

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 8 MARCH 1988

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

QUEENSLAND



PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[HANSARD]

Legislative Assembly

FIRST SESSION OF THE FORTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT—continued

(Fourth Period)

TUESDAY, 8 MARCH 1988

Under the provisions of the motion for special adjournment agreed to by the House on 2 December 1987, the House met at 10 a.m.

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. L. W. Powell, Isis) read prayers and took the chair.

COMMISSION TO ADMINISTER OATH

Mr SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor has been pleased to issue a Commission under the public seal of the State empowering me to administer the oath or affirmation of allegiance to such members as might hereafter present themselves to be sworn.

Commission thereupon read by the Clerk.

ELECTIONS TRIBUNAL

Judge for 1988

Mr SPEAKER: I have to report that I have received a letter from the Honourable the Chief Justice notifying that the Honourable Mr Justice James Burrows Thomas will be the judge to preside at the sittings of the Elections Tribunal for 1988.

PAPERS PRINTED DURING RECESS

Mr SPEAKER: I have to report that the following papers were ordered to be printed and circulated during the recess, in accordance with the resolution of Parliament passed during the session of 1901—

Reports—

Rural Lands Protection Board 1986-1987
 Department of Mines 1986-1987
 Queensland State Service Superannuation Board 1986-1987
 Department of Forestry 1986-1987
 Department of Family and Youth Services 1986-1987.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Changes in Ministry; Leader of the House; Government Deputy Whip

Hon. M. J. AHERN (Landsborough—Premier and Treasurer and Minister for the Arts) (10.04 a.m.), by leave: I desire to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor on 9 December 1987—

(a) Accepted the resignation of the Honourable Michael John Ahern, B.Agr.Sc. as—

Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing of Queensland;
 Minister for Transport of Queensland;
 Minister for Education, Training and Technology of Queensland;
 Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services of Queensland;
 Minister for Tourism, National Parks and Sport of Queensland;
 Minister for Family Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs of Queensland;
 Minister for Justice and Attorney-General of Queensland; and
 Minister for Health and Environment of Queensland;

accepted the resignation of the Honourable William Angus Manson Gunn as—

Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police of Queensland;
 Minister for Works, Housing and Industry of Queensland;
 Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying of Queensland;
 Minister for Employment, Small Business and Industrial Affairs of Queensland;
 Minister for Primary Industries of Queensland;
 Minister for Northern Development and Community Services of Queensland;
 Minister for Corrective Services, Administrative Services and Valuation of Queensland; and
 Minister for Mines and Energy and Minister for the Arts of Queensland;

(b) Appointed—

Ivan James Gibbs, Esquire,
 William Hamline Glasson, Esquire,
 Brian Douglas Austin, Dip.CE, MIEAust., Esquire,
 Vincent Patrick Lester, Esquire,
 Martin James Tenni, Esquire,
 Neville John Harper, Esquire,
 Geoffrey Hugh Muntz, AAIV, Esquire,
 Peter Richard McKechnie, Esquire,

Robert Carl Katter, Esquire,
Donald McConnell Neal, Esquire,
Paul John Clauson, Solicitor, Esquire,
Robert Edward Borbidge, Esquire,
James Henry Randell, Esquire,
Theo Russell Cooper, Esquire,
Mrs Leisha Teresa Harvey, B.A., Dip.Teach,
Brian George Littleproud, Esquire

to be Members of the Executive Council of Queensland;

(c) Appointed—

- the Honourable Michael John Ahern, B.Agr.Sc., Premier and Treasurer of Queensland to be Minister for the Arts of Queensland;
- the Honourable William Angus Manson Gunn to be Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works, Main Roads and Expo and Minister for Police of Queensland;
- the Honourable Ivan James Gibbs to be Minister for Transport of Queensland;
- the Honourable William Hamline Glasson to be Minister for Land Management of Queensland;
- the Honourable Brian Douglas Austin, Dip.C.E., MIEAust., to be Minister for Finance and Minister Assisting the Premier and Treasurer of Queensland;
- the Honourable Vincent Patrick Lester to be Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Affairs of Queensland;
- the Honourable Martin James Tenni to be Minister for Mines and Energy of Queensland;
- the Honourable Neville John Harper to be Minister for Primary Industries of Queensland;
- the Honourable Geoffrey Hugh Muntz, AAIV, to be Minister for Environment, Conservation and Tourism of Queensland;
- the Honourable Peter Richard McKechnie to be Minister for Family Services and Welfare Housing of Queensland;
- the Honourable Robert Carl Katter to be Minister for Northern Development, Community Services and Ethnic Affairs of Queensland;
- the Honourable Donald McConnell Neal to be Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services of Queensland;
- the Honourable Paul John Clauson, Solicitor, to be Minister for Justice and Attorney-General of Queensland;
- the Honourable Robert Edward Borbidge to be Minister for Industry, Small Business, Communications and Technology of Queensland;
- the Honourable James Henry Randell to be Minister for Local Government and Racing of Queensland;
- the Honourable Theo Russell Cooper to be Minister for Corrective Services and Administrative Services of Queensland;
- the Honourable Leisha Teresa Harvey, B.A., Dip.Teach, to be Minister for Health of Queensland; and
- the Honourable Brian George Littleproud to be Minister for Education, Youth and Sport of Queensland.

I lay upon the table of the House a copy of the *Queensland Government Gazette* of 9 December 1987 containing the relevant notifications.

I desire to inform the House that arrangements have been made, and the Honourable the Speaker informed accordingly, for the Honourable Brian Douglas Austin, Dip.CE, MIEAust., Minister for Finance and Minister Assisting the Premier and Treasurer, to be Leader of the House.

I desire also to inform the House that Leonard William Stephan, member for Gympie, has been elected Government Deputy Whip.

Whereupon the honourable member laid on the table the document referred to.

OPPOSITION APPOINTMENTS

Mr GOSS (Logan—Leader of the Opposition) (10.09 a.m.): I have the honour to inform the House that I have been elected by the parliamentary Labor Party to be Leader of the Opposition in this House. For the information of honourable members, I table a list of the parliamentary Labor Party shadow Ministers and their portfolio responsibilities, and I seek leave to have that incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

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

Queensland Parliamentary Labor Party—Shadow Ministry

- W. K. Goss, Member for Logan—
Opposition Leader, Shadow Treasurer and The Arts
- T. J. Burns, Member for Lytton—
Deputy Opposition Leader, Police and Main Roads
- P. J. Braddy, Member for Rockhampton—
Justice and Attorney-General, Community Services
- E. D. Casey, Member for Mackay—
Primary Industries
- P. Comben, Member for Windsor—
Health, Environment and Conservation
- W. T. D'Arcy, Member for Woodridge—
Tourism, Sport and Racing
- K. E. De Lacy, Member for Cairns—
Finance
- A. G. Eaton, Member for Mourilyan—
Land Management and Forestry
- R. J. Gibbs, Member for Wolston—
Mines and Energy
- D. J. Hamill, Member for Ipswich—
Education and Youth
- T. M. Mackenroth, Member for Chatsworth—
Works, Welfare Housing and Family Services
- K. V. McElligott, Member for Thuringowa—
Regional and Northern Development and Small Business
- R. T. McLean, Member for Bulimba—
Water Resources and Maritime Services
- G. R. Milliner, Member for Everton—
Industry, Communications, Technology and Consumer Affairs
- E. F. Shaw, Member for Manly—
Local Government and Expo
- G. N. Smith, Member for Townsville East—
Corrective Services and Administrative Services
- D. F. Underwood, Member for Ipswich West—
Transport
- K. H. Vaughan, Member for Nudgee—
Employment, Training and Industrial Affairs

LIBERAL PARTY APPOINTMENTS

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (10.10 a.m.): It is my honour to inform the House that on 31 January 1988 the member for Nundah tendered his resignation as the Leader of the parliamentary Liberal Party, I was elected as Leader and the member for Mount Isa was elected as Deputy Leader.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table, and ordered to be printed—

Reports—

Premier's Department for the year ended 30 June, 1987

The Board of Professional Engineers of Queensland for the year ended 30 June, 1987

Board of Architects of Queensland for the year ended 30 June, 1987

Queensland State Emergency Service for the year ended 30 June, 1987

Queensland Police Superannuation Board for the year ended 30 June, 1987

Department of the Valuer-General for the year ended 30 June, 1987

The following papers were laid on the table—

Proclamations under—

Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act and Another Act Amendment Act 1987

Stock Act Amendment Act 1987

Sugar Acquisition Act 1915-1987

Forestry Act 1959-1984

Forestry Act 1959-1987

Forestry Act Amendment Act 1987

Queensland Marine Act Amendment Act 1981-1985

Queensland Marine Act and Another Act Amendment Act 1985

Orders in Council under—

State Development and Public Works Organization Act 1971-1981

Firearms and Offensive Weapons Act 1979-1986

Urban Public Passenger Transport Act 1984 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Industry and Commerce Training Act 1979-1987

Workers' Compensation Act 1916-1986

Rural Training Schools Act 1965-1984 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Electricity Act 1976-1986

Explosives Act 1952-1981

Mines Regulations Act 1964-1983

Mining (Fossicking) Act 1985

Petroleum Act 1923-1986

City of Brisbane Market Act 1960-1986 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1985

City of Brisbane Market Act 1960-1986 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Deer Farming Act 1985

Fisheries Act 1976-1984
Primary Producers' Co-operative Associations Act 1923-1986
Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act 1926-1987
Queensland Grain Handling Act 1983-1986
Stock Act 1915-1987
Veterinary Surgeons Act 1936-1986
Fauna Conservation Act 1974-1985
Forestry Act 1959-1984
Forestry Act 1959-1987
Land Act 1962-1987
National Parks and Wildlife Act 1975-1984
Harbours Act 1955-1982
Harbours Act 1955-1982 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984
Harbours Act 1955-1987
Harbours Act 1955-1987 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984
Canals Act 1958-1987
Irrigation Act 1922-1986 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984
Irrigation Act 1922-1986, the Water Act 1926-1987 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984
River Improvement Trust Act 1940-1985 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984
Townsville/Thuringowa Water Supply Board Act 1987 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984
Water Act 1926-1987
Water Act 1926-1987 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Regulations under—

Professional Engineers Act 1929-1975
Main Roads Act 1920-1985
Firearms and Offensive Weapons Act 1979-1986
Second-hand Dealers and Collectors Act 1984-1985
Pawn-brokers Act 1984-1985
Hawkers Act 1984-1985
Traffic Act 1949-1985
State Transport Act 1960-1985
Valuers Registration Act 1965-1985
Surveyors Act 1977-1987
Industry and Commerce Training Act 1979-1987
Electricity Act 1976-1986
Explosives Act 1952-1981
Petroleum Act 1923-1986
Fisheries Act 1976-1984
Fishing Industry Organisation and Marketing Act 1982-1987

Fruit Marketing Organisation Act 1923-1985
Hen Quotas Act 1973-1987
Milk Supply Act 1977-1986
Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act 1926-1987
Stock Act 1915-1987
Clean Air Act 1963-1987
Fauna Conservation Act 1974-1985
National Parks and Wildlife Act 1975-1984
Queensland Marine Act 1958-1985
Irrigation Act 1922-1986
Water Act 1926-1987

By-laws under—

Wheat Pool Act 1920-1986
Harbours Act 1955-1987

Rules of Court under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1961-1987

Reports—

National Crime Authority for the year ended 30 June, 1987
Barley Marketing Board for the year ended 30 June, 1987
Queensland Barley Growers' Co-operative Association Limited for the year ended 30 June, 1987
Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing for the year ended 30 June, 1987
Director of Marketing for the year ended 30 June, 1987
Grain Research Foundation for the year ended 30 June, 1987
Lower Burdekin Rice Producers' Co-operative Association Limited for the year ended 30 June, 1987
Queensland Fish Management Authority for the year ended 30 June, 1987
Rice Marketing Board for the year ended 30 June, 1987
South Queensland Commercial Egg Producers' Organisation for the year ended 30 June, 1987
Queensland Fish Board for the period 1 July, 1986 to 5 September, 1987
River Improvement Trusts for the year ended 30 June, 1987
Water Boards for the year ended 30 June, 1987
Drainage Boards for the year ended 30 June, 1987
Bore Water Boards for the year ended 30 June, 1987.

PANEL OF TEMPORARY CHAIRMEN

Resignation of Mrs L. T. Harvey; Nomination of Mr T. A. Burreket

Mr SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received the resignation of Mrs Leisha Teresa Harvey, member for Greenslopes, from the panel of Temporary Chairmen of Committees.

Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order No. 13, I nominate Mr Tony Anthony Burreket, member for Townsville, to fill the vacancy.

LIBRARY, PARLIAMENTARY BUILDINGS, PRINTING AND REFRESHMENT ROOMS COMMITTEES

Resignation of Members

Mr SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received from (a) Mr Brian George Littleproud his resignation as a member of the Library Committee, (b) Mr Robert Edward Borbidge his resignation as a member of the Parliamentary Buildings Committee, (c) Mrs Leisha Teresa Harvey her resignation as a member of the Printing Committee and (d) Mrs Leisha Teresa Harvey her resignation as a member of the Refreshment Rooms Committee.

Appointment of Members

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Nicklin—Leader of the House) (10.20 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That—

- (a) Mr Gordon Leslie Simpson, member for the electoral district of Cooroora, be appointed a member of the Library Committee to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr Brian George Littleproud;
- (b) Mr Michael Desmond Veivers, member for the electoral district of Southport, be appointed a member of the Parliamentary Buildings Committee to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr Robert Edward Borbidge;
- (c) Mr Huan Donald John Fraser, member for the electoral district of Springwood, be appointed a member of the Printing Committee to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mrs Leisha Teresa Harvey; and
- (d) Mrs Yvonne Ann Chapman, member for the electoral district of Pine Rivers, be appointed a member of the Refreshment Rooms Committee to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mrs Leisha Teresa Harvey.”

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Queensland Economy

Hon. M. J. AHERN (Landsborough—Premier and Treasurer and Minister for the Arts) (10.22 a.m.), by leave: It is appropriate that at the beginning of this first full parliamentary session under my administration I report to honourable members on the state of the Queensland economy and its future prospects. This statement also provides a backdrop to the formulation of a comprehensive State economic development strategy which will be the centre-piece of my Government’s economic platform.

Let me emphasise at the outset that our economy is fundamentally sound. Over a period of some 15 to 20 years, we have seen remarkable expansion and diversification of the Queensland economy—highlighted by large-scale growth in mining, manufacturing and service industries which has reduced our previous dependence on the rural sector, although its importance is still high. However, in the national and international economic environment in which we now find ourselves, it is essential to reassess our strategies and focus attention on those areas in which we have the greatest potential for development in the future.

Queensland is currently experiencing a period of consolidation, following the rapid expansion of the early 1980s which enabled the State to establish a higher base of economic activity than that previously attained. Throughout this period, Queensland consistently achieved higher rates of population growth and economic growth than those for Australia as a whole.

Recently, because of our export orientation, we have been more affected than other States by depressed commodity prices. Much of the State has also been afflicted by drought conditions. Nevertheless, the economic fundamentals remain sound, and our recent performance reflects our underlying economic strength. In this regard, at the end of my statement I will table a paper that shows that, compared with our population share of 16.5 per cent, Queensland is making an above-average contribution to Australia's economic performance for a majority of key indicators.

As a Government, we are critically concerned that Queensland's unemployment rate remains above the national average and that our employment growth—which until recently was very strong—has now also shown disturbing signs of weakness. We are addressing this issue as a matter of some urgency and will be taking appropriate action, having regard to the likely thrust of the State economic development strategy.

As to the future—our diversity and extent of natural resources will provide the basis for long-term growth and development. Our population growth is expected to remain higher than that for Australia as a whole, and this will provide a platform for further economic growth.

Moreover, projections to the year 1992 by the National Institute of Economic and Industry Research indicate that Queensland's growth will exceed that of Australia for other major economic aggregates such as gross State product, employment, consumption and investment. Nevertheless, we cannot be complacent about this situation. In particular, we cannot divorce ourselves from what is happening in the rest of Australia and, indeed, in the rest of the world.

Because of our small domestic market and relatively open, export-oriented economy, we must face up to the challenges of volatility in world trading conditions for many of our key products. In recognition of those challenges, my Government is devising an economic strategy to broaden and deepen the State's economic base. Of course, further expansion and diversification of agriculture, mining and mineral-processing, energy-related industries and tourism will be critical to the State's continuing economic development. However, resource and tourist-based industries are not enough.

The priority of my Government's economic strategy will be the creation of a broader and deeper economic base through greater expansion of the manufacturing and services sectors.

Traditionally, Queensland's secondary industries have involved processing of agricultural commodities and some minerals. It will be my Government's aim to expand the State's economic base in areas of manufacturing industry and high technology where we have particular skills, advantages and products to exploit. Higher-value-added industries will provide large multiplier effects on incomes and employment.

To assist in this process, my Government has established a Private Sector Economic Advisory Committee composed of a wide cross-section of the State's business community including the rural sector, manufacturing, mining and tourism. That committee will provide a private sector perspective to supplement the sources of economic advice that are available within the public sector.

My Government sees its role as that of a facilitator, that is, facilitating economic development within the State so as to improve the standard of living of our citizens. This requires that the least possible constraints are placed upon, and the maximum possible encouragement is given to, private sector expansion of the economy. Accordingly, my Government will continue the long-standing and successful policies of low taxation and financial responsibility, coupled with the provision of appropriate economic infrastructure and the minimisation of Government regulations.

In summary, Queensland's long-term prospects for development are sound and strongly based. However, we are entering a difficult economic phase and we can no longer rely on the decision-making processes which have served us well to this point. To meet the challenges that lie ahead, and to ensure that there is widespread support for the tough decisions which have to be made, the Government has set in train the

machinery to develop a long-term strategy for broadening the State's economic base. As I have already indicated, our future is promising. The Government is now taking action to ensure that that promise is realised.

I lay upon the table of the House the paper referred to.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Redevelopment of Expo Site

Hon. M. J. AHERN (Landsborough—Premier and Treasurer and Minister for the Arts) (10.29 a.m.), by leave: Following the joint preparation of a development guideline document by the Premier's Department, the Expo Authority and the Brisbane City Council, public invitations for expressions of interest in redeveloping the post-Expo site were advertised on 26 November 1986 and closed on 16 March 1987. Thirteen proposals were received and were evaluated by a committee comprising—

- the Director-General, Premier's Department;
- the Under Treasurer, Treasury Department;
- the Chairman, Expo Authority; and
- the Town Clerk, Brisbane City Council.

Following analysis of the 13 submissions and a report thereon by the evaluation committee, the Government endorsed the following short list of proponents, who were invited to submit more refined proposals to demonstrate project feasibility and to conform as far as practicable with development guide-lines. The proponents were also afforded the opportunity to review their financial offers—

Mr Burns: You are looking after the new National Party stooges.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Lytton will remain quiet while the ministerial statement is being made.

Mr AHERN: As I was saying, the proponents were—

- World City 2000 (Hooker/Thiess Watkins—now Essington);
- CM Group (Cunnington/Tobishima);
- Kern Corporation; and
- River City 2000 (Kern, Pidgeon, SFIT, Conrad Jupiters).

Revised development proposals and financial offers were subsequently received by 13 November 1987 and were evaluated for financial return, planning acceptance, project viability, overall risk and other relevant factors. The evaluation disregarded alternative offers, where made, which relied on the issue of a casino licence and/or specific undertakings by the Government towards a world trade centre on the site. Each proposal was examined by the Brisbane City Council in relation to planning, traffic and other issues relevant to the council, and it was accepted that all proposals were capable of implementation. On this basis, taking into account all factors, including price, the River City 2000 group was judged as most worthy of being granted preferred developer status, which was accordingly awarded on 4 February 1988.

Mr Mackenroth: Were they the best price?

Mr AHERN: All criteria; is the honourable member listening?

Approval was subject to specific conditions in relation to early agreement on principal issues and provision of suitable security. In the event of non-performance by River City, preferred developer status may be withdrawn and conferred on another proponent.

I wish to clarify two other matters which have been the source of ill-informed and mischievous comment. The first of these is a world trade centre and the second is a

casino. Fricker Developments has, at this time, the backing of the World Trades Centres Association to construct and manage a world trade centre in Brisbane. The site for this facility is not yet settled.

In recognition of the eminent suitability of the Expo site for such a facility, the Government has required, as a condition of awarding preferred developer status, that River City open up discussions, with Government support, towards establishing a world trade centre, or a major element thereof, on the Expo site.

In regard to the second point—the Government has taken the decision that the next casino in south-east Queensland will be located on the Expo site. The Under Treasurer has been requested to investigate all aspects of the granting of a casino licence for the site and to report back to the Government. The successful post-Expo development consortium does not have a licence to operate a casino on the site. It has simply been requested by the Government to provide a physical facility within the site. No decision has been made as to when a licence might issue or indeed the mechanism by which a licensee might be chosen. These aspects can only be considered when the Under Treasurer's report has been received.

The Government, having taken a decision to locate the next casino on the Expo site, would have required the successful developer to include the necessary physical facility, whomever the successful developer might have been.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Australian Labor Party Comments on Electricity Supply Industry

Hon. M. J. TENNI (Barron River—Minister for Mines and Energy) (10.33 a.m.), by leave: Over recent weeks, the ALP has done its very best to show up the financial performance of Queensland's electricity supply industry in a bad light. First, it was the former Leader of the State Opposition, then the Federal Finance Minister, Senator Walsh, and then the deposed State Opposition Leader again who blasted the industry over an imaginary huge hike in electricity prices just around the corner.

Contrary to the statements made by the ALP, for the third year in a row, the industry last month brought down a retail price increase which was less than half the Consumer Price Index. So much for the Opposition's claim of a huge jump in tariffs!

Next, the ALP switched to claims about privatisation being considered by this Government in the light of a forecast Budget deficit. I do not know how many times I have to say it, but no-one in his right mind would consider, without a great deal of very careful thought and analysis, selling to a private concern a public utility that is performing as well as the electricity supply industry.

As the electricity industry is performing well and is actively seeking ways to improve and further improve its performance, there have to be very compelling reasons to sell off part or all of this operation to private enterprise. So far, I have not seen any of those reasons, and they certainly do not exist in the stolen Cabinet briefing notes which were given to the ALP.

Unlike the ALP, which has set out to destroy public confidence in the electricity industry, this Government is working in a much more constructive way to reduce energy costs to consumers. A few years ago the industry gave a basic commitment not to increase retail electricity prices by more than half the Consumer Price Index each year for the next several years and to maintain stability in pricing at the lowest possible level consistent with good commercial practice.

Mr Vaughan: What did you do for the first eight years?

Mr TENNI: Nothing could be much clearer than that, surely. If the honourable member cannot absorb that, he had better get out of here.

No other Australian State has given such a commitment to its customers, and, in fact, Queensland is the envy of every other State for its electricity-pricing policy. I remind this House that retail electricity price increases were less than half the CPI in 1986, 1987 and once again this year. Unlike the ALP the State Government has every confidence in the electricity supply industry, which is being run on very sound, competitive, private-enterprise lines using the most up-to-date commercial practices.

The former Opposition Leader's claim that every domestic consumer in Queensland is paying \$16.50 a week towards interest repayments to run the industry is both dishonest and very misleading to the people of this State. To arrive at this debt-servicing cost for the domestic consumer, it seems that the honourable member has divided the annual cost of interest for the entire electricity industry by the number of domestic consumers. This conveniently ignores the enormous contribution to the industry's finances made by the commercial and industrial sectors.

If Mr Warburton bothered to read the industry's annual report, he would know that the average total amount a domestic consumer pays for electricity he or she uses is about \$10.70 a week. Rather than the \$16.50-a-week interest bill that Mr Warburton has pulled out of his hat, the domestic user contributes more like \$3.50 a week towards the interest bill.

Mr Vaughan: That is still too much.

Mr TENNI: It is not \$16.50.

Frankly, it is about time that the Opposition accepted the undeniable fact that the electricity supply industry in Queensland is a very efficiently run big business. I emphasise the word "business" because the Opposition seems to overlook this fact every time.

Queensland's electricity industry has assets of \$6.9 billion balanced against debts of about \$4.1 billion, a ratio not unlike those of major private companies. The industry has an annual revenue of \$1.4 billion and the whole operation is run on commercial lines more akin to a private company than to a public utility. These figures make absolute nonsense of claims of poor financial performance made by the ALP.

Mr Speaker, the latest attempts by members of the Opposition to discredit the electricity supply industry have done little more than draw attention to their own inability to do their sums correctly.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Is there any other business?

Mr BURNS proceeding to give notice of a motion—

Mr Glasson: This is a speech.

Mr BURNS: This is a notice of motion. Can the Minister not understand a notice of motion?

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (10.41 a.m.), by leave: Last week in the *Courier-Mail* and various other newspapers throughout Queensland my name appeared as a result of an entry in the diary of suspended Police Commissioner Lewis. I quote from the *Courier-Mail* of Wednesday, 2 March, which states—

“Lewis wrote on June 21, 1982: ‘Det.-Sgt Carter phoned re alleged assault by Hinze at races or trots after 7 p.m.’

June 22, 1982: ‘7.30 a.m. saw Hinze ... phoned R. Gibbs MLA re alleged assault by Hinze.’”

In my own local newspaper—it passes as a newspaper, but in fact it is little more than a sausage-wrapper—the headline on the same date states—

“Gibbs, Hinze described in assault claim”.

This gives the distinct impression to the people of Ipswich either that the former Minister for Racing and I have indulged in some kind of fisticuffs together or that there was some fracas at the races involving us.

On last Thursday, 3 March, on page 4 of the *Courier-Mail* Mr Hinze stated that he was named incorrectly. The article states—

“He said the incident only involved his making representations on behalf of parliamentary colleague ‘Bobby Gibbs’.”

In my personal explanation I will outline exactly the incident that occurred. Because I was not totally sure of the details, last Friday I phoned Mr Hinze to confirm the facts with him and, after speaking to him for some 10 seconds, the facts came back to me. There was an incident in 1982 and I will outline it to the House.

Mr Gunn: You're protesting too much.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I am not protesting too much. I am told that the Minister's initials are changing from WAM to RAM.

At some time on that date in 1982 I was approached by a constituent in my electorate who, on the preceding Thursday at the Woolloongabba dog-track, had been involved in an incident over a greyhound. The fellow was an owner-trainer. As honourable members would be aware, the procedure on a racecourse is that the dogs are led into a room for a check to be made by the veterinary surgeon. On this occasion, when the vet checked the dog, he discovered that one of the dog's testicles was much larger than the other. For some inexplicable reason the veterinary surgeon took it upon himself to squeeze the dog's testicle. The dog was far from amused, and, as a result, when the dog went onto the race-track, its performance was less than expected. When the dog was returned for a further veterinary check, the veterinary surgeon advised the owner-trainer that he wished to take a swab from the dog, because he was of the opinion that the dog might have been administered with some kind of drug to slow it down.

As I recall, my constituent objected to this inference. Angry words passed between the veterinary surgeon and my constituent, a punch was thrown and, as a result of that punch, the veterinary surgeon stated to my constituent that he intended to charge him with assault. Under the rules of the Greyhound Racing Control Board of Queensland, if my constituent was found guilty of assault he would not then be eligible to go onto any race-track and follow his sport.

The following week I approached the then Minister, Mr Hinze, at Parliament House, explained the situation to him and asked him if he would check for me if charges were to be preferred against the gentleman in question. I am aware that the Minister then asked the Police Commissioner to find out if charges had been laid. The following day the Police Commissioner phoned me at my electorate office and advised me that he had checked out the incident, that he was not aware of any charges being laid or of any charges pending against my constituent and that the incident was only minor.

I want to say categorically and emphatically to this House that at no time have I been involved in any shape or form in fisticuffs on a racecourse, at a trotting track or at the greyhounds.

A Government member: Only at Parliament House.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: Of course I do not deny the incident that took place some years ago, which ended in a very fine draw between the honourable member for Woodridge and me.

As I said, they are the facts of the incident. I hope that those newspapers that have gone out of their way to report it in a way that is unfair to me will rectify that.

SELECT COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Resignation of Mr T. R. Cooper

Mr SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received the resignation of Mr Russell Cooper as a member of the Privileges Committee.

Appointment of Mr L. F. Gately

Mr FITZGERALD (Lockyer) (10.47 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That Mr Leo Francis Gately, member for the electoral district of Currumbin, be appointed a member of the Privileges Committee to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr Theo Russell Cooper.”

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION UPON NOTICE

Tully/Millstream Hydroelectric Scheme

Mr GILMORE asked the Minister for Mines and Energy—

“With reference to an article in *The Townsville Bulletin* during the week commencing 15 November 1987, in which the Member for Townsville East, Mr Geoff Smith, claimed the proposed Tully-Millstream hydro-electric scheme was just a political axe being used against the Federal Government—

Will he re-iterate for Mr Smith, and other Opposition Members, the true situation with regard to the Tully-Millstream project?”

Mr TENNI: The remarks by the member for Townsville East are only to be expected, since he belongs to the same political party as north Queensland's greatest knocker, the Federal Minister for the Environment and unofficial “Minister for Misery and Dole Queues”, Senator Richardson.

Any suggestion that the Queensland Government is promoting the proposed \$480m Tully/Millstream hydro scheme as a means of confronting the Hawke Government is utter rubbish.

The proposal is part of the very necessary long-term planning by the Queensland Electricity Commission to ensure that this Government continues to meet its commitment—regardless of ALP distortions—to provide the lowest energy costs possible to electricity-consumers.

I can assure far-north Queenslanders, who have been hard hit by the likes of Senator Richardson, that this Government strongly supports in principle the Tully/Millstream hydro project, which is expected to be operational in the period 1996 to the year 2000.

A detailed assessment of the project will be possible following the completion later this year of a \$4.3m feasibility study to confirm the scheme's technical feasibility, location of works, cost and environmental impact.

Unlike the ALP, the Queensland Government strongly believes that it makes very good economic sense to make full use of hydroelectricity, which, when compared with coal-fired power stations, is a renewable resource. Unlike the Labor Party, this Government also wants to create jobs in far-north Queensland, not destroy them.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Unemployment

Mr GOSS: I ask the Premier and Treasurer: does he agree that unemployment is the single biggest economic problem facing Queensland today? If so, apart from his latest effort in announcing yet another investigation or inquiry through what he called a “dole-queue autopsy”, what urgent, direct and concrete steps has his Government taken in the last 100 days to cut the State's jobless rate, which remains the highest in the nation?

Mr AHERN: My Government has put a very high priority—indeed, the highest priority—on the management of the economy in Queensland. It has been put at the top of the agenda. It was at the top of the Business Paper this morning. I made a ministerial statement on the economy as a whole to the Parliament. I indicated where the problems lay and the Government's strategy to settle the main issue. I have indicated that the Government has been prepared to recognise that there are some problems within the community and it is methodically moving to address those issues. However, the total proposal must await the development of an overall economic strategy. Opposition members have been preaching to the Government for the 20 years that I have been in this Parliament. On this occasion, they cannot object to the mechanisms that we have selected.

The Opposition asked what immediate proposals the Government is to put in place. Those matters are under study. Once it has the necessary information, the Government will develop the right proposals, properly targeted. However, what has to be understood by honourable members opposite is that the Commonwealth Government—

Mr Goss: Why haven't you got the information now?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Premier listened to the question in silence. It is only courteous that honourable members listen to the answer in silence.

Mr AHERN: Thank you for that, Mr Speaker.

All honourable members must understand that at present the economic restraints on State Governments are very real. At the last May economic conference, Treasurer Keating gave to the States of Australia a very tough diet. For Queensland, during this financial year it meant a cut-back of \$150m on what could reasonably have been expected previously. Under the three-year rolling program that was presented on that occasion, next financial year a further reduction of \$150m was proposed. In the third year of the triennium for which the program was presented to the Government, a further reduction of \$210m was foreshadowed for forward planning purposes. What great options are available to the State Government at present?

The Government will give the necessary emphasis to the task, but it will proceed carefully and with proper planning, given the overall resources of the State and the need to keep taxation down in the contemporary context.

Honourable members opposite can see the results in New South Wales, where Barrie Unsworth has tried to spend his way out of political trouble. He is spending his way into Opposition.

In the international context today, big-spending Governments are a disaster. Queensland has a small-business Government, a low-tax Government, and that is likely to continue.

Fitzgerald Commission of Inquiry; Superannuation Pay-outs to Police Officers, Public Servants and Members of Parliament

Mr GOSS: My second question to the Premier relates to Cabinet's failure yesterday to act decisively on the matter of superannuation pay-outs to persons on the public pay-roll facing serious allegations of corruption before the Fitzgerald inquiry. I ask: what does the Premier propose to do if next week or next month some other police officer, public servant or member of this Parliament who is the subject of serious allegations of corruption before the Fitzgerald inquiry indicates his or her intention to resign and claim a publicly subsidised lump-sum superannuation pay-out? Will the Premier again seek to make another private arrangement with those people—as his government has done with the suspended Police Commissioner—or will he take a firm stand and establish in legislation the general principle that no such person who is the subject of serious allegations of corruption before the Fitzgerald inquiry should be allowed to take a publicly subsidised superannuation pay-out until cleared by the inquiry?

Mr AHERN: The basic premise of the question by the honourable Leader of the Opposition is false. Yesterday Cabinet made a decision in regard to the Queensland Police Commissioner, who is currently under suspension. That was the immediate problem that Cabinet faced. It was in the position in which an application for retirement or a foreshadowing of such an application had been made. The retirement became due on the previous Monday. So that was an immediate problem, which required resolution, and it was, I hope, resolved satisfactorily in terms of the immediate problem.

Mr Goss: What about other cases?

Mr AHERN: I am about to get to that. Let me deal with the initial premise in the question.

I have outlined the immediate problem which presented. The Cabinet discussed the total circumstances of the matter. It is my understanding that, as a result of negotiations that were taking place this morning with my senior officers, amicable agreement will be reached with the Police Commissioner in respect of this matter until the end of the Fitzgerald inquiry.

The general issue in terms of a legislative response has not been ruled out by the Government—contrary to the supposition that the honourable Leader of the Opposition makes in his question. He is dead wrong. I have not ruled that out. In fact, the totality of the situation needs to be addressed carefully, with the issues viewed one at a time, bearing in mind the various presentation of information before the Fitzgerald commission of inquiry. So I refuse today to rule out any legislative response, but I believe that the immediate problem has been resolved satisfactorily and that the Government has acted properly and very sensibly in relation to the matter. I think that, if the honourable Leader of the Opposition listened to the media reports this morning and read the editorials, he would find that the community generally has accepted the validity of the response that the Government made in relation to this matter.

However, the general issue needs to be addressed very, very carefully in relation to citizens' rights—their civil rights. Where in Australia has any Labor Government enacted legislation of the type suggested by the honourable Leader of the Opposition? Nowhere! All that has happened is that somebody has floated a proposition to this Government. Nowhere in the British Commonwealth that I know of has that type of legislation with its retrospective effect been implemented. This Government is prepared to study the issue. It is looking at it very, very carefully and it is prepared to balance the civil rights of citizens in this State to a fair trial and to a charge in a court. All these matters need to be taken into consideration.

It is all very well to be gung-ho about all of these matters, but what about the rights and immunities of reasonable citizens in Queensland? Do those rights need to be taken into account? Of course they do! Those rights need to be taken into account and will be taken into account by this Government as it proceeds carefully in relation to this matter. The Government is taking all the advice of senior counsel that is available to it. The Government has acted properly and thoroughly and it has the situation well under control. The premise in the honourable member's question is quite wrong.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Under the provisions of the Standing Orders and the Sessional Order agreed to on 19 February 1987, the time for questions has now expired.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

First 100 Days of Ahern Administration

Mr GOSS (Logan—Leader of the Opposition) (11 a.m.): This week marks the first 100 days of the Ahern administration. Queenslanders are now entitled to ask the question, "For all the great promises of last year, what do we have to show for it?" It is time for an audit, a stock-taking, in relation to this so-called new administration.

Two weeks ago I returned to Queensland from overseas curious to see what——

Mr Austin: You were in a hurry.

Mr GOSS: I was just a couple of days early.

I was curious to see what Queensland was like three months down the track under the vision of excellence. When I arrived in Brisbane, what did I see? The prisoners were up on the roof, ripping the gaol apart. Queensland has a State Government still searching for an economic strategy and posting a \$400,000 reward for anybody who might be able to find it. The Government is in the position in which it had promised an economic strategy and, not having one to offer, it is offering \$400,000 and asking for someone to please find one for it.

What else did I find? Deception in relation to the State finances, with paper-shuffling, tax-avoidance schemes to hide the true extent of the State debt——

Mr Ahern: Table it. That's a complete nonsense. It's never been accepted.

Mr GOSS: The member for Caboolture will deal quite adequately with the Premier on that.

Government members interjected.

Mr GOSS: What else did I see? Prisoners rioting at the gaol, fresh allegations——

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GOSS: They seem very sensitive very early, Mr Speaker.

What else did I see? Last week, yet again, high unemployment figures. When the Premier was asked a question about that today, what could he offer 130 000 people on the dole queue in Queensland? What did he offer the jobless in this State? He says, "You are on our agenda. We have to get some more information. We are going to set up a committee to look at dole queues." Three years ago in Rockhampton the Queensland Government decided to set up a committee to look at unemployment. The former Premier did not do anything as a result of that inquiry, and we are now to get another committee.

Instead of real, economic and productive recovery in this State, the Government believes in a management consultant and committee-led recovery.

What else did we see? We saw fresh allegations and evidence of verballing in the Whiskey Au Go Go case——matters in respect of which this Government has still not taken a firm stand. So what has changed in Queensland? The only thing that has changed is that the Premier and his Cabinet are prepared to take a firm stand——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! It is very difficult for me to hear the honourable member, and I am closer than some honourable members. The House will come to order and there will be silence from honourable members, including the member for Mount Isa.

Mr GOSS: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The only issue on which I am aware that the Premier and his Cabinet have been prepared to take a firm stand is the good old humble condom. On everything else they are a wavering and a limp Government. In short, nothing much has changed. We have been promised a vision of excellence, but it now seems quite clear that the preoccupation of the Government is with image rather than substance——with promises rather than performance.

It is no wonder that the former Premier, Sir Joh, was recently moved to say——

"Neither Flo nor I am prepared to prop up a tired old party that does not know where it's going. It's so tragic it would be laughable if it wasn't so sad. The poor chaps are hopeless."

That is what he said—"The poor chaps are hopeless."

The truth is that the same National Party machine men, the same power-brokers, still run this State and still make their special deals in quiet rooms. They still do special deals for the VIPs. Instead of this State being run for the benefit of all Queenslanders, it is run still for the special few. I think that there will be more debate in this House on the subject of the Expo contract. The Premier and his Government will have to answer more questions about who really made that decision before the Cabinet meeting occurred.

What has happened to the Premier's and this new Government's prescription to solve the problem of our economy? Some years ago, when this Premier was Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology, we heard about a vision of the future, a Queensland economy studded with high-tech industry. Where is it? The results have been paltry indeed. When the Premier presided over that portfolio that sector declined as a proportion of the Queensland economy. Where was the vision of excellence then when our manufacturing sector was falling away and relocating to southern States? That sector was relocating to southern States and it declined as a proportion of the Queensland economy. That occurred when the Premier was in charge of that portfolio. What stands out as the great achievement of that Ministry, the Ministry of Primary Industries or the Ministry of Health under that particular gentleman? I do not recall anything, except his failure to deliver on condom vending machines.

When they were in America a couple of weeks ago, did the Premier and Sir Leo Hielscher tell the Wall Street bankers that the Queensland Government did not have an economic strategy and that the Government was going to advertise for one on the Premier's return to Queensland? Did he tell them that?

Mr Ahern: We got a loan.

Mr GOSS: Perhaps the loan would not have been provided if the Premier had told them the truth. But did he tell them that? Did the Premier tell the Wall Street bankers that he was going to use \$400,000 of the public's money to try to find a strategy that had already been promised? No. I am sure he did not.

I turn briefly to the Fitzgerald inquiry. It needs to be said—and it needs to be understood by all Queenslanders—that what that inquiry has established, and in particular what the Lewis diaries show, is that across this State, across politics, Government and various professions, there is a network of special deals.

Mr Ahern: Careful.

Mr GOSS: I ask the honourable member what I should be careful about.

Across this State is a very extensive network of special deals, special friends, back-scratching and influence-peddling, which has corroded virtually every corner of the social fabric of this State. That has created a very serious situation. If my memory serves me correctly, 13 of the 18 Ministers claim that they knew nothing of what was going on. Did they simply turn their heads away, or was it incompetence on their part? Do they claim that the network that has been revealed in those diaries is the fault of the former Premier? Do they want to blame all of the sordid mess on the former Premier and absolve themselves? The public will not accept that. It will exact a price.

I have already commented on the Lewis superannuation issue. Once again, it represents a failure to act decisively on the general principle. The Premier had made comments about a breach of faith in relation to contract. As I said before, what about a breach of faith on the part of people who have used their high offices to corruptly enrich themselves and to do so much damage to the social fabric of this State?

I turn now to the State's economy. Last year, it was claimed that the Budget would be a balanced one with no new taxes being introduced. How that tune has changed in such a short period! The paltry excuse has been offered that it is somehow the responsibility

of the Federal Government. When is this Government going to take some responsibility? If it had acted upon a strategy similar to the one that was adopted by the Victorian Government, 50 000 additional jobs would have been created in this State and 50 000 fewer persons would be in our very substantial jobless queues. However, this Government has not acted. It claims that the options of the States are very limited and that more information is needed.

As I will outline during this forthcoming session, the Opposition has undertaken a major study that will demonstrate a way in which to maximise economic growth and employment. In both the long term and the short term a future Labor Government will cut waste and inefficiency and will divert funds to schools, police stations and the health-care system. It will remove \$2m from the unnecessary Kingaroy airport upgrading. It will also remove the \$500,000 of public money that is planned to be spent on advertising to link the National Party with the success of Expo 88. That \$2.5m could be diverted to funding for teachers, teacher aides, more police and better conditions for nurses and hospitals. This Government's priorities are wrong.

In summary, there is no vision of excellence. There is no vision. There is no excellence. It is a myth, a marshmallow. On the way to the next Labor Government, that vision of excellence will be stripped away. There is no vision of excellence; just a haze of mediocrity.

Federal Government Road-funding

Mr LINGARD (Fassifern) (11.10 a.m.): If ever there was something that the ALP along with all State parliamentarians should consider, it is the issue of the Federal Government's granting of funds to roads in this State. The ordinary citizen has been conned; local government bodies have been conned; and the State Government is being forced to try to overcome the anomalies.

Why has the citizen been conned? Every citizen knows that 55c of every dollar that he spends on petrol goes to the Federal Government. Only 45c goes to the oil companies, the distributors and the retailers. Those figures have been verified by the Australian Institute of Petroleum. Of the 55c that goes to the Federal Government, only 11c goes back into road maintenance.

Generally, the average motorist is aware of those facts. As well, all motorists are aware of the Australian bicentennial road program——

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I rise to a point of order. It is my understanding that you, Mr Speaker, have recently made a ruling that speeches in this House shall not be read. I draw to your attention that the honourable member is reading from a brief.

Mr Scott interjected.

Mr Underwood interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I do not need the advice of the honourable member for Cook, or that of the honourable member for Ipswich West.

Mr LINGARD: Have a look at the hair-style on the member for Wolston. First of all he had a perm put through it, then he had a rinse put through it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I draw to the attention of the honourable member for Fassifern the fact that speeches should not be read verbatim.

Mr LINGARD: As I was saying, honourable members should have a look at the hair of the honourable member for Wolston. First of all he put a perm through it, then he put a rinse through it, then he decided to cut part of it off the top and have the sides whitened. He is the Liberace of the front bench of the socialist party.

Honourable members should also have a look at a recent cartoon that appeared in Ipswich's *Queensland Times* newspaper. It is no wonder that he hates the cartoons that appear in that paper. The cartoon depicts Goss talking to Ahern with Gibbs standing

there in football boots and picking his nose. Fancy putting a pair of football boots on Gibbsey!

An honourable member: Bob Gibbs.

Mr LINGARD: Bob Gibbs.

About two years ago at a reserve grade grand final, while playing for Wacol, he tried to get a few votes. In the first half he played on the wing and did a Fonda Metassa. At half-time the captain came to him and said, "You have got 12 votes if you go off for the second half." The captain did not want him. The whole team voted for him.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: They thought I was wonderful.

Mr LINGARD: The honourable member has a big head, too. It would not even fit through the bars at Wacol gaol.

If the ordinary motorist is asked, he will say that he believes that he pays an extra 2c a litre—

An honourable member: You are reading it.

Mr LINGARD: I am not reading my speech.

As I was saying, he believes that he is paying an extra 2c a litre so that Australia will have a better road system. He believes that that 2c is on top of what he paid previously. However, he is clearly being conned. The Federal Government, obviously broke, obviously adopting the policy that there are no votes in roads—I would not be surprised if Tony Koch writes that up as a big win for the honourable member, either—has now started to pocket more of the money originally raised to maintain roads. It has now syphoned some of that money into consolidated revenue.

The motorist who pays 55c to the Government when he buys \$1 worth of petrol obviously believes that that is being paid under the old Road Grants Act and the Australian Land Transport Program and that it is still being committed to roads. However, one should look at what the Federal Government is doing. It is starting to pocket the money originally raised for roads. In fact, the grants under the combined bicentennial road program and the old Road Grants Act do not come up to what they were previously. The Federal Government is putting the money into consolidated revenue.

On top of that, the original contributions under the ALTP are being used for varied projects such as transit centres and railways, further reducing the actual contribution to the road system. That is notwithstanding the fact that Bill Hayden went to Ipswich and Labor politicians whinged when they could not open the transit centre there. As I said, some of the original contributions are now being applied to such transit centres.

Any thought that the grants would be increased as per the CPI, as Mr Peter Morris promised in his 1985 press release, is a complete and utter myth. Quite obviously the average citizen has been conned. However, the second group which is being made to bear the brunt of this devious exercise is the 134 local authorities in this State. Members have to fight for them because they depend on funding to maintain employment and the servicing and maintenance of local roads. The Federal Government is aware of this because the Australian Roads Outlook Report showed that roads were necessary to the economy of a country, as well as showing that more trucks are using our roads than previously. The most alarming aspect is the fact that the recent Cameron report on road-funding, if implemented by the Federal Government, will see Queensland's share of the arterial and local road grant cut by 22 per cent.

Local authorities are in serious trouble. Roads can be maintained in three ways. The first is by direct grants by the local authority; the second—that is, those that constitute the national roads grid—is by the Federal Government; the third—the declared roads—is by the State and the Commonwealth. The latter category is divided into main roads, arterial roads and local roads. Funds for these are provided predominantly by the Commonwealth Government from fuel taxes and, to a lesser extent, by the State

Government from vehicle registration fees. Local councils in my electorate advise me that if funding is to continue to be provided in the way in which it is provided now, they will not be able to build new roads or to upgrade existing roads over the next four years. This means that, at the very best, all they can do is try to maintain the roads. This means that men will lose jobs and that one of Queensland's greatest assets—that is, the road system—will deteriorate. Clearly, the Federal Government believes that there are no votes in roads.

Anyone who has a close knowledge of local government can see what is happening. Figures show a massive decrease in the funds allocated by the Federal Government from money collected by the Consolidated Revenue Fund. That is why I say that the citizen is being utterly conned, because he believes that the 2c a litre that he pays for fuel under the Australian bicentennial road development program is being added to what was previously provided for roads. The figures show quite clearly that the funds previously placed into consolidated revenue for roads are now being used for other than road maintenance while only the 2c a litre excise comes back into the bicentennial road program. Figures show that local government is receiving at least \$6m less in 1987-1988 as compared to 1984-85. The same thing has happened over several years.

What does the Federal Government say? I quote from the House of Representatives *Hansard* on 16 April 1985, when the Federal Minister Peter Morris said—

“Let us look at Queensland which will get a fraction less for roads in total than it is getting this year. Because it is getting \$5m less for arterial roads, all hell is going to break loose.”

Mr Morris criticised the fact that roads were at risk because, as he said, “A few million dollars less is available”. What did Peter Morris say must happen? He said—

“State Ministers have to go back to their own Cabinet tables and persuade their colleagues and get a better deal for themselves.”

I repeat: when a Queenslanders spends \$1 on petrol, he pays 55c to the Federal Government. He pays a special 2c levy for the bicentennial road program. These figures come from the Australian Institute of Petroleum.

I wish to quote what Ralph Hunt had to say in 1982 when he introduced the ABRD Program—

“The overall objective of this program is to upgrade Australia's road network to a high standard by 1988. Investment in all categories of roads—National, Urban, Rural Arterial and Local Roads—will substantially increase.”

The national highway system would be one of Australia's greatest assets.

As a State Government, we must protect Queensland's local government authorities. Obviously, in many instances they have developed sophisticated road maintenance and upgrading machinery. As well, they employ a significant number of personnel. Some local government authorities have developed an efficient, economical service which raises funds for other local government works. The service is so important that we as a Government must fight for this funding—not as a gift but as a right. When motorists are charged over \$4.8 billion in taxes but receive less than \$800m for the road system, it is time for all politicians to stand up and fight the Federal Government. When motorists are asked to pay an extra 2c per litre to improve the roads while the original grants contributed by the motorist are decreased, all members of Parliament have to agree that the motorist has been conned, local government has been conned and it is about time we all got together to fight.

Redevelopment of Expo Site

Mr SHAW (Manly) (11.20 a.m.): The National Party has sought to convince Queenslanders that it has a vision of excellence for this State. However, the Government's scandalous plan to dispose of the Expo land has destroyed this myth—before it even got started!

Mr Austin: Are you reading that?

Mr SHAW: No way.

The National Party Government of Queensland has shown that it not only does not have a vision of excellence, but lacks any vision whatsoever, beyond seeing the opportunity for private profit. The hopes of so many people that Queensland had passed into a new era, where fair play and adherence to high principles of conduct might prevail, have been dashed, ruthlessly.

From the first day in 1983, when the Expo Bill was introduced into the House, the Opposition has given its complete support to the exposition. It did not support some aspects of the legislation—in particular, the resumption of land and the extension of town-planning powers to the authority—and it expressed strongly its fears that the Government appeared to have the intention of misusing Expo 88 to grab the newly acquired parkland on the south bank.

Mr Austin: You said it was a phantom project.

Mr SHAW: Never.

These fears were increased by the deliberate refusal of the then Premier, Mr Bjelke-Petersen, to give an assurance that the existing parkland would be returned. His absolute refusal, on repeated occasions, convinced honourable members on this side of the House that nefarious plans had already been made.

It was also clear from the outset that all reasonable people, not blinded by dollar signs, wanted the area saved from exploitation. The Expo Authority, the council, many Brisbane architects, planners and academics all expressed the view that the existing parkland should be maintained and the area generally developed so as to provide something to which the city would point with pride into the next century. It is incredible that Mr Ahern and Mr Gunn would have us believe that all of these people have now changed their minds.

In the light of the Premier's and the Deputy Premier's questionable claims that Cabinet had acted on the unanimous recommendations of its assessment committee, it is interesting to look again at the stated intentions of the Expo Authority and the Brisbane City Council, which are, of course, represented on that committee.

Last year, in response to fears that I expressed in the media, the Expo manager, Mr Minnikin, said—

“The former Clem Jones Gardens, a stretch of parkland on the Brisbane river bank, will remain as parkland after Expo 88.”

That was a clear promise. It has been just as clearly repudiated by Cabinet. Some quotes from the *Courier-Mail* of 13 April 1987 make extremely interesting reading. At that time I had again expressed in the media concerns that the park was to be lost and I had pointed out that, while the Expo Authority and the council might have agreed on its preservation, the Government intended to override any such agreement and had the power to do so. In this *Courier-Mail* story, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen again refused to guarantee the park's return, but he did say that my claims were hog-wash. Mr Minnikin said, “Under an agreement with the council, the authority legally was bound to return the park”, but he agreed that the State Government could override the agreement. So he confirmed the existence of a legal agreement with the council for the park's return.

The same story quotes the Lord Mayor, Alderman Atkinson, and her remarks bear repeating also. She said—

“Riverfront parkland is sacred and sacrosanct. It is absolutely non-negotiable.”

Strong stuff! She also confirmed “the park's return has always been part of the deal” with the Expo Authority.

Mr McPhie: You are quoting something.

Mr SHAW: Yes, I am quoting something.

I ask: who reneged, and exactly how? The Premier should explain this. Was this legal agreement between the council and Expo cancelled by mutual agreement—and I note, with great disappointment, that the Lord Mayor has abandoned her previous stance and has supported the destruction of the park—or was the agreement overridden by Cabinet, as we feared it would be?

The full details of this agreement and the transfer of parkland title to the Expo Authority must be released. The Premier must come clean and inform us: did Alderman Atkinson and Mr Minnikin mislead the public last year, or did Cabinet ride roughshod over its committee? What compensation, if any, has the Brisbane City Council received for its approximately \$30m worth of parkland, to which it had freehold title and which was purchased with tax-payers' money? If no compensation has been received, then, on this point alone, it can hardly be argued that Expo is costing tax-payers nothing. In fact, when one considers the incredibly generous financial terms which the State has extended to the consortium, it is increasingly difficult to determine what the cost to Queenslanders will be. It is equally obvious that there will be a cost.

I have not spoken to any of the tenderers involved and do not have sufficient information to suggest which tender should have been accepted. However, the very visible inadequacies of the River City 2000 proposition convinced me that this tender should certainly not have been accepted. The Opposition calls on the Government to explain its incredible actions in rejecting a tender which offered \$150m cash and, instead, is opting to accept a down payment of \$50m followed by \$25m a year for six years.

Mr Davis: It's a dead set rort.

Mr SHAW: It certainly is.

Without going into the arguments of whether or not this total of \$200m over six years is higher or lower in today's values than other tenders, the acceptance of this tender places the consortium concerned in a most advantageous position. The Queensland Government has made itself a money-raiser and financial guarantor for a private consortium.

It is not merely a matter of Queensland's waiting patiently to receive the balance of payments over the next six years. The Expo Authority is due to be wound up in March next year. At that time, the authority is required to balance its books. Any loans that it has raised must be finalised. It must pay its debts. The Expo Authority cannot wait six years for its money, so the State Government has agreed to pay it the \$153m that the Government considers to be the cash equivalent of the hire-purchase agreement.

In January 1989 the Queensland Government will have received only \$50m from River City 2000. Two months later it has agreed to pay the Expo Authority \$153m. Where, I ask, is the extra \$103m to come from? The Government will have the option of getting the \$103m from its normal Budget. Of course, that would mean fewer teachers, policemen, nurses, and other services to Queenslanders.

It is more likely that the Government will raise a loan. It is notable, and one may well ask whether it is coincidental, that, immediately after announcing the acceptance of the River City 2000 time-payment scheme, the Premier embarked on a trip overseas where he borrowed \$130m at 8.5 per cent over five years. That is very close to the terms given to the consortium. This was intended to finance electricity industry expansion, which, given the excess generating capacity presently existing, seems to be the last thing Queensland needs.

The interest payable and the redemption period coincides remarkably with the finance being provided to River City 2000 by the State Government. Whether it is this money that will be provided to the consortium or whether the money comes from some other source remains to be seen.

We must desperately hope that the Queensland Government knows that it can borrow the \$103m at a lower fixed interest rate than it is accepting from the consortium.

Obviously, if it fails to do this, the State and its tax-payers will be financially subsidising the project. If it does no more than carry the loan, as it has promised to do, the State Government is still giving financial assistance to River City 2000. It is giving the consortium special treatment that hundreds of other companies in Queensland would dearly love to share. More than that, it is giving this private consortium assistance that it refused to provide to the Expo Authority, which is a non-profit organisation working to provide something for Queenslanders.

In 1984 the Expo Authority asked for permission to borrow its funds off shore at lower rates of interest. The State Government refused. In 1984 the Queensland Government also refused to guarantee bank loans for the Expo Authority. Today it is doing that for a private consortium. The effect of that was that the Expo Authority was forced to borrow an extra \$20m, which was a significant drain on the authority's resources and an impediment to its ability to pay for the parkland that the people now want retained.

The Government is granting low-interest finance to its favoured developers. Four years ago the Expo Authority wanted to borrow at fixed interest charges so that it could budget with certainty. "No", said the Government, which forced the authority to borrow at the prevailing rates, which I think were about 13 per cent. This demand placed a considerable burden on the Expo Authority and made its task more difficult. But, to this Government, company profits are more important than the public benefit. It has now agreed to provide a fixed interest loan to the consortium, which knows exactly what it will pay over six years. That is a benefit that was denied to the Expo Authority. There has been no mention of the consortium's paying a 0.25 per cent handling fee, which the Treasury required the Expo Authority to do.

The consortium is proposing a commercial development of the area. It is quite a good standard of commercial development and I would be the first to praise it if it were to take place on freehold land purchased on the open market, but it is not.

Time expired.

Expo 88; Road-funding; Federal Government Grants to Aborigines

Mr McPHIE (Toowoomba North) (11.29 a.m.): I feel that the speech about Expo made by the member who has just resumed his seat was made in the wrong Chamber. It is an Australian Exposition and, if it had not been for the help provided by the State Government, it would never have got off the ground. No financial help was provided by the Australian Government. That speech should have been made down there. He should have complimented the Government.

Mr Simpson: The other States would not have it.

Mr McPHIE: No, the other States would not touch it.

Thanks are due to the Government of this State that Expo is being held in Australia. The Queensland Government was responsible for getting Expo under way in this bicentennial year. Even though there are financial problems, the Government should not be criticised. Today financial problems exist in so many walks of life. I do not know that the Government can be blamed for them.

I side with the comments made by the honourable member for Fassifern, who accused the Federal authorities of ripping off the entitlement of the people of this State and this country by not allowing the money from road taxes to flow through to them. The road-tax money should be reallocated to the States and the local authority areas for the development and the maintenance of roads right across Australia. As the member for Fassifern told the House so eloquently, the money is not coming back in the proportion that it should. It is remaining in the coffers of the Federal Government.

I now wish to address my remarks to the latest annual report of the Federal Department of Aboriginal Affairs. It is another area in which the people of Australia, and the people of Queensland in particular, are being rorted by the Federal Government

through the misuse of funds. The member for Fassifern addressed the same problem, though in a different area.

The 1986 census figures show that Aborigines in Australia number 227 645, which is only 1.43 per cent of Australia's population. However, they have control of or have allocated to them one-seventh of the land mass of Australia. That is a staggering amount of country.

Mr Ardill: What about the Japanese? They don't even live here.

Mr McPHIE: I am glad that you raised that matter. The Japanese are totally different. They are private-enterprise people who came and bought land on an open, free market.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr McPHIE: The Japanese people who have bought land in Australia are entitled to do that. They are free-enterprise people investing in Australia. They are not being given land in massive proportions without consideration for the number of people involved. It is a totally separate question. The whole structure of our private-enterprise, free-enterprise system evolves from the issue.

The Federal Government's policies on Aborigines are straight-out socialist policies, under which a select minority are receiving concessions and privileