred to the "real dollar cut-back" In other words, the inflation-adjusted cut-backs amount to \$4m. He continued—

"When the factor of rising inflation is taken into account, that results in an effective cut-back of \$20m."

If that is the level of intellectual ability of Government back-benchers, I feel sorry for the future of this State.

When the Premier and Treasurer of Queensland (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) was in Cairns on the Friday before last opening Crossland Motors—honourable members should listen to this because it is a good story—he was making his speech and carrying on as only the Premier can.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr De LACY: Yes, I was invited and I happened to be there. In fact, I had a privileged position, from which I had an opportunity to see some of the notes from which the Premier was reading.

He turned the page and it said, "Commonwealth Government taxes \$360m" That reminded the Premier, so he said—

"I want to say something about the sugar industry. The Federal Government should come to the financial assistance of the sugar industry because each year they get \$700m out of the sugar industry in taxes."

While the Premier stood there, he doubled the figure from \$360m to \$700m.

Mr Campbell: And he's the Treasurer!

Mr De LACY: And he is the Treasurer of Queensland.

He had a reasonably sympathetic audience. He thought it sounded good, and \$360m, of course, is only half as good as \$700m.

Mr Littleproud: You read the notes?

Mr De LACY: I admit that. I was sitting at the back and I saw the Premier's notes.

Let me put that claim into perspective. This morning, I heard the Minister for Primary Industries endeavouring to answer a question upon notice from the honourable member for Mackay (Mr Casey). The Minister said that last year the total value of exports from the sugar industry was \$636m. He said that the value of the whole of the sugar industry to Australia was in the vicinity of \$800m. I put it to honourable members that the Premier is suggesting that the Federal Government is taking \$700m out of that \$800m each year.

Apart from providing a glaring example of the Premier's economic illiteracy and his scant regard for the facts or the truth, it also points to another issue: the lengths to which the Queensland Government will go to avoid giving financial assistance to the troubled sugar industry. If this is the way it is going to dodge its responsibility to the sugar industry, it deserves to lose all its credibility. Cane-farmers want assistance; they do not want shonky statistics.

I shall cite another example of economic greatness insofar as it refers to the sugar industry. I wish to deal with something raised last week by the honourable member for Mulgrave (Mr Menzel) about the sugar industry. He came up with a novel approach that did not receive much publicity. That is probably because it came from the honourable member for Mulgrave. I do not know whether all honourable members picked it up, but the honourable member for Mulgrave suggested that the industry and the State Government should ignore the Federal Government. The honourable member for Mulgrave said, "Let the State Government and the industry pick up the tab for financial assistance." He delivered a five-point program for the salvation of the industry. He said—

"Basically the recommendations involve the lifting of the delivery price immediately from \$150 to \$180 a tonne with the Queensland Government paying the interest. So far as the report is concerned, Canberra should be told to go to hell because Labor has demonstrated that it is simply playing politics with the sugar industry."

Mr NEAL: I rise to a point of order. Mr Deputy Speaker, I understand that the honourable member for Cairns is quoting from a *Hansard* pull. As I understand it, honourable members are not permitted to quote directly from the *Hansard* pulls.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! Would the honourable member for Balonne restate his point of order?

Mr NEAL: My point of order is that the honourable member for Cairns is quoting from a *Hansard* pull. I understand that that is not permitted in this Chamber.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I remind all honourable members, including the honourable member for Cairns, that *Hansard* pulls are not regarded as privileged documents and are not allowed to be quoted from in this Chamber.

Mr De LACY: I thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I was merely stating what I recalled the honourable member for Mulgrave said last week in this Chamber.

I realise that the honourable member for Mulgrave is and has been very often at odds with his party, particularly in relation to the sugar industry, because—and I am genuine when I say this—he is one of the few members on that side of the Chamber who talks to cane-farmers rather than sugar-millers. As I said, the honourable member for Mulgrave is very often at odds with his party and at odds with his electorate, for that matter, particularly in relation to the matter of the Babinda bypass.

The honourable member for Mulgrave must have a very fertile imagination to have dreamed up this scheme. I wonder whether he has cleared with the Premier and Treasurer

his suggestion that the Commonwealth Government not be involved in a financial sense in the rescue operation of the sugar industry. I wonder whether the honourable member for Mulgrave has conveyed those sentiments to Mr Kerin and Mr Hawke. However, I will undertake on his behalf to convey his sentiments. I do wonder whether he is speaking on behalf of the sugar industry or just making another rat-bag statement.

A little while ago the honourable member for Cunningham (Mr Elliott) criticised the members of the Labor Party for being doom-and-gloom merchants. I have heard that many times. Do Government members believe that politicians who comment on the economy should be positive and constructive? Are they opposed to negative comments or the doom-and-gloom merchants?

Mr Bailey interjected.

Mr De LACY: I will remind Government members that the Premier and Treasurer has said—

“There is no way in which this nation can have a sound economic base. How can this nation ever succeed?”

The Premier and Treasurer was referring to the paid advertisement in *The Australian* by Mr Leard.

In today's *Australian* is an advertisement headed, “Australia is going broke”. The advertisement points out that, by 1988, Australia's overseas indebtedness will be \$100m. John Leard points out very clearly that Australia is going broke and that there will be more and more unemployment as long as the Federal Government remains in office. The Premier and Treasurer has carried on in that vein for some considerable time. Have honourable members ever heard such doom and gloom before? I suggest that it borders on being treasonable.

The difference between the Premier and Treasurer attacking the Federal Government over its economic position and members on this side of the Chamber attacking the Premier and Treasurer and Government members on the economic mismanagement of this State is that what Labor Party members say is based on fact.

Almost every reliable indicator and every reputable political, professional and financial commentator points to the economic mess in Queensland. The only people who ever defend Queensland are the Premier and Treasurer, Government members who are looking for a position on the front benches, John Stone and people who seek a bit of political assistance to set up business in Queensland, such as Murdoch, who was here the other day. All of the professional economic commentators agree that Queensland is dragging the chain in Australia's economic revival.

Mr Fouras: Have you heard the rumour that John Stone is going to run for Aspley?

Mr De LACY: I did hear a rumour that the present member for Aspley may not recontest the seat and that John Stone will enter Parliament through Aspley and become the flat-tax, flat-earth economic guru of the Queensland Government.

The advertisement inserted by John Leard and referred to by the Premier proves only one thing: a person can be economically illiterate but still make money. It does not follow that, because a person has money, he spends it wisely. That someone would pay \$70,000 for a national advertisement full of such economic nonsense boggles my imagination. I suggest that a drunken sailor in the streets of Kings Cross could spend \$70,000 much more productively than that. It further proves that a person can be economically illiterate but still Premier of Queensland.

Mr Veivers: And Treasurer.

Mr De LACY: Yes, indeed. Leard in his advertisement, and the Premier and Treasurer in his comments, confused the Budget deficit with Australia's overseas indebtedness. In economic terms, they bear no relationship. I need say no more about that.

In spite of statements by the doom-and-gloom merchants on the Government side, Australia's economy is doing well. Government members have a great deal of trouble coming to grips with that. Our economy is doing well under the steady hands of Hawke and Keating.

Mr Fouras: There's been a five per cent growth for three years.

Mr De LACY: Exactly.

To balance the nonsense that has emanated from the Government side during the last week, I wish to include in *Hansard* assessments of Australia's economy. The first is an article by the AAP correspondent Andrew Kruger in New York. I will quote selectively the important parts of the article. It says, in part—

“Australia continued to lead the international economic scoreboard for nine selected countries both in economic performance and expected growth.

The latest analysis released by the Conference Board in New York yesterday showed the Australian economy improved significantly in the last month for which statistics are available.

The latest leading index was running at 13 per cent.

What is impressive is Australia's overall economic performance and anticipated growth when compared with the other eight key economies used in the scoreboard.

Leading indices for Japan and Italy, for example, were climbing by only 10 per cent, followed by Canada at 9 per cent.

West Germany and France were expected to experience economic growth of 5 per cent and Taiwan 4 per cent.

Britain trailed at 2 per cent while the United States was last with projected growth of only 1 per cent.”

I refer now to an article published in *The Bulletin*, which has never been known for its left-wing leanings. The article emanated from a report on the Australian economy by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development—

“Australia's average annual volume growth of output from 1978 to 1983 was twice that of the United States, or Germany. It was faster, but not so great an extent, than in Canada, Denmark, France, Italy, Sweden, Switzerland and, of course, the United Kingdom. Growth dropped behind the others in 1983, but it is right back up there for 1984 and 1985.

Government spending on goods and services is a smaller proportion of total output in Australia than in Canada, Germany, Denmark, Italy, Sweden, the United States and the United Kingdom.”

One could be excused for thinking that Government members are living in another world when one considers the selective statistics that they quote.

The article continues—

“Australians save a higher proportion of their income than Americans or the British. We save nearly as high a proportion as the French, and more than the Swedes. The Japanese save a lot more, the Germans a little more.

Capital spending in Australia is a higher proportion of output than it is in almost all major European market countries, including Germany, France and the United Kingdom. It is also higher than in the United States.

Export growth in Australia in the five years to 1984 was much higher than in major European market economies, and higher than in the United States.”

I notice that Government members are conspicuous by their silence.

That report places into context all the bleatings by the Premier and Treasurer and the sycophants on the Government side of the House and the wishful thinking about the Australian economy. Government members have developed into a fine art the selective use of statistics; but as the National Party Government in Queensland lurches from crisis to crisis, its performance is beginning to wear a bit thin. The people of Queensland want performance, not rhetoric.

In the few moments that remain, I wish to address myself to comments that have been made by the honourable member for Roma, Mr Russell Cooper. I see that he is not in the Chamber. However, last week, when he seconded the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, he made comments to which I will shortly refer. I used to think that Mr Cooper was a decent bloke, that he was a simple country soul—a bit out of touch with the real world but, nevertheless, a decent bloke.

Mr Littleproud: What a pathetic sort of statement to make.

Mr De LACY: I always take people as I find them. I do not allow preconceived political opinions to colour my judgment.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I remind honourable members that yesterday I said it is customary to refer to honourable members by their correct title. In this instance, it is the honourable member for Roma.

Mr De LACY: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. It is the honourable member for Roma to whom I have referred.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member has now made it clear.

Mr De LACY: Thank you.

I still think that on the Government side of the House there are a few decent blokes. However, I shall not name them, because it would not do their political careers any good.

Mr Veivers: It might go to their head.

Mr De LACY: That is right; I suppose it could.

Unfortunately, I do not believe that the honourable member for Roma any longer fits into that category. I am sorry that I have had to make that assessment. I believe that the honourable member now belongs to the small-minded and nasty people who belong to the National Party. During his speech in this debate, the honourable member referred to me as the “card-carrying communist for Cairns”. Although I do not usually dignify a comment such as that with a response, let me say that to become a member of the Australian Labor Party, one must sign a declaration specifically stating that he or she is not a member of the Communist Party. I wonder whether the National Party has a similar declaration so that members can state that they are not members of the Fascist Party, the Nazi Party or the Ku Klux Klan. In fact, I am beginning to believe that membership of such organisations might be a precondition for membership of the National Party or the League of Rights.

I understand that the honourable member for Roma is a very strong supporter, or perhaps even a member, of the League of Rights, which is a reactionary organisation that is dedicated to racial purity and—if one is able to read correctly its propaganda—the overthrow of the so-called International Jewish Conspiracy.

The attitudes of the League of Rights, with which the honourable member for Roma aligns himself, are racist, anti-liberal, anti-intellectual, anti-Australian, royalist, and God, Queen and country. Those attitudes are so irrelevant to the mainstream of the Australian way of life and so manifest in the paranoia that was displayed yesterday and again today by the Premier and Treasurer and other Government members when reference was made to standing up for *God Save The Queen*. Such attitudes find a fertile breeding ground

in areas of rural Australia and find their way into this Chamber through disciples such as the honourable member for Roma.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the honourable member for Cairns that, because there is an agreement whereby members will limit their speeches in the Address in Reply debate to 30 minutes—and if it is intended that that arrangement should be retained—the honourable member's time is up.

Mr De LACY: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I accept that.

Mr BAILEY (Toowong) (3.10 p.m.): I am delighted to have the opportunity of recognising the appointment of Sir Walter Campbell as Governor of Queensland, because he has had a very distinguished career in law and as Chancellor of the University of Queensland. Sir Walter will be a superb Governor of Queensland and a great representative of Her Majesty the Queen.

It is interesting in this debate to follow the honourable member for Cairns for whom, I must admit, I have reasonable respect. I was surprised that he should use the latter part of his speech to make some of the comments that he did. I do not think that that is usual for him.

Once again this debate has followed a fairly predictable pattern, with the Government expounding its successful fiscal policy—and I might add it is a strong and most appreciated Government—and the Opposition doing what it does best, that is, whingeing, attacking Queensland, and acting as the surrogate promoters of the Hawke Government. Their concern about Queensland seems to be tempered by excuses and justifications for attacks on this State by the Federal socialist Government. That Government has penalised Queensland in many ways, including the reduction of funding and grants. One can only assume that many speeches made by Opposition members have been prepared by their federal colleagues. They make such outrageous claims that they are statistically feasible. Of course, the majority of Queenslanders see them for what they are, that is, backers of lost causes and incompetent policy-makers.

Their continued backing of the Federal Government's assault on both the independence and finance of Queensland is not going unnoticed by the community. Even the slowest of honourable members opposite cannot ignore the polls which show that their inability to back Queensland is not appreciated by those Queenslanders who care for their State. Negative knocking seems to be a pre-occupation of members of the Opposition. Like all people who lack a positive approach they pay the penalty by attracting community disdain and contempt.

We are for ever hearing about the continuing power dispute. How unfair it is of Labor members to talk of a continuing dispute when even blind Freddy knows that the dispute is over, that SEQEB is operating more efficiently with co-operation from contractors and SEQEB workers alike. There are now no longer expensive demarcation disputes and no bludging on wet days, and work practices all round are more effective. I might add that, having visited the Taringa depot on many occasions, I have found that the men are contented and working hard, but they still have to put up with terrorism from, I assume, those who are paid from the coffers of other union movements and unions to harass and terrify the families of those who have decided that the work ethic is not a bad thing.

These people arrive in a number of cars with false number plates, take the keys out of the vans of the SEQEB workers and throw them into the bush, and then explain to the workers what they will do to their wives and their children. These actions are denied categorically by the leading members of the Opposition, most of whom were former ETU workers or ETU leaders. I find it absolutely appalling that their point of view is so highlighted in the media in Queensland.

I am for ever reading about the plight of former SEQEB workers when I know that they sent broke hundreds of small businessmen in this State. Thousands of people were

put through absolute purgatory during the SEQEB power dispute because overpaid workers in the power industry decided that they would penalise this State because, in their opinion, contracting and free enterprise were not acceptable. I am sure that the voters in Queensland certainly understand the imposition and will vote accordingly in the next election to convey their feelings.

We now know that the publicans who asked staff to work when the SEQEB dispute was again raised are having bans placed on deliveries of alcohol to their hotels. The bans are affecting 22 hotels so far, and probably more will be involved. What are the unions about? They are using blackmail and terrorist tactics. I can well understand why the people of Queensland and Australia are so sick of what has happened to the union movement which, at one stage, was a highly respected organisation in Australia.

In the circumstances, Opposition members still encourage the workers who would not return to work to think that there is still a dispute and that there is a chance of their getting their jobs back. Opposition members still threaten to hold the State to ransom. Like some small child whose game has been halted, they petulantly refuse to accept reality and they hold out hope when there is none. Realism is hardly their strong point. However that is only normal for the Labor Party nationally, and for the unions in particular.

This country is fast heading towards becoming the poor white coolie of the Pacific. The Labor Government does not care about taxing business and individuals. Taxing is what it is all about. It says, "Let us get rid of incentive; it is a thing of the past." On the other hand, the unions demand more and more for less and less. The problem in Australia is that the average Australian worker is becoming a bludger. He and she contribute as little as possible in the working environment because unions have managed to take away the need for hard work. There is no piece-work; excellence and productivity are not encouraged. Workers who want to do better and work harder are penalised and made to feel that success is something about which they should feel guilty.

Sir Theodore Bray—in anyone's terms, a respected journalist and administrator—has just returned from a trip to South East Asia. He points out that Korea, Japan and China are fast becoming the major power bloc in the world. The people who live there and those who run their industries and their governments are amazed at Australia's attitude to work, its strike history, its delusions of efficiency and its incapacity to meet the contracts into which it enters. In those countries, people work. They earn their holidays. Their loyalty to their companies and countries is obvious. Their progress is very apparent.

Here, the Hawke Government talks about consensus, which, in reality, is just the easy way out. It says, "Let us not make the hard decisions. Let us just disappear into economic disaster with a deficit that is crippling us and overseas borrowings that are now having to be met with borrowings." What is our future under that sort of Government? Perhaps Anne Warner and her Socialist Left colleagues are looking forward to the day when Australians reach such depths of despair that socialism will be the only alternative. Most of us will be either employed by the State or supported by it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I have been insisting on honourable members' being referred to by their correct titles. I must be consistent in that respect. I remind the honourable member for Toowong of that.

Mr BAILEY: My apologies, Mr Deputy Speaker. I was referring to the member for Kurilpa.

I am sure that soon we will be seeing once again the bumper stickers that were so widespread in the Whitlam era—"Will the last businessman leaving Australia please turn out the lights"

Let me take one area which is well overdue for reform—Government regulation. In this case, of course, I am referring to both local and State regulation. In fact, one of the reasons why I came into Parliament was to try to help, where possible, businesses

in this State, both large and small, that were slowly being strangled by the bureaucratic red tape and regulation that can drive even the most efficient businessmen to distraction. It also inhibits in many ways the successful operation of their firms.

I commend the Premier and Treasurer for appointing Sir Ernest Savage to head an organisation that I hope will be supported by all people who have a complaint or a problem about the regulations and restrictions that have burgeoned over the years. It will be a massive task but one which, once again, will encourage private enterprise towards making better profits and employing more people. How different is that from the stultifying practices of the Hawke/Keating partnership in Canberra?

Balanced budgets—what a unique exercise in Australia! Yet that achievement is attacked and deprecated by the Labour Party. Surely even it must realise that what the increasing deficit is doing to this country must be reversed. Australia is likened to Brazil, a country that borrows to pay the interest on its borrowings, but the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton) has the temerity to suggest that the Government spend its way into deficit to try to lift the State out of the so-called recession. What a terrifying recipe for total disaster!

There is no understanding of the basic problem that any company or family that continues to run on deficits ultimately has to pay the piper. All honourable members are aware that there is a day of reckoning. Governments are no different; a day of reckoning must come. All that we can hope is that there is not only a change in Government attitude but also a real change in direction by the Federal Government into living within its means. If there is not, very soon we will be not only the poor white coolies of Asia but the poor white coolies of the world, with only a series of posters to remind us of the standard of living that we once enjoyed. It is called biting the bullet.

Decisions must be made, even difficult ones such as rationalising third-party insurance, so that Queenslanders can still be covered. It is not a popular move, but it is essential. Governments do not like making such decisions, but must make them in the interests of the community.

All that is heard from members on the other side of the Chamber is political gamesmanship. Although that is fine as far as it goes, it is not the way in which the community will be convinced that there is a possible alternative Government on the benches on the other side of the Chamber.

This State still does not have a petrol tax or a tobacco tax. Certainly, some charges have been increased, but at least the Government has the courage to increase them up front. The charges are not indexed so that the people of the State are caught by increasing costs and inflationary pressures. The Canberra tax-hiking mob claim that they are reducing expenditure while at the same time they are skilfully stealing more and more from the community by indexing taxes and charges. No wonder Mr Seventy per cent hit the slide.

The voting public is not stupid; it sees through the permanently negative posturing of the Opposition and will continue to do so while those honourable members grace the Opposition benches.

Earlier the honourable member for Cairns (Mr De Lacy) discussed the lack of media coverage of the positive aspects of the Queensland economy. I point out that the August edition of *Rydges* magazine has a photo of the Premier of this State on the cover and contains an article referring to the economic successes of the State.

I will read a couple of passages from the article into *Hansard* to defy some of the members on the other side of the Chamber. This illustrates that a senior journalist from a magazine that must be one of the most respected financial journals in this country has the reverse attitude to that of the so-called expert economists quoted so frequently by my friends on the other side who dwell on doom and gloom.

Mr Borbidge: The article makes a fool of them.

Mr BAILEY: It certainly does.

The first paragraph of the article states—

“Queensland is set to market itself to the world, particularly the tourist destinations of the Gold Coast, Whitsunday and points north. Queensland needs to go offshore for customers to support an excess of \$6bn currently being invested in additional tourist infrastructure.”

That is not the sign of a really ailing economy. The sum of \$6 billion is a lot of money to be invested. No-one in the Opposition gives the Premier or the Government credit for the amount of money that is invested in the State; the Opposition ignores these facts. Who would invest in a State that is considered to be in financial trouble? People on the realistic side of politics cannot understand the attitudes of Opposition members; attitudes that cannot be justified.

The third paragraph states—

“What is emerging in Queensland, on top of unprecedented spending in the last decade, is an elitist society fashioned under a right wing sun. Joh and his many allies in business are selling a political philosophy to the international investing public. A society which will be free of the dreaded socialists, offer commercial and personal security, all with the bonus of a great climate.”

I could not have put it better myself. In fact, it could be said that we in the National Party wrote this article ourselves; but we did not. It has been written by the editor of *Rydges* magazine.

I will go into this a little further because honourable members on the Labor side of this House and the six-pack tend to give the Government a touch-up. *Rydges* continues—

“For southerners who think Queensland has fallen in a heap, then they are counselled to think again. The investment activity is staggering. And the quality of the projects even more so.”

One could not find a better recommendation for what is happening in this State.

The last paragraph of the article states—

“If the entrepreneurs, the investors and employers can bring their financial and philosophic zeal to training and the philosophy of service, then there will be no holding back the elitist society emerging under the right wing sun.”

One cannot find a better recommendation for Queensland than in that article in *Rydges*.

I point out to the orphan Annies and nervous Nellies on the Labor Party side of this Chamber that some people understand and perceive what is happening in this State. The businessmen in Queensland appreciate what is being done, as does the general community, which is subjected to the most extraordinary amount of negative journalism and negative comment from the other side of the Chamber. The community is entitled to perceive the reality of what is happening in this State.

Certainly the economy is not as great as it could be. It took the State 18 months longer than other States to get into the recession but, because of the leadership of the Premier and Treasurer and his capacity to induce enthusiasm, the people of the industrial nations are lining up to invest in this State. If that is not a recommendation for the economy of Queensland, I do not know what it is. Certainly, I cannot think of a better one.

My electorate has many signs of the good economic management of this Government. Might I add that the schools are all in respectable shape. New libraries and class-rooms, science laboratories and other facilities have been built, or are still under construction. The very exciting Toowong railway project, which is worth more than \$50m, is now well under way and has excited not only the community in Toowong but the whole of

the western suburbs. It will prove a bonus to business and to those who live in the area. The crime rate has been reduced by some very commendable work by the local Criminal Investigation Branch, under the very capable direction of Sergeant Bob Dallow, and the police in uniform. What a superb job these much-maligned Queensland policemen do. I do not think any honourable member would disagree that there is a need for more of them.

Unlike the forgettable member for Mackay (Mr Casey), Dr Rupert Goodman, who lives in my electorate and runs the Australian Flag Society, still seems to think that the traditions of Australia are important, that they are relevant and that "God Save The Queen" and the flag are an important part of the heritage of this country. He works very hard for that cause. Unlike *The Bulletin* exercise, which tried to create a philosophy that the flag needs to be changed, the response to Dr Goodman from every part of the community—I do not care which party they vote for or from which part of the economic spectrum they come—is that people recognise the basic reality that this country has a history that is worth thinking about and worth admiring. Dr Rupert Goodman, who does this work basically at his own expense and all in his own time, works very hard to make sure that the people of this nation do not have a change imposed upon them without letting the other side of the story be known. How often is it that the other side of a story is known? I recommend to the Minister for Education that the history of the flag be put into every school in addition to the peace studies and all the other nonsense that the Opposition wants to introduce, so that schoolchildren can look at the reality of Australian history.

Mrs Chapman: They should go into Mackay.

Mr BAILEY: Yes. I am sure the people of Mackay are absolutely staggered that a member of Parliament——

Mr Littleproud: A flag should be put in the Mackay electorate office.

Mr BAILEY: Although the Labor Party stands beneath the Australian flag, it seems to be the only party that wants to change it.

Ever since the embarrassment of the Hawke climb-down on the MX missile, the Australian dollar has been in trouble. People in this country do not hear about the realities of Australia being a strong nation. When we travel overseas we are very cocky, but we are a small nation. The realities of Australia's place in the world have to be realised; the nation has to rely on international trade. If Australia prices itself out of the market, which it is doing; if it becomes unreliable on contractual obligations, which it is doing; and if it becomes the political laughing-stock of the world through the decisions such as the one on the MX missiles, which it has done, how does it expect to retain the place that it earned so desperately over the years by hard work, by pioneering and through unionism? In the old days the unions had the work ethic in mind.

I am sure there are many good unions, and certainly there are a number of great union leaders in this country, but I wonder how some of the other union leaders obtained their positions. It must be because the rank and file do not get involved in the election process. That is what causes the problem. That is quite extraordinary, because the members do not perceive the damage that their leaders are doing—or do not want to perceive it. It is only when the ultimate decision is made, that is, when the pocket is affected and the nation has become the equivalent of a banana republic, that the reality will hit. The other side of the Chamber has some very excellent, rational thinkers, the sort of people that one would consider as friends.

I do not understand how they can possibly conceive of a situation such as that now being faced—which needs to be redressed—yet justify the continuing SEQEB dispute. That staggers me. One would expect some Opposition members to do that, but not the many sensible members of the Opposition. One of them has just strolled in—the

honourable member for Brisbane Central (Mr Davis). If one could hear his interjections more often—

Mrs Chapman: He is sensible?

Mr BAILEY: Sensible, because there has to be humour in the House. It is nice to have humour in the House, and I welcome the honourable member back to the Chamber. I hope that he listens to the debate.

There is no need to go over the achievements of the Queensland Government; the majority of Queenslanders are aware of them. The achievements can be seen in Brisbane. One need only look across the Brisbane River to the Expo 88 site. A massive new building project is taking place at Roma Street. One has only to look at the number of cranes in Brisbane alone and at the realities of what is happening in Queensland, not the negative side.

Mr Fouras interjected.

Mr BAILEY: The only cranes with which the honourable member is familiar are those that fly. He is a bird-watcher from way back.

The Hawke Federal Government does not seem to think about looking after the rural sector and giving the Queensland Government a helping hand to resolve problems in the sugar industry. It talks about looking after the rural sector, but the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin) is a fraud and a sham. He does not do anything in reality.

Mr Kruger: What about the National Party, who look after the sugar industry in this State and who have done nothing; and you know it?

Mr BAILEY: It is nice to hear the honourable member chattering again, but it is not worth while replying to him.

The massive turn-out by farmers in Canberra provides a reply to the honourable member's question. They did not go down there to say that they were enjoying what the Federal Government is doing to them; they went down there to tell the honourable member's colleagues that the Queensland Opposition does not care. The Labor Party has never cared. In the history of Australian politics, the Labor Party has never represented the rural areas properly. That is why there was a need to create the Country Party in the first place.

Mr Kruger interjected.

Mr BAILEY: Members of the Opposition have no concern for the rural sector. They have no idea of the realities.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Randell): Order! I ask honourable members to cease the cross-firing in the Chamber.

Mr BAILEY: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

They are the realities. One can understand why the Labor Party gets upset. It has lost all the seats in country areas because it has never done anything for country people. Country people have been the backbone of Australia for many years. However, Opposition members think that they will win those seats back. They are like empty vessels such as those used for pos in hospitals. On many occasions, that is about the best thing for which Opposition Members could be used.

To return to the massive turn-out by farmers in Canberra—the farmers made the point that it is about time that the Government started thinking seriously about the survival of the rural sector. The taking away of the taxes that were imposed in the first Hawke Budget is fair. The realities were faced there. I understand that Mr Kerin is admired for many of the things that he attempts to do in country areas. I would hate

to take away from him any credit that is due. Mr Kerin is endeavouring to do a good job. I do not know whether his voice is heard sufficiently——

Mr Kruger: What about the increases in third-party insurance? You are not worrying about that.

Mr BAILEY: I have mentioned compulsory third-party insurance. Had the honourable member bothered to be in the Chamber, he would have heard my reference to compulsory third-party insurance. The honourable member should go back to sleep.

Even though Mr Kerin is quite effective, I wonder whether the Hawke Government takes him seriously. Mr Kerin is trying. The Savage report, with its limitations and restrictions, was at least an attempt to do something for the sugar industry. Whether it is sufficient is ridiculous to speculate at this time, because the Federal Government expects the Queensland Government to match its funding. The Federal Government makes a large amount of money out of——

Mr Kruger: Have you seen the report and seen how many people had an input into it?

Mr BAILEY: I have read the report. It is a great deal more than Opposition members have done, judging by the comments that they have made. Opposition members believe that that is a solution to the problems in the sugar industry. That is absolutely absurd. It is not only naive but also irresponsible and dangerous to think that as soon as a report is issued it can be implemented and regarded as the end result. The people in the industry must be consulted. The Opposition does not seem to care about consulting people, unless it is a consensus and it has the safe way out of coming to a result. Because it has 300 decisions, the Opposition regards that as a safety factor. The Opposition says, "Let's not make a decision; let us pass the buck to somebody else." Imagine if the Opposition won government! I cannot imagine what would happen to this State. Apart from the different factions, the Opposition cannot get its act together. How would Labor Party members reach consensus? It is absolutely extraordinary.

The Federal Government's proposed taxation reform was a joke. The Labor Party in Queensland actually supported that ridiculous exercise. Supporting those clowns in Canberra and their efforts has probably done Queensland Labor members more harm than anything else has for years. Keating has to bail out. He backed down on three suggestions. They should not really be called three suggestions; more one suggestion repeated with a couple of additions during the Labor Party's period in office. Then the Federal Government invited everybody but Uncle Charlie to Canberra to try to reach consensus. No wonder they ended up with a camel when they tried to design a horse. Opposition members have to be realistic and face the fact that the Federal Government that they support can put Australia so far into the hole that, no matter when a coalition Government gets back in, it will take years to repair the damage. That is the reality. Opposition members accuse the Government of fiscal irresponsibility. They condemn the Queensland Government, yet it is the only Government that balances its Budget. That is extraordinary. No Opposition member would run his household on the same basis as the Federal Government is running the economy, yet Opposition members expect the Queensland Government to accept that as a realistic exercise.

Mr De Lacy: The Hawke Government has halved the deficit whilst it has been there.

Mr BAILEY: The Federal Labor Government actually held a tax summit without even contemplating cutting Government spending. That is not tax reform; it is tax lunacy.

Mr De Lacy: Answer my question. You are blaming the Labor Government for the deficit?

Mr BAILEY: I am quite happy to place some blame on the previous Federal Government as well. However, the Government currently in power has been in there twice.

It is quite extraordinary, with the strange welfare philosophy of the Federal Government and its attitude of indexing the various costs that it imposes on the community, that it talks about reducing the deficit. The Federal Government will not bite the bullet. The Queensland Government bites the bullet. Opposition members accuse the Government of fiscal irresponsibility because it is going to balance the Budget. Ultimately this country will go down the tube. I am sure that Opposition members, as concerned Queenslanders, could influence the Federal Labor Government to change its course.

I commend the Government for having the courage of its convictions, which has been demonstrated by the very responsible decisions that it has made. Hopefully, after the Government's attack on the irresponsible sections of the union movement, the union movement will think twice before it takes on the community once again. Quite frankly, I believe that most Australians have had a gutful of the posturing and strikes that have occurred in this State during the last year and prior to that.

I reiterate my support for the comments made by the honourable member for Mount Gravatt (Mr Henderson) and the honourable member for Roma (Mr Cooper). I also convey the loyalty of my constituents to Her Majesty the Queen.

Mr SMITH (Townsville West) (3.38 p.m.): I was surprised by some of the remarks made by the honourable member for Toowong. When he and a couple of other Government members entered the House, it was said that the net intelligence quotient of the Government side of the House would be raised somewhat.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr SMITH: That is taken as read.

If the honourable member for Toowong judges the economic performance of the Government on the basis of a balanced Budget, I am afraid that he needs to go to the university in the area that he represents and take a few lessons. When the indebtedness of the Government is taken into account it is rather a sad picture, and I will return to that point later in my speech.

Again, the Governor's Speech contained the usual rhetoric to which we have become so accustomed in this State; rhetoric that falls on the deaf ears of the hard-headed business community and the people of wider intelligence and experience in Queensland.

To illustrate some of these items I will pick out a few points from the Speech and elaborate on some of them at a later stage.

First of all it says the Government is confident of maintaining the momentum of its capital works and other programs. What utter nonsense! Clearly there is no hope that the Government will be in a position to do that. It is simply a hollow statement which means nothing.

The capital works spending, including the special works program, was of the order of \$122m less than in 1984. In parallel with that, in the last 12 months Queensland lost 1 000 full-time jobs. It was the only State in which that happened. In other States, the number of full-time jobs increased. That is an indication of the terrible state of affairs in Queensland.

The Opening Speech refers to negotiations for a major pipeline to link the State's natural gas reserves. I tend to think that those negotiations will go on and on but lead to nothing.

The Government claims that it is determined to combat unemployment, and cites a 10-point plan that it says is in full swing. I suggest that it is in backswing.

Another major statement was the claim that the State would continue its strong emphasis on health and hospital development with a multimillion-dollar program. The Government continues to claim that it has been disadvantaged under the Medicare program. That is absolute nonsense and needs to be refuted at every opportunity. My only regret is that if I address myself to that statement, it will consume most of the time I am allowed in the debate.

Mr Austin interjected.

Mr SMITH: The Minister for Health has extracted enormous publicity from it. I have never seen such a performance. He continues to tell blatant untruths about the Commonwealth/State Medicare agreement.

Mr Austin: You can't refute it.

Mr SMITH: Of course I can.

Mr Austin interjected.

Mr SMITH: I merely point out the true story. The Minister says the opposite.

Other significant claims are about Queensland's leading Australia in the development of applications that exploit satellite technology. That is also likely to finish up as an embarrassment and another example of hollow rhetoric.

Perhaps not of the same order of financial magnitude is talk of road safety programs that are to be boosted in the interests of preserving life. That is another statement that has been repeated again and again by Government spokesmen without any action to back up the rhetoric. It might be considered parochial, but I refer to a training school in Townsville that has been talked about for months. The Minister for Transport (Mr Lane) knows about it; I am sure that he supports it. One department after another holds it up. Although one hears a great deal of talk about road safety and the need to do something practical about it, in practical terms nothing is done.

Mr Davis: He's too frightened to tackle the country areas; that's what it boils down to.

Mr SMITH: Of course. He has always been that way.

This is an incompetent Government. Just how long that can be concealed from the public is anybody's guess. Although I do not wish to hand out any bouquets to the Liberal Party, bearing in mind their wishy-washy, Queen Street-oriented policies, it must be recognised that some of the former Liberal Ministers, the best of whom are no longer in the Parliament, at least gave the previous coalition Government a semblance of respectability and managed to steer it away from the excesses of incompetence plainly exhibited by the National Party Government.

Mr Innes: You weren't even here then.

Mr SMITH: I was here 18 months ago. I do not know where the member for Sherwood was. He must have been in some sort of trance.

It is becoming well understood by the commercial community that the Government of Queensland is a very poor economic manager. It would probably be more accurate to describe the members of Cabinet as fair-weather managers who in good economic times threw out their chests and claimed credit for what had been achieved by other Queenslanders and organisations. However, the economic crunch has arrived. That fact is disputed only by those in the Government, including the Premier and his Deputy, who can best be described as economic nincompoops. The Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern), one of the few members of the Government with any credibility, has been very careful to distance himself from the hollow utterances of the leadership of the Queensland Government.

One of the most damning documents ever produced by the Government is a publication entitled *Queensland Million Dollar Projects*, which was described at the time as—

“An in-depth analysis of current development projects under consideration, formerly announced or in the planning stages for the State of Queensland, Australia.” That is a fairly grandiose description.

A similar document was produced in 1980. One would have to be a little suspicious that such documents have appeared in election years. I suppose we can look forward to another offering in 1986; but, unless it is a little more realistic than its predecessors, it will enjoy an even lower credibility than its forerunners.

Inside the cover of that 1983 document, a leading item appeared, and it is worth while restating its contents as follows—

“Confidence in Queensland and its future has been clearly expressed by both private enterprise and Government. Currently 1,420 projects valued at \$44,312.36m are boosting the State’s development. This indicates a continuing faith in Queensland. It highlights the fact that, despite a slowdown in the national economy, plans have been made for growth in Queensland because it is a resourceful, stable and reliable part of Australia. The analysis of million-dollar projects listed in this booklet covers those under construction, firmly announced or in planning stages as at 30 April 1983. Most of the projects listed in this publication occur in the private sector. Queensland appeals to both individual and business interests largely as a result of positive Queensland Government policies designed to encourage development in all sectors of the State economy. These policies have, for example, established Queensland as the low-tax State of Australia.

The continuing investment and expenditure in Queensland outlined in the following pages has not only assured the orderly growth of Queensland, but has also stimulated business confidence and produced positive expectations for the next decade. Lucrative opportunities in Australia and Queensland continue to attract international investors.”

It is informative to investigate the fate and present status of some of those 1 420 projects, supposedly valued at over \$44 billion. Let us take a few examples, such as the Ben Lomond uranium mine at \$100m, unlikely to ever get off the ground, and the Julia Creek shale oil proposal by the CSR to cost \$6,000m, which has been round for about 20 years. Its likely development could be described as nothing more than a pipe-dream. Then, we have another beauty—the North Queensland alumina refinery. It is described as being in the planning stage and having a projected outlay of \$910m. I hope nobody in this House has mortgaged his future on the likelihood of that project moving forward this century.

There are various other coal projects included in that grand figure of \$44 billion that are unlikely to move any further for the remainder of this century. Even such items as the Mackay tourist resort and the Shute Harbour resort at \$100m seem to be a long way from the starting line.

There is a highlight under the section “Southern Queensland”, which is described as the Taroom coal and gas conversion project, to cost almost \$500m. The Premier and Treasurer has been predictably quiet about it since the time it was published.

Mr Davis: Just as he was about the Rundle project.

Mr SMITH: Yes. That was a good one, too.

I could go on at greath length. In fact, I could take up the whole time I have in this debate in simply pointing out the projects that are listed in that hollow document but which have not gone ahead and are unlikely to ever go ahead. Sadly, though, some people have relied on the honesty of this Government and have made investments on the basis of the veracity of some of the official Government documentation.

As an example of this sort of thing, I will refer to the encouragement given by this Government to Goninans of north Queensland. Because of the Government's laissez-faire approach to economic matters and its total absence of a demonstrated overall strategy, this company—a company of repute and a member of Howard Smith Industries—bought out the existing business in Townsville of Mr Tony Rock of General Engineers and Agents, and spent a very large amount of money in re-equipping the plant at the Bohle Industrial Estate for the production of diesel locomotives. Again, with the clear association of convenient election timing, the Minister for Transport accepted the first of 13 locomotives in December 1983.

There is no doubt, of course, that calculations misfired to some extent because of the early election. We find now that Goninans have virtually closed down because they made the mistake of depending on the rhetoric of the Government with respect to the continued support of its operation. Since the original contract concluded, the Government has not seen fit to award more work in spite of the fact that the product has been well received in the Railway Department and has an excellent service record.

In reality, the Government must be guilty of one or two counts. First of all, the argument could be mounted that there was sufficient existing capacity in Queensland to produce locomotives to meet the Railway Department's requirements, and no encouragement that would widen competition ought to have been given to that organisation. If that is not so, and if the Government believed that another manufacturer ought to establish operations and in fact encouraged another manufacturer to set up business—which it undeniably did—the Government has an obligation to support the continued operations of that organisation.

Mr Austin interjected.

Mr SMITH: The Minister for Health can laugh, but the Government's action has affected many people who have staked their future on the continued operation of the plant. Now, suddenly, it has gone.

The Government would be in a position to quote the Goninan expansion as another multimillion-dollar project within the framework of the document that I referred to, but this instance proves how hollow that claim can be.

I should think that the Goninan experience will be a very sobering one indeed for manufacturers in the south, whom the Premier is attempting to entice to Queensland. Even in this area of Government rhetoric, where the Premier hits the headlines and talks about a mass exodus of organisations from Victoria to Queensland, the facts do not match the rhetoric, because very few organisations have in fact made the transfer and some of those that have done so are of questionable value to Queensland.

Mr Davis: There will not be much left of Fourex after Bond has finished with it.

Mr SMITH: No, and that is sad.

The Premier very conveniently omits to tell the public of the flight of some of the more technically based industries from Queensland to the southern States or of the exodus of skilled professionals and technicians who, having tested the economic climate of Queensland and looked at its potential under the National Party Government, have voted with their feet and returned to a more favourable economic climate provided by the Cain, Wran and Bannon Governments.

If honourable members want to look at a growth industry in Queensland—and, quite frankly, I do not like looking at it, but it is there and cannot be denied, even though the Premier would seek to conceal the vital facts—I refer them to the growth in the number of bankruptcies recorded in Queensland. In the 1984-85 financial year they hit the 1 000 mark. That figure is based on calculations appearing in a Commonwealth publication for the three Queensland bankruptcy districts. The rate of bankruptcy is an indicator of two conditions. The first condition is that Queensland is, and has been for

a considerable time, the white-collar crime State of Australia and the haven of the \$2 company expert. That environment allows the operation of sharks, tricksters and confidence men, including one of the Premier's advisers and promoters, a former member of the National Party State management committee and Senate aspirant, namely, Mr Metcalfe.

Mr Davis: We know about him.

Mr SMITH: Yes, but he always deserves a mention.

The fact is that the Queensland bankruptcy rate has soared well above the national level. I understand that the increase was about 22 per cent.

Mr Davis: He is not bankrupt yet.

Mr SMITH: I understand that he has been bankrupt several times, but that it is not official. I will come back to Mr Metcalfe later when I have more time to devote to his activities and his continuing role as a major confidence trickster involving the beleaguered sugar-growers and the millers.

The high number of bankruptcies recorded in the last financial year is almost twice the number recorded in the mid-1970s and represents a significant increase—I understand almost 26 per cent—over the number recorded in the previous financial year.

I challenge spokesmen for the Government, if they reply to anything I have said today, to attempt to explain why the bankruptcy rate in Queensland is so high, particularly as the increase in Queensland bankruptcies has occurred while the rest of Australia has experienced a significant reduction in the number of bankruptcies.

The Queensland figures reflect poorly on the policies and attitudes of the Bjelke-Petersen Government and further confirm the deteriorating economic conditions in this State, as indicated by increased unemployment, industrial disputes, failing private enterprise investment and less housing construction.

On the number of bankruptcies, I present the following information—

Financial year	Number
1977-78	517
1978-79	538
1979-80	694
1980-81	808
1981-82	642
1982-83	701
1983-84	865
1984-85	1 000

A significant point that must be understood with respect to those statistics is that the bankruptcies relate to individuals, partnerships and other unincorporated enterprises. In other words, the figures do not relate mainly to the larger incorporated organisations.

A very interesting event occurred in Queensland in May this year, when *The Courier-Mail* hosted an economic symposium on Queensland development. At that symposium, the sort of rhetoric that this Government hands out received short shrift from many of the qualified people who delivered papers, made statements or contributed to the debate at that symposium.

An interesting contribution was made by Dr Owen McCarthy, who said that Queensland's lagging economy showed that insufficient importance had been attached to concentrating on selected industries to overcome the State's poor performance—incidentally, a view that was shared by a significant number of spokesmen.

This Government was shown to be totally lacking in economic strategy. It has recently taken an intense dislike to Professor Percy Harris of the James Cook University,

because he is a man who does not trifle with the truth. He is a very forthright person. He pointed out in a paper that he gave at that symposium that any economic strategy had to have five significant dimensions.

The first dimension was the prescription of the ultimate objectives and the interrelated intermediate and specific objectives. Simply, that would be a prescription explaining the goals to justify the policies that a Government ought to pursue. He described it as the "why" dimension.

The second dimension was described as the industrial dimension, which would be concerned with the plan or projected performance of the various economic sectors over the development period.

The third dimension cited was the regional dimension, which would be concerned with the interregional distribution in the changes of the levels of activities in the various economic sectors; in other words, where the activities and policies were to apply.

The fourth dimension was the means by which the objectives underlying the economic strategy are to be obtained, and that strategy would, therefore, be concerned with the policies and programs to be implemented by the planning authority or Government charged with achieving those objectives.

The final element, of course, was the time strategy, which must be a clear statement of the period over which the objectives are to be obtained and details of phasing in an implementation of the various policies and programs.

That is a fairly simple statement. It is entirely adequate, and nothing more needs to be said. It is simply that the Government is totally deficient in any strategy whatsoever. Because it is so deficient, it is very concerned about the remarks of Professor Harris.

I notice that the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern) has just walked into the Chamber. I am sure that he would understand what I have said. I singled him out as someone who, I have noted, does not subscribe to the utterances of the Premier and Treasurer and the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer. One of these days he might get an opportunity to comment on what I have said.

Until the Government of Queensland is able to accept the need for greater planning and the need for corporate objectives that are compatible with overall development strategy, this State is doomed to wallow in the mire of mediocrity.

I do not doubt that some of the comments that I have made today will fall on the ears of the economically deaf members on the other side, because they are not prepared to accept that Queensland is part of a wider community and has to compete within that community. They still think in terms of Queensland being the island that ought to be the exclusive domain of members of the rural community, having the total and overall say in running the affairs of this State.

One thing that they should be able to understand is that laymen and economists alike have traditionally taken the state of housing construction as being a reliable economic indicator of anything—from the state of the nation to the individual States or a particular local government area. Figures released this month show that although there is something of a housing boom in Australia generally, Queensland is running against that tide with a net decline. The Indicative Planning Council for the industry, which also advises the Federal Government, has placed Australian housing commencements for 1984-85 at 151 000—a 10 per cent increase on 1983-84, and the highest total since 1973-74.

However, in the same period, the Queensland housing picture showed that commencements were estimated to have been 30 600, which is a 2 per cent downturn on the previous year. It was further forecast that commencements in Queensland for 1985-86 would be 28 000, which is an 8 per cent drop on figures for the previous financial year. They are alarming figures.

The reason for this is simply that Queensland families are finding it more difficult than families in most other States to pay off their homes. In fact, despite a drop in average income, Queenslanders are paying more of their weekly wages towards repayments. A survey by the Real Estate Institute and the Australian Societies Group, which applies to approved loans, shows that in 1984 Queensland families had to apply 19.7 per cent of their gross income to meet home-loan repayments and in the March 1985 quarter the figure was 22.4 per cent. That is quite a sharp increase.

An interesting aspect shows that while average monthly loan repayments in Queensland increased by \$13, family income fell by \$2. Queensland was the only State of Australia that showed a net family income reduction. I wonder just how much more evidence the people of Queensland need to have placed before them so that they will accept the reality of the incompetence of this Government.

Recently the Government has been squealing—that is a very proper word—about its allocation from the Federal Government for housing. The Government should never be allowed to forget—and the public needs to be reminded—that any funding problems the Queensland Government might have with respect to federal authorities relate to its intransigence in 1974 when it refused to take up the full allocation of moneys that the then Labor Government was prepared to make available to individual States. The other States picked up the allocation that Queensland was offered and, of course, subsequent allocations from both the Fraser and Hawke Governments have been based on the allocations from 1974. The Queensland Government could not talk Fraser into changing the allocation.

Nevertheless, Queensland has twice since that period signed new housing agreements with the Commonwealth on the basis that the allocation formula will come up for review in 1990. If at that time the Queensland Government wishes to exercise the option of taking a full entitlement, I am sure it will be able to do so. It is important that these matters are brought out because of the way in which the Queensland Government hides behind the tired rhetoric of federal-bashing in an attempt to avoid the focus of public attention on its own incompetence.

In discussing in more detail some of the matters in the Government's program that were highlighted in the Governor's Speech—I wonder whether the natural gas pipeline plans for Gladstone, for which the Bond Corporation has submitted a proposal for \$300m, will have to be reviewed again in the light of Mr Bond's expenditure in other areas.

I would be the first to agree that, overall, it is desirable to have a gas pipeline to Gladstone, but I am concerned that the economics have not been examined properly by the Government or that it is not revealing all the facts. Private developers are reluctant to become involved and the Government has stated that if private enterprise is not prepared to do the job, the Queensland Government will.

I remind the Government of the rather sad experience of the former Court Liberal Government in Western Australia, which committed its State and the Federal Government to huge expenditures on providing a gas pipeline—only to find the product was in over-supply. It was a great embarrassment to everyone concerned. However, the subsequent Government—the Burke Labor Government—has had to bear the brunt of the mismanagement of the conservative Court Government. It is very likely that the same thing will happen in Queensland if the pipeline to Gladstone goes ahead.

The current fertiliser-manufacturing industry in Queensland is adequate to meet foreseeable demand. If there was an upturn in the sugar industry, there would be a shortfall of up to 20 per cent in the available supply of fertiliser from existing domestic manufacturers. That shortfall would be met by importation. However, very few people think that the sugar industry will be likely to need more fertiliser in the near future.

To build a fertiliser plant from the foundations upwards and to build a pipeline will require a massive capital outlay. If fertiliser is produced at Gladstone as a result of the pipeline, the surplus supply of product will reduce profitability.

Low fuel prices are needed if the fertiliser industry is to make good profits, because a tonne of fuel is needed to produce a tonne of fertiliser. However, low fuel prices usually go hand in hand with low world commodity prices. It therefore follows that the demand for fertiliser is reduced.

There is not a great difference in freight costs between, say, Brisbane to Townsville and Rockhampton to Townsville, so the location of the plant will not help the cost structure of producers.

The last time that Queensland had two fertiliser plants, that is, one owned by the Austral Pacific group and the other by ACF and Shirleys Ltd, neither company was making a profit, so, to avoid bankruptcy, they were forced to merge. At present there are two fertiliser blending plants north of Gladstone, in Mackay and Cairns. Because, to be viable, the proposed new plant would have to manufacture a full range of fertilisers, those blending plants could be adversely affected by a new plant at Gladstone. To manufacture a full range of fertilisers would necessitate importing potash and rock phosphate. Unless subsidised, the Duchess rock phosphate freight would be similar to sea freight. That phosphate also has a high fluoride content, which causes manufacturing problems.

To sum up—to justify a large capital outlay and to get any kind of return, the following conditions would have to apply: high sugar prices causing high fertiliser demand, high grain prices, low fuel price and, importantly, high world prices for fertiliser, which would make imports non-competitive with the local product. That is not a very good scenario. The sad truth is that, because existing plants would be affected and jobs in the north would be similarly affected, no extra jobs would be created in Queensland as a result of fertiliser manufacture.

Some very authoritative statements on the electricity industry in Queensland have been made by the Opposition spokesman (Mr Vaughan). I do not want to cover that familiar ground, but I think that Queenslanders have to be reminded that they pay the highest electricity charges in Australia. An average Queensland family now pays \$520 a year for its electricity, while the average Sydney family, for the same amount of electricity, pays almost \$200 a year less.

In particular, the partial closure of Collinsville is of great concern to northern industry, northern councils and the community at large. Some very significant business decisions were taken in the Bowen/Collinsville area on the basis of a guarantee early this year from the Queensland Government that there would be no change to the status of the Collinsville station.

Nobody seriously believes now that the cut will stop at only a partial closure. It is obviously only a matter of time before Collinsville gets the axe totally, in spite of a great deal of money having been spent there recently by the Queensland Electricity Commission on the maintenance of plant and the provision of accommodation for power station workers. There has been, in fact, a veil of secrecy over the incompetence of the Government's planning of power stations and, now that the veil has been drawn aside, the situation is shown to be incredibly bad.

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (4.8 p.m.): In this debate I wish to draw attention to the laser lunacy that seems to be sweeping certain areas of our community and to call on the Government to do something about it before people are seriously and permanently injured. At the moment there is the spectacle of untrained salesmen selling dangerous pieces of equipment to untrained and ignorant operators. At best, that must be somewhat questionable.

The distinction in this case is very easy to draw. The hazards of ionising radiation have been known for some time and are fairly minor. Many of us can recall when we were children putting our feet into machines at the shoe shops and having them X-rayed to see whether shoes fitted. It was worked out that over a period that could cause damage, that over a period with multiple exposures, possibly something could go wrong.

That led to fairly stringent controls on ionising radiation so that now X-ray machines can be sold only by people who are qualified and can be used only by people who are qualified, even though to cause damage with these machines requires multiple exposures. Yet lasers, which require erroneous use for only .25 of a second, are being sold. When they are used incorrectly, they can cause permanent damage to the eyes of unknowing people—and they are very, very easy to use incorrectly.

In 1981, the Standards Association of Australia published Standard 2211 covering laser beams, their use and application in Australia. A classification system for lasers and a series of precautions that ought to be followed in their use and employment were laid down. That occurred in 1981, but nothing has been done to ensure that people are protected from badly used and misused lasers in the hands of people who do not know what they are doing. All sorts of strange brochures are being circulated in the community, advertising those products without even mentioning some of the dangers that could go with their use.

For the benefit of honourable members, let me explain that the Standards Association of Australia classifies lasers, just as X-ray machines are classified. The two classifications that are most applicable in everyday use—the sort of things about which I am speaking—are class 2 lasers and class 3B lasers. Both of these lasers usually operate on helium-neon tubes and have a wave length of 632.8nm. All of them are basically the same. They are the deep red lasers that honourable members have probably seen on television and elsewhere.

A class 2 laser is relatively innocuous. Usually the only part of the body that it can damage is the eye. The eyes are extremely susceptible. Because of the construction of the eye and the way it focuses light, the effect on the back of the eye—on the retina—is 100 000 times the concentration of the light that passes through the cornea. It concentrates the light of lasers passing into the eye and can literally burn out the backs of eyes.

As I have said, class 2 lasers are said to be relatively innocuous. One must ask how innocuous they are when compared with the effects of X-ray machines that Governments all over Australia and throughout the world have been more than happy to regulate, both in their use and in the training of operators. In 0.25 of a second, a class 2 laser can cause permanent damage to the eye. It must be conceded that, usually, the blink reflex would close off the eye to the beam. Unless a person was in a position in which he looked or stared at the beam, his reflexes would protect him. Nonetheless, it is a dangerous situation.

Does one find the persons who sell class 2 lasers displaying large signs and warnings saying, "Don't put this near your eyes"? Companies such as Pro-Prom Pty Ltd of Kuranda in Queensland advertise a class 2 laser. On the front cover of its brochure is depicted a person virtually shining the laser into another person's eye.

I will not go into the efficacy of the claims made about these lasers, except to say that some people would claim that they will fix sagging facial muscles, lines and wrinkles and invigorate the skin. Honourable members have seen enough television commercials to know that lines and wrinkles are first associated with the area around the eyes. In this brochure, a product is being advertised by use of a photograph. The laser is being used in the near vicinity of the eye. An exposure to the eye of 0.25 of a second can cause permanent damage. It is just not good enough that products are marketed in this way, with no warnings, just, "Come in and buy one."

The problem gets worse. One of the dangerous things about lasers is their propensity for reflecting their light. If a laser strikes a shiny surface, it will bounce off it. For example, if it strikes a mirror it loses very little of its intensity. Not only is the person in the illustration to which I referred pointing the laser in an eye; he is sitting in front of a mirror watching himself do it. If he misses the first time, perhaps he will bounce it off the mirror and get himself on the second pass; I do not know. That sort of irresponsibility is just not good enough.

It is worst still with class 3B lasers. Class 3B lasers are extremely dangerous. The flicking of a class 3B laser across an eye can cause permanent blindness. Yet these lasers are being peddled by untrained salesmen to untrained operators who make all sorts of interesting claims about them. It is boasted that they are the highest-powered acupuncture and therapy lasers available. One advertisement even boasts that the laser is the only laser in class 3B that meets all the requirements of the Australian Standard AS2211. Regrettably, it would appear that the only criterion that has to be met in this State to meet that requirement is to put two stickers on the outside saying, "This is a laser. Watch out.", or words to that effect. There is no requirement for training of the operator or for proper briefing documents to go with it. I would assume that the company concerned, because of its reputation, would at least provide an adequate outline of the dangers of operating the particular device.

It is crazy that devices that do not even require physical pressure on a switch to operate them, that can be set to go automatically for 70 seconds or more, that are putting out enough power to cause instantaneous blindness, are allowed to be sold and used in the totally uncontrolled manner that they are at the moment. It is only a matter of time before one of these would-be wrinkle-fixers or back-pain-fixers—whatever one wants to call them—causes someone permanent injury.

It is known that these lasers are dangerous. It has been known since 1981, when the Australian Standards Association said a few things about hazard control. What did it say about class 3B lasers, the lasers that can be used for all sorts of interesting things? Page 13 of the Australian Standard on Laser Safety states—

"Class 3B lasers are hazardous if a direct beam or specular reflections are viewed by the unprotected eye."

That means that they may shine in a mirror and bounce back and a person may be injured. It states further—

"Eye protection should be worn if there is any possibility of viewing either the direct beam or a specular reflection from a surface "

The Australian Standards Association says that eye protection should be worn if there is any possibility at all of that happening. What happens in Queensland? Nothing!

When class 3B lasers are operated outside, the Australian Standards Association says that people should wear protective clothing under certain circumstances; yet in this State this dangerous equipment is not subject to one bit of control.

Mr Lee: Who should control them?

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member for Yeronga asks who should control such equipment. In my opinion, it should be controlled by the Health Department's Division of Health and Medical Physics. That department does an excellent job of monitoring ionising radiation from X-ray machines and so on.

The Department of Labour Relations and the Queensland Government participated in a committee which, in 1981, tabled an Australian Standard about which absolutely nothing has been done. I ask the Government to explain why these operators—I will not call them shonky operators, because perhaps they do believe the claims that they make about wrinkles and so on—are allowed to openly put out glossy brochures showing people apparently doing the exact opposite of what the Australian Standards Association requires. What is done about it? Not a thing!

That is bad enough, but to allow class 3B lasers to be sold openly by untrained operators who undertake procedures that would have to be called marginal at best is just entirely without justification.

The Minister for Health is pretty good at getting his photograph in newspapers, wearing funny hats and having colour brochures of himself put on the wall at the Royal National Exhibition. It is about time that the Minister got on the ball and started doing

a few things about public health in this State, and I warn him that he will hear a bit more from me about it as the weeks go by.

Mr Henderson: That will frighten him.

Mr GYGAR: I am pleased that the honourable member for Mount Gravatt agrees with me that the Minister should be frightened, because the health of Queenslanders cannot be left to chance. It cannot be left to slide along as it has for the last four years. Does the honourable member suggest that we should wait for another four years? Probably that would be a good idea, because in 18 months' time Queensland will have a new Health Minister. Perhaps something will then be done. For four years, nothing! That is just not good enough.

I call on the colleagues of the Minister for Health to take him quietly aside and tell him to get off his seat and stop merely having his photograph taken; to stop looking for a new seat, a new ministry, or whatever it is that he is looking for this week. A couple of weeks ago, he said that he did not want to be Minister for Health. It is fairly obvious why. He is not doing a very good job. He should get on the ball again.

If it is good enough for X-rays, it is more than good enough for lasers. We cannot afford to wait until an innocent individual, thinking, in his naivety, that the Government would not allow an untrained person claiming to practise medicine or paramedicine to use a dangerous apparatus, has his eyes burned out by someone who has not been supplied with the proper information or training to use dangerous equipment that is openly available on the market. It is not good enough. I call upon the Government to do something about it in this session of the Parliament.

Mr KRUGER (Murrumba) (4.22 p.m.): In his Opening Speech, the Governor made no mention of the sugar industry. That is shocking. I will explain why that has occurred.

The National Party, of course, wishes to use the sugar industry as a political football. In the last few days, that has become more and more obvious. In every speech that Government members make, they bash Canberra. The Premier makes the statement that there has to be honest discussion between both Governments. Because of the attitude of and statements by members of the Government, that has not eventuated. Much of the blame lies at the feet of the Premier or his speech-writers. The Queensland Government has again set out to do what it believes it can do best—bash Canberra.

The real problem confronting the State is the division within the ranks of the Queensland Government, as you, Mr Deputy Speaker, would be quite well aware, although you might not like to admit it from your present position. The party is today called the National Party. The city-based National Party members are the conservatives of this State. They are trying to conjure up a good reason why they should be supported by the voting public. On the other hand are the traditional members of the old Country Party. I do not want to bring you into the debate, Mr Deputy Speaker, but I suggest that you are one who believes in the traditional style of Country Party Government. The split in the ranks is more and more obvious.

The sugar debate has shown that people are concerned about the man on the land. The city National Party members, however, are concerned only about the vote of the general public. For ages, Government members have spoken at length about factionalism on this side of the House. We are novices compared with the National Party, which has been split down the middle. The traditional Country Party members who might do something for the State are limited by not having the power or the pressure to control the Premier and the city conservatives.

What has been the result? The traditional Country Party people are still trying their best, but the city conservatives have completely neglected the man on the land. I will be directing my remarks to the sugar industry, which is the part of the rural sector to encounter problems most recently. The conservative National Party members in the Parliament have completely neglected and rejected those who work on properties.

Government members know that, and what has happened is that a population drift has occurred.

My colleague the honourable member for Lytton (Mr Burns) mentioned yesterday that the numbers had gone down and he went through each of the electorates concerned. Of course the numbers of people in the electorates have decreased because the people can no longer tolerate the representatives in country areas. Presentation of the Bill demonstrated concern about the matter but, of course, the Federal Government had no real power in this situation.

Before turning to analyse the intent of the Queensland Government, which is evident in the extent to which it is prepared to go, using financial and legislative means, to assist the sugar industry, I will analyse the events that led up to the announcement of the formation of the 100-day committee. That committee is presently in the hot seat.

I ask all honourable members to remember that the report of the committee was not a report of the Federal Government. If one were to examine remarks made by members on the Government side of the House, one would see that Government members have tried to get some kind of recognition of the 100-day report as a report of the Federal Government and for the proposition that what is contained in the 100-day report was thrust upon the Queensland Government by the Federal Government. That is not true, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I am sure that you realise that.

Government members are well aware of the attitude of the Federal Government. The Federal Labor Government said that what was contained in the report of the 100-day committee ought to be negotiated. Of course, although it has been denied, the Premier and Treasurer claimed in this House only a couple of days ago that the Leader of the Opposition said that the committee's recommendations ought to be implemented. The Leader of the Opposition in fact said that the negotiating procedures outlined in the report ought to be implemented or carried out. It is very, very important to remember that point as my analysis proceeds.

It is an appropriate time to mention that yesterday the Queensland Government refused to debate the plight of the sugar industry. In an attempt to bring on a debate, Sir William Knox raised the issue. However, the Government denied to honourable members the right to debate the problems that exist in the sugar industry. It is very significant, especially when the problems that confront the sugar industry are taken into account, to remember that the Government that actually buys the sugar was not prepared to debate the current issue. For one, the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts (Mr McKechnie) would be disgusted if the Government refused to debate issues about canned fruit or deciduous fruit that grows in the area round his electorate. Irrespective of where anyone lives, the man on the land is entitled to a fair go. I point out that the National Party has always maintained that the man on the land is the guts of this State's productivity. To some extent, I concur, but I point out that Government members who say such things are not giving rural people a fair go.

In support of my contentions, I wish to refer to reports that have appeared in the newspapers. On Sunday, 31 March 1985, in the *Sunday Sun*, the following headline and article appeared—

“\$75m plea to save sugar

Joh to meet PM

Premier Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen will press Prime Minister Bob Hawke for \$75 million a year special aid for the sugar industry in Canberra tomorrow.

Sir Joh said yesterday a breakthrough had been achieved in getting all sections of the industry to agree on a plan to get the industry through the worst crisis in its history.

‘There has been difficulty getting the industry to speak with one voice,’ said Sir Joh.

'Now we have them all moving in the same direction'."

That was indeed the case, and all Government members would know that it was. However, that agreement broke down, and I will tell all honourable members why. It is because the Queensland Government wants to play politics instead of getting on with the job. However, the next thing we know, Sir Joh accepts the suggestion by the Federal Government that an inquiry be set up. I was in Canberra on the day that he was there.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I have been insisting on correct parliamentary titles being used in the Chamber. So that I might be consistent, I wish to remind the honourable member of that direction.

Mr KRUGER: The Premier and Treasurer of this State—and this is quoted in the *Daily Sun* of 2 April 1985—said the following—

"Joh accepts Fed sugar inquiry."

I shall refer to Sir Joh as the Premier and Treasurer of this State, but Heaven knows that at times I wonder why.

The article states—

"A new tripartite committee will make recommendations on federal funding and restructuring needed to save the troubled sugar industry."

I point out that although the Premier and Treasurer said that at the time, he has not stopped bashing the efforts of that committee ever since.

The article continues—

"The Premier, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen agreed to the establishment of a committee proposed by Prime Minister Mr Hawke at the half-day sugar summit in Canberra yesterday.

Although similar to previous recommendations rejected by the Premier, the new committee was agreed to by Sir Joh after Queensland won its chairmanship.

Sir Joh said the new inquiry would be a starting point.

'We're going to go step by step,' Sir Joh said."

That is what the Premier and Treasurer had to say at that time about the sugar industry, but I must point out that now that the report of the 100-day committee has been brought forward, and bearing in mind what the Premier and Treasurer had said about being happy because Queensland won chairmanship of the committee, the Premier and Treasurer now wishes to reject the report on the basis that sugar industry representatives made no input. As my speech proceeds, I shall pay more attention to that aspect. Away from pressures of the discussion desk in Canberra, the Premier adopted a different role.

I will deal quickly with a statement made by Mr Braithwaite indicating that there should be co-ordination, or a joining of the State and Federal Parliaments. That suggestion was worthy of consideration, but he then resorted to garbage. There will be no favourable results until both sides are happy with the proposal.

I was indeed staggered by an article that appeared in *The Courier-Mail* of 8 August 1985, which reads, in part—

"If Queensland agrees to match the \$50 million federal grant, it is expected that this would be sufficient to underwrite a Number One Pool price of \$240 a tonne for sugar, the figure put up by the sugar industry as the base subsistence level."

The more important part of that article is to be found in the following—

"Members at the meeting impressed on Sir Joh and Ministers the need to act quickly on the recommendations of the review committee's '100-day report', which is expected to be released early next week.

They told Sir Joh Queensland must get political mileage from the move and 'not let Canberra do the running'."

That is the most disgusting and despicable statement that I have read since coming to Parliament. It is astonishing to think that things were about to move before political pressures were brought to bear. Clearly, the Premier was told at the meeting, "Mr Premier, if you are not prepared to act in this way we will not go ahead."

I could produce article after article from the media which, no doubt, most honourable members have seen, but I do not want to tire members with them. However, I was very worried by an article that appeared in *The Courier-Mail*, under the heading, "Politics delays aid to sugar industry." That heading is one of the most upsetting aspects in the whole story. In part, the article reads—

"Two and a half hours had been set aside for negotiations between the Queensland Primary Industries Minister, Mr Turner, and his federal counterpart, Mr Kerin, following the handover.

But Mr Turner's power to negotiate has been withdrawn by the Queensland Government. Instead, a meeting of Queensland Government backbenchers has been called for tomorrow to discuss the recommendations."

What a heap of political garbage! It is astonishing to think that a Minister of this State, who ought to know something about sugar, had his powers to negotiate withdrawn. If the Minister does not know something about sugar he should learn. If he cannot learn, he should step down. If he cannot do the job, the Premier should get rid of him and get someone who can.

The Premier, the Federal Government and members of this Parliament have said continually that the sugar industry is very important to Queensland and the Commonwealth. I agree with that. There can be no argument about it.

One article in the press pointed out that when the mills die, so will the towns. We all know that. The article further said that tropical coastal towns will die without the region's largest employer. We all know that. What is the Government doing about it? It is doing nothing at all, and that is what surprises me.

On 21 August 1985, the Premier and Treasurer of Queensland (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) said in a ministerial statement—

"The Leader of the Opposition and several of his ALP colleagues are also on record as advocating joint funding to assist the industry on a fifty-fifty basis between the Commonwealth and State Governments."

I bring to your attention, Mr Deputy Speaker, that it was not so long ago, when the industry first hit a really serious problem, that the Government of Queensland was saying, "We want a fifty-fifty contribution from Canberra." The money came from Canberra but the measly mob in the Queensland Government said, "We have paid the money, but Canberra has not."

That was not honest. The ministerial statement continued later, in this way—

"The State Government has a long and enviable record of assistance to the sugar industry, including the allocation of about \$31m in assistance in the current sugar crisis."

We have told the Government the truth about that \$31m time and time again, but the Premier still says that it was Queensland money. We have proved that it is not Queensland money, but neither the Government nor the Premier is prepared to admit that the money did not come from the State Government. If we are to make a contribution to the sugar industry, we must be honest about it.

In the same statement, he said—

"The State Government will not make final decisions until the industry has had time to consider fully the ramifications of the report. My Government expects reaction from the industry following its meeting scheduled for early September."

At this stage I draw attention to the first page of the committee's report, which states—

“With the assistance of the sugar industry, the Working Party has examined the industry and now presents its recommendations which embrace both restructuring and financial assistance.”

I draw attention to page 47 of the report. This is important; I would not refer to it if it was not. It states—

“Submissions were presented to the Sugar Industry Working Party from the following organisations and individuals . . .”

It lists the growers' representatives, including the Combined Hambledon and Mulgrave Mill Suppliers Committees, the Mossman District Cane Growers Executive, the Cairns District Cane Growers Executive, and the Babinda, Innisfail, Herbert River, Burdekin and Invicta committees. There are 22 of them. Input from the milling side of the industry came from another 22 organisations, including the leading millers. Then there were the shire councils and local government groups, community groups, sugar industry organisations and other organisations and individuals. The report states that various papers and submissions were prepared by organisations in response to specific requests from the sugar industry. Now the Premier and Treasurer says. “We have got to go back to the industry to find out what it is on about.” For God's sake! The working party received the input to which I have referred, which was the basis of its discussions and recommendations. Yet this Government is prepared to sit back and procrastinate further while it finds out what the industry is going to do. What the Government is on about is delaying the matter to see whether it can embarrass the Federal Government. The Federal Government has set out to ensure that it meets its responsibilities. It also wants to ensure that the Queensland Government meets its responsibilities. I am starting to think that that will not happen.

In his ministerial statement, the Premier and Treasurer also said—

“I repeat that the Queensland Government will certainly continue to play its part.”

I certainly hope that it does. As I have just said, I do not believe that that will happen. I think that it is trying to play ducks and drakes again. Consultation is needed to ensure that the industry receives fair and reasonable consideration.

On 22 August, when introducing the Appropriation Bill, the Premier and Treasurer said—

“The sugar industry is a prime example of an industry very hard hit by world market conditions.”

He admitted that the industry was not being hit very hard because of lack of Federal funding. He said that the downturn in overseas markets was causing the problems. Yet Government members stand in this place time and time again and try to imply that the sugar industry has collapsed because of the Federal Government. Then the Premier and Treasurer said—

“It is really the one dark spot in Queensland's overall economic picture. It is of tremendous concern to the Government because of the importance of the industry to Queensland as a whole and the economics of so many of our provincial towns.”

He should stop bashing Canberra and get on with negotiations. One wonders why he tied the hands of his Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) and did not allow him to talk. There is no good reason why he should not let the Minister talk and why he should wait for further industry input when the industry made a massive input to the 100-day committee.

The Premier and Treasurer boasted that he would accept Canberra's proposition because the State Government was to have the chairmanship of the committee. Why was not the chairman good enough to discuss the sugar industry with the right people? I believe that he did discuss the industry with the right people. At this stage I am not

saying that I or members of my committee agree with everything in the report, and, if time permits, I will say more about that later.

I now look at something about which I am very concerned. An article in the *Sunday Sun* of 18 August 1985, under the heading "Cane Farms Face Bitter End", states—

"Six hundred cane farmers and their wives and children have nothing to look forward to but a bitter end.

For them, there will be no hope of help when, and if, State and Federal Governments agree on a salvage scheme for the sugar industry.

The 600 are 10 per cent of Queensland's farmers who, experts say, are doomed because expected aid is too low and too late."

That is the report of the committee. It is not the report of John Kerin or of the Prime Minister, as Government members try to indicate to the House. The report states clearly that 600 people are affected.

Ron Camm has suggested that, if the Sugar Board is abolished, no savings will be achieved. He suggested quite correctly that the abolition of the board will not add one cent to the incomes of farmers or millers. He suggests that the board is not the problem facing the industry. The only thing that I have against his suggestions is that sometimes people are pitchforked into positions that they are not entitled to hold. With that reservation, it is my belief that the intentions and policies of the Sugar Board have been good for the industry for a long time. With the right people on the board, it could justify its actions and functions before the industry and the Parliament. The fault does not lie with the people who have been selected; that is how it happens.

Another article on the sugar industry reported that the Premier is bitter over the sugar industry report. Sir Joh has said that there is no need for extensive talks with the Federal Government, because solving the sugar industry's problems is a very simple matter. He claims that the people want money.

The Premier is right in suggesting that the people need money, so why is the State Government procrastinating? It should get together with the Federal Government and the industry and negotiate, and the State and Federal Governments should put money forward. The talking can be done afterwards and Government members should stop the hoo-ha and the Canberra-bashing. That is not important at this stage. The more carry-on there is, the worse the situation gets.

The old guard and the new guard—Government members like to use those phrases—in the National Party are bickering and fighting. By "old guard" I mean the old Country Party people. The Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts (Mr McKechnie), who is sitting on the other side of the Chamber, knows about this because his father was part of the old group, who knew that the Country Party's real objective was to stand up for the people on the land.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr KRUGER: I think that he does.

Mr Davis: The new Minister is a member of the League of Rights.

Mr KRUGER: That might be part of the problem. He may have drifted away from Country Party aims. If he does not know about them, he should.

Mr McKECHNIE: I rise to a point of order. The member for Brisbane Central has said repeatedly in this Chamber that I am a member of the League of Rights. On many occasions I have asked the occupant of the chair to ask the honourable member to withdraw such comments. I am not a member of that organisation, and I ask him to withdraw his remark.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The Minister has indicated that he is not a member of the organisation mentioned by the member for Brisbane Central, so I ask the honourable member to withdraw the comment.

Mr DAVIS: I do not think that the remark will appear in *Hansard*.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to withdraw the remark that the Minister is a member of that particular organisation.

Mr DAVIS: For the record, I will withdraw the remark—if it is in the record.

Mr KRUGER: Another article refers to a cane-farmer who has been told to quit his land by his bank-manager because of the problems in the industry. I would like to think that no-one has to leave the industry. However, if a number of farmers on non-viable farms are in debt too deeply and have to leave the industry to make the rest of it viable, then that must happen. We must be realistic. I hope that a price can be agreed upon that will allow these people to stay; however, world prices are beyond our control.

If the industry is to survive, restructuring is needed. Deregulation is a nasty word, but restructuring is a fact of life; that is the difference. The industry can be restructured if, in the long term, there will be some relief for the industry.

On-farm costs must be cut. Honourable members representing sugar areas know very well that some farmers have more equipment than they need. Capital expenditure on some properties is out of all proportion. Many farmers have their own harvester; yet economists would suggest that many of those farmers are not big enough producers to have their own harvesters.

Mr Shaw: They are tax deductions, that's why.

Mr KRUGER: That is the point that I am coming to, and I am pleased that the honourable member mentioned it.

During the days of plenty, cane-farmers had between five and 10 tractors with an implement on each tractor. I point out to the House that I was one of the most successful small-crop farmers in the State and that when I was farming I had only one tractor. I could change an implement in under a minute. I had no need to have five tractors, even though I sprayed one day, I put the chisel plough on the next day and I then wanted to use the disc plough or the rotary hoe. Those implements can be changed easily. Not all of the people in the industry did, but at that time many of them set out to reduce their income tax by buying \$40,000 tractors. I have no gripe about that but, if these people are now looking for financial support, they have to toe the line. I believe most of them are fair dinkum about it.

I will now speak about the restructuring of the industry. Firstly, there is no need not to restructure the industry. If the State or Federal Governments are to make some contribution, they need some sort of feedback. I am sure that most farmers are honest and that the Governments will get a feedback. If the Queensland Government does not procrastinate, if it does not stand by and if it does not continue to bash Canberra, a result will be achieved. As I have been discussing the matter with the Federal Government, I know that it is prepared to put up the money. It has said so time and time again. I wish to quote to the House a media release from the Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin) as follows—

“The Minister for Primary Industry, Mr John Kerin announced today that he would meet the Queensland Cane Growers' Council Executive in Brisbane next month in a bid to speed up negotiations over assistance for the sugar industry.

Mr Kerin said that, as well, today he had telexed his State counterpart, Mr Neil Turner, indicating that he would be willing to also talk with him again on 3 September in Brisbane.”

I hope he gets better results than he did the last time he came to Queensland when the Premier and Treasurer of this State denied the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) the opportunity to talk to Mr Kerin. As a result, they could not get down to discussing the fundamental issues.

Now another two or three weeks has passed by and this morning the Premier said that the sugar industry would not get any benefit until 1986. If some agreement is not reached in the near future, Mr Deputy Speaker, you can bet your bottom dollar that it will be too late. In the very near future people will want to know whether they should replant or what acreage to plant. They need to know whether the money will be there and whether sugar is to remain a viable industry. If people want to say that the industry will not be viable, a decision must be made on who should be removed from the industry. If that is to happen, it should be organised in such a way that the Federal and State Governments put in the required money so that the growers at least get a fair and reasonable deal.

As I have already mentioned, I am not happy with the word "deregulation" and I will tell the House why that is so. I know of the problems that face the Federal Government. I realise that Government members are always saying that the steel industry and the motor vehicle industry should be deregulated and that it is much easier and much more responsible for them to deregulate. I have talked to Mr Kerin about this and he is aware of the matter and has it under consideration.

Some of the "open cut" deregulation that is suggested in this booklet is not feasible. I am sure Mr Kerin is aware of that; if he is not, I will make him aware of it. If deregulation were to take place in the way that is suggested in this report, as Sir Joseph McAvoy said only the other day, it would pave the way for millers and big growers to take over the industry when things come good.

Although I call it restructuring, I agree with deregulation, as it is intended, so that the farmers who have to get out can opt out. In the case of the dairying industry, Labor policy was always the same—if somebody's dairy was not big enough, he could acquire another one to make a viable operation. There is no reason why the necessary mechanism cannot be arranged for that sort of thing to occur in the sugar industry. However, when it comes down to the basics as laid down in the report, not everything is palatable to everybody in the industry. Whether or not things are palatable does not matter so much at this stage. The industry has to move forward with the idea that money will be forthcoming to get it back on its feet.

The issues can be negotiated. What has been happening in Queensland over the last two or three weeks is that the State Government will not allow negotiations to occur. To me, that is a reflection on the people in the industry, people whom the National Party purports to represent. That is what leads me to believe that the old, hard rump of the Country Party is still out there. The National Party conservatives in the city are selling the people of Queensland down the drain.

Until such time as the Government factions get themselves together and do what the people of Queensland want them to do, they can no longer boast to this Assembly or to the people of Queensland that the National Party represents the man on the land. That time has long gone. I am sure that the honourable member for Warwick (Mr Booth) wants to get to his feet to say that, once again, the honourable member for Murrumba is correct. He has complimented me on many other occasions. I am sure that he will do the same today.

I turn now to the other problems faced by the Queensland Government. There was the shemozzle in the milk industry involving the hierarchy in the National Party. This will provide something for the honourable member for Warwick to debate. Problems occurred with the independent shellers in the peanut industry. The free enterprise people have tried to take control of the industry. The board that was formed by the Labor Party has now been condemned and knocked back to the extent that the chairman of the board (Mr Magnussen) recently stated that he had to accept the pressures that had

been applied. He said that those people in the free enterprise shelling situation will be able to have a part of the industry. There are legal reasons for that. If the Queensland Government had acted properly, those problems would not have arisen.

I believe that the Government of Queensland has let down the farmer—the man on the land—and if Government members are going to be conservative operators from the city, they had better form a stronger city base.

Mr BOOTH (Warwick) (4.51 p.m.): The honourable member for Murrumba suggested that I would be very pleased with his speech. I was. I think that he deliberately made a bad speech to make my speech look good. However, we have similar views on some things. As the Opposition spokesman on primary industry matters, he has, I suppose, endeavoured to make a contribution. I pay him a tribute for at least speaking about primary industries. I will not take anything away from him on that score.

I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I am pleased to take part in the debate this afternoon.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr BOOTH: I believe that they put a great deal of work into it and that they made an excellent contribution.

I pledge my loyalty and that of my constituents to the Crown. I propose to refer to the Governor's Opening Speech, my electorate and several other matters.

The Governor's Opening Speech was far-ranging. There are many primary industries in my electorate. The Governor said that a number of Bills dealing with primary industry matters would be introduced. He said that Bills dealing with soil conservation and biological control methods would be introduced. I am not aware what will be in the Bill dealing with biological control methods. This is an area into which the Government is moving. The Government will have to face up to its responsibilities and do something in that area.

A company that operates in my electorate is engaged in biological control, including the preparation of such things as bacteria controls. The fact that that company is starting to make headway and that it is affiliated with several other companies throughout Australia is proof that it is about time that that area was thoroughly examined. It is not something with which anyone should tamper. It should not be allowed to run free. The matter should be kept under review constantly. The Governor made it fairly plain that the Government was going to move more strongly into soil conservation.

Mr Davis: They are always going to go into soil conservation.

Mr BOOTH: A great deal has been done. It is a big job and it is not easy. It is very difficult for anyone to be sure about the right way to go about it.

Mr Comben: We have soil conservation needs now.

Mr BOOTH: I would agree with the honourable member for Windsor that if every tree had been left in the State, soil conservation problems would not exist. Brisbane would not exist, either, and there would still be wombats in Queen Street.

Development has to be carried out. I am prepared to admit that perhaps too many trees were knocked down on some occasions. However, if it had not been for the early development—and my area was one of the first to be developed—it is quite likely that people would not have been able to be self-sufficient and produce the necessary food.

As I have said, I believe that development had to be carried out. However, I am concerned about one aspect of soil conservation that I suggest the Minister for Primary Industries should keep his eye on. The right of appeal should not be taken away from the owners of properties adjoining those on which soil conservation has been carried out.

It is all very well to say that the Government should come up with a good plan and that should be it. It must be remembered that whatever soil conservation work is carried out, whether it be the construction of waterways or something else, the person on whose property the work is done has to pay for that work. It is fair and reasonable that people should have the opportunity of appealing if they believe that it will not be beneficial to their farm or property.

It is quite easy for a soil conservation officer to go on to a property and say, "I will fix up your problem." However, if the soil conservation officer is going to create a very expensive problem for someone else, there must be an avenue of appeal. Up till now the plan has worked fairly well. Soil conservation officers have been fairly careful. Some problems have been experienced, but there has always been a right of appeal. That right of appeal should remain. I would be very concerned if any attempt was made to take away that right of appeal.

On another aspect of soil conservation, that is, the acceptance of the water—and expensive works have to be carried out in order that a property may accept the water—greater difficulties are experienced, because sometimes a land-holder has to lose 4 or 5 ha—sometimes more but usually less—of his best land because it is near a waterway. In addition to losing that land, he could be called on to spend \$5,000, \$6,000 or anything up to \$20,000. Usually it is no more than that, but it could be in some areas. That is the area in which assistance should be channelled in regard to soil conservation. The strain must be taken off people who have to find that money, particularly when there is no benefit to them.

The works that I refer to are known as works of community benefit. I do not believe that any impact will be made on soil conservation from now on unless some funding is provided for that type of work. I know that it has been said that the new Soil Conservation Act should put the bulldozer over people. I hope that the Government does not fall for that. That is not the way to go. The Government is on the right track. More assistance is needed for those people who are forced to take water. In some areas, perhaps too much water is being put into one waterway. It is quite common nowadays to go to properties on which three natural waterways have converged into one. It takes a bit of handling, costs a good deal of money, and sometimes does not work. That is an area that should be closely monitored.

I turn now to the dairy industry, because it seems to be heading for new difficulties. The Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin) believes that the way to solve the problems of the dairy industry and, for that matter, the cane industry is to deregulate. He seems to think that that is the Mr Fix-it, that that is the way to go.

Mr Vaughan: Wasn't that the recommendation of the Savage committee?

Mr BOOTH: Yes. That is one of the recommendations that concern me. I did not want to comment on that, because I am not an expert on sugar. However, I do want to comment on the deregulation of the dairy industry. Deregulation of the dairy industry will not solve the problems. It is a bit like war; it will solve no problems and create many.

I was associated with the industry for much of the time during which regulation was introduced. Some has been removed. The intention of regulation was to support the industry. We were fairly successful in overcoming problems that occurred when oversupply in one area was dumped in another, causing the price to drop.

The price of butter, cheese and most other manufactured dairy products is so low that the time must be close when people will not be able to afford to produce. The only reason production is possible is that the industry has what is known as a product mix, with portion of the milk being sold for consumption by the general public and the remainder being used for manufacture. The price gap between milk for manufacturing and milk for consumption has always been substantial. However, recently the disparity has become worse. I am concerned about it. Deregulation, if it occurs—because of defeat

in the Senate, it has not occurred this year—will have very serious, long-term effects on the industry.

Mr Comben: Scared of the free market, are you? That's what it means.

Mr BOOTH: The free market might not be of the benefit imagined by the Labor Party. I have never been a supporter of wrecking any industry. Mr Sinclair has been attacked for allowing too much tariff protection. That might be so. I heard him defend himself on a national program at the week-end. He might have allowed a little too much, but he made the point that every industry had to be considered before decisions were made across the board. I respect him for it. That is something that both he and Mr Kerin agreed on: industries should be considered individually.

If the Federal Government deregulates completely, producers will dump in this country instead of selling overseas. The consumer might enjoy cheaper dairy products for a short time; but, once the farmer is forced out of production, the price will increase. That will happen in other industries, including secondary industries.

I do not intend confining my speech to Mr Kerin and the subject of exports. I deal now with the Milk Entitlements Committee. I am extremely disappointed at the decision of the committee affecting dairy-farmers on the Darling Downs. The results obtained for the people in my area have been very meagre. They are probably a little better off than they were, but the position is still most unsatisfactory. I obtained statistics that I intended quoting, but the picture has been distorted by factories closing and the production being taken up by other factories. Consequently, it is difficult to give meaningful figures.

The overall position is not good. The Milk Entitlements Committee should be reviewing the position with a view to making improvements. There should be equality in quotas for all suppliers. I realise that a system cannot be devised under which every producer has the same milk quota. I do not advocate that; nor did any of the legislation passed by the House. However, in my opinion, there should be much more equality for all suppliers in south-east Queensland. The Milk Entitlements Committee developed a technique under which it had stage 1, stage 2, stage 3 and stage 4. It seems to have painted itself into a corner, with too much sophistication. The committee should completely reconsider the matter.

I turn now to the subject of education and the document entitled *Education 2000*. It has been attacked by many people who have regarded it as a proposal that will be fully implemented. I do not think that that was ever the intention behind producing the document. The idea of the document was to obtain some feedback and get people thinking. It was designed to promote discussions, and in my area at least it has been particularly successful. I will not say a great deal more about it, except for this: I attended several meetings to obtain a response to the *Education 2000* policy. I found the people to be enthusiastic about it, and large crowds sat through an explanation of it. There was plenty of feedback, and I believe that the new system must do some good in the long term.

Mr Eaton: Do you think that the people who attended those meetings got any response from the Education Department officials? I found that they did not answer all the questions.

Mr BOOTH: I can only say that they did in my area. It is a pity that the honourable member for Mourilyan feels that that was the case in his area. Of course, because I was not present, I will not dispute the matter with him. However, in my area the officials who represented the Education Department did an excellent job. The regional director attended with a senior inspector and two or three other officials, and I thought that all of them were capable of explaining the new policy. I guess every area is different.

Mr Eaton: They said that it was only a discussion paper and they asked for input from the people; yet, when the time came, they could not answer questions that they were asked.

Mr BOOTH: I will not debate that with the honourable member for Mourilyan, because I did not share his experience. However, I take on board that the honourable member feels that way about it, and that he has taken the opportunity now to make that claim.

I was intrigued by the speech made by the honourable member for Ipswich (Mr Hamill). He spoke for a long time about pre-schools and kindergartens. His chief object seemed to be to apologise for the role played by the Federal Government. In my opinion, he would have been better off saying nothing about it. It is probably true that most honourable members would be a little annoyed because the Federal Government has seen fit to withdraw its support in respect of pre-school and kindergarten education.

I am confident that the Queensland Government will take up the leeway. Nevertheless, kindergartens and pre-schools are finding it very difficult to operate, and I fear that it will not be easy for kindergartens in the near future.

Mr Fouras: There has been no-cut back for kindergartens. It does not start until next year.

Mr BOOTH: That is right, but that time is fairly close. What the honourable member for South Brisbane is as good as saying is that, because something does not commence till three months time, it will never happen. It probably will happen, but I will be very pleased if it does not. I merely mention that I am disappointed that the Federal Government is withdrawing its support.

Another matter that has become a good talking point in my electorate is the Southern Downs College of Technical and Further Education. I wish to put the record straight by saying that acquisition of land for the college has been completed, and that the Queensland Government is presently awaiting a decision of the Tertiary Education Commission on whether or not construction of the college will be proceeded with. Everything appears to be in order, and I am hopeful that construction will take place.

Mr Davis: In that area, they have a good Federal representative, so they have no worries.

Mr BOOTH: I will have something to say about that gentleman. I am very disappointed in the Federal representative because he is the greatest knocker I have ever come across. However, if I have sufficient time I will have more to say about him later.

I usually mention construction of the gates on the Leslie Dam, and I believe that they are nearing completion. I am sure that the honourable member for Brisbane Central will be delighted to hear that, as he will be able to go out to the dam and have a sail round when the gates are officially in place.

I wish to mention a new issue that has arisen because of some changes that have occurred in my electorate. I take up a point previously mentioned by the honourable member for Murrumba. He said that the bigger farmers are out-producing the smaller farmers. I inform the House of a revived trend in lucerne production. My electorate contains some excellent alluvial land, and vegetable and lucerne production seems to be increasing. However, with lucerne production there is one problem in that if hay is to be sold in New South Wales, it must be fumigated. That is a fairly costly procedure. It costs in the vicinity of 50c a bale. I cannot see any reason for that. Schedule W has its boundaries on the Condamine River, which means that a few farms can sell without the necessity of fumigation. However, the great majority cannot. Although I am not against fumigation where it is necessary, I believe that that boundary could be safely moved a good deal farther from where it is.

For a start, we should be careful. I believe the boundary could be moved safely to the New England Highway, that is, the road from Warwick to Toowoomba, and the road from Warwick to Killarney via Yangan. By so doing, many more farmers could participate in sales to New South Wales without fumigation. My theory is that the

boundary should be the eastern fence of the New England Highway between Warwick and Toowoomba. If the powers that be think that that is going too far, at least it should take in the shire of Allora. The other new boundary that I propose is the eastern fence of the road from Warwick to Killarney via Yangan, with the northern fence as far as Emu Vale and the eastern fence from Emu Vale on to the border. That would allow many more growers to take advantage of sales in New South Wales without fumigation problems.

I intend to press this matter. The main problem is the New South Wales Department of Agriculture. It is afraid that ticks will be a problem if the boundary is shifted. I know that the Primary Industries people in Queensland have to contend with that fear, but I think we could get the boundary altered if the Queensland Department of Primary Industries strongly recommended such action.

Mr Davis: I agree with your summation.

Mr BOOTH: I can see no reason why that should not be recommended.

A little earlier, the member for Brisbane Central referred to the member for Rankin (Mr David Beddall).

Mr Davis: He's made a big impression; he's all for Warwick.

Mr BOOTH: So far, all he has tried to do is to knock Warwick on every occasion. The last time he came to Warwick, he said, "I think the Warwick dairy will close." The directors of that dairy had no intention of closing it. It is as solid as a bank. There is no reason at all for such talk. He is only trying to destroy confidence in the city, but the city is surviving despite him. It is not going ahead with the help of Mr Beddall but in spite of a knocker like him. I cannot understand what he is trying to do but, recently, he asked what had been done for decentralisation. He did not say what he would do but asked what had been done.

Warwick has an industrial estate with some of the best industrial land in the State.

Mr Davis: Are there any businesses on it?

Mr BOOTH: A fair few businesses are on the estate and more are coming there. A fair amount of industrial development has taken place.

It would be far better if Mr Beddall were to say, "We will try to do something about it," rather than say that nothing has been done. He was very foolish. The number of businesses on the industrial estate has increased. I see no reason why anything should go wrong in that area. I put to Mr Beddall that if he cannot do anything for Warwick he should do nothing to try to damage it. When he reaches that decision, things will go ahead much better.

In speaking about strikes in essential industries I want to talk common sense rather than be intolerant. When people go on strike they probably intend to remain on strike for only a couple of days but, if someone does not give in, they will stay out as long as necessary. A few weeks ago I was told by a man who was defending the strike idea. "It may have been as well to let us go out for 12 weeks and get it out of our system." I should think that if ever a strike in the power or any other essential industry in Queensland lasted 12 weeks, Queensland would be closed down. It would be a complete mess. The effects on all sections of the community would be too bad to contemplate.

I suggest to honourable members opposite that they should be telling their people that strikes in the power industry are just not on, that they are very foolish to contemplate. The workers must make a livelihood and those who are conducting their own businesses simply cannot carry on in strike situations.

Mr Fouras: Why not talk about conciliation?

Mr BOOTH: Conciliation can work only if both sides want to make it work. It cannot work if workers go out on strike and say, "We won't go back until we get everything we want." Conciliation cannot work like that, and the honourable member for South Brisbane knows that as well as I do.

I want to refer to another matter that is causing concern. It is not good for the nation and it will create far-reaching problems. I refer to the continuing increase in farm costs.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr BOOTH: That is all right. Earlier, an Opposition member said that the farmers went down to Canberra and demonstrated. Of course they did; but it was the last thing that they wanted to do. The only reason they went to Canberra was that many of them, particularly the younger ones, are in such a state that something has to be done. The member for Brisbane Central may be delighted that farmers are finding the going tough, but I point out to him that he will not get prosperity in the cities if the people in the country are in poor circumstances.

The position in which people in the country find themselves is not confined to any one matter. It has been stated in this Chamber and in the press that the price of fuel is the problem. That is only one of the problems.

Mr Davis: World parity pricing was introduced by the National Party.

Mr BOOTH: It is not a question of who introduced it. Since the Labor Party assumed office in Canberra, the price of fuel has increased by 12c a litre. That has been a terrible impost on people in the country. Admittedly, the Federal Government recently reduced the price of fuel by 2c a litre, but that is a very small amount. Even if the price of fuel were reduced substantially, it would not get the farmer out of trouble. The greatest problem that he faces is the high cost of labour. I suppose that everyone has to contend with those costs. Capital costs and overheads are also major problems. Under today's conditions, it is nearly impossible to make a farm pay. Some people may be able to do it, but they are few in number.

I turn now to orderly marketing. The honourable members for Murrumba and Lockyer also referred to this matter and said that if farmers are forced out of sugar they will move into vegetables or some other crop and create similar problems for other groups of farmers. Statutory boards will have to start to look at forecasting. For many years, farmers have tended to specialise. They buy certain equipment for their farm. They can use that equipment if they stay in grain or grow pastures for cattle, but problems arise if they move into other areas. Statutory boards should start looking right now at doing some forecasting. It is not much good a farmer planting a crop only to find, when he is about to harvest it, that the price for that crop is very low.

This year there is an excellent crop of barley on the Darling Downs. It looks good but, with the dismal prices that have been predicted, I doubt whether it will return the cost of production. That just cannot continue. I know that the Barley Board is concerned about making forecasts. People might decide not to plant barley, only to find that the price is OK.

The barley industry is beset with recurring problems and it might well be in the best interests of those concerned to try some other crop. I am not singling out the Barley Marketing Board, because in recent years it has not been the policy of orderly or statutory marketing boards to make forecasts. With regard to efficiency, I think that the Barley Marketing Board is on a par with most other boards. However, unless projections of what to plant can be made at least a few years in advance, the growers will strike fairly serious trouble.

Mention was made by several members about the expensive harvesting equipment that smaller farms cannot really afford to purchase. In recent times, smaller farmers

have been able to buy one good, efficient harvesting unit and supplement their income by doing contract work. I do not think that honourable members are doing the right thing by suggesting that the smaller farmers should not purchase this equipment.

In conclusion—I point out that things are not easy for people on the land—they are not easy in my electorate—and are more difficult than they have ever been. I do not blame the Federal Government solely for that. I simply say that it is a fact of life. The overseas markets for many commodities have collapsed and attempts should be made to look at those markets that our primary producers can service and to avoid those that may be non-viable for some time.

Mr VAUGHAN (Nudgee) (5.22 p.m.): In his Opening Speech, the Governor said that the State ended the 1984-85 financial year with an accumulated surplus in the Consolidated Revenue Fund of \$166,000. While the Government takes great pains to boast about balancing the Budget, it conveniently chooses to ignore or skate round the many problems that exist in this so-called rich and prosperous State.

Because I was unable to speak in the debate on the Appropriation Bill last week, I take this opportunity to comment on some of the grossly misleading statements that were made in that debate by the Premier.

The Premier's description of the Queensland economy was, at best, selective and misleading. At worst, it was totally wrong. The Premier highlighted only those statistics that showed Queensland in a favourable light and chose to ignore those statistics that describe the real state of the Queensland economy.

When discussing retail sales, the Premier chose to look at the month of April 1985 in which retail sales in Queensland rose by 13.2 per cent. The latest figures for June 1985 indicate that retail sales rose by 9 per cent in the 12-month period ended June 1985. That is a favourable result, but is not as good as the April figure. Queensland can only be said to be holding its own in this sector of the economy because the State recorded 16.1 per cent of total retail sales for the whole of Australia in 1984-85. The Queensland population is 16.1 per cent of the Australian total.

The Premier said that motor vehicle registrations in Queensland maintained a marginally higher rate of increase than that recorded for the whole of Australia for the 11-month period ended 31 May 1985. That statement is totally incorrect. New motor vehicle registrations for the year ended June 1985—the latest figures for Australia that are available—rose by 11.8 per cent, whereas Queensland registrations rose by 5.5 per cent, which is less than half the Australian increase. I refer the Premier to page 5 of the Australian Bureau of Statistics Catalogue No. 93030 for motor vehicle registrations in Australia as at June 1985, which was released on 19 August 1985.

The Premier said that Queensland exports had risen sharply in recent months and that the value of our exports for the financial year to April 1985 was 20 per cent higher than the figure for the corresponding period in the 1983-84 financial year. In fact, figures for Queensland exports are available for the year ended 30 June 1985. They show that Queensland exports rose 20.1 per cent compared with the figure for the previous financial year, but that exports for Australia as a whole rose by 23.7 per cent in the same period. That shows once again that Queensland is lagging behind the rest of Australia.

I now turn to mining. The Premier said that Queensland now leads New South Wales in coal production. That statement is entirely false. Queensland's coal production for 1984-85 was 54.3 million tonnes and production in New South Wales—measured on the same basis, saleable production—was 58.4 million tonnes. The Premier should seek better advice.

The Premier said also that the gross value of minerals produced was up by 21.6 per cent. What I want to see is the value-added figure, which gives a more accurate indication of the profitability of the industry. For instance, in 1983-84 the turnover of mining establishments increased by 20 per cent over the previous year, but, value added, increased by only 6 per cent.

I now turn to construction. In this, the Premier was so carefully selective in what he presented to the House that it had the effect of disguising the true situation. Firstly, the Premier stated that, in the nine months to March 1985 the construction activity in the spheres of commercial and industrial buildings had increased by 13 per cent over the same period in the previous year. That is correct. However, for the same period, the comparable Australian increase was 38.9 per cent. The Premier bothers to compare Queensland's figures with those for the whole of Australia only when it suits him. In fact, figures are available up to May 1985, when Australia still showed a strong rate of growth of 37.2 per cent.

There is more. I will consider the value of new dwellings approved. The Premier did not mention these figures. In Queensland, in the 11 months to May 1985, the value of new dwellings approved was \$1,250m—a decline of 3.1 per cent over the same period for the last financial year. Because new dwelling approvals are a leading indicator of economic activity, that is important. That shows that many complementary industries, such as furniture and hardware, will be feeling the pinch in the year to come. The Australian figure for the 11 months to May 1985 was \$6,764.3m—an increase of 15.7 per cent. Honourable members can see how badly Queensland is lagging in that sector.

The figures of bankruptcy were not mentioned by the Premier. For 1984-85, the number of bankruptcies in Queensland was just on 1 000—an increase of 15.6 per cent over the previous year.

Mr Davis: That is a growth industry.

Mr VAUGHAN: That is a real growth industry. Sadly, receivership seems to be one of the few growth industries in Queensland.

I now turn to unemployment. The Premier totally neglected to mention that Queensland has the highest rate of unemployment in any State. In Queensland it is 9.2 per cent, compared with the Australian average of 7.8 per cent. The Premier and other Government members would have everybody believe that everything in this State is a bed of roses, when in fact the opposite is the case. If they did not have Canberra and the other States to abuse and criticise and the workers of this State to attack and blame, they would be lost.

Balancing a Budget is no great feat, it is what has to be done without the counts. The people in this State are doing without a lot. But what does the Government do? It blames, or tries to blame, the Federal Labor Government for not supplying enough money. On the one hand, the Premier advocates lower taxes—there is nothing wrong with that—a reduction in the deficit and a cut in Federal Government spending; but, on the other hand, at the same time he wants—or, rather, demands—more money from the Federal Government and whinges when it is not forthcoming.

On numerous occasions, all honourable members have heard the Premier, in one of his regular exhibitions of Canberra-bashing, threatening to take Queensland out of the Federation—to secede. If the Premier and the others on that side of the House are so dissatisfied with the treatment that they contend this State is getting from the Federal Government, I challenge them to do something about it. Let us have a referendum of the people of this State to see whether they want to remain Australians or whether they want to sever their relations with the rest of their fellow countrymen and become Queenslanders totally. At least then the Premier and the mob of fascists on the other side of the House would find out the extent to which they have brainwashed the people of this State.

If Queensland were to secede from the rest of Australia, the Premier would be able to have *God Save The Queen* or whatever else he wanted as Queensland's anthem and he would not have to worry about changing the Australian flag. However, as I understand it, whether he wants to or not, the Premier cannot secede from the Commonwealth. A mere statement in that regard could be considered to be treason.

It is interesting to note that this year the Governor made no reference to the national flag. In 1983, the then Governor said that the Government pledged its loyalty to the national flag. In 1984, the then Governor commented that many Queenslanders were apprehensive about moves to change the flag and that the Government was concerned about *Advance Australia Fair* being proclaimed as the national anthem and about the proposed alteration to the oath of allegiance.

Last year, in the Address in Reply debate, I took the opportunity to set the record straight on those matters. However, it appears that the Premier and Treasurer is determined to continue to create confusion and discontent in the minds of the people of this State in relation to the national anthem and the Australian flag. Despite a proclamation by the Governor-General, the Queen's representative, he refuses to accept *Advance Australia Fair* as the national anthem. He has forbidden Queensland schoolchildren to participate in a national flag competition. So much for the free and democratic society to which the Governor referred in his Opening Speech!

As the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton) said on Tuesday in leading for the Opposition in the debate on the Governor's Opening Speech, it was not so much what the Governor said in his speech as what he did not say. Significantly, he made no reference to the situation facing the sugar industry, which the Premier and Treasurer is trying to pass over to the Federal Government. He made no reference to the SEQEB situation, in which the Premier has almost emasculated the largest electricity distribution authority in the State and is doing his best to persecute the hundreds of sacked SEQEB employees, whom he sacked on 11 February, and their wives and families.

It was interesting to note the comments made by the Premier and Treasurer last night on television and quoted in the press this morning. He said, "You never kick a man when he's down." He was referring to a situation involving a member of this Chamber. The Premier does not practise what he preaches. He advocates, "Never kick a man when he is down" But what is he doing to hundreds of SEQEB workers, their wives and families? He is persecuting those persons and kicking them when they are down. He refuses to do anything to change their position.

The honourable member for Warwick (Mr Booth), for whom I have a very high regard, referred to the SEQEB dispute and the Queensland electricity industry. He made an appeal for no more industrial disputes. If the Premier and Treasurer was prepared to sit round a table, negotiate and talk about the situation that exists in the SEQEB, the industrial disputation that exists in this State would be discontinued tomorrow. The Premier will not go to the conference table. He will not allow SEQEB or the Queensland Electricity Commission to negotiate a settlement of this dispute.

In February the Premier emasculated the State Industrial Commission to prevent it from settling the dispute. He was instrumental in introducing legislation into this Chamber to change the whole scene as far as Queensland's industrial laws were concerned, particularly in the electricity industry. The Premier has continued to prevent that dispute from being resolved.

If some of those Government members who have any brains were able to prevail upon the Premier, who, I believe, is reaching the stage at which he is not responsible for his actions—he should see a doctor, just as he advised the honourable member for Aspley (Mr Cahill)—perhaps a different situation would prevail in this State and nation.

Mr Littleproud: What about we go back to the decision when they got the 35-hour week? Wasn't that supposed to be the end of disputation?

Mr VAUGHAN: The honourable member knows as well as I do the history of the SEQEB dispute. He knows very well that early in February 1984 the Premier set out to trap the SEQEB workers and the Electrical Trades Union and to force a situation upon the electricity industry so that he could introduce the legislation that was introduced. He wanted to create the situation that exists in this State today. He imported the new general manager of SEQEB, Mr Wayne Gilbert.

I have quoted from the annual report of the South East Queensland Electricity Board, which details the circumstances that existed in SEQEB up till June last year. The annual report states that industrial relations in SEQEB and in the industry generally had never been better. The annual report also states that the incidence of industrial disputation in 1983-84 had fallen by 66.9 per cent and that the continuity of supply of electricity to consumers in the SEQEB district had never been higher. Those facts cannot be denied. It was 99.98 per cent continuity of supply. Yet Government members have the gall to argue that the situation that currently exists at SEQEB is the fault of the workers who were sacked by SEQEB. That is not correct.

The Premier and Treasurer boasted that he had that legislation. He brought it back after having had it prepared overseas. The Premier and Treasurer was looking for an excuse to get square with SEQEB workers and in fact the whole electricity industry, because he never forgave the Cabinet which, while he was away on one of his many overseas trips, negotiated a shorter working week in the supply industry. When he returned from overseas, he found that it had been agreed to. The Premier and Treasurer vowed and declared that he would rectify the situation and get even, and that is what he did.

The Premier and Treasurer is on record as boasting that he set out to get square with the electricity industry and to try to get rid of the Federal Labor Government. He was quoted in *The Sydney Morning Herald*. He spoke on the Haydn Sargent program. Haydn Sargent also appeared on *State Affair* to take the Premier to task.

If Government members did not have Canberra or the workers of this State to bash, they would have nothing else to do. That is what they are all about.

Government Members interjected.

Mr VAUGHAN: I do not mind being provoked by Government members. It is time they were told a few home truths about what is happening in this State.

I turn to the current position at SEQEB. Mr Wayne Gilbert, the general manager of SEQEB, has come out and said that everything in SEQEB is rosy and that he will save \$26m a year. Very shortly I will take him to task on that. He is quoted in the paper as saying that SEQEB does not need new employees. However, it is a fact that the general manager of SEQEB has just obtained permission from the Queensland Electricity Commissioner and the Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr I. J. Gibbs) to send an emissary across to New Zealand to recruit linesmen for SEQEB because it does not have enough linesmen to carry out the work. All honourable members know what is going on.

If honourable members opposite who have electorates in the SEQEB area say that they have not been contacted by their constituents, either they are not doing their jobs or they are not being honest.

At the week-end, the general manager of SEQEB was quoted in the press as saying that SEQEB has 50 contractors working for it and that they are employing 200 men. He alleges that, through the use of contractors, SEQEB is able to save \$10m a year. I do not know how he calculated that figure. As I have said in the press, I will be interested to read the 1984-85 annual report of the South East Queensland Electricity Board to see what the real position is. I do not believe that that will be achieved. Unfortunately, that report will not be available until January or February next year.

My information is that those contractors are making a killing, that they are being paid \$35 per man-hour. If that represents a saving on employing permanent staff, I will walk to Burke. Some employees of contractors openly boast that they are netting more than \$1,000 a week. They are really making a killing. I do not say that all of them are doing that, but certainly many of them are going round openly boasting that they are making a fortune out of the current situation in SEQEB. Not only are they doing that, but they are also using SEQEB equipment and materials. They are working on a trial and error basis because many of them are still not able to carry out the work that the

sacked SEQEB workers were able to perform in a skilled and efficient manner. Hundreds and hundreds of dollars is being wasted. Tools are being lost or flogged off by the contractors. It goes on and on.

Mr Littleproud: Those are serious allegations.

Mr VAUGHAN: I know that they are serious allegations, but who will pay for it? Electricity consumers will have to pay for it. Mr Wayne Gilbert, the Premier and all the yes-men—the clones—on the other side of the House will be held responsible by the electricity consumers when the truth comes out.

The SEQEB general manager boasts that all is well in SEQEB; that it has all the men it wants. However, SEQEB seeks permission to go to New Zealand to recruit 30 men, so it is said. However, it is known that more than 30 are sought. In addition, men are being brought to Brisbane from country depots.

Mr Newton interjected.

Mr VAUGHAN: They have been brought from the Caboolture electorate and from the Landsborough electorate. The men are boarded in large numbers at the Caravilla Motel to supplement the depleted work-force in the Brisbane area. Because the SEQEB management considers the outlying areas not to be important, it sends contractors out to the country depots to carry out the work.

To give one example of the use of contractors, I refer to tree-cutting. Page 8 of the SEQEB annual report refers to tree-cutting under the heading "Reliability of Supply" It says—

"The greatest threat to reliability of supply continued to be trees fouling overhead power lines. More than 40% of blackouts in the Brisbane area occurred during windy weather. SEQEB spent \$1.8 million on tree trimming in the vicinity of overhead power lines in 1983/84."

On 27 March—I made a note in my diary—I phoned SEQEB, saying that I was a consumer and drawing attention to the fact that across the road from me in Somers Street, Nudgee, the trees were growing up through the low-tension mains and reaching the high-tension mains. The response I received from the person who answered the phone was, "Very well. We now have contractors doing the work. We will have somebody out there before the end of the week." Do you know when the work was done, Mr Deputy Speaker? Today! Even then, I would say the work was done only because two new power poles had to be erected across the road from my home.

The Government talks about buying Queensland-made goods and taking action to create employment in our State. Do you know who did the tree-cutting, Mr Deputy Speaker? A company called Decor Corrosion from New South Wales. The elevated-platform vehicle is registered in New South Wales, the place of business is in New South Wales and a New South Wales telephone number is shown.

The matter does not stop there. We all know Robin Russell. He was the hero in the system control during the period of the disputation and also when problems occurred to the system during storms. He has gone out on his own to become a contractor. He will make a mint of money out of it. At no cost, he was given the design of underground layouts in estates that SEQEB technical officers spent thousands of dollars to draw up. Who bears the cost of that? The electricity consumer.

I am told also that the maintenance of the 110 kV lines—the high-tension lines—is behind schedule and that in the not-too-distant future the Queensland Electricity Commission 110 kV gang will be split to provide sufficient workers to effect repairs to the SEQEB 110 kV lines before something drastic happens.

Complaints have been made about brown-outs throughout the city. I am told that the voltage at Samford—it ought to be 240 V—is down to 220 V and is causing problems.

Mr Shaw: That is deadly.

Mr VAUGHAN: It is for the consumers, who are likely to lose their refrigerators, freezers and other electrical appliances. SEQEB does not have the men to correct faults.

What a fiasco was created by the Minister's statement on 24 March last year that any domestic consumer in an area with access to the controlled hot-water tariff—H 56—who did not change over to that tariff from the H 55 continuous hot-water tariff by 1 July this year would automatically be transferred to the D 50 tariff, which is the domestic power and light tariff and is much higher. Anybody who had not been transferred had to pay the D 50 tariff rate for the volume of hot water consumed, and a consumer would therefore face an average increase of \$3-\$4.

Not only because of the incompetence displayed by management of the South East Queensland Electricity Board but also because of the low morale that exists within SEQEB, very little, if anything, was done to inform consumers of the savings to be gained. When I raised the issue in March and April this year, after the announcement of an increase in electricity charges, the fact that nothing had been done became apparent. In fact, the Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr I. J. Gibbs) admitted it.

One of the engineers employed by SEQEB—he probably drew the short straw—had to appear on national television. He was asked what SEQEB had done to inform its consumers about the tariff increase, and he had to hang his head and shuffle his papers. He acted in a very sheepish way. I felt very sorry for him. He said, "Well, we have some brochures and pamphlets in our depots", which demonstrated that nothing had been sent out to consumers.

However, since that time, those consumers who were lucky enough to be able to be transferred to the H56 tariff have been receiving electricity at a more economical rate. The annual report of the South East Queensland Electricity Board states that only 20 000 consumers were changed over in 1983-84 in areas outside Brisbane. At that time, the Minister for Mines and Energy made an announcement that 44 000 consumers in the Brisbane metropolitan area were yet to be changed over; but 12 months later, 41 000 consumers were still waiting to be changed over to the more economical tariff. Why had the change-over not taken place? The answer is that SEQEB did not have the manpower to effect the change-over. When that was brought to the notice of SEQEB management, it then engaged contractors who, I believe, are making a fortune.

Moreover, Ipswich, one of the oldest, established areas in south-east Queensland and an area that one could assume would have access to the H56 tariff, has not yet been connected to the more economical tariff. When consumers in Ipswich inquired, they were told that it would be one to two years before the change-over could take place.

Mr Milliner: What about Arana Hills and Everton Hills?

Mr VAUGHAN: The change-over for those two suburbs has been clarified. Areas such as Arana Hills and Everton Hills that were said to be unsuitable for the change-over—SEQEB said that it would never happen—will now in fact be changed to the H56 tariff. Because of a question that I asked the Minister for Mines and Energy this week, it has suddenly become possible to have consumers in those suburbs connected.

In June this year, the Minister agreed to extend the time in which application should be made for connection to the more economical tariff. I suggested that for those people who wanted to make the change-over to the less expensive H56 tariff, a concessional tariff should be struck until it could be effected, because consumers on the H56 tariff could expect a saving of \$18 a quarter.

I point out that in June 1985, 360 000 consumers of electricity had not been connected to the less expensive tariff. Because of that, I put forward a proposal to the Minister that a tariff of 5.75 cents should be applied. That represents 25 per cent of the average hot-water consumption at the continuous tariff rate and 75 per cent at the

controlled tariff rate, instead of 7.27c a unit, which is the continuous tariff rate. It should be remembered that a consumer who received electricity on the continuous supply tariff receives only 25 per cent more electricity than a consumer who has the advantage of the controlled tariff. I suggested to the Minister that that would have resulted in a saving of \$13 a quarter for some 360 000 consumers who, although they would like to be, cannot be changed over because of the inefficiency, bad management and maladministration of SEQEB.

I specifically asked that they be given some measure of financial relief, but the Minister knocked me back. He said that it would be unfair for other consumers to have to subsidise them. However, the Minister did not think about the subsidisation by Brisbane domestic consumers of electricity supplies to consumers in the rest of Queensland. It appears that, on the one hand, it is all right for Brisbane consumers to subsidise consumers in other parts of Queensland; but that, on the other hand, it is not all right for consumers throughout Queensland to contribute a little extra and afford a concession in the short term to those 360 000 who are waiting to be changed over to the H56 tariff.

The general manager of SEQEB made a statement at the weekend in which he said that 14 225 man-hours had been lost in a six-month period. As I pointed out, it was very convenient for Mr Gilbert to refer to the situation leading up to 11 February when all the employees were sacked. As I pointed out, he conveniently chose to ignore the situation that existed in SEQEB until June 1984 when the Premier decided to interfere in the smooth running of the electricity supply industry to create a situation out of which he could make political capital. And that is what happened. The Premier knows, we know and everybody else knows that the Premier makes political capital out of industrial disputes. I do not like industrial disputes but, unfortunately, the Premier thrives on them. He will not let industrial peace exist in Queensland as long as he is in control.

I call on the Minister for Mines and Energy and all Government members to keep in mind that if it is good enough for the Premier to say about one of his Government colleagues, "Never kick a man when he is down," it is good enough for Government and Opposition members to say, "Let us stop kicking the SEQEB workers and their families who are down." The Government has persecuted them enough. It has taught them a lesson if ever there was a lesson to be taught. Let the Government call a halt and do something to restore SEQEB to the type of organisation it was so that it can get back on the rails again and Queensland can once more have a decent electricity supply industry.

Mr LINGARD (Fassifern) (5.52 p.m.): Throughout the turmoil of a parliamentary session, when political grandstanding and attempted point-scoring such as that engaged in by the honourable member for Nudgee become accepted practice, it seems to me that it is unfortunate that some of the welfare work and promotion of schemes that benefit the public are not given the publicity in this House and by the media that they should be given. I have in mind schemes such as International Youth Year, which tend to be overshadowed by events that often mean very little to the man in the street and the young people of our great State.

Last year, the Government promoted the Year of the Family. The theme for the Year of the Family was, "Take the time to be together." It was aimed at three types of family. Firstly, we acknowledged that we had one group of families with serious difficulties in the family situation. The second group comprised middle-of-the-run families who were typical of the average family. The third group comprised families who might be working extremely well and enjoying great happiness of life while being extremely efficient. The first group of families with serious difficulties was generally promoted with support schemes. However, the Year of the Family was really aimed at the second group because the theme was, "Take the time to be together"; take the time to spend more time together in whatever way is possible—by talks or by ringing grandmothers, aunties and families in the extended family situation. It did not matter how it was done. The theme was to take the time to be together.

Unfortunately, the ALP members immediately started to ridicule the concept of the Year of the Family. However, when they realised that the public was coming in strongly behind the Year of the Family, they started to quieten down. The whole year was an amazing success and a credit to the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs.

Following on from IYY, 1986 will see the Year of the Parent. I hope that, after 1986, we may have the Year of the Aged because, without doubt, it is necessary to focus attention on the aged.

International Youth Year was promoted at an international level by the United Nations. It was accepted by the Federal Government, and the Queensland Government was asked to participate. Because the United Nations initiated it and the Federal Government supported it, I would have thought that the Queensland ALP would have come in behind it. However, I have seen no support from the Queensland ALP. It has left everything to the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs and Government members.

The three themes for International Youth Year are peace, participation and development. On 3 April, I warned this House about the peace movement. I said—

“ . . . in warning the people of Queensland about the peace movement. The present movement is now dominated by socialists and communists. It promotes a policy of antinuclear war, pacifism and anti-uranium development. The peace movement's policies might initially appeal to the idealistic thoughts of young people. However, I remind young people and all Queenslanders that there are three methods of promoting peace for one's country and ensuring residents of Australia are free from attack in the future.

The first method is the idealistic, pacifist thoughts of the peace movement. That type of attitude was held by men such as Chamberlain, who was the English Prime Minister before the last world war. It was criticised by Winston Churchill, and Churchill was proved to be correct. History has shown that the concept of pacifism has no future in a realistic world of continual turmoil, upheaval and social unrest. The communists and socialists promote it so that a country becomes weak and the force of communism can unleash its power. The communists involved in the peace movement certainly do not ensure that Russia lays down its arms.”

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr LINGARD: I am being interrupted by the member for Brisbane Central. The leader of the peace movement in the Queensland Teachers Union stood as a socialist against the member for Brisbane Central. He is now a signed-up member of the Communist Party, and the member for Brisbane Central knows that. That man is running the peace movement in the QTU. It is no wonder that the honourable member is turning round trying to interject.

My speech on 3 April continued—

“The second method of ensuring peace is the development of defence forces and warfare so that they act as a deterrent to any attack. Australia, as an island, lends itself to that strategy. However, we must look with fear at the Federal Government's attitude towards disbanding the school cadets, cutting defence expenditure and bowing to the pressures of its own factions over the MX missile program.

The third strategy is the development of treaties, such as the ANZUS Treaty, which ensure Australia's allegiance and support from powers such as America. It is almost 40 years since the Coral Sea Battle, and unfortunately, young people forget that it was only through the final assistance of America that Australia was saved in World War II. The Federal Government and left-wing influences are leading us down the path of destruction as they actively promote pacifist and idealistic ways.”

The theme for the International Youth Year is a year of action. I believe that it is a year of action in two ways: firstly, action by the older people, the Government and the influential forces, which will promote methods for younger people to participate and

develop and, secondly, action for young people to participate as much as possible. It is no use implementing these schemes when the young people do not participate in them.

The International Youth Year is promoting seven committees in Queensland. They are: education, accommodation, income security, law, recreation, health and employment. In the area of education, the committee comprises representatives of the Queensland Parliament, the Queensland Multicultural Co-ordinating Committee, the Queensland Council of Parents and Citizens Associations, the Queensland Parents and Friends Federation and the Queensland Teachers Union.

The subcommittee has been informally expanded to include young people representative of the following population groups: Aboriginal, migrant, disabled, women and unemployed, covering secondary and tertiary education areas. Although the subcommittee does not have on it representatives of homeless or isolated youth, the ideas of these young people have been sought by a visit to a youth emergency shelter and by a link between Yeronga and Macgregor High School students and students identified by the Secondary Correspondence School as being isolated.

As well, the education committee is promoting many excellent projects. As its major project for International Youth Year, the education subcommittee proposes sample-surveying of secondary school students in Years 10, 11 and 12. It is proposed to survey approximately 3 000 secondary school students in Years 10, 11 and 12 in approximately 30 to 40 Government and non-Government schools.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.

Mr LINGARD: The goal of the education committee is to assess the attitudes of the target group to the two most important elements of the education process—namely, the teachers and the curriculum—with a view to assisting policy-makers by focusing on any weakness in these two elements.

The accommodation committee has put out a brochure aimed at young people to encourage them to stay at home if possible. The brochure asks young people to consider whether they really have to leave home and urges them to discuss their problems. It points out that if a young person is to study or look for work in a different town or city, he or she will have to leave home. However, other reasons may lead young people to decide that the time has come to leave. The brochure asks young people to remember that living with parents or guardians can be financially, emotionally and academically rewarding. Young people are urged not to burn their bridges and to break the news to their family carefully. Leaving with their friendship and co-operation will mean a home to return to if things go wrong. It points out that when a person is broke, hungry, lonely, depressed or without somewhere to go, parents are often the only people with an open door.

The recreation subcommittee is looking at the theme of a forum to come up this week-end. That theme will discuss ways of involving young people in community activities. It seeks answers to a number of issues. What limits the involvement of young people? Why should young people become involved in community activity, firstly, as consumers and, secondly, as deliverers of services? Does youth have sufficient input into decision-making in sporting, recreation and cultural groups? What are the issues in the leisure areas that affect young people? What strategies are needed in the community to improve opportunities for young people as leisure-consumers?

I commend the Department of Youth for its brochure concerning employment. The department has established many excellent schemes, possibly the first of which was YESS—the Youth Employment Support Scheme. This scheme has two major components: the operation of centres that assist unemployed people in preparing for, finding and retaining employment; and the administration of a grants program providing assistance to local voluntary organisations conducting courses to assist unemployed youth to prepare for and gain employment. YESS can help three groups: young people, parents and employers.

Excellent youth and community groups have been created. The Youth Employment Support Scheme Centre can assist with information and advice on all services and funding programs provided by the Department of Youth. These include Youth Employment Support Scheme grants, Youth Leadership Training grants, Youth Assistance Scheme grants and the Duke of Edinburgh's Award Scheme. They are all excellent schemes.

The Youth Assistance Scheme allows for the payment of subsidy on the capital cost incurred in providing facilities catering for youth and community recreation programs. The Youth Leadership Award Scheme provides residential leadership schools that are conducted on a rotational basis throughout the State. The schools provide training and development in both theory and practical skills for leaders or associate leaders in youth organisations. I have been to several of these schools and I am extremely impressed by their success. Recently, schools have been held at Camp Duckadeng in Yeppoon, which is a magnificent centre. Selected students from throughout Queensland come to these schools for two weeks. It is to be hoped that they go back to their communities and promote schemes within their own peer groups.

Grants are available under the Youth Leadership Training Scheme to youth organisations towards the cost of conducting courses for the training of youth-leaders or, alternatively, towards the cost of sending members of the organisation to such courses conducted by similar organisations for these purposes.

Administration and training costs subsidies are available to State associations for administration expenses and the cost of employing a State director of training.

The Duke of Edinburgh's Award Scheme is open to all young people between the ages of 14 and 25 years and gives opportunities for personal achievement, community and social involvement, adventure and widening of interests.

In addition, throughout the State of Queensland 50 local communities are assisting to promote International Youth Year in their areas.

Many significant events have taken place already this year. The opening in the gardens was attended by 30 000 people, who were addressed by the Minister for Welfare Services (Mr Muntz). That was a magnificent opening. At the Mount Gravatt show, IYY activities were promoted through the assistance of the Education Department.

The coming week-end will be a magnificent IYY week-end with the aim of promoting activities and issues that will provide young people with an opportunity to express their opinions in a series of seminars to be held in Block B at the Queensland Institute of Technology. The seminars will be conducted by IYY subcommittees set up to examine issues that affect young people today, such as accommodation, recreation, education, health, law and income security.

Mr Muntz: How would you say the programs of IYY in Queensland would compare with those in the other States?

Mr LINGARD: The beauty of IYY in Queensland is that the Government has adopted what was commenced by the United Nations. People would have to admit that obviously the State Government would have a dubious attitude towards the United Nations.

The concept of IYY has been promoted by the Federal Government, and the Queensland Government has accepted it. Quite obviously, the Opposition in this State has played no part whatever in IYY. In other States—I instance Victoria and New South Wales—it has not worked well. I glean that information from the meetings of all the committees. The Queensland Government appointed a special secretariat to run IYY. As I have already said, many Government members have taken part in IYY.

In October this year, a youth conference will be organised by the Rotary organisation, which has participated in IYY. People selected from all of the local authorities throughout

Queensland will come to Camp Cal in Caloundra for four days and then come to this House to participate in parliamentary procedures. That will give them an opportunity to say what they think the youth of this country should have.

Mr Alan Sherlock, the chairman of IYY, should be congratulated, as should Mr Alan Pettigrew of the Department of Welfare Services; Mr Joe Consoli, the Director of Youth; and the special secretariat that has organised IYY. All in all, IYY has been a magnificent success in Queensland. People must appreciate this Government's concern for some of the things that come out of the United Nations. Credit must be given to the way in which the Queensland Government has supported the Federal Government in the concept of IYY. However, as I have already mentioned, the Queensland Opposition has played no part whatever in the promotion of IYY, even though it has been promoted by the Federal Government. One must ask whether members of the Labor Opposition support young people or are just too lazy or too incompetent to get out there and mix with young people.

Mr Muntz: Could it be that they are just not interested in the youth of Queensland?

Mr LINGARD: I do not think they have the competency. Fancy sending along the member for Kurilpa! Honourable members can imagine what sort of success she would have in promoting these sorts of programs to young people.

Mr BURNS: I rise to a point of order. I have been unable to find an invitation from the Minister to any of these things, because there is a big photo of the Minister stuck over everything that has been sent out.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I do not think the honourable member has made a point of order. He may have made his point, but there is no point of order.

Mr LINGARD: I wish to speak about *Education 2000*. In July 1983, the Minister for Education was faced with two problems. First of all, he had to realise that other States had compiled reports on education. Western Australia had the Beazley report, Victoria had the Blackburne report and there were the Karmel review and the Paidiai report in the United States of America. Therefore, the Queensland Government had to consider whether a report on education was necessary. What also had to be realised was that there was to be change in education from the 1880s through to the year 2000. Anyone who has read Alvin Toffler's *Future Shock* would realise that the students of today are under much more pressure from change than any of our generation or our parents' generation ever were. The older generations saw the introduction of motor vehicles and aeroplanes and industries. In education, the system of lecturing also changed. However, present students are faced with things such as space travel, computers, the invention of silicon chips and the change in the structure of families. I thought it was disgraceful when recently the New South Wales Government gave legal recognition to de facto relationships.

Students, therefore, are young people having to face the legality of de facto relationships. The frozen embryo, cloning and other things will affect the young people of today. It is obvious that education is moving very quickly. All honourable members must admit that by the year 2000 the education system will need to change drastically. Many people would like to see education come back to the basics. We all admit that, yet the system must change.

We are all thankful that the education system changed from what it was in the 1940s and 1950s. The system has adapted to changes. The Minister was faced with a situation of having to prepare a discussion paper to be distributed to the community for an opinion on education as it moves towards the year 2000. The Minister appointed all of his directors—the people who knew what was going on in education—to prepare a discussion paper.

I believe that this is an honest attempt by the Education Department to look at both the positive and negative aspects of its present structure and programs. Instead of

being supported by the ALP, the department is being ridiculed. What incentive is there for the department to be honest and realistic about its own education system if it is going to be ridiculed by the ALP and the Queensland Teachers Union?

The education system in Queensland is expanding. In Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia the populations have peaked and the education systems now have time to sit back, breathe and consolidate. With Queensland's exploding population and development of satellite areas both north and south of Brisbane, the continual demand for new schools and resources can be seen.

Criticism came from the ALP and from the QTU. They started to tell teachers that they would have to work longer hours if the proposed system were implemented. They started to tell people that the present schools would be pulled down, that new schools would be built and that Years 4 to 10 would be grouped together. They said that there would be a complete change in the physical system of Queensland schools. That is untrue, and the Minister said that that is untrue. They said that there would not be enough finance to build all the schools and that there would be a lack of teachers. Some independent schools have already implemented some of the methods that are being promoted in the program outlined in *Education 2000*. Questions were asked as to what would happen with our present education systems that are already trailing. Criticism was made about that.

We all know that changes are needed to the curriculum system, especially in the continuity of curriculum as children move from pre-school through to Year 12. I think that the pre-school system is the most magnificent system that has been put into any Australian schools in recent years. At present, pre-schools exist for 78 per cent of students. I believe that, as long as they remain as activity-type base systems under which the children enjoy social contact with other young people, the pre-school system will be a magnificent one.

Problems exist also in technical and further education and secondary education. Compared with what has happened in Tasmania, they have moved wider apart. Canberra brought those two areas closer together. The Queensland Government believes that it is necessary for the TAFE schools and the secondary schools to move closer together.

As to staff preparation—anyone involved in the education system would know that staff have to be more prepared for the new systems that are coming into our organisation. The Queensland Government has always been concerned about young teachers, who show magnificent ability in teaching and move through the promotional bandwagon into the administration system, moving away from the teaching of young people. Hopefully, it may be possible to involve them in the teaching of young teachers so that they will stay within the system.

As to credentialling—problems exist in the reporting system. Problems always existed in the old system. It must be remembered that the credentialling or reporting system has to be fair to the child. It is necessary to provide the employer with an indication of how the child has been going, and it must assist in the tertiary selection.

Finally, I remind the Federal ALP Government and the members of the Queensland ALP Opposition of the genuine plight of the rural areas of our country, especially Queensland. Australia has 170 000 primary producers who deserve a better deal. They represent only 7 per cent of the Australian work-force, yet they contribute 40 per cent of the nation's exports. Clearly, because primary producers represent only 7 per cent of the work-force, they are being abused by the Federal Government. The Federal Government believes that it can afford to lose that vote.

The importance of the rural sector cannot be overstated. That sector alone provides an average of 42 per cent of export income. It employs directly and indirectly more than 1 million people and produces 90 per cent of the nation's food. The National Farmers Federation has put the total level of recently Government-imposed farm costs

at \$2 billion or \$11,793 per farm. After allowing for Government benefits to farmers, the net cost penalty to the farm sector is put at \$1.18 billion or \$6,942 per farm.

Rural Australians have been seriously penalised. In recent years their average living costs have increased dramatically and their position has been worsened by the recent reduction of \$116m in petrol subsidies to country areas. Thousands of farmers and their families are now living below the poverty line, which is estimated to be \$252.50 a week for a family of four.

The average farmer is in an unenviable position, with an unsympathetic Federal Government, industrial troubles, increased costs and low world prices for some goods. Australia's farming population cannot withstand another onslaught of increased costs and charges. The Queensland Government totally supports the call by the rural industry for a reduction in Government expenditure before the implementation of further tax burdens. This is demonstrated by the Queensland Government's attitude to electricity charges.

If a capital gains tax and death and gifts duties were introduced, they would be the final straw for many farmers. The national average farm income for this year is predicted to be \$6,600 compared to the average Australian income of \$17,700. The reaction of the rural sector to the Federal Government was seen recently when 30 000 farmers went down to Canberra to appeal to the Federal Government.

I turn to fuel costs imposed at the Federal level. The Primary Industry Minister (Mr Kerin) made it clear that the Federal Government would not contemplate Mr Hawke's statement about reconsidering farm fuel prices. This was ridiculed by Mr Kerin in Cairns on July 9. The people of Queensland know that any promises that are given by the National Party Government are fulfilled. That is one of the reasons they have shown faith in the party at the polling-booth.

I support the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and I assure the Governor of the allegiance of my constituents in the electorate of Fassifern.

Mr DAVIS (Brisbane Central) (7.33 p.m.): Even though the honourable member for Fassifern is not a metropolitan candidate for the next State election—he is the member for an adjoining provincial area—it is a pity that he was not able to see the Mike Evans report tonight on Channel 7. I believe that he summed up the feelings of most of the people in this State on just how badly the National Party is performing in this State. He said—

“The problems that the National Party have got at the present time are irreparable.”

He said also that he could not see how any city National Party members could hold their seats at the next election. In other words, Opposition members say goodbye to them all.

Mr Gunn: He was sacked.

Mr DAVIS: The Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer has said that Mike Evans was sacked. I was not aware of that. It was my belief that Mike Evans was the principal architect in the formation of the National Party throughout this State. On behalf of the Opposition, I thank the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer for telling honourable members that Mike Evans has been sacked.

The debate on the Address in Reply affords honourable members an opportunity to speak about their electorates. In many instances it is also one of the most boring debates in Parliament.

I do not blame the Governor, but the claptrap that is put up to him must make the opening of Parliament one of his most boring tasks. For the most part, the Speeches are a repetition of previous Opening Speeches. We all know the promises about railways.

I did not notice, in this year's Speech, any reference to the Redcliffe railway. It must have disappeared in a tunnel somewhere along the line.

Mr Milliner: The Speech is an insult to the gentleman.

Mr DAVIS: It is, but then the State is an insult to the Westminster system. It annoys me whenever the State, at tremendous expense, sends to the House of Commons a Speaker, Chairman of Committees or Temporary Chairman—but never anyone from this side of the House. On his return he praises the Westminster system; but I put it to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that not very much of the Westminster system operates in the Queensland Parliament. Those presiding officers bask in glory with Speakers and Chairmen from other Parliaments, but they do not tell the real truth about Queensland. The Government might call what happens here the Westminster system, but it is certainly not what I have read about.

Mr Lingard: You only know the Russian system.

Mr DAVIS: I do not know which Government member said that.

An Opposition Member: The silly one.

Mr DAVIS: Am I expected to be a genius? With so many stupid members on the other side, I could not possibly tell from that description.

I do not need to defend the member for Mackay. He will certainly do that if the Government is game to bring his motion on for debate.

In the Address in Reply debate, Government members continually pledge their loyalty. I do not need to do so. The first time I entered Parliament I took an oath. However, on behalf of the Brisbane Central electorate, I pledge that my constituents are in favour of the national anthem and will not be breaking laws. For the benefit of honourable members who have not even come into the twentieth century, let alone into 1985, I refer to the following article, which refers to a *Commonwealth Government Gazette* of April—

“The Queen has given her seal of approval to Australia's national anthem, *Advance Australia Fair*.

When the Federal Government announced in April last year that *Advance Australia Fair* was to be the national anthem, it retained *God Save the Queen* as Australia's royal anthem to be used in the presence of the Queen or other members of the royal family.

The Governor-General, Sir Ninian Stephen, yesterday said the Queen had decided that when she attended public engagements in Australia, both anthems should be played.

God Save The Queen will be played at the beginning of most engagements and *Advance Australia Fair* at the end.

Sir Ninian said it might be more appropriate on some occasions for both anthems to be played at the beginning of the engagement.

He said the Queen also wished both anthems played at engagements in Australia by other members of the royal family.

On those occasions, abbreviated forms of the anthems would be played.

‘These changes have been welcomed by the Prime Minister,’ said Sir Ninian.”

As a law-abiding citizen of Australia, naturally I support *Advance Australia Fair*. I am sure that my colleagues do also.

Mr Kaus: Do you know the words?

Mr DAVIS: I know the words backwards. Does the honourable member wish me to give a rendition now?

Mr Kaus: Yes.

Mr DAVIS: I would do so, but I have so many important items to raise in my speech that I do not have the time to be singing in the Chamber.

I am annoyed with the Opening Speech, which is nothing more than a political hand-out from the Premier's Department. However, I am sick and tired of the apartheid practised at garden parties, which is one reason I have not attended for a number of years. I had always thought that in this Parliament, the Speaker or Deputy Speaker was the person who looked after the precincts of Parliament and the members of Parliament. I am becoming sick and tired of going to garden parties and being treated as a second-class citizen. Whereas the reserved seats are always placed under a canopy—I really do not mind because half of the people under what looks like a big tent have big hats on and they look like they are in a circus anyhow—every member should, along with his or her guest, be treated as members of a parliamentary group.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: What did you think of the good senator when she was photographed as a model of a new style of dress?

Mr DAVIS: As a matter of fact, I am glad that the honourable member for Wolston mentioned that because I have obtained photocopies of that photograph. As all honourable members would know, I am a supporter of dress reform.

I now wish to raise a question that has been raised many times in the House. I refer to Brisbane being known as the great capital influence of this nation.

Mr Menzel: Hear, hear!

Mr DAVIS: I am pleased to hear such a response from the honourable member for Mulgrave (Mr Menzel). It is always nice to hear from the brilliant economist of the north, so that I will have something to put on the record.

Mr Menzel: At least that gives me a little bit of credit.

Mr DAVIS: As a matter of fact, I quite like the honourable member for Mulgrave. In saying that, I realise that I am probably the one man out on the Opposition side of the House. Nevertheless, the honourable member usually says something that I later discuss with my wife, and we laugh all night about it.

The big news of the week was that a great Queensland company, Castlemaine Foux, had finally capitulated in the take-over bid by the Western Australian take-over merchant, Mr Bond.

Mr Menzel: Another capitalist.

Mr DAVIS: That is for sure. I think that what will happen very shortly is that instead of a Foux coming on, it will be a Swan coming on because Mr Bond, in building his empire of capitalism, has closed down a number of the trading organisations that he has taken over. For instance, in Western Australia, when Mr Bond took over brewing Swan lager, the hotels closed down one after the other. That happened despite the fact that, in Western Australia, the brewery did not own the hotels.

I maintain that, given a couple of months, Bond and his cohorts will be tossing up whether Foux beer will be manufactured in Queensland, New South Wales or Western Australia. That seems to be a habit of capitalists, and it is one of the reasons the Australian Labor Party loathes capitalism in its monopolistic form. I will give an example of what I refer to. I believe that Queensland in general, and Brisbane in particular, should be known as the take-over capital of Australia. Any time that a southern company decides to come into Queensland, there is a great fanfare of trumpets. Time after time, it is said that a southern company is finally establishing its operations in Queensland. Great stuff.

For the benefit of the honourable member for Mulgrave, because he would not have the capacity, obviously, to absorb the effects of these take-overs, I will examine how many take-overs have occurred in Queensland during the last 15 to 20 years, which is the period of National Party Government in Queensland. Allan and Stark's was taken over by Myers Ltd. I can remember the young ladies in blue of the BCC stores, but there are no more BCC stores because they have been closed down and completely subsumed. They have become part of a conglomerate. I remember T.C. Beirne, which was taken over by David Jones. It previously employed 500 people in Fortitude Valley but now it is history; it is no more. I mentioned that Waltons had been taken over by Mr Bond, and another example is John Hicks and Co, which employed 150 people in George Street. It was "Goodbye, John Hicks"; it has now gone. I can also remember Luya Julius, but it has now gone. McWhirter Limited was also taken over by Myers. Consider the service customers get from Myers now. McWhirters used to offer door-to-door delivery. That has gone. A customer now has to call a Yellow Cab, or call a Yellow Truck to get a big item home.

When the Bulimba Brewery was taken over by Carlton and United Breweries, other breweries were closed up. When Thomas Brown was bought by a southern company, the real estate was sold and another 150 people were put out of employment. I could go on and on. I think of ACF and Shirleys Fertilisers. When Appleton Industries at Hendra was taken over, it was goodbye to the jobs of more than 1 000 people.

Mr Burns: Do you remember Malleys?

Mr DAVIS: Malleys was a big manufacturer of white goods. Its takeover meant that up to 700 jobs went down the tube.

An Opposition Member: What about ACI?

Mr DAVIS: ACI is another example.

I repeat that Brisbane is the take-over capital of Australia. It should therefore be appreciated that when a firm announces that it intends to open a head office in Brisbane, it will be greeted with a big cheer and the Premier will make the most of the situation.

The demonstrations that occurred outside Parliament House on opening day have been mentioned. I contrast that demonstration with the performance of the 10 000, 15 000 or 20 000 who demonstrated in Canberra. I am not sure of the number.

Mr Menzel: It was 40 000.

Mr DAVIS: Is the honourable member sure that there were 40 000 demonstrators? I heard many Government members say that they attended the rally. How many of them did attend?

Mr Menzel: How many Opposition members attended?

Mr DAVIS: I know of only one Government member who attended, and that is the member for Cunningham.

Mr Vaughan: Is it true, Mr Davis, that you are a member of the National Farmers Federation?

Mr DAVIS: The honourable member is insulting me, but I am pleased that he referred to that organisation.

I support demonstrations by those who wish to demonstrate against Governments. They have a right to demonstrate. I tell people that although, naturally, I did not like to see so many thousands of people demonstrating against the Federal Labor Government, nevertheless, that is their right, and I will support their right to demonstrate. At no time did anyone see the police try to bash people at the Canberra rally.

To illustrate how politicised the police are becoming, I should say that anyone who attended the races years ago knows that if a horse did not run a good race, or it was thought that the jockey might have hooked the horse, quite often a demonstration started. Early this year, the Premier was invited on a rare occasion to go to the gambling mecca to make a presentation. Just after the race for which he was to make the presentation, in which the rider of the favourite ran a very bad race, a little old man started to give the jockey a nice little pay. A moment later, a policeman about twice the size of Dowling, the football forward, rushed in to get the little man, who was only giving the jockey a big pay because he had hooked the horse. The big policeman missed the little bloke of about 60-odd, who darted away. Immediately, the big blob of a policeman asked his sergeant, "Will I go after him, sarge?"

Recently, a similar demonstration was held outside this Parliament House. The members of the Special Branch were sorting out people at the demonstration.

Mr Menzel interjected.

Mr DAVIS: The honourable member for Mulgrave is heckling me to stop free speech in this Parliament.

I am glad that Government members have referred to the fact that cattlemen, farmers and others went down to Canberra to pay off the Federal Government. I wish that the member for Cunningham were in the Chamber, because he might be able to give us a little more information. An article in a publication, under the heading "Descending on Canberra", states—

"When 10,000 farmers descended on Canberra—"

according to Government members, it could have been 40 000—

"last month for the tax summit, the locals could have been forgiven for thinking it was a sex summit. On the Sunday night before the planned demonstration, destitute farmers booked out most of Canberra's prestigious lodging houses and after dinner headed in masse to Fyshwick—Canberra's industrial suburb which hides its seven bordellos."

For the benefit of Government members, I point out that "bordellos" means brothels. The article continued—

"At 11.30 p.m. on the said night, Canberra's only taxi company had a call from one of the larger bordellos, asking drivers to desist in bringing any more 'country gentlemen' out there.

Apparently in all seriousness, the taxi telephonist was told that 'the girls can't keep up with the demand'."

Mr Burns: Is it true that they wanted a subsidy for that?

Mr DAVIS: Either a subsidy or a prop. As I said, I am glad that they went down there to demonstrate.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Do you think that Mr Elliott put on the demonstration.

Mr DAVIS: I like the member of Cunningham. If he were present in the Chamber, he might be able to help us.

I admire the girl who flew all the way to Canberra in a private aircraft and put a big load of cow dung in front of Parliament House. That was good stuff; it got the message across. Also, there were 162 private aircraft on the tarmac at the Canberra Airport. That was extremely good stuff, too. As I have said previously, I question some of the problems that are raised.

I think that *The Albert and Logan News* is published in the area represented by the member for Fassifern (Mr Lingard). As many people do not receive a daily copy of that

newspaper, I shall quote from an article that appeared in a recent edition. I have been able to obtain from the Parliamentary Library a copy of that article, which states—

“Not all the farmers made it to the recent protest rally in Canberra.

One of our journalists was travelling through N.S.W. at the time of the protest and got caught up in the farmers convoy in a small town just outside of the national capital.

A colleague he knew there was telling him that three of their local farmers could not make it for the protest because they were otherwise engaged—one had to take his wife to the British Open Golf Championship—”

Mr Hamill: Where is it played?

Mr DAVIS: At St Andrews, at the top of Scotland. It is a very difficult place to get to. The article continued—

“another had taken his wife on a cruise down the Rhine—”

that is in Germany—

“and the third had taken his family to Disneyland.”

That, of course, is in the United States of America. The article continued—

“According to this colleague, these three farmers often boast publicly that they have not paid taxes for the past four years.”

Mr Menzel: Tell us about Juni Morosi and Jim Cairns.

Mr DAVIS: I know that the honourable member likes the truth and that he is taking note of what I am saying.

The article concludes with this punch line—

“One of them also has a student receiving the TEAS allowance for advanced education.”

That article does not come from a communist publication; it comes from *The Albert and Logan News*.

My late friend and colleague Kevin Hooper often spoke about the Imperial honours on new year's day and on the Queen's birthday. I find that that is the most exciting part of the year. I asked myself the other day to imagine the excitement on the Premier's face when he opened up *The Courier-Mail* and said to his wife, “Look at this! I have been given a knighthood!” The recipients of knighthoods are always interviewed by *The Courier-Mail* and are always stunned at the news; they do not know anything about it!

The Premier had to sign the paper to nominate himself for a knighthood. Of course, that was after Sir Edward Lyons—his name should appear in small letters now—told the Premier to nominate himself for a knighthood because it is such a good thing to have. I suggest that members of the National Party back bench try as hard as they can to get one while they are still being given out. It is said that a knighthood is worth \$50,000 a year.

Mr Milliner: Can you imagine Sir Brian Austin?

Mr DAVIS: No, I am sorry, I cannot imagine Sir Brian Austin. Quite truthfully, I must say that Buckingham Palace would not accept such a recommendation because of what he did to the Liberal Party. I think that to give a knighthood to Brian Austin would be carrying things a little too far because even though knighthoods are always accepted on recommendation, the Minister is on the black list. It must be remembered that the people in London are conservatives.

I am always interested by the fact that every little Tom, Dick and Harry gets an honour.

Mr Austin: A mate of yours got one.

Mr DAVIS: Who—Jack?

Mr Austin: Yes.

Mr DAVIS: We got rid of Jack; he learned the error of his ways.

Mr Booth interjected.

Mr DAVIS: Perhaps the honourable member for Warwick nominated the lady who received an award for years of service to the local branch of the Country Women's Association. Another person was nominated for services to the Charleville district. Someone else received an honour for being prominent in the Mackay Business and Professional Women's Association.

Better still, I like the political honours such as the knighthood bestowed upon the former Liberal leader and member for Ipswich, Llewellyn Roy Edwards. Noddy expressed the same surprise as other recipients and claimed that he did not know that he had been nominated.

I reckon that stupid people are nominated, because they claim no knowledge of the award. I am led to believe—I do not have any spies in Buckingham Palace—that, after a person has given out hints—“hint, hint, say no more; put me in”—the nomination is made and notification is received from Buckingham Palace that the recommendation is OK, the person is asked whether he will accept the honour. However, all recipients are reminded that when the announcement appears in *The Courier-Mail* they are to look aghast. What hypocrisy! The quicker Imperial honours are got rid of, the far better off this country will be.

It is amazing how badly our system of law enforcement is going, particularly in the courts. Recently I read that a police officer was fined \$300 when he pleaded guilty to twice smacking a young driver across the mouth and ripping up his licence. That is what is called justice in Queensland.

The very next day, under the very obnoxious legislation introduced by this Government, a magistrate fined a person \$300 for protesting. Because the offender came from interstate, and admitted that he had come from interstate, his fine was much greater than the \$200 that was imposed on a resident of Queensland. Is it any wonder that the people of this State are dead set sick and tired of this Government?

Mr Austin: Tell us how you rigged the ballot at Bribie Island.

Mr DAVIS: I would like to ask the Minister where he stands on South Africa.

Mr Austin: I do not know; it is a bit big.

Mr DAVIS: The policies that the Government is pushing forward in this State are exactly the same as those of the Government of South Africa. This Government is politicising the police. The Government is using the police as tools of politics, and it will regret it.

In conclusion, I wish to place on record a comparison of the cost of living in this State with that in other States.

Mr Austin: Give us a bit on Medicare, will you?

Mr DAVIS: The Minister has made a nice sort of a fool of himself on Medicare. On Monday the Minister thought that he had better give a blast on Medicare because he wants to get out of his Health portfolio. He has said to the Premier, “Please, I am sick and tired of this portfolio. I will do anything to get out of it. I will even take over the job of prisons.”

Mr Austin: Tell us the figures.

Mr DAVIS: Oh, no! About 35 minutes later the Premier announced that the State would accept the Medicare funding. The Premier must have great faith in the Minister. It is no wonder that the Minister was mentioned by Mike Evans today.

A comparison of the cost of living in different States shows that in Brisbane the cost of motor vehicle registration is \$319; in Sydney, \$280; and in Melbourne, \$248. In Brisbane a litre of milk costs 78c and in Melbourne, 72c. Electricity costs \$126 in Brisbane and \$85 in Sydney. A single pensioner pays \$69 for electricity in Brisbane, and when my friend the member for Nudgee (Mr Vaughan) is in charge of electricity in this State, a single pensioner here will pay what is paid by a single pensioner in Sydney—\$29. In Brisbane, the cost, including stamp duty and fire levy, of insuring a \$40,000 house is \$67, whereas in Sydney it is \$16. That is the difference between living in the Labor States of New South Wales and Victoria and living in this National Party hill-billy State up here.

Mrs HARVEY (Greenslopes) (8.3 p.m.): I take great pleasure in reaffirming my loyalty and that of the constituents of the Greenslopes electorate to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. At my election in 1983 I felt greatly privileged to be chosen by the electors of Greenslopes to represent them. Since that time I have been heartened to find that the people of the area are prepared to involve themselves whole-heartedly not only in the issues and problems of the Greenslopes electorate but also in the wider concerns that affect all Queenslanders.

The community centre that I recently announced for the area is the direct result of my community's participation in the family week that I organised last year. My call to the clergy for their assistance in gathering the community together was met with an overwhelming response. Together with the combined clergy, I was able to develop a plan for the electorate based on its needs.

The Greenslopes electorate contains a large number of elderly people who live in home units. Up till now, those people have had no facilities for communication or integration in the area. I feel that many assumed that these people would use the facilities in the city. Because the elderly find it difficult enough simply to move about, quite apart from having to go into such areas as the city mall—which is predominantly a place for young people—to communicate with other people, that was an incorrect assumption.

The area also has a large number of sole parents—in fact, it is 10 per cent of the population—and their specific problems also needed to be addressed within the area. There was a lack of facilities in the Greenslopes electorate. As there was no library or gathering place, people sat at bus-stops, hoping to meet someone so that they could strike up a conversation. Elderly people wandered through the local Myer store in the hope of meeting other persons they knew so that there would be some sort of interaction during the course of the week. For many, the week's outing was lunch in the Myers canteen. It became most apparent to the clergy and to me that these problems needed to be addressed.

I was in a position in which I could devise a strategy for proving to both the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) and the Government that we are indeed prepared to be an involved community. It was up to the people in the Greenslopes electorate to prove that they needed help to help themselves. As I drove through the electorate with the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting and Treasurer (Bill Gunn), we looked at the possibilities for the area. Very little was offered other than one unique building in the Coorparoo shopping centre. At the moment it is the technical and further education building and is called Alexandra House. A number of negotiations had to take place to procure the building for the community.

I am indebted to the support and the generous sacrifice of the Minister for Education (Mr Lin Powell) in giving up that very valuable Education Department building to my community. When I showed the Minister through the building, it became obvious to him that the site had great historical significance to Queensland and to Coorparoo. Also, it became obvious that the site was ideal because people could move about in it and

communicate without making a special trip. In other words, on their way to or from shopping they could go to the building, sit down, meet other persons and perhaps talk while having a cup of tea.

As an infant school was located on one side of the building and a primary school was situated on the other, it became quickly apparent that young mothers would also have a venue where they could stop and meet other mothers before or after school. They would also have an opportunity to be entertained in a simple way without having to make a special effort or to spend money. An L-shaped TAFE complex will remain on the site. The TAFE authorities have been very co-operative in offering their support in the future by providing weekly meals for the elderly residents of the area on their visits to the community centre.

It is important to explain the concept of the community centre, because it is unique. It is proposed to make the building and its gardens area a very flexible one, open to everyone without charge and without membership. Because of its proximity to nearby schools, there would be a natural flow of people, including the TAFE students who would walk across the grounds. The building would not be tied up by other small special interest groups, or it would merely go back to catering for a small section of the community rather than a complete cross-section. Following restoration by the Government, the building will be self-supporting financially. It is proposed to have a number of projects emanating from that building to address the social problems of that area. I have in mind a number of possible programs for the building, but I await communication with the wider community to discuss their ideas.

I am very grateful to the Minister for Welfare Services (Mr Geoff Muntz) who has been very generous in his many offers of support. This new concept in local interaction of mixing the aged with the young and all other groups in the area is one that should be a pilot program for other persons in the future. There is much to be gained in an area in which the elderly can mix with the young as opposed to a senior citizens concept that compartmentalises a section of the community. It is very important to point out that the Federal Government's slug of the elderly by the assets test proves its total disregard for those same people who have in the past years made their contributions to society. This community centre proves that the State Government adopts a caring attitude and shows a real understanding of the vital role that the elderly still play in the community. It is a role that I see played time and time again in my electorate.

I mention in particular the Meals on Wheels service in my area. The efforts of Meals on Wheels at Holland Park have resulted in the construction of a new building that will provide a well-equipped kitchen in that area to serve a large number of people. Many examples of this type of work being carried out can be found in my electorate.

Another example of the activity in the Greenslopes electorate is the Coorparoo Uniting Church, which celebrates its centenary next year and for which the members plan a heritage week. I find it quite heartening that after 100 years of service to the community that church still considers it important to strive for new ways in which to actively serve the community.

In consideration of the needs of the elderly and visually impaired people who use the Coorparoo junction, I invited the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) to accompany me on an inspection of the problems arising at the pedestrian crossings at the junction.

The result of that visit was the installation of sound/light signals, which many people have found to be of great assistance. The road at the junction was resurfaced by the Main Roads Department to reduce the incidence of people tripping in small pot-holes and rough ridges in that road. An elderly gentleman actually tripped on that road when I was pointing out the problem to the Minister.

Because of the many motor vehicle accidents that occur at that intersection, I have made consistent representations to the Minister for a solution. I expect that shortly I

will be able to announce the installation of "No right turn" signs in that area as well as a median strip in the vicinity of Warilda, Sylvia and Ernest Streets, Camp Hill, on Old Cleveland Road. That will assist the pedestrians who try to cross the very wide and busy sections of Old Cleveland Road. There are a number of pensioner units in the surrounding area whose residents will greatly benefit also.

On behalf of the children who attend Coorparoo High School, the Church of England Grammar School and Villanova College and who have to walk across the railway level crossing in Cavendish Road on their way to school, I invited the Minister for Transport (Mr Lane) to inspect the dangerous situation prevailing there, with the result that the footpath has been realigned and raised to separate it from the roadway and therefore render it much safer for students.

Recently, I attended the 50th anniversary of the Coorparoo RSL sub-branch. Listening to the shared memories of war-time struggles and experiences, I felt ashamed that Australia now has a Federal Government that denigrates the sacrifices of these people. The proposal for a new flag removes from these men and women the vital symbol of freedom for which they have struggled and the banner under which many of their loved ones died. I call on the Federal Government once and for all to drop the proposal to introduce a new Australian flag. Why should many of those who fought to save our flag in two world wars now have to fight again on their home soil to save this flag and everything that it stands for?

I am grateful that the pressure brought to bear by the RSL has caused the Federal Government to back down for the moment at least on the ID card proposal. So few who have not known the struggle of Australia's diggers recognise the dangerous precedent that such a move would set. Had ID cards been enforced in Europe in World War II, many of the intelligentsia—those who opposed fascism and communism and were marked for certain extinction—would have had no chance of escaping to the west. The first step is an ID card; the next step is a tattoo.

As a member of a family that was almost entirely exterminated in the last world war, I implore Australian society to take the lead from its painfully wise diggers and never give even the smallest aspect of its privacy and independence to big Government.

Last August, I attended the Coorparoo High School production of *Oliver*. As I watched in total fascination, it occurred to me just how much our young people contribute to our society which goes unnoticed or unrecognised. I am endeavouring to obtain for the school a much-needed music block. I am sure that the musical production went a long way towards convincing the members of the Education Department who were present that the school deserves the music block for which it asks. Schools in other electorates leave it to the member to obtain facilities for them. I am happy to say that my schools join me in my efforts. That effort multiplies the success rate.

Students from the Coorparoo primary school and the Camp Hill primary school attended family week as story book characters, to the delight of the hundreds of locals who turned out for the opening ceremony. St Joachim's of Holland Park sent a skipping team to demonstrate their talents. I am delighted that the youth of my area so ably demonstrated that our young are indeed something to be proud of. I expect that they will play an important role in our community centre, which their participation helped to obtain.

I am delighted to advise that the Coorparoo primary school will be getting its much-needed tuck-shop. The school is 108 years old, so the facility is overdue. It will eliminate the dangers inherent in small children venturing out into the heavily trafficked Coorparoo junction to buy their lunch. I have asked the p. and c. to give careful consideration to providing nutritional foods and to meet the needs of children for breakfast, as an increasing number of children arrive at school without having had breakfast. They cannot be expected to achieve when they are hungry.

I take this opportunity to thank the Minister for Works and Housing (Mr Claude Wharton) for his genuine interest in the needs of the Greenslopes electorate. Immediately after I was elected, I took him round the electorate to itemise our needs, most of which either have been met or are in the process of being met. I am particularly appreciative of the willingness of the Works Department to comply with my request not only to build a much-needed administration block for the Holland Park primary school but also to do it in keeping with the 70-year-old timber buildings. The result is a beautiful administration block, which is an exact replica of the lovely old buildings that it adjoins. The residents of Holland Park and I are delighted with the attention to authenticity that the Works Department displayed. It is indeed a credit to the Minister.

The Greenslopes electorate does not have a great deal of industry, but a considerable amount of local employment is created in a small industrial area in the vicinity of the Coorparoo Railway Station. It came to my attention that one of the industries, which manufactures dog spikes, was threatened, under a State Government decentralisation preference policy, with the loss to a new factory in north Queensland of a bread-and-butter tender with the Railway Department. I am grateful that the Premier and the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Mike Ahern) accepted my argument for saving those 10 jobs in Coorparoo.

Some jobs were lost from the area when shops were burnt down at the Coorparoo junction. That caused considerable hardship for those concerned. However, there is evidence of some growth in local small business following the establishment of a number of new shops in the area. It is expected that a good deal more will come.

The people of the Greenslopes electorate have been extremely interested in *Education 2000*, which was put forward by the Minister for Education. I have made at least 50 speeches on the proposal, both in my electorate and in neighbouring areas. I was heartened by the genuine interest and concern expressed by parents. Some misunderstood points; others highlighted matters relevant for further consideration by the Minister.

It is worth while for everyone to put in a submission, whether it contains a personal point of view or the views of an established committee. It was immediately apparent to me that the media had already beaten the Government in explaining the policy of *Education 2000* and that, as a result, a great deal of misguided opinion needed to be sorted out. It is a pity that the people to whom I spoke had already set up defences even before the concept was completely understood. The concept to which I refer is the concept of education being child-centred.

It is not so amazing that people did not grasp the concept when it is borne in mind that the only information that had been circulated was about buildings being disassembled. Although it should have been obvious that that was a ridiculous idea to expound, given the state of many established schools, nevertheless, that was the idea that had been presented. Of course, that had to be changed.

Once the parents truly understood the concepts of *Education 2000*, such as the continuity of curriculum proposal, it was accepted, because parents realised the advantages that would be provided for their children. Another proposal was for greater interaction between teachers. Once teachers realised that, it was taken on board and it was accepted in my area. I firmly believe that teachers are very dedicated and will always think of the children first, despite the fact that they are prompted by unions to think only of themselves. I believe that the tide has turned.

Now that people understand the concept of *Education 2000* and have grasped its meaning, they are prepared to take on board the many advantages it offers. The fear of change has been replaced by an understanding of the need for the education system to keep pace with social changes.

The people of my electorate have grappled with the problems of education, but have now grasped the idea of *Education 2000* and its advantages. I am very happy to say that the proposal relative to children in Year 3 who are developmentally closer to

Year 2 has proved to be popular among many of the infant schools and with parents. The policy of delayed specialisation has been accepted by parents because, after all, it would be an advantage to give Year 8 students an additional couple of years of maturity and an opportunity to assess their own talents and skills. Previously, the poor children in Year 8 had to decide all of their life's future at the age of 12 or 13. They had to make a profound choice about their areas of specialisation for the future.

As regards the other proposals, some have been less popular than others, but at least people have had honest discussion and are in a position to make reasonable submissions.

Mr Vaughan: Are you being coached by Vince Lester?

Mrs HARVEY: As a member of the education committee, I do not need to be coached by anybody on this.

To summarise, my work in the electorate over the past 12 months has been very fruitful. It has been very rewarding for me, as a member of the various ministerial committees, to be able to provide information to the people of my electorate on a first-hand basis. As a member of the welfare committee, I have been able to give advice on welfare, on the problems of child abuse, and on problems concerning the aged. I have also gained information on other problems that relate to the social aspects of an electorate. I am indebted to the Department of Welfare Services for the assistance that it has given to me, which has enabled me to carry out my work in the electorate.

I believe that, as a member of the education committee, I have been of assistance to other electorates as well as to my own in explaining the importance of the new education concept and being able to open for many parents doors that lead to a genuine understanding of the concept and participation in its implementation.

As a member of the employment and industrial affairs committee, I have been able to address problems associated with apprenticeship and business, and to pass on, first-hand, information provided by the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester). The Minister has also visited my electorate and met its people personally. As a member of the committee, I am able to impart information that people want to hear and are pleased to be made aware of.

I thank the many groups and individuals who have contributed to improving and developing the Greenslopes electorate. In years to come, I expect further growth and development in the Greenslopes area. I am sure that the electorate is only starting to show real signs of improvement, growth and community spirit. Its community spirit will carry it a long way yet. A start has been made, but much remains to be done.

As a member of Parliament it is very heartening to know that I have the community behind me every step of the way and that I have support and eager enthusiasm for the community centre, which will play a major role in the area.

A number of people in the area have a great deal of expertise. I am sure that they will be willing to offer it to the community at large. I am looking forward to tapping their expertise for the benefit of the area.

I hope that in years to come the Greenslopes electorate will prove that, from the seeds sown in the last 12 months, a great deal will happen in this electorate which has been around for a long time but still seems to have a long way to go in terms of catching up with the times. I am sure that the electorate is looking to the future and to having its community recognised as one that is prepared to do something for itself rather than to sit round waiting for someone to do something for it, which seems to be the attitude adopted by Labor members. The people in Greenslopes get together to try to do something for themselves. They try to forge ahead in their own area and make sure that the facilities they need are provided, not by the Government alone but by a combined community effort.

The community spirit engendered in the area has a dynamism that cannot be stopped. In years to come I expect it to be a force that will ensure, over all, great changes in the area. In my area the clergymen from the numerous churches form a solid base. It is interesting to note that the entire electorate has only one hotel. That is an indication of how the area started out. It has remained predominantly the same.

I thank the people of the Greenslopes area for their efforts on their own behalf and for making my job a very rewarding one.

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (8.29 p.m.): I join with other speakers in pledging my loyalty and that of my constituents to the Crown. I congratulate the Governor on his elevation to his high office. I certainly wish him well and much success in his job, which will not be easy. He will probably need a great deal of help, because he will be pushed into areas where he has to handle difficult situations that are not of his making.

I was pleased to hear the two earlier Government speakers refer to *Education 2000*. The submissions invited from the public are to close within a couple of days.

Mr Randell: The time has been extended.

Mr EATON: I am pleased that that is so.

At the start, I noted a little complacency. All members were issued with what is called a silver booklet on *Education 2000*, and a summary was presented in a blue copy. I found it hard to stimulate interest when I distributed the blue copies. They did not go into enough detail. The future of young people is of real concern in the light of the systems that will be forced upon them.

Mr Comben interjected.

Mr EATON: I was surprised to hear Government members say that *Education 2000* was so well received. Early in the piece, not long after the *Education 2000* report was first released, I attended two meetings in my electorate that were quite crowded. They were held to try to stir up some interest among the public. As the Minister had made a copy of the *Education 2000* report available, we felt that we should make a contribution or encourage other people to make a contribution so that Queensland could end up with a system that was satisfactory to students, teachers, parents and others involved in education.

Because the meetings were called when not a lot was known about *Education 2000*, the officers from the Education Department were not able to answer specific questions. They were only able to say that the report had been released to create discussion and to get an input from the public. We felt that the Government was trying to sell *Education 2000* without the departmental officers knowing its full impact. I felt, particularly early in the piece, that they were pinned down.

The Government did not say who would administer the system. People were just told that the report was open for discussion. They felt that it was a foregone conclusion. It appeared to be a hobby-horse of the Minister and of another public servant. Many people got their backs up. After public meetings and discussions with teachers and members of parents and citizens organisations throughout north Queensland, I sent a number of petitions to the department objecting to *Education 2000*.

I am yet to meet a person who is in full agreement with the suggestions or recommendations made in either the silver copy of *Education 2000* or the blue copy of *Education 2000*. People admit that there are some beneficial sections in the report, but they are not sure about other sections.

Mr Randell: It is only a discussion paper.

Mr EATON: I know that, but the Government and the Minister have been selling it as the be-all and end-all. I sincerely hope that it is only a discussion paper and that it remains as a discussion paper for a long time to come.

Mr Randell: He has been very fair. He has given every opportunity for submissions in writing.

Mr EATON: On television and radio and in the newspapers in my area, I have encouraged people to participate in the discussion. Although I was opposed to *Education 2000*, I must admit that I do not have the academic qualifications that many school-teachers have.

Mr Fouras: At recent meetings, all the schools in my area would not have a bar of any of it.

Mr EATON: That is the situation that I have found. Even if people did not like *Education 2000*, I asked them to make submissions because that is the only way in which the Minister can find out what the community feels. I encouraged them to make submissions whether they were for *Education 2000* or against it. We were given plenty of blue copies of the *Education 2000* report to hand out in the community, and I lent my silver copy of the report to the people who came to see me about the matter. As I have said, the blue copy was not very explanatory and did not help those people who were not aware of the contents of the discussion paper.

I was a little disappointed about the enthusiasm with which the Minister and some Government members have pushed *Education 2000*. Over the years, I have noticed that the department will introduce a new education system, but, before all the facilities are provided, the Government runs short of money and takes the easy way out; it changes the system. A few years ago people were told that the greatest education system of all was the Canadian system. Now they are told that that is not the case. In the last 10 or 15 years, two or three different education systems have been introduced.

Mr Randell: Your party has not criticised the education system up to now.

Mr EATON: If the Education Department had met its obligations under some of those other systems, there would have been no need to change the system. The facilities would have been provided and advantage could have been taken of them.

Mrs Harvey: Times have changed, and the needs of education have changed.

Mr EATON: But are we advancing as we should be?

The greatest contributions to science were made in the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. One of the early scientists discovered how far the moon is from the earth, and about 10 years ago scientists determined that he was only 3 miles out in his calculations. All that that early scientist had was a slate, a pencil and the stars to guide him. When one considers the advances in modern technology, his was an amazing discovery.

It is my belief that too many people have an input into education. When my children were going through the school system, I wanted to be as helpful as I could to them. However, I became very annoyed because of the changes to the system. The teacher sent a note home saying that I would be no help to my children if I was familiar only with the old system. Parents were warned not to compare the old with the new method because it would be confusing for the children. After hearing an address at a parent/teacher night at which the new system was explained, I could understand why that would be so.

Mr Innes: Did you try to read that silver document?

Mr EATON: I did, yes.

Mr Innes: Did you understand it?

Mr EATON: Some of it I did, but much of it I did not understand. That is why I have raised the matter tonight. I did not realise that the Minister for Education (Mr

Powell) had extended the time in which submissions could be lodged. I have had a bit of an advertising splurge in my electorate so that as many people as possible could make comments on it.

I feel sorry for the young people of today. The education system is forced on them by society; they are taught only what we want them to learn at school. To a certain extent, they are protected and mollycoddled at school; but at the end of their school-days they receive a certificate which says that they are qualified, that they are as good as the next man and that they can do a dozen jobs. That places great pressure on them, because, although they have a certificate that says they are qualified to work, they discover that they are not wanted in the work-force and that they have to try to make do on the dole. That is a disgrace and a reflection on the older people in our society today.

Mr Randell: You are criticising the system. The Minister is trying to do something about getting input from the public.

Mr EATON: The Minister has gone about it the wrong way. He should have named the people involved and stated how the system will be administered. Some information was sent out, but the people were left in the dark.

Mr Randell: Are you criticising the committee of review?

Mr EATON: No; but when did the Minister announce that? That was only a short time ago, but the *Education 2000* paper was out months ago. The public is not very happy about some of the people who are on the committee of review. The public feels that some well-recognised people should be on the committee and that it should be a wider committee of review. The community has a certain degree of suspicion, and that does not augur well for the new system. Before anything constructive can be achieved, the suspicions have to be allayed and overcome.

Mr Lingard: Can you tell us what you would do with that committee? What type of people would you put on it?

Mr EATON: The committee should have been set up from the word go to draw up the paper before it was published. As it turned out, the paper was floating round the countryside, but nobody could tell the people anything about it.

Mr Fouras: The reality of *Education 2000* is that it is nothing more than a vehicle of propaganda for the Minister. It is just an exercise in futility.

Mr EATON: That is the general feeling in the community, and I am sorry about that.

I feel strongly that we should do as much as possible for our young people today. As I have already said, they are mollycoddled through school. We are told that they must not be hampered or hindered and that things must be made easy for them. The senior and junior examinations have been done away with because of the pressure that they placed on students. I believe that the young people of today, as were those of the past, are quite capable of handling those pressures. Examinations were set at the end of each year in the early grades so that as students grew older and the exams got harder and longer, they could handle the pressure.

Today, students are sent out into society after being protected for so many years. It is claimed that the education system in Queensland is the best in the world. When a young person receives his leaving certificate or his university degree, he is told that he is qualified and just as good as the next man. That is not so. The greatest pressure that can be put on a young person is to equip him for a job that society cannot provide. That must be taken into consideration. As much effort should be put into creating employment as is put into educating people. It is no good educating people if society

cannot find a place for them. A great number of this nation's young people have a great contribution to make if they can be provided with the necessary opportunities.

Mr Lingard: Surely you are not going to blame the education system for there being no jobs.

Mr EATON: No, I am not, but I think they are problems that have to be worked out hand in hand.

Mr Lee: That is a fair enough answer, too.

Mr EATON: Yes.

As some other members of the Opposition have done in this debate, I wish to touch on the controversy that has resulted from the 100-day report into the sugar industry. As an example of the many newspaper items on this subject, I have chosen one from the *Daily Sun* that clearly points out that, when it comes to the provision of aid, the Premier does not want to know the sugar-producers. The article in the *Daily Sun* states—

“Sir Joh said it would be wrong for Queensland to contribute to the proposed \$145 million rescue package because the problem was a national one.

‘Benefits from the industry impact on the national economy and are not confined to Queensland,’ he said.

Sir Joh was speaking amid mounting criticism of the report, which recommended a joint State and Federal rescue mission.”

Everyone must remember that the chairman of that committee was a Queenslander who was appointed upon the request of the Queensland Government.

The press article continues—

“He said the State would be forced to subsidise Canberra's share of assistance through national taxes.

‘That would amount to double taxation and more discrimination against Queensland by Canberra’ Sir Joh said.”

The sugar industry has been a great contributor to the wealth of the nation and it has been a great export-earner. From time to time the Federal Government has seen fit, wherever possible, to put money into the industry to help it on a national level. In the past the Federal Government has provided large loans. In the late 1960s and the early 1970s the Federal Government provided \$20m-odd as a special loan.

I have with me tonight a copy of the 1983 annual report of the Rural Reconstruction Board. I had hoped that somebody might challenge me to have the pertinent parts incorporated in *Hansard*. The report shows that the State Government withdrew \$10m from the funds of the Rural Reconstruction Board, placed it into the Consolidated Revenue Fund and then said that it was State money that it would lend to the millers. If anybody wishes to argue with that statement, I have those facts and figures here. As I have said, I would be quite happy to have those facts incorporated in *Hansard*. The Premier and his Government want to absolve themselves from the responsibility of giving aid to the industry.

I see that the former Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Ahern) has just entered the Chamber. A couple of years ago, during debate on the Sugar Acquisition Act Amendment Bill, the then Minister promised an inquiry into the industry. That inquiry did not take place. Had there been an inquiry it would have brought to light two years ago the problems that have come to light as a result of the report of the 100-day working party. However, at that time the Government did not see fit or did not want to have an inquiry into the sugar industry, as was promised by both the Premier and the Minister at that time. That promise was made as a result of a backlash from the sugar industry. I can remember one night when all the delegates of the northern district flew down to

Brisbane to have a special meeting with the Minister and to listen to the early stages of the debate on that Bill. Two years later the 100-day working party has defined the problems of the industry.

I blame the officials and the hierarchy of the sugar industry organisation, and I intend to name those organisations. They are the Proprietary Sugar Millers Association Pty Ltd, the Co-operative Sugar Millers Association Ltd, the Australian Sugar Producers Association Ltd and the Queensland Cane Growers Council. Last year I asked the Minister for Primary Industries if discussions had taken place and, if so, what time those discussions took place and when he first received the submission from those four organisations. He replied that the discussions took place in March, that he received the submission signed by the representatives of the four organisations on 8 May, I think it was, but it was not made public until approximately 19 October.

However, not one of the farmers in the paddocks—the grassroots people in the industry—was consulted. They were ignored and kept in the dark until legislation was brought before this Chamber. They then discovered that the sunset clause was to be extended for another two years.

At present, there is a considerable amount of distrust in the sugar industry because of what has taken place. The producers at the grassroots level do not have any faith in any of the organisations that represent them at the top. That is why they are disappointed at the attitude adopted by the Government and by the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen). They do not want to participate or meet their responsibility to get the industry out of trouble.

The problems will not be solved overnight. The main aim is to consider the long-term interests of the farmers. Over the years, it can be seen that the cane-farmers and sugar-producers have contributed greatly to the National Party and to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation. Farmers have entered my office with complaints and withdrawn the authorities that they have given to the sugar-mill.

Mr Newton: Why don't they put the money from the tax summit into it?

Mr EATON: I will answer that question later.

The farmers are upset. They have signed an authority to allow the sugar-mill, when sugar payments are made, to make deductions from the payments and donate the money to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation. Permission has been given for National Party membership fees to be deducted from their sugar cheques and for the money to be paid directly to the National Party or to the local branch of the National Party.

The farmers are making donations, through the sugar-mills. That happened during the good years. Many farmers believed that the Government was doing the right thing, and everything was running smoothly. Generous donations were made. The National Party would be able to find out from its own organisation what those donations were. A Bjelke-Petersen Foundation breakfast was held in Innisfail. According to a local newspaper, donations and pledges amounted to \$27,000, with more to come.

It cannot be said that the cane towns and the sugar industry have not made a contribution to the Queensland Government. Today, when they are down and out and need help, the Government does not want to honour its obligations.

Mr Vaughan: Is the National Party still screwing those farmers for those donations or membership fees?

Mr EATON: As one fellow said when he cancelled the authority that he had given to the sugar-mill to make the deduction, "They had the hide to come round and ask me why I did it, and I told them." I would not be permitted by you, Mr Deputy Speaker, to repeat what he said. I had better move on to the next subject.

Mr Ahern: He was able to cancel it.

Mr EATON: He was.

Mr Littleproud: They cannot cancel that \$10 coming from the ETU fellows.

Mr EATON: They can once they return to work.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr EATON: The farmers are not receiving value from the Government. The Government should honour its responsibilities.

The farmers should be trying to get together with those persons in the industry and the industry organisations. However, because of the way in which the hierarchy has been selected and appointed over the years, there is a considerable amount of disgust in the industry. The Central Sugar Cane Prices Board is chaired by a judge. Every other member of that organisation would be a financial member of the National Party. Unless a person was a financial member of the National Party, he would not obtain a position on that board. That is an established fact. The farmer in the paddock knows that. Everything is coming to light.

The farmers are very disenchanted with the National Party. The National Party must be constructive, honest and fair dinkum with the farmers in the industry. It cannot afford to let them go.

My electorate has three sugar-mills. One farmer was declared bankrupt and his farm was sold. Another farmer has been ordered from his farm. Bankers have called in several other farmers and given them 30 days in which to do something. Those 30 days will probably seem like years to these farmers. Those farmers have visited my office and told me that there is not much hope. They have said that they can only go home and pray for a miracle. I know that one will not occur.

I will go into more detail about the DPI. Many good men work in the DPI, particularly in research. Farmers are becoming more aware of the need to diversify because of the problems that have been in existence for a long time in agricultural industries such as sugar, potatoes and maize. All primary industries are starting to go through a very torrid time economically, with the tight market-place and the cost of production rising all the time on a falling market price.

The primary producers feel that perhaps the DPI could have men out in the field who are a bit more senior than some of the young people of today to whom they are looking for advice, and finding it is not available. I believe that this is because, over the years, the department has not put into research the money that it should have. In Queensland today many new industries could be developed but the DPI is only just starting to investigate and research them now. If the department had done that a few years ago, it would be up with the times now. The department did not look far enough ahead at that time. Now the need is there and the department does not have the money or the services to provide to the rural community. In my experience, the DPI has always been helpful. However, a person can only give what he has, and the public feel that a little bit more should be available to put back into the land.

Diseases are creeping in. The banana and papaw industries in north Queensland are doing fairly well at the moment. There is a market for those fruits, but disease has been discovered. The University of Queensland undertook some research to try and eradicate it. However, the researchers thought they had got onto something, made a great deal of noise and then had to run for cover because they found out that they did not have the answer to the problem at all. I highlight these problems because they are important to the people of north Queensland. They feel a little neglected from time to time because they know that the numbers are in the south east and that the squeaky wheel gets the oil. That indicates the problem that is faced in the north.

I turn to tourism. North Queensland is value for the tourist dollar. It has the mountains and the ocean. Over the years many new facilities have been provided. North Queensland has rivers, beaches—you name it. It has two international airports.

The Government will have to do a bit more to enable tourists to get round, because 80 to 90 per cent of the tourists who come to north Queensland from interstate and overseas travel by road. I know that the Government is doing its best to upgrade the roads all the time. The Premier and Treasurer announced an allocation of \$600m in the last Budget for that purpose. However, honourable members know that it takes \$1m a mile to bitumen a road. In a State as big as Queensland, the Government would not be able to give every major town 20 miles of road. In terms of miles, that is not good value for money. Although \$600m sounds a lot, at \$1m a mile that amount will not provide many miles in each electorate.

Mr Davis: Camm was the Main Roads Minister. That's how much the north got looked after, and N. E. Lee was the worst contractor the department ever had.

Mr EATON: That is right.

The National Parks and Wildlife Service needs upgrading. I regularly visit its office in Cairns and have discussions with the officers. I have found them most helpful. However, a couple of months ago I had occasion to visit that office. The rangers were being given some lectures by the police on how to handle difficult people in national parks and so on. It was a disgrace. The National Parks and Wildlife staff were trying to work in their offices, and there were three people to one office. I could not get in until one person came out. I believe that the Government should make more money available in a place such as Cairns, which has Cape York, a declared wilderness area, and national parks all over the place. Those places are really a great asset of Queensland. The Government has a good deal more to do in those areas.

Moving away from the heavy industrialised and residential areas out into the backblocks, there are areas such as the Herbert River Gorge, the Herbert Falls and the Blencoe Falls. Proper tracks could be established in those areas.

I know that the Government is reluctant to do so because, if too many people are encouraged to visit the area, safety fences will have to be constructed. That will be an expensive operation because of the steep gorges and chasms 1 000 feet deep. However, that is what the tourists come to see. The roads are being improved further and further into Cape York. Cars and caravans venture up past Coen. That is a real trial. The dips in the road are so steep that a caravan of more than 20 feet would be on land at the front and the back, with the wheels suspended in the air, and a tractor would be needed to pull it out.

No facilities are available now at the lakes on the Atherton Tablelands. Years ago a family lived in a house that was attached to a shop, where it was possible to buy roast meals. Tourist buses stopped there for morning and afternoon teas. Two families at Tully Falls kept the tourist tracks open and cut wood for the fireplaces so that visitors could boil a billy to have a cup of tea and a picnic. The tourist industry of north Queensland and the Government in those days catered for the family tourist. Today that is not so. Visitors have to stay at the motel. The facilities required to encourage the family tourist are not available.

The subject I conclude on is the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade. The Government has instituted changes. I remind the Government of the importance of maintaining small QATB centres out in the country. They have provided a tremendous service over the years. One has to have lived among those people to appreciate fully the value of the ambulance bearers in those areas. Because of the closer settlement and hospitals being centralised into bigger townships, the provision of the service is becoming more costly. Small country hospitals at places such as Herberton have been closed. Despite the size of Innisfail, people are sent to Cairns, Townsville or Brisbane for major operations. Years ago doctors would amputate legs in a little place like Herberton—and

both arms as well—and the patient would have returned home in three months. Nowadays, if a person has anything more than a carbuncle, he has to be flown to Brisbane. These days, hospitals say that they have no facilities and that they must send a patient to Cairns.

The QATB at Mount Garnett has to take people in need of attention to Mount Surprise. That is a four-hour drive, depending on the condition of the patient. If he cannot travel at top speed, the journey to hospital could take anything up to eight hours. The ambulance centres in areas such as Mount Garnett, Ravenshoe, Millaa Millaa—Milanda is attempting to get a centre, but it does not presently have one—Silkwood, South Johnstone and even Innisfail have felt the pinch of the present hard times. The Government has to make facilities available to finance those centres and keep them going.

Mr Vaughan: The Government has just increased the compulsory third-party premiums, too.

Mr EATON: That is right. Ambulances should be free. Further, they should not be required to pay the fuel tax. Fuel should be supplied to them at cost. The service they provide cannot be measured in dollars. The men who man the centres are dedicated personnel. It is dedication that keeps the fellows going; it is certainly not the money. Nowhere else in society today could a man be given a job and then a box full of raffle tickets so that he can go out and earn his wages.

Mr NEWTON (Caboolture) (8.59 p.m.): I pledge my loyalty and that of my constituents to the Crown and congratulate Sir Walter Campbell on his appointment as Governor of this great State of Queensland. I wish him good health. I have extended to him an invitation to visit my electorate. Just as his predecessor, Sir James Ramsay, travelled throughout Queensland meeting its people, I know that Sir Walter Campbell will do the same.

I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, which was moved by the honourable member for Mount Gravatt (Mr Henderson). He spoke of Queensland's economy. His motion was ably seconded by the member for Roma (Mr Cooper), whose conclusion—and that of the Government—is that the economy of this State is sound. The people of Queensland can rely on the Government to continue stable and effective management of the economy.

Only last week the Leader of the Opposition announced that the National Party is not fit to govern our State; if only the Opposition had the numbers in the House; and so on. I suggest to the honourable members opposite that the reason that the Opposition does not have the numbers is that the people of this State know the policies and the deficiencies of the Australian Labor Party. The people of Queensland would not trust the future of this State in its hands.

The nation has again witnessed a Labor sham—the 1985 Federal Budget. Despite that, the Leader of the Opposition announced proudly to the people of Queensland that the Federal Government's Budget achieved what the Queensland Government cannot. I am astounded. The Queensland State Government believes in planning and implementing policies that will ensure sound economic growth while not risking the nation's economy on an outside factor such as the Australian Council of Trade Unions. Unbelievably, the 1985 Federal Budget's overall economic effectiveness depends totally on the ACTU. The Federal Government's claim of discounting the effect upon wages of the severe currency devaluation that was experienced earlier this year depended for its success upon acceptance by the ACTU. It is shameful that such a major decision rests with the ACTU. Yet the Federal Treasurer (Mr Keating) says that he has the ability to stand up to the ACTU and deliver the benefits of wages discounting. He is the same man who promised substantial tax reform.

The *Age* newspaper in Melbourne summarised the Federal Government's irresponsible position in an article that was published on 21 August 1985 as follows—

“If the Government failed to convince the ACTU to agree to deferral of part of the 3.8 per cent wage increase due under full wage indexation, we can kiss goodbye to Mr Keating's Budget, his wider economic strategy, the economy recovery and indeed Mr Keating's and the Government's political future.”

Is this the type of economic planning that the State Leader of the Opposition wants Queensland to follow?

Honourable members opposite fail to realise that, to encourage growth, Governments should provide a suitable climate in which private enterprise can flourish. This Government has shown that it can achieve that aim.

The honourable member for Mount Gravatt (Mr Henderson) illustrated how the Queensland Government, by providing essential services, has boosted this State's economy. However, both State and Federal Governments must tackle today's enormous problem—unemployment.

The unemployment problem cannot be solved by increasing the size of the public service. It must be solved by private enterprise. By increasing the public service, as the Hawke socialist Government has done, the problem will only be compounded. The private sector is the sector that creates long-term employment and, as the honourable member for Mount Gravatt said earlier in this debate, the tourism industry is creating thousands of jobs in Queensland each year. The tourism industry is booming in Queensland owing to the Government's initiative. Yet the socialist Government in Canberra has considered, and might yet introduce, a 12.5 per cent services tax that would cripple that most vital industry.

The Federal Government had not considered that a tax of this nature would reduce Australia's international competitiveness by 12.5 per cent. The tourism industry is an industry of the future, and Queenslanders will benefit from the growth of that industry. The Queensland Government works towards encouraging industry, rather than taxing industry to death.

In September, the second part of the continuing saga of the Federal Budget will be presented to the people of Australia. Australians are presently looking down the barrel of a proposal for a capital gains tax that will limit the ability of industry to reinvest and upgrade facilities. Time and time again, socialist Governments hinder the private sector.

Mrs Chapman: A capital gains tax would wipe out the nation.

Mr NEWTON: It would, because there would be no money for investment.

The honourable gentlemen opposite still suggest that Queensland should follow Canberra's lead. What a disgrace. The present economic climate has adversely affected unemployment in Queensland, but people are still voting with their feet by moving to Queensland. Unfortunately, though, that migration can have a detrimental effect on unemployment in Queensland.

Recent statistics prove that during the past three years a total of 13 005 people in receipt of unemployment benefits migrated from other States to Queensland in search of employment. Department of Social Security figures show that in 1982-83, 28 717 people on employment benefits moved to Queensland, and 23 078 people moved out of the State. That indicates a net gain of 5 641. That is why Queensland has higher unemployment figures. In 1983-84, a further gain of 5 156 was recorded. In the 11 months to May 1985, the number was 2 208.

In summary, during the 1983-84 financial year, 63.7 per cent of net Queensland interstate migration was made up of people receiving unemployment benefits from the Social Security Department. No wonder we are going broke with the poor old tax-payer always giving and never receiving.

The unemployed in southern States have lost all confidence in the socialist Governments and are moving to Queensland to enjoy the benefits of living in a truly free enterprise State. The Queensland Government recognises the unemployment problem and, through its wise policies, is encouraging private enterprise to employ more staff. Successive Labor Governments have tried many short-term employment-generating projects, but they have all failed.

Mr Davis: What is it—"program", or "project"?

Mr NEWTON: Either, if the honourable member so wishes.

Queenslanders have a Government committed to providing the right climate for private enterprise to expand. That expansion then flows to all sectors, benefiting all levels in the community. The facts show the true picture. The Queensland economy is sound, yet we still hear bleating from the Opposition.

On many occasions the Leader of the Opposition has said that the economy is stagnant. What rubbish! I travelled the north with the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services (Mr Tenni) and witnessed a new high school being built at Cooktown, the new road from Cape Tribulation to Cooktown, which will be an asset for the people in that area, the enterprise of the Jacques Bros plantation and many other enterprises and initiatives that are proceeding in the area.

One of them is the new Lotus Glen prison, which is to be built at a cost of \$15m. That prison is to be modelled on the Woodford prison. As I said when I was in the area, the project will stimulate employment. The Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs said that the Government will spend \$5m on general services and maintenance and that the annual take-home pay for staff will be \$2.5m, much of which will be spent in the local area.

I should remind honourable members that the Woodford prison is in my electorate and is built so that it fits in with the area. A tourist road passes it and takes in the Somerset Dam. Many people drive past and readily accept the prison.

I have only to look at my electorate of Caboolture to realise the benefit of the Government's policies. Caboolture is only one small part of the State, but it is witness to the results of these policies. The Australian Bureau of Statistics has confirmed that Caboolture is the fastest-growing area in the State and Australia—thanks to good National Party representation. The Government has provided the essential services and the private sector has done the rest. That can be seen from housing, office development, and expansion in the saw-milling industry.

Caboolture has benefited from the provision of two new police stations in the area, one on Bribie Island and the other at Caboolture.

The member for Brisbane Central said that the Government is promising, but not delivering. I remind him of the new railway station at Caboolture and the electrification of the rail link from Brisbane to Caboolture. That link will be completed in mid-1986. The Governor's Opening Speech referred to the electrification of the line to Gladstone, new road overhead bridges and the four-lane highway to Caloundra, which is shortly due for completion, as everyone who visits the Sunshine Coast can see.

The Government has provided public accommodation in Caboolture, including 36 new pensioner units, with more to follow. Since October 1983, more than \$2m has been spent to upgrade educational facilities to cope with the growth in population. Added to that is the construction of the new school at Beachmere, at a cost of \$1.3m. It will open at the beginning of the 1986 school year.

With all that input, new businesses have come into the area and created employment, and the whole community has benefited.

The program outlined for the current session promises every Queenslander continuing stable and capable Government and provides the opportunity for free enterprise to flourish.

Mr WHITE (Redcliffe) (9.11 p.m.): On behalf of my constituents of Redcliffe, I take the opportunity to indicate allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen. I also take the opportunity to wish Sir Walter Campbell every success. I am sure that he will proceed in office as his predecessors have done and will give a long period of distinguished service to the State.

Tonight, seated in the public gallery are members of the ES & A club. They, together with the members of many other service clubs and community organisations in Redcliffe, Caboolture and Pine Rivers, play a significant part in the development of our communities.

I am pleased to see that the Minister for Works and Housing (Honourable Claude Wharton) is present in the Chamber. Through the Queensland Housing Commission, my constituents have been most fortunate to have pensioner units constructed on the Redcliffe Peninsula. It is an area in which there is a high preponderance of elderly people. About 34 per cent of my constituents receive the age pension, and housing is a continuing problem. Only a few weeks ago, the Minister opened the latest block of pensioner units on the corner of Maine Road and Duffield Road. That is an indication of what is happening in the area. A new block of 42 units has been established. Those units are occupied by people who previously were paying rents of between \$60 and \$70 a week, which they could not afford.

Mr Davis: Did you get an invitation?

Mr WHITE: Yes.

Mr Davis: Isn't it amazing that you people get invitations but Labor people don't?

Mr WHITE: For the benefit of the member for Brisbane Central, I point out that I extended an invitation to the Minister to come to my electorate and officially open the units, which he was kind enough to do. The people of Redcliffe had an opportunity to meet the Minister and also to see what had been done.

There has been a tremendous amount of progress in my area. It began when my colleague, the honourable member for Yeronga (Honourable Norm Lee) was Minister for Works and Housing. That was when it was first decided not to build ghettos, as the Labor Party does, settling masses of people in one area and creating similar social problems that flow on to the community at large. The policy that has been pursued over the years since the member for Yeronga initiated that program has been to integrate public housing into the community and not to establish ghettos.

Mr Lee interjected.

Mr WHITE: That has happened at Redcliffe, and it is working well. The elderly folk have integrated themselves into the community. They have easy access to transportation and shopping. They are not stuck 10 miles out of town where they cannot get transportation. We are gradually getting on top of the housing situation, and I am very grateful for that.

I want to quickly mention the police, the hospital, the boat harbour and the TAFE college in my area.

The new \$2.5m police station has been established under Inspector Errol Walker, who is in charge of the district. The police are doing a pretty fair sort of a job under difficult circumstances. Redcliffe is no different from the other areas of the State. The incidence of crime is increasing rapidly, and recently this has been drawn to public attention by Sir William Knox. There is no question that more police are needed. Their communications system needs to be improved, and I am pleased that Redcliffe will be

included with Ipswich, the south side and the rest of the north side in the new communications network.

Mr Lee: Will you ever get the railway there?

Mr WHITE: The honourable member for Yeronga made mention of the rail link, but I do not like Redcliffe's chances of getting it. Nevertheless, that is not a promise of the Liberal Party; it was the Premier's promise, and it will be interesting to see whether he honours it.

Deception Bay, which is in the neighbouring electorate of Caboolture, represented by Mr Newton, has a problem with a lack of police officers. I am sure that the honourable member for Caboolture has made mention of that. The rapid development of Caboolture, Morayfield and Deception Bay is feeding off the district of Redcliffe itself and putting considerable strain on the police force.

There is a growing need for additional nurses at the Redcliffe Hospital. The nursing and medical staff are under considerable pressure, but, to their great credit, they are doing what I regard as a magnificent job.

Mr Innes: Do you think that if Mr Austin advertised himself less there would be more money for more nurses?

Mr WHITE: The honourable member for Sherwood has a valid point. It seems to be becoming more evident every day that Ministers are more interested in spending millions of dollars in self-promotion rather than putting the money into nursing staff.

Mr Menzel: You blokes used to do it.

Mr Lickiss: It was never allowed.

Mr WHITE: I assure the honourable member that it was never allowed. Approximately \$4.5m has been spent in an advertising campaign to promote the Government when the State is facing a shortage of nurses, police and teachers.

Representations have been made, and I take this opportunity to congratulate the Redcliffe Hospitals Board, under the leadership of magistrate Phil Rogers, on the work that has been carried out. The hospitals board does not have an easy job. It has to cop the crow for many things that are not of its making. Nevertheless, it is doing a job for which the community of Redcliffe is grateful.

It is clearer every day that Medicare is becoming more and more of a rip-off. It cannot be doubted that the Medicare scheme that was introduced by the Federal Labor Government is a racket. There is no question that it will cost the people of Australia a great deal of money. It discriminates against the people who are prepared to insure themselves privately and carry the burden, as people who can afford to do ought to do, so that we, in turn, as a community, will be in a position to help people who are really in need.

Already the incidence of attendance at doctors' surgeries and hospitals is on the increase simply because many people are treating a day at the surgery in the same way as a day's shopping. That is a direct consequence of bulk billing, which has been introduced through the Medicare scheme. Medicare is not about improving the health of this nation; it is about the redistribution of wealth, as Sir William Knox has pointed out on a number of occasions. That is a tragedy. What the community should really be concerned about is improving the health of people, rather than looking at systems such as Medicare.

Mr Lee: It is said that the cost of Medicare will increase 12 per cent every year for the next three years.

Mr WHITE: The honourable member for Yeronga has indicated that the cost will increase. When the scheme was introduced originally, the Labor Party said, if my memory

serves me correctly, that it would be a 1 per cent impost on the wage-earners of this country. It is already known that that does not generate sufficient funds. That promise has already been broken. There is no doubt that it will cost the people of this country a great deal of money and certainly will do nothing to improve the health of this nation.

Mr Lee: A shortfall of \$1,000m.

Mr WHITE: Already there is a shortfall.

I shall make mention briefly about the boat harbour at Redcliffe. I am sorry that the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services (John Goleby) is not in the House. He has been down to inspect the boat harbour and I am hopeful that something can be done about the siltation problem there.

On the matter of education—in the main, my electorate is very well served, for which I am very, very grateful. The electorate has two fine State high schools, a number of denominational high schools and a variety of State primary schools and pre-schools that are running very well. In fact, the peninsula has something like 33 private and public educational institutions. Recently the electorate was privileged to have opened a new private enterprise kindergarten in the Kippa-Ring area. The Ultracare Child Care Centre is paving the way as an example of how private enterprise can come in and play a role. Why shouldn't private enterprise play a role in child care? I invite honourable members who have not seen these facilities to come to the peninsula to have a look at them. Under the directorship of Diane Northey, that institution is being run very well. I should not use the word "institution", because it is a happy place where children are well and truly cared for.

The electorate has need of a TAFE college facility. I do not mean a full-scale TAFE college, but a mini-TAFE college. It is unfortunate that the Government has seen fit at a Commonwealth level to direct all funds into having Taj Mahals such as that at Bald Hills instead of dividing the funds up and spreading them round the State so that places such as Redcliffe and Caboolture could have mini-TAFE colleges. The TAFE college at Bald Hills is simply too far away and far too expensive for many people to take advantage of it.

I now turn to a number of issues that fall broadly into the category of privatisation—deregulation—about which honourable members have heard considerable debate. Quite recently, I had an opportunity to spend some time in the United Kingdom and the United States of America. There is no question of the worth of privatisation of public utilities such as British Petroleum, British Aerospace, the Sugar Corporation, the National Freight Corporation, Jaguar, Telecom, North Sea Oil and, not the least important, council housing, which, for years, has been a socialist, Government program.

People in Britain now have the opportunity to buy their own homes—to own their own little bit of dirt and their own home. I tell honourable members that it is a very popular movement. It is quite interesting that in Britain the Labor Party has now, after sticking to something that has been so outdated for something like 40 years, changed its policy simply because the people have said that they want to own their own homes.

I congratulate the Thatcher Government on what it is doing in that area of privatisation. The Government has quite wisely made the decision to offer to the employees shares in public corporations such as Jaguar and Telecom. Why shouldn't that be done in this country? This country should be the bastion of free enterprise. It has so many resources and so many utilities that the opportunities are there just for the asking.

I ask honourable members to look at the response of the employees of Telecom when the British Government told them they could take up ownership in their own outfit. They responded magnificently. The people in Britain are now receiving an excellent, efficient service. Australia can learn from that experience. For too long people have been hung up on the theory that the Government knows best.

Mr Lee: If you want a job mucked up, give it to the Government.

Mr WHITE: The honourable member for Yeronga is quite right. If the operation of a utility of that nature is given to the Government, there is no question that two things will occur. Firstly, it will be inefficient; secondly, it will be very expensive.

I know that, recently, people have been waiting up to two months to have a telephone connected. That is a public disgrace. The sooner that Australia begins to look at those things, the better. I was very pleased to see that the Liberal Party federally has made moves in that direction, particularly in respect of matters such as the Commonwealth Banking Corporation, Telecom, TAA and Qantas. The sooner that they are sold off to the public, and the people of this nation are given a share in those corporations, the sooner this country will be better off.

I am pleased that the Minister for Works and Housing (Mr Wharton) is in the Chamber. I congratulate him on the moves that he has made to provide funding for accommodation for those elderly persons who are exempted from pensioner units and cannot afford to buy a \$50,000, \$60,000 or \$70,000 home unit. I hope that the Minister will extend that scheme further down the line. As soon as Housing Commission homes are owned by the people who live in them, the better the community will be.

If one drives round this State and looks at the Housing Commission estates and then has a look at the estates that are privately owned, one can see the difference. People will respond and look after their own home. I know that it embarrasses the Labor Party, and it should be embarrassed because its colleagues in Britain have changed their policy. The popular policy is for people to own their own home. Why should they not own their own homes instead of paying rent and dissipating a large sum of money throughout their lives? Through home-ownership, people gain the benefit, customers receive the price advantage and efficiency is achieved.

I understand that similar plans are in tow in Britain for companies such as British Airways and Rolls Royce. I raise the issue again because these are matters that ought to be examined at a State Government level. I do not wish to pursue that matter at length tonight. However, it is time that a good, hard look was taken at those matters.

I turn now to the growth of public sector charges. It is abundantly clear that, in recent years, the public sector is increasing its share of the gross domestic product, with the private sector having to accept a reduced level of profitability. Nowhere is this more clear than in the small business area. The more that Governments charge business people to operate their businesses, the more unemployment will be created.

It is not much use Government members saying that all is bright and beautiful in Queensland. Things are not that bright here. Serious problems are occurring across the nation. Recently, *The Courier-Mail* reported that, in the two years from December 1982 to December 1984, employment in the State grew by only 6 600—a rate of only 0.7 per cent. That compares with 4.4 per cent in New South Wales and 4.7 per cent in Victoria. Even South Australia, which is supposed to be in a depressed state, was up 3 per cent.

The Government should not be complacent. Queensland is a growth State with enormous potential. It has certainly had some very successful years of development in the last decade. However, Queensland is experiencing problems at the moment, and there is no point in sweeping them under the carpet and saying that it does not, which is a Government tendency at the present time.

Mr Lee: It all happened when our coal contracts started to go down.

Mr WHITE: The honourable member for Yeronga has quite cogently raised the matter of coal contracts. It is abundantly clear that the end of the boom is here. Queensland has no new major coal developments on the program for the next decade.

Mr Vaughan interjected.

Mr WHITE: Obviously the honourable member for Nudgee is well informed on the coal industry.

The fact is that Queensland has no new coal developments on the program for the future decade, and that is a terrible tragedy when this State has such an enormous resource of coal. The Government has become very dependent on rail freights and royalties, which have become a form of indirect taxation.

Mr Innes: We will have to rely on the civil war in South Africa.

Mr WHITE: As the honourable member for Sherwood has indicated, Australia has been fortunate that other countries that have supplied raw materials to the Western World have had domestic political problems. In some respects, Australia could be a beneficiary of the situation in South Africa. However, it would be very foolish to sit back and say that, because South Africa has political problems and some companies will not invest in South Africa, the problems in this country will be solved. Those companies will not come here, because it has become too expensive for them to do so. They have been slugged on rail freights and royalties, and the industrial relations on the waterfront in this country are absolutely appalling. In many respects, Australia has priced itself out of business.

When I was in the United States, I spoke to people in the coal industry who told me, "You are no longer an attractive country in which to invest money in raw materials, because your industrial relations situation is not good and you are slugging companies." Indeed, companies such as Utah have been slugged over the years.

The level of taxation is rising at all levels of government. These tax slugs are rising at a rate greater than the rate of inflation and the growth in private-sector charges for goods and services. The business community and Joe Blow in the street are being hit by taxes at a rate greater than the rate of inflation. The Consumer Price Index clearly reveals the impact of Government charges and taxes. Not only is it bad for business but it is also bad for job creation. That is the key. These charges are contributing significantly to rising inflation and the loss of exports and, as a consequence, new developments.

Inflation is contributing to the increased cost of salaries and wages, especially now that they have been tied to the CPI. Apparently the Federal Labor Government even wants to discount that. There is no reason for Labor Party members in this House to jump up and down, because the message in the minds of Mr Keating and Mr Hawke seems to be abundantly clear: if something is to be done about unemployment in this country, something needs to be done about putting the lid on the cost of production. It is only by minimising these factors which contribute to increased wages and salary claims that a sustained recovery of the economy will be possible.

I turn briefly to some of the figures. During the four years from 1979 to 1983, total public-sector receipts grew from \$38,522m to \$58,072m, or an increase of 50.8 per cent. The CPI in the same period grew 95 points to 127 points, which is an increase of 34 per cent. Charges and taxes rose by 50 per cent and the CPI rose by 34 per cent.

Prima facie, Governments at all levels have been demanding more and more revenue and at a rate exceeding the rate of inflation. Thus, a significant burden has been placed on the tax-payer and the economy, which is borne out by the increasing proportion of the gross domestic product that is represented by public sector receipts, and I give this example. In 1979-80, public sector receipts represented 33.6 per cent of GDP; by 1982-83, the proportion had risen to 36.1 per cent. I do not know the latest figures, but I understand that we are heading towards 40 per cent.

I now list the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures for taxation receipts, extracted from Budget papers. In the period 1979-80 to 1983-84, the following increases in taxation receipts were recorded—

	%
Commonwealth	61.8
New South Wales	71.7
Victoria	82.7
Queensland	67.7
Western Australia	58.2
South Australia	48.1
Tasmania	44.9
Northern Territory	77.9

Statutory authorities are out of control. In this State, for example, statutory authorities spend more money than is provided to the Government in the State Budget. I do not know how many there are. When I was in Cabinet, I was told that there were about 800. Other people tell me there are a thousand. I do not know what the population of the United Kingdom is. Is it 70 million or 80 million?

Mr Vaughan: Don't ask me.

Mr WHITE: I thought the member for Nudgee would know. He has claimed to be well informed on most things.

The population of Britain exceeds ours by an enormous number. Its 2 000 statutory authorities have been reduced by half; so Queensland, with only a fraction of the population, has about the same number of statutory authorities as the United Kingdom. It is time that the matter was seriously considered. When compared with increases in the CPI or GDP, taxation has outstripped any real growth in the Australian economy. The CPI is up 44.2 per cent and GDP is up 58.2 per cent.

I am conscious of the time. I am aware that the member for Callide (Mr Hartwig) is anxious to speak tonight. I thank the House for its indulgence and conclude by expressing the hope that the Government is serious about a review of business regulations. I congratulate the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern) for the initiatives that he has taken. I hope that the committee chaired by Sir Ernest Savage will do something about overregulation in this State.

Mr HARTWIG (Callide) (9.38 p.m.): It is my pleasure to take part in the Address in Reply debate. I thank the members who preceded me for cutting their speeches short to make time available for me.

I take the opportunity, first of all, to assure His Excellency the Governor of the continued loyalty and allegiance of the people of Callide not only to the Crown but also to our flag. It is almost 14 years since I first entered this Chamber. It has been a great pleasure and privilege to have had the honour to serve such a wonderful area of Queensland for such a long time. During that time, of course, I have seen many members come and go. Although I have seen only the one Premier over those 14 years, I have seen a number of Leaders of the Opposition—Messrs Houston, Tucker, Burns, Casey, Wright and now Warburton. In that time the Deputy Premiers have been Sir Gordon Chalk, Sir William Knox, Sir Llewelyn Edwards and, of course, Mr Gunn.

I wish to speak briefly on the richness of the electorate of Callide. Probably no other electorate in Queensland can boast the amount of money that has been afforded the electorate of Callide, principally in roads and power stations. Something like \$25m has been allocated for power stations at Callide "B" and Stanwell and for the purchase of land at Broadmount. I believe that, within a short period, a power station built at the mouth of the Fitzroy River will tie into the grid system of Gladstone, Biloela, Stanwell and Broadmount.

I have served the electricity industry through membership of various regional boards, and I wish to point out that, since 1981, by way of ministerial advice, I have not received one letter that advised me what is occurring in the electricity supply industry. The people of central Queensland know what I have done for the power industry and the contributions that I have made, yet the Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr I. J. Gibbs) sees fit not to write to inform me what is taking place in my electorate in regard

to construction of power stations. That is a reflection on the Minister because I am elected in exactly the same way as he is. The only difference is that I am not in this Chamber as a Government member; I am here as an Independent because an outside political organisation sentenced me.

I now turn my attention to the problem of Queensland roads. It astonishes me that, in a State such as Queensland, the Government continues to construct narrow roads. People say to me, "What is the Government doing about the road toll?" All I can say is that the Government should take a good look at the trucks on our roads; the overall size, width and length of them; yet the Government continues to construct highways that are only seven metres wide. It should be remembered that, even in subdivisions, a seven-metre road is not acceptable, but a width of seven metres is tolerated for highways. I might add that, since 1979, 3 674 people have been killed on Queensland roads and that is a tragedy in terms of loss of life.

Perhaps one day, as has happened in other countries, the Government will wake up and construct wider roads. In Queensland, there should be nothing but highways eight metres wide. Our roads must be of adequate width to make them safe.

I would like to address some remarks to the benefits of tourism. I inform the House that the Iwasaki development is coming along very well. I suggest to honourable members that, if they have a week-end to spare, they visit Yeppoon and view the Iwasaki resort. It is magnificent and I have no doubt that it will result in providing a tremendous boost to tourism in Queensland. I also mention Broome Head, which is located between Stanage Bay and Shoalwater Bay, will be developed as a resort area, at a cost of \$200m. Of course, other developments at Stanage Bay and North Keppel Island, in addition to the subdivision developments that are taking place in the shire of Livingstone, assure that shire and that part of Queensland of future progress.

I turn my attention now to the problems associated with lack of water. On the central coast, the residents have to look to a pipeline for water supply. There is no major dam in the area; yet one of the largest resorts in Queensland has been constructed there. It is still not possible to guarantee the owners of the resort an adequate supply of good quality, treated water. I point out that the water supply is piped. I am pleased to see the Minister for Works and Housing (Mr Wharton) in the Chamber listening to what I am saying. Surely, water is the life-blood of development. Without it, development cannot take place. The shire of Livingstone is charged with responsibility for not only the people of the Capricorn region and the coastal regions, but also for the supply of water to one of Australia's largest tourist resorts. I give notice that very shortly I will be seeking the Government's assistance in constructing a pipeline from Rockhampton that will bring treated water to the coast.

The shire of Livingstone is perhaps unique in one respect. Although it welcomes a large army establishment being situated there, it must be remembered that that establishment takes up over a million acres of land. The shire of Livingstone does not receive one cent in rates from the land used by the army in the Shoalwater Bay area. However, I should mention that an increased allocation of \$200,000 has been received for the maintenance of roads. The land designated as forest is also not rateable land. Reforestation in the Byfield area takes up about 40 000 acres. Trucks with huge loads of timber leave that forestry area heading for various mills and the railhead, but the Department of Forestry does not contribute a cent towards the cost or maintenance of the road.

The Government must review its policy, which is common to all areas. Local authorities should look at Government land that cannot be rated. I refer to land occupied by post offices, the CSIRO and other authorities that do not pay rates. Local authorities have to maintain roads and streets and provide water and sewerage but are not able to collect rates from a big part of their areas.

Members of Parliament have a hard job to do. Over the years, many members have dedicated themselves to their duties. In spite of that, the media grasp opportunities

to hang them. In particular, I shall refer to *The Morning Bulletin*, published in Rockhampton, and its recent attack on the Livingstone shire. That newspaper said that the Livingstone shire should be divided between the Rockhampton City Council and the Broadsound and Fitzroy shires. There is no hope in hell of that happening, because the Capricorn coast and the Livingstone shire have great potential. The area will remain the master of its own destiny.

I do not know why newspapers should continually knock an area. They have a go at the Iwasaki development and at different shires. The road to Yeppoon, which is in the Rockhampton city area, has not been changed for the last 20 years. It has more bends in it than has a snake crossing a hot bitumen road in the middle of summer. It carries up to 4 000 vehicles a day, which is a tremendous volume of traffic. Rather than get the Yeppoon road upgraded, *The Morning Bulletin* prefers to pick on the Livingstone shire.

Thanks to the assistance of the Minister for Main Roads, Local Government and Racing, for whom I have the highest admiration, over \$9m has been injected in the approaches of the Yeppoon road from Rockhampton. That road is now one of the best roads to any resort on the east coast of Queensland. I can only say a big "Thank you" to the Department of Main Roads. However, nothing has been done to improve the section of the crooked road to Yeppoon that is in the Rockhampton city area. The member for Rockhampton, who is in the Chamber, will agree with me that not one bend has been taken out of that crooked road.

If I wanted to attack *The Morning Bulletin*, I would refer to the railway line that runs down the main street of Rockhampton—it does very little about that—and the Rockhampton airport, which is the worst airport for a city of its size in Queensland. If *The Morning Bulletin* wants to take me on, I am quite capable of looking after myself. Let the proprietors print a decent newspaper and we will provide the people to buy it and read it.

Mr Elliott: That is what you get for being the shire chairman; they tend to attack you.

Mr HARTWIG: Yes, they do.

Queenslanders value tourism. Yeppoon is a coastal resort and realises the part that tourism will play. The Iwasaki resort will open in November this year. It is expected that 2 000 people a day will visit that resort. Even now, almost that number visits the resort daily simply to look at it. It is magnificent. The swimming pool is the largest in the southern hemisphere. A radio telephone is virtually needed for communication between one end and the other. The surroundings look very well indeed.

I am glad to note that the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police is in the Chamber. I like the Minister, but I did not like the recent efforts of some of his officers in stopping the traffic passing through Five Rocks. I was very concerned about that matter.

Mr Braddy: Yewdale and I have fixed that up.

Mr HARTWIG: It has been fixed up all right—until the next period of wet weather.

I now refer to primary industries. People in the country have had enough. They have had enough of Canberra and of Government intervention.

I shall look at imports. I refer to the dairy industry. Today in Queensland, there are fewer than 2 000 dairy farms. In the 1940s there were 24 000. Our imports of dairy products have increased by 50 per cent. In 1981-82, we imported dairy products to the value of \$45m. In 1983-84, that had increased to \$67.9m.

The meat industry is in dire straits. Imports are up 50 per cent. In 1981-82, imports of beef totalled \$10.1m. In 1983-84, they totalled \$14m. In the first nine months of 1984-85, the value of imported beef into Australia had risen to \$15.9m. The total for 1984-85 was estimated to exceed \$20m.

It does not appear to me that political parties have played their part in looking after primary producers. They have gone down the drain. A primary producer's costs have risen over 40 per cent in the last three years, while his returns have shown an increase of a mere 12 per cent.

What do we find today? Cane-farmers are being sold up; dairy-farmers have almost gone out of existence; cattlemen have reached the end of their tether.

High unimproved valuations by the Valuer-General's Department have not made the lot of the man on the land any easier. This year, the Valuer-General's valuations in the Livingstone shire in some instances increased by 1 000 per cent. I do not know the reason for the increase. If Mr Hawke wants to introduce a capital gains tax or death duties, he will have a decent base on which to work.

This year, cotton-growers are taking \$100 a bale less.

Finally, I wish to say a few words about the fishing industry. A few years ago—I think in 1981—the Queensland Government abolished fish boards and asked fishermen in various areas of Queensland to set up co-operatives. The Rosslyn Bay Fishermen's Co-operative is in existence. After struggling for three years to get some agreement between the Queensland Fish Board and the Department of Harbours and Marine, the co-operative has got nowhere. All that it is asking for is half the area of the present Queensland Fish Board lease.

I know that the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) has discussed the matter with the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) and the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services (Mr Goleby). After three years of political muddling, the Rosslyn Bay Fishermen's Co-operative is no further advanced. It is time that the Government paid some attention to the bureaucratic exercise and granted the co-operative's requests, that is, to lease to it half of the Queensland Fish Board area at Rosslyn Bay, to index the lease fee and to provide a long enough lease to allow the construction of a suitable building so that share-holders will stand to gain some interest on their investment.

The Fish Board facility is an interesting tourist attraction. It provides fresh seafood for the general public; yet it is a miserable building in which to operate. As I say, a lease cannot be finalised with the Department of Harbours and Marine, and I ask that consideration be given to that matter.

In recent weeks, much has been said about South Africa. It was my privilege to spend some time in Africa, mainly in Zambia in the middle of Africa, where I attended a world conference. A native of South Africa there has no land rights under black rule. I asked why the blacks were not granted land rights, and I was told that in Zambia there are 70-odd different tribes, which speak about 48 different languages.

I also spent some time in South Africa. Socialism is rife in all parts of Africa other than South Africa. Honourable members have probably noticed on the television that it is always coloured people fighting coloured people. The troops are sent in to maintain order. A member of Mugabe's Government shot a white farmer dead, but was acquitted. Nothing appeared about that in the papers here. Another black urinated from the third floor of a hotel on to a group of white people. He was not sentenced, either. In Australia, we do not hear of these atrocities against white people. In Lusaka, a white girl wearing diamond rings went downtown and had her hand hatcheted off—four fingers were cut off. I can only think that Kim Hughes and his cricketers will do a hell of a lot of good playing cricket and trying to break down this lack of understanding.

South Africa is the last bastion against communism in Africa. Where do the terrorists get their arms from? Boatloads of arms and ammunition are being supplied to the terrorists in Zimbabwe, Botswana, Lusaka and Zambia.

Mr Davis: How many whites have been shot dead in South Africa?

Mr HARTWIG: I have just explained that a Minister shot dead a white farmer and was acquitted. The honourable member for Brisbane Central should speak with the white people in Africa, as I have done. What I say is true. The honourable member only believes what he reads in the paper and is subject to political propaganda. It is my belief that, if the Government imposes trade restrictions on South Africa, it will not help the cause one iota. As I said, it is black fighting black, and that is what has been going on for years. The Government in South Africa must try to keep the peace.

I take this opportunity to say that it has been a great pleasure to serve my 14 years in this place. I have appreciated the help that I have received from the Premier, Ministers and honourable members on both sides of the House. In this place, one makes friendships that are valued for life. All honourable members should recognise the work that is done in this Chamber rather than tear each other's throats out. That is an independent point of view. Men are men, and we should treat each other as such. We must treat each other with respect. Too much is made of a little incident. An honourable member may be nailed to the wall as his political opponents try to crucify him. That is not good, and it is not becoming for parliamentarians. In this respect, I make reference to the treatment handed out to the Minister for Racing (Mr Hinze) over the last few days. He has done a tremendous amount of good for this State and has done his job well. He has always treated me courteously, and I hope that he continues to be with us for many years to come.

At 10 p.m.,

In accordance with the Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 27 August, the debate stood adjourned.

RURAL LANDS PROTECTION BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 19 March 1985 (see p. 4095, vol. 298) on Mr Glasson's motion—

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

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (10 p.m.): The Opposition is not opposed to the legislation; in fact, as it brings under one document quite a number of Acts and amendments, we welcome it. The consolidation of the legislation in one Bill is something that the Opposition welcomes.

I wish to raise a number of points about which the Opposition is concerned. Although the Opposition does not oppose the Bill, it wishes to raise these concerns. Much has been said in the State of Queensland about quangos, particularly the number of quangos. I would have thought that the introduction of this Bill, which consolidates previous legislation, would be a good opportunity to do away with some of the existing quangos, but that is not the case.

A reading of the legislation reveals that the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board and the Rabbit Board continue in existence. The Minister has not taken the introduction of this legislation as an opportunity to get rid of some of the quangos in this State. The Government stands condemned for not taking that opportunity. Much has been said by honourable members, including many Government members, about the need to do something about quangos, but all this legislation does is legitimise them, allow them to continue and, as I will expand on later, allow them to grow.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister referred to the difficulty in proving whether a particular plant or animal is the one alleged and that, to enable an officer to prove it, he intended to reverse the onus of proof and allow his officers to claim that an animal or a plant was in fact that sort of animal or plant. The person who owned the animal or plant would then have to prove that it was not what the Minister's officer

had claimed. That is a draconian measure to place in any legislation. The supposed experts can claim that a person has a prohibited plant or a declared animal, and the onus then falls on the person to prove the contrary. The Opposition certainly does not agree with that part of the Bill.

The Opposition is also certainly alarmed at, and quite opposed to, the maintenance of the dingo barrier fence, which is presently being reconstructed by the Crown at public expense, by a levy on benefited areas and a Crown contribution. Mr Deputy Speaker, you would be well aware that many years ago the Queensland Government built the dingo barrier fence to protect primary producers in the areas where dingoes were becoming pests on sheep farms. Those primary producers have not looked after the fence and, over the years, it has been allowed to deteriorate. The stage has been reached at which, once again, the Government will pay for the fence and contribute towards its maintenance. Those who gain the benefit from that fence should be the ones who pay for its maintenance.

I know that the primary producers and the members of the National Party will say that the sheep-producers cannot afford it and will produce all sorts of arguments, but the Government has consistently said in this House that the user must pay. When it comes to driving a motor vehicle on the road, the Government says that the user must pay. The user must pay for compulsory third-party insurance. The price to consumers of electricity has continued to rise, but the user must pay. The same principle should apply to the dingo barrier fence.

Many years ago, when the Government paid to build that fence, it should have been made the responsibility of those who were gaining the benefit of it to maintain it. However, what has happened is that the fence has been there and the primary producers have not cared about maintaining it. They have just said, "The Government has put it there; it should maintain it." That has resulted in more subsidies for the primary producers—the sort of thing that we continually hear in this House.

I think that the Government has made an unwise decision, because the Minister said that the fence would be reconstructed at public expense and maintained with a Crown contribution. One needs to ask why the Government has done that. I return to a statement made by the Minister for Lands and Forestry on 14 December 1981. He said—

"State Cabinet in Charleville today had agreed to allocate \$1.13 million to retain and realign, where necessary, 2 000 kilometres of the dingo barrier fence in southern Queensland."

He detailed where the fence was to be located.

The Minister further stated—

" Cabinet would be loath to accept yearly responsibility for maintenance of the fence.

The Treasurer had indicated, however, he would favourably consider any request for assistance to maintain the fence in difficult economic periods caused by drought or recession in the industry."

One needs to ask why, since 1981, the Government has changed its opinion on the maintenance of the dingo fence. It is not as though the Queensland Government is completely new, although in 1981 there were some different faces on the Government benches. Honourable members are well aware that, in 1981, the National Party was firmly entrenched in this State. It is not as though there is a new Minister for Lands and Forestry in the Government. Mr Glasson was the Minister for Lands and Forestry in 1981; he is the Minister now. What happened from 1981 to 1985 to make the Minister change his mind?

In February 1982, the following article appeared in the press—

"The president of the Maranoa Graziers Association, Mr Bill Bonthron, told the association's recent executive council meeting at Surat: 'If the fence goes ahead,

the State Government could be watching local authorities taking some of their best supporters through the courts to collect the levy.'

Delegates carried a vote of no confidence in the Lands Minister, Mr Glasson, over his handling of the fence issue."

In 1982, people in the Minister's electorate warned the Minister that, if the Government did not pay, his best supporters would end up in court because they would not be able to pay the levy. He was told that his best supporters would probably not vote for him at the next election. One can infer that because they carried a vote of no confidence in the Minister.

I would like to know what would happen if people such as the sacked SEQEB workers carried a vote of no confidence in the Government. Would the Minister jump up tomorrow and change his tune on whether he was going to re-employ those people? Certainly not! I think that Maranoa was in the Minister's electorate or near enough to it.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr MACKENROTH: It is near enough to the Minister's electorate. It is near enough to the electorate of Gregory. It is out in that area.

Mr Glasson: It is nowhere near it.

Mr MACKENROTH: Was it ever in the Maranoa Federal electorate? It was!

The Government was threatened by the primary producers' organisation that if it did not go ahead and meet the cost and pay for its maintenance, its best supporters may end up in court and that probably those supporters would not vote for the Government. In 1985 the Minister has been bludgeoned by the primary producers into changing the opinion he held in 1981 to again pay for the dingo fence with tax-payers' money.

A dingo fence in western Queensland will not benefit the people in my electorate. The people in my electorate are consistently told by the Government that they have to pay for everything that they want. The Minister cannot tell me one thing that is paid for by the people in his electorate that is of benefit to the people in my electorate.

Mr Glasson: The wool industry.

Mr MACKENROTH: The Government subsidises the wool industry.

The Minister cannot show me in dollars and cents where something that is paid for by a person in his electorate benefits someone in my electorate. I bet that he cannot do that. He cannot show me one thing that is of an individual benefit to those people either in his electorate or in mine. That cannot be done. The Minister should remember that I am quoting his own words, or the words of his Government, that the user must pay. That is something that must be considered when this principle is examined.

I will deal with some other parts of the Bill that are of concern to me. As I stated earlier, the Minister has not taken the opportunity in this Bill to get rid of at least one quango and a number of other smaller quangos that are set up under previous Acts. He has allowed them to continue. In my opinion, that should not have happened.

Under this Bill the Minister may from time to time appoint committees for the purpose of advising him in relation to any matter connected with the Bill. He can set up any committee that he chooses, and the members of such a committee will be paid for their membership of it. The Bill is not just keeping these quangos in existence; it is allowing more quangos, more committees, to be set up by people outside the public service, who will be paid allowances and who really are not required to be approved by Parliament.

Another provision that concerns me relates to the qualifications of members. Under that provision, a person who is a member must be an owner or occupier of rural land. I have already stated that I do not believe that so many boards are needed. A number of them could certainly be done away with. A single board is all that is needed under this Bill. However, if the Government is going to have them, I do not see why this provision must be inserted in the Bill. A person who resides in a particular shire and has a great deal of experience in dealing with rabbits would be an excellent person to have on the committee. However, under the Bill that person must be an owner or an occupier of rural land.

Clause 53 provides that restrictive employment provisions will be inapplicable to membership of the board. I ask the Minister to state categorically in this House whether or not that clause will allow a member of Parliament to be a member of any of these boards and, if so, if a member of Parliament is appointed to one of the boards, will that member be able to be paid? I believe that that particular clause could allow a member of Parliament to take a position on a board and be paid for that position. I ask the Minister to state clearly and explicitly whether or not a member of Parliament can take a position on the Rabbit Board or the Rural Lands Protection Board and be paid for that position.

The reason I ask the Minister to state clearly the position is that the Opposition does not want a repeat of the Ian Henderson fiasco in this Parliament. The Minister should remember that if his people knew what they were doing when the honourable member for Mount Gravatt was appointed to the Griffith University, that fiasco would never have occurred. That is the reason why I ask that particular question.

Under this Bill, the department is being told that it must control declared plants and animals on land under its control. I have no objection to that provision. However, I do object to the provision that states that the Lands Department will not take that action in relation to any other land. On many occasions I have written to the Minister about my electorate and he has always answered that the Lands Department has too much land and could not possibly afford to clean up that land, but that he has no objection to adjoining owners doing the Government's job and paying for it.

Why will the Government take the responsibility for cleaning up its own land in rural areas but will not do so in residential areas and, indeed, in some areas in the middle of the city of Brisbane? The Government should undertake that responsibility and clean up that land when it is necessary that that be done.

The Opposition is also concerned about the provisions in the Bill that give an authorised person or inspector the right at any reasonable time, by virtue of and without other warrant than the provisions of this Bill, to enter upon any land and any premises on land in order to ascertain whether declared plants or animals are on those premises or in those premises.

The power of entry is something that no Government should give so freely. In the almost eight years that I have been in the Parliament, powers have increasingly been given to inspectors and authorised people. The committees set up under the Bill may appoint inspectors and other staff. It is wrong that those people should have the right of entry "at any reasonable time" "Reasonable time" is not defined, but I suppose it would be any time that the inspector considers to be reasonable. Those people may enter a property for inspection. The Parliament should be very wary of permitting such a provision in any legislation.

Earlier I spoke about committees. A provision of the Bill deals specifically with committees. A local authority which is directed by the Minister can set up a plague locust destruction committee for the area. If bureaucracy goes mad, I would like to know how many committees could be appointed and how many people would be paid under the legislation. Suppose a plague locust committee is set up in an area. That committee can appoint a secretary and has the right to employ such persons as it deems necessary. Really, the Government has gone mad, abrogating its responsibilities to a number of

committees. That should not happen. If the Government is serious about controlling quangos, it should take action.

Clause 141 gives power of entry to people who are appointed by a plague locust committee. The Minister may order a small local authority to set up a committee which, under the Bill, passes on authority enabling people to enter property to look for plague locusts. Once again, the power of entry is given to people who could run wild. We have all had experience of persons who, having been given too much authority, have been carried away with that authority.

The final provision in the legislation that I deal with relates to prohibited or declared plants and how such plants get into the country. The Australian customs and quarantine statement tells people to—

“ . . . read carefully and complete the statement.

If you do not understand any question, do not sign the statement.”

People are asked to tick a box indicating whether they have any—

“plants or parts of plants, live or dead, including fruits, nuts, seeds, bulbs, flowers, mushrooms, straw, bamboo, wooden articles or articles made of plant material”

I quote a letter from the Customs Service dealing with the statement that people are required to sign. It says—

“Each passenger may complete his or her own statement or a husband and wife travelling together may complete the one statement. In instances where the one statement is submitted to cover both husband and wife either one of them may sign the form.

You refer in your letter to Section 234 of the Customs Act. This section does refer to declarations and documents produced to officers.

‘234 (1) A person shall not—

- (e) Make in any declaration or document produced, given, delivered or furnished to any officer any statement which is untrue in any particular or produce, give, deliver or furnish to any officer any declaration or document containing any such statement;’.”

I am sure that any honourable member who has any common sense would know that I am about to refer to the fact that the Premier and Treasurer of this State brought through customs seeds that had not been declared on the quarantine form. The reason given by the wife of the Premier and Treasurer was reported in *The Courier-Mail* as follows—

“She said the Premier’s secretary had prepared the customs declaration forms on the plane, and apparently they were not signed.

‘This Customs fellow brought it out to me and said, “here will you sign this”.’ ”

The wife of the Premier and Treasurer is saying that, because a customs officer told her to sign it, she is then not responsible for whether the answers to the questions are correct. That is not right.

I point out that the wife of the Premier and Treasurer is not merely a Premier’s wife: she is a senator and, as such, is supposedly a law-maker of the nation. Senator Lady Bjelke-Petersen should be well aware of the responsibilities of people who sign their name. The effect of signing one’s name is that a statement is made about the information being correct.

The customs declaration form states that it can be signed on behalf of oneself or on behalf of one’s wife or husband. Therefore, the wife of the Premier and Treasurer signed the declaration on her own behalf and on behalf of her husband, and would have

signed the form to indicate that it was correct. I wish to emphasise that the act of signing is the important part.

What happened when the Premier and Treasurer and his wife brought the seeds into Australia? Instead of simply trying to explain, the Premier and Treasurer tried to show that the customs officials were victimising him by searching his bags. I draw it to the attention of all honourable members that the Premier and Treasurer had been found to have seeds in his bag that were not declared on the customs declaration form; yet he tried to say that he was being victimised because officials looked inside his bag. That is what the Premier and Treasurer said, and he made no mention about whether the form had been signed incorrectly or not.

Mr Menzel: I bet they did not look in Bob Hawke's bags when he got back from overseas.

Mr MACKENROTH: If that is the case, how did the Special Minister of State (Mr Mick Young) end up having to stand down from Cabinet? That would not have happened if Australia's Prime Minister did not expect the highest standards of his Ministers and officers.

The Federal Government stands condemned for not prosecuting the wife of the Premier and Treasurer for having signed a false declaration. I think also that the Federal Government was very weak in not having taken action against the wife of the Premier and Treasurer. That is what it should have done. The Federal Government should have taken the same action that Fraser took against Moore back in the days when Fraser was Prime Minister of a Liberal-Country Party Government; and it should have taken the same action as was taken by the present Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, previously. I think that the Premier and Treasurer got out of this problem very lightly.

What did the Premier and Treasurer then do? He stated that he had been embarrassed because he had to undergo a search—a search that every other person who comes into the country may have to go through. One might well ask why the customs officers searched his bags. That was because they knew that, in 1981, the Premier and Treasurer had been party to the importation of seeds into Australian.

Mr Menzel interjected.

Mr MACKENROTH: That is on the record, and the honourable member for Mulgrave can check it.

How can the Government expect the people of Queensland to do the right thing under the provisions of the Bill that is presently before the Parliament when the State's chief law-maker—

Mr Glasson: You are very dishonest.

Mr MACKENROTH: Tell me why I am dishonest.

Mr Glasson: Because you know very well that the Premier and Treasurer had no idea that the seeds were in his bag—it is such a simple thing to do—nor did his wife know that the seeds were in there. The seeds had been in there for months, and you know that very well.

Mr MACKENROTH: I would point out to the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police that it is not the responsibility of members of this Parliament to assert the innocence or guilt of the Premier and Treasurer. I believe that, under section 234 (1) (e) of the Customs Act, the declaration that was made was clearly false.

Mr Menzel: Why don't you come back to the Bill?

Mr MACKENROTH: I am speaking to the Bill. I am talking about seeds being brought into the country. I am thinking about the provisions of the Rural Lands Protection Act, and the fact that people do bring seeds into this country.

Section 234 (1) (e) of the Customs Act does not provide that a person must be aware of making a false declaration. It refers only to a person making a false declaration.

The Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police should be honest and answer this question: Did the Premier have seeds, and did the Premier's wife sign a declaration saying that he did not have seeds? That is what happened. There were seeds in the bag, and the Premier's wife signed the declaration saying that there were no seeds. In doing so, she made a false declaration.

It is not up to the Minister or me to pass judgment on that. The judgment should be made by a court. Under the Customs Act, the Premier's wife should have been charged for making a false declaration. She would then have had the opportunity to put forward her case. That should have been done; I am appalled that it was not done. I hope that the Premier does not get similar protection in the future.

Mr COOPER (Roma) (10.26 p.m.): I listened to the honourable member for Chatsworth. I do not intend to become quite as sidetracked as he became. In speaking to the Bill, I will refer to the barrier fence. Perhaps the honourable member for Chatsworth should join actors equity, because he performed fairly well.

Mr Mackenroth interjected.

Mr COOPER: The honourable member failed to mention Paddington Bear, but he did mention that quite a few Government members represent rural electorates.

The honourable member for Chatsworth also asked us to name——

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr COOPER: Does the honourable member intend to speak soon?

I repeat that the honourable member for Chatsworth asked Government members to name some areas in which the rural sector does pay its way. I assure him that rural sectors do pay their way and, in doing so, they may help the people in his electorate. Any assistance that the Government can give rural areas means lower costs of production and cheaper goods so that people in his electorate may live a little better. No-one should forget that the imposts foisted on the rural sector by the Federal Government cost each farmer in Australia about \$7,000 net a year. I am safe in saying that the rural sector more than pays its way. It is virtually keeping people such as the honourable member for Chatsworth.

In speaking to the Rural Lands Protection Bill, I will be referring to the barrier fence. The Minister, in his second reading speech, outlined clearly the purpose of the Bill. It has been long-awaited by industry and local government. The Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board is anxious to have it in place. I welcome the fact that it is going through tonight.

In brief, the Bill is designed to bring all legislation relative to land protection or pest control under one Act. It will blend legislation covering stock routes, the barrier fence, plague grasshoppers, rabbits and other facets of rural land protection. It will introduce a system whereby vermin and noxious plants will be categorised according to the degree of control required. To give examples, water hyacinth west of the range might be categorised as requiring eradication; groundsel infestation might require reduction; and the spread of parthenium might have to be prevented beyond a particular area. Similarly, animals such as rabbits may have to be eradicated, and the numbers of others such as dingoes, might have to be reduced. Animals such as marsupials might come under a management program.

Regulations will cover the use of poisons, the management of the barrier fence, local authority precepts and rabbit and locust control.

Some local authorities have been concerned about rabbit precepts. My own local authority is one of them. Because we do not have many rabbits, the local authority believes that it should not be paying a precept to control their future spread.

I well remember the rabbit plagues that hit this State back in the 1940s and 1950s and the damage that they caused to pastures. We must remain vigilant. We must never allow those outbreaks to occur again.

I remember the costly methods that were used to control the pests—trapping, poisoning and shooting, and the introduction of myxomatosis, which broke the back of the rabbit plague. We must learn from past lessons and remain vigilant. Therefore, I believe that precepts are warranted.

I will speak briefly about the dingo barrier fence. I am fully aware that, in the past, it has been a controversial issue. It has been likened to the Berlin Wall or to the Great Wall of China. It used to meander across three States for about 8 500 km. It was first built in the 1880s to control rabbits. In 1914, it was reconstructed to control the dingo. The country over which it meandered was extremely rugged. It was desert and forest country. It was subject to flooding, fire and the build-up of sand dunes.

Because of the damage done by pigs and kangaroos, the fence fell into a shocking state of disrepair. A big decision had to be made whether to realign and reconstruct it. That split the industry for a time. Being the vice-president of the Maranoa Graziers Association, I was involved in the discussions. I was opposed to the reconstruction of the fence, but a decision was taken to realign and reconstruct the fence and, after that happened, I got behind the proposal and supported it.

At present, the reconstruction is in its final stages. The department and the board have borrowed about \$320,000 to complete the link from Tambo to Adavale. Contracts have already been let to complete the Stanthorpe spur line. That will cut off forests and orchard areas from sheep areas. The fence, which has been reduced in length to 2 800 km, should be fully reconstructed by early 1986.

Now that the decision has been taken and money has been spent to realign and reconstruct the fence, maintenance will be absolutely vital. Without maintenance, the whole exercise will be pointless. Sixteen to 25 permanent patrolmen will be employed to grade either side of the fence and to keep regrowth under control. They will have to keep the fence in a good state of repair to stop dingoes coming from the north into the safer sheep areas in the south. Of course, they will be poisoning with 1080 in selected areas on both sides of the fence.

Land-owners will have to accept their share of responsibility. They will still have to take their own measures within the barrier fence. They will have to construct their own fences. Some of them are already using electric fences. Some will use the netting fences that are already in existence. Of course, they will have to continue with baiting.

As a matter of interest, the total cost of reconstruction is expected to be about \$3.5m. Those costs are shared by the rate-payers and land-owners, and the Government will make a contribution. In the next year, maintenance is expected to cost between \$500,000 and \$600,000.

Control of dogs will still be required, mainly by 1080 baiting. I have had quite a bit to do with that. The present method of baiting can be quite inconvenient. A new method has been trialled and it could be brought into use shortly. I am looking forward to it. The new method will involve the use of beef crackling, that is, brisket fat, whale oil, ant repellent and mercury, which will prevent the bait from rotting too quickly. Of course, there will also be some 1080.

Mr Davis: You will also lose quite a lot of natural fauna.

Mr COOPER: No. The baiting is fully under control. There are no problems. The department and the land-owners are extremely careful with 1080. As I have used it and

as the honourable member has not, I think that I am in a better position to say what the effect will be.

Roughly 60 000 baits were trialled from Hughenden down to south-western Queensland, and questionnaires were sent out to property-owners to evaluate the success or otherwise of the trial. It appears that the trial has been reasonably successful, and to that end, the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board has ordered 1 million baits from Western Australia, which will be carefully distributed to regional inspectors. Properties will have to be of a certain size and meet other criteria—for example, they cannot be too close to a town—before the baits will be issued. In some areas, syndication of properties may be permitted. The baits will come in packs of about 500 costing \$25 a pack or 5c a bait. They will have a longer life than the baits in use but will dissolve in three months and with moisture. The new baits will be more convenient than the current method, and I look forward to using them myself.

Mr Davis: How big is your property?

Mr COOPER: It is big enough to qualify here.

Mr Davis: I would just like to know.

Mr COOPER: Perhaps the honourable member would like to work it out in hectares.

Mr Davis: Hectares or acres—it doesn't matter to me.

Mr COOPER: 11 500 acres.

A new unit system of funding the board's operations will be introduced, each unit costing about \$1,000. The number of units that local authorities will be charged will depend on the location of the shires and the problems within the shires. Some may have problems with parthenium weed, others with rabbits, dingoes, noxious weeds and feral animals. The number of units needed by each local authority will be assessed accordingly, and local authorities should not pay much more than they do at present.

Some shires may be asked to contribute towards the cost of the spread of a particular weed, for example, parthenium weed. In March of last year, I spoke in this place about the gall-forming moth, hoping that it would be successful in combating the spread of the weed. It is well-known that the honourable member for Peak Downs (Mr Lester) was known as the member for parthenium weed. I am sure that he will be extremely pleased to know that the gall-forming moth is spreading. Heavy infestation of the moth has been reported in the Peak Downs region and in the Emerald, Bauhinia and Duinga shires. Lighter infestation has been reported from the Charters Towers and Nebo areas south to Roma. That is good news.

The gall-forming moth has also taken to noogoora burr, which is a relative of parthenium weed. The effect will be two-fold. The moth will attack noogoora burr, which acts as a host, enabling the moth to attack parthenium weed, or it will attack the parthenium weed first. With a good spring coming up, the spread should continue. Parthenium weed has caused tremendous problems in the central west and northern areas.

I commend the work of Dr Rachel McFadyen and others involved in the Fletcher Research Station's experiments. They have continued their research in this particular field and are experimenting in other areas. This experimentation has meant a tremendous cost-saving to land-owners and is of enormous benefit. I hope that it will continue. On behalf of the industry, I thank them sincerely for their work.

This Bill is very intricate and of tremendous importance to the rural sector.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr COOPER: I am well aware of the opinion of the honourable member for Brisbane Central of the rural sector.

Mr Stoneman: Anti-rural, they are.

Mr COOPER: I know that the Labor Party is anti-rural, so I will take the honourable member's comments with a grain of salt.

I commend the committee chaired by Mr W. F. Smith for its report and I commend the board, local authorities, the industry and the Minister and his department for their contributions. I would not for one moment forget to mention the chairman of that board, Mr David Cory, who is reasonably well known in this place. He has been waiting for this Bill to be dealt with. I am sure he will be enormously pleased. I also commend the work of Mr Doug Grant, the executive director of the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Division. The Bill will be welcomed by the industry and I ask honourable members to support it.

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (10.41 p.m.): In his second-reading speech the Minister said—

“The present Bill proposes that a single precept be imposed on local authorities. Amounts levied on individual shires will be assessed from year to year depending on pest problems in their area and the level of control activity proposed. A flexible contribution from consolidated revenue towards board activities will also be available from year to year.”

The Government does not have a very good track record in helping local authorities by making money available. All honourable members would be aware of the current economic trend in rural industries and would be familiar with the problems associated with flora and fauna that are mentioned in the Bill. Areas of rich agricultural land, such as exist in my electorate, naturally produce a bigger problem with weeds and pests, and I instance wild tobacco, lantana, wild sunflower, noogoora burr, bindii, parthenium weed and giant sensitive weed, which the Government and local authorities have been trying to eradicate for many years. Also in my electorate is what is known as the giant South African snail.

After the Bill is passed by this House, it is still subject to amendment. Under the legislation the board has a great deal of power to declare pests and invertebrates. That brings to mind that, because a particular wildflower grew in one area of Western Australia, under legislation in that State a declaration was issued on that land. Because of that, the farmer who owned the land was stopped from working it. Although that farmer owned a large piece of land, what he was left with after the Government made its special declaration to preserve those wildflowers was not enough for him to make a living. Because the piece of land that he was left with was surrounded by the area of wildflowers, nobody wanted to buy that land. I notice that, in the legislation under consideration, the National Parks and Wildlife Service has an input, and that is as it should be, but I am a little afraid that, in years to come and as times get harder, the board or some other organisation could pressure the Government to declare a plant as being a noxious weed or some animal as a pest, which would throw the onus of eradication onto local authorities and land-holders.

The Minister would be aware of the problems with noogoora burr. In the Gulf country I have seen creeks that are lousy with it. Short of spending a couple of million dollars, there is no way that that burr could be eradicated in a short period. A similar problem exists with the giant sensitive weed, which people of the north have been trying to eradicate for years. Although to some extent it can be kept under control by local authorities serving notices on farmers who are not prepared to control it, there must be good follow-up action because, once that plant seeds, the seed stays in the ground for years and years. I travelled that area when I worked for one of the electricity boards, and we used to come across that pest and report it to the local authorities.

My point is that I am wondering if, at some future date, the provisions of the Bill might get out of hand. The Government might find itself in the position of having to relax the provisions of the Bill simply because enforcement of its provisions would put

farmers out of business. That is my main concern. My other concern is that to enforce the provisions of the legislation may place a load on local authorities, which are already feeling the pinch.

Local authorities are the largest owners of road in Queensland. Weeds do grow on roads. I would like the Minister to cover that matter in his reply.

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Condamine) (10.45 p.m.): I rise to support the Minister in the passage of the Rural Lands Protection Bill through the House. No matter which rural endeavour one follows, there are always pests to overcome. In the wool industry, they are worms, lice, dingoes, feral pigs and many diseases. The grain industry has its weeds, rust, birds, pigs and kangaroos.

Successful management—even the viability of a project—very often depends upon the effective control of the pests associated with that project. In most cases, the control is possible, but not always easy, on a farm-to-farm basis. However, other types of plant and insect pests threaten whole areas and whole industries. The control of such pests requires a co-ordinated approach. To effect such an approach, it is necessary to have either State or Federal Government legislation.

Although most people in an area may undertake to eradicate a pest, there are, unfortunately, some individuals who do not take the trouble to eradicate the same pest on their properties and, as a result, those properties remain a constant source of infestation for a whole area.

For example, right in the middle of a farming area one property may be engaged in grazing. The land may be only partially cleared, and the presence of pests on the grazing property may present a continual source of infestation to the neighbours; yet the existence of that pest does not necessarily mean that the property-owner himself is disadvantaged by its presence.

The presence of stramonium, which is a poisonous plant, can cause whole truckloads of valuable grain to be condemned; yet the same plant causes no threat to graziers. If the grazier's land harbours stramonium, the seeds can be borne by water, wind, animals or birds to infest neighbouring properties. The farmers on properties surrounding that infested grazing block may be very vigilant in the eradication of such a weed on their properties. They may even seek the co-operation of the grazier. However, unless he agrees to co-operate, his land can continue to be a threat. Such situations have precipitated the legislation that is before the House.

Various laws and Acts have been enacted by earlier Parliaments. This Bill is yet another refinement of the same thrust to isolate, eradicate or control pests, and it is to be supported.

The Bill is realistic in that it recognises that in some areas it is possible to eradicate a pest totally, whereas in other areas a pest may be so widespread that it is possible only to prevent its spread to other areas. In fact, a pest that can be eradicated completely in one area may exist in another area and be impossible to eradicate completely in the second area. The Bill addresses itself to both those problems. Its contents have been carefully compiled by experienced departmental officers in co-operation with representatives of rural industries and local government.

The Bill combines four separate Acts into one piece of legislation to make the enforcement of their provisions and the management of our rural lands more efficient. The Acts incorporated within this Bill are the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Act, the Plague Grasshoppers Extermination Act, the Barrier Fences Act and the Rabbit Act. The Bill also incorporates the Smith report recommendations, concepts from interstate legislation, board resolutions and suggestions from organisations and Government departments.

The terminology in the Bill includes “declared animals” and “declared plants” These are then given a particular category of control required. The plant categories cover

eradication, reduction and prevention from spread beyond a particular area. For animals, the categories of control are eradication, reduction in number and subject to management.

In addition, to complement these categories and to effect the desired protection, the movement interstate or intrastate of specified animals or plants can be either prohibited or allowed under specific controls. Likewise, keeping and selling of plants may be totally prohibited or allowed subject to prescribed conditions. I hasten to add that animals under the control of the Fauna Act and indigenous to Australia cannot be declared in any circumstances.

The Bill also proposes remedies to faults detected in the existing pieces of legislation. For example, where whole shires were bound to be in one prescribed area, the new Act will enable parts of a shire to be prescribed, while the rest of the shire can be free of such prescription.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: What can be done about all these pests, particularly the ones on that side of the House?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: The honourable member is extremely lucky that the barrier fence was erected. It stopped the spread of myxomatosis in rabbits, which would have wiped out a few Opposition members.

The control of pests on Crown land has often been the cause of dissent. Under the Act, the Crown or the lessees of Crown land are treated the same as any other land-owner and are subject to the provisions of the Bill. Obviously, penalty clauses have to be written in to enable the legislation to have power. I am of the opinion that these clauses are comprehensive.

Some powers will be enforced on unwilling, unco-operative land-owners. However, it must be remembered that all land-owners have a responsibility to protect their lands for the common good of all land-owners. That being the case, a degree of compulsion is necessary.

Funding of the management of the Act obviously must come from land-owners. It is an application of the principle of the user pays. A precept will be collected from local authorities to fund the board. In turn, local authorities must collect these funds from land-owners in the shires. The shires have the power to vary the level of contribution within the shires, allowing for a variation in contribution if different parts of a shire are declared to be in different categories of pest-infested areas.

The wide co-ordinated approach made possible by the Bill has effected some magnificent successes in Queensland. I am reminded of the battle against prickly pear in the 1920s and 1930s. That succulent plant spread over millions of acres of land in Queensland and seemed uncontrollable. The scientific research led by Dr Mann, coupled with the actions of the then Government and the co-operation of land-owners, saw land rendered useless returned to profitable use.

It is interesting to note that the insect called cactoblastis is remembered in Queensland with great affection, particularly in the Chinchilla district where the Cactoblastis Memorial Hall was built as a memorial to the insect. I believe that it stands as a tribute to the efforts of those responsible for such a marvellous biological-control success. By way of coincidence, the Cactoblastis Memorial Hall at Boonarga will celebrate its golden jubilee in February of 1986. The highly developed agricultural land surrounding the hall today bears no resemblance to the same area over 50 years ago when it was completely covered with pear.

In more recent times, the erection of the dingo barrier fence and the rabbit fence is a fine example of co-operative effort that has offered control over pests that threatened huge tracts of ground.

Currently, parthenium weed poses great problems to grazing lands in central Queensland. However, its spread is being curtailed and, in the Darling Downs and

western downs, officers of the Lands Department have a policy of complete eradication which, to date, has been highly successful.

In addition to these publicised pests, many lesser stands of various plants are detected by officers who immediately carry out control measures and closely monitor the site for a considerable time afterwards to ensure that an outbreak does not recur.

In 1984 I attended a symposium organised by the Lands Department. The purpose of that symposium was to provide an education service to land-owners. The symposium covered such subjects as—

- safety measures in using chemicals;
- methods of application of chemicals;
- identification of pests;
- instruction in categories of control; and
- plants that infest watercourses.

It was pleasing to see land-owners from a wide area attend the symposium. The officers were obviously highly skilled and capable of gaining the confidence of land-owners with their practical approach to their work. If such a symposium is an example of the quality of control this Bill can provide and indicates the level of acceptance of the existing control measures that have been enacted, I have every confidence that the Rural Lands Protection Bill will provide an even better level of protection in the future.

I support the Bill.

Hon. W. H. GLASSON (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police) (10.54 p.m.), in reply: I thank all honourable members who made a contribution to the debate. As the title of the Bill indicates, the role of the Rural Lands Protection Bill is to amalgamate four Acts that were already in place, that is, the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Act, the Barrier Fences Act, the Plague Grasshoppers Extermination Act and the Rabbit Act. Those Acts come under the control of the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board. I congratulate that board for its preparation of the Bill. It has taken a considerable period to prepare, and no effort has been spared to perfect it. It has been shown to branches of the Local Government Associations throughout the State, so any concern that has been expressed tonight regarding that association has been well canvassed. Indeed, its input into the Bill was very full. Every industry in the State of Queensland has received a copy of the Bill and has expressed a view. The Bill has been given full support. I see no reason to pursue the matter further.

I shall comment on two matters raised by the member for Chatsworth. He referred to clause 35, which relates to the constitution of the board. I give an unqualified assurance that no member of Parliament will be appointed to any such board. He referred also to clause 141, which deals with power of entry. It would be impossible to administer any legislation, but particularly that which is to keep rural lands free of vegetable and animal pests, if it were not clothed with the power of entry.

I thank the members for Condamine and Roma for their contributions. They have a thorough appreciation of the intent of the legislation. The member for Mourilyan expressed concern, but I assure him that he has nothing to worry about in the legislation.

Motion (Mr Glasson) agreed to.

Committee

Mr Menzel (Mulgrave) in the chair; Hon. W. H. Glasson (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 34, as read, agreed to.

Clause 35—Membership of Rabbit Board—

Mr GLASSON (10.58 p.m.): The amendments are occasioned by the fact that the legislation was not in place when appointments were made to various positions. The amendments are to formalise and put in place the legality of the Bill in total. Therefore, I move the following amendments—

“At page 21, line 25, omit the expression—

‘(1) The’

and substitute the expression—

‘(1) Until the expiration of 30 June, 1988 the Rabbit Board shall consist of those persons who were members of that board under the Rabbit Act 1964-1984 immediately before the commencement of this Act.

(2) On and after 1 July, 1988 the’ ”;

“At page 21, line 33, omit the expression—

‘(4)’

and substitute the expression—

‘(5)’ ”;

“At page 21, line 38, omit the expression—

‘(4)’

and substitute the expression—

‘(5)’ ”;

“At page 22, line 1, omit the expression—

‘(2)’

and substitute the expression—

‘(3)’ ”;

“At page 22, line 2, omit the expression—

‘(1)’

and substitute the expression—

‘(2)’ ”;

“At page 22, line 5, omit the expression—

‘(3)’

and substitute the expression—

‘(4)’ ”;

“At page 22, line 6, omit the word—

‘division’

and substitute the word—

‘divisions’ ”;

“At page 22, line 8, omit the expression—

‘(4)’

and substitute the expression—

‘(5)’ ”;

“At page 22, line 11, omit the expression—

‘(1)’

and substitute the expression—

‘(2)’.”

Amendments (Mr Glasson) agreed to.

Clause 35, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 36—Appointment and term of office of members—

Mr GLASSON (11.2 p.m.): I move the following amendments—

“At page 22, line 13, omit the words—

‘of the Rabbit Board, other than the member *ex officio*,’

and substitute the words—

‘, other than the member *ex officio*, by whom the Rabbit Board is to be constituted on and after 1 July, 1988’ ”;

“At page 22, line 17, omit the words—

‘take effect on and from 1 July 1985’

and substitute the words—

‘be made before 1 July, 1988’ ”;

“At page 22, line 21, omit the expression—

‘35 (1)’

and substitute the expression—

‘35 (2).’ ”

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 36, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 37—Qualifications of members—

Mr GLASSON (11.3 p.m.): I move the following amendments—

“At page 22, line 35, omit the expression—

‘35 (1)’

and substitute the expression—

‘35 (2)’ ”;

“At page 22, line 41, omit the expression—

‘(1)’

and substitute the expression—

‘(2)’ ”;

“At page 23, line 1, omit the expression—

‘35 (1)’

and substitute the expression—

‘35 (2).’ ”

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 37, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 38—Vacating member’s office—

Mr GLASSON (11.4 p.m.): I move the following amendments—

“At page 23, after line 23, insert the following words—

‘(d) in the case of a member appointed by section 35 (1), if he, in relation to the office of member held by him, ceases to be qualified as prescribed by section 17 of the Rabbit Act 1964-1984,’ ”;

“At page 23, line 24, omit the expression—

‘(d)’

and substitute the words—

‘(e) in the case of a member appointed pursuant to section 36,’ ”;

“At page 23, line 26, omit the expression—

‘(e)’

and substitute the expression—

‘(f)’ ”;

“At page 23, line 29, omit the expression—

‘(3) (e)’

and substitute the expression—

‘(3) (f)’.”

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 38, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 39—Casual vacancy in member’s office—

Mr GLASSON (11.5 p.m.) I move the following amendments—

“At page 24, line 8, omit the words—

‘is qualified as prescribed by section 37 (1) may’

and substitute the words—

‘is—

(a) in a case where the member was appointed by section 35 (1), qualified as prescribed by section 17 of the Rabbit Act 1964-1984;

(b) in a case where the member was appointed pursuant to section 36, qualified as prescribed by section 37 (1),

may’ ”;

“At page 24, after line 13, insert the following words—

‘(4) For the purposes of section 38 (3) (d) and subsection (2) (a) of this section the provisions of the Rabbit Act 1964-1984 shall continue to apply as if this Act had not commenced.’ ”

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 39, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 40—Chairman—

Mr GLASSON (11.6 p.m.): I move the following amendments—

“At page 24, line 14, omit the expression—

‘(1) The’

and substitute the words—

‘(1) Until the expiration of 30 June, 1988 the chairman of the Rabbit Board shall be the person who at the commencement of this Act holds that office.

(2) After the expiration of 30 June, 1988 the’ ”;

“At page 24, line 16, omit the expression—

‘1 July 1985’

and substitute the words—

‘that date’ ”;

“At page 24, line 19, omit the expression—

‘(2)’

and substitute the expression—

‘(3)’ ”;

“At page 24, line 19, after the word ‘chairman’ insert the words—

‘at any time after the commencement of this Act.’”

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 40, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 41 to 257, and schedules 1 to 3, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, with amendments.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr Glasson, by leave, read a third time.

The House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.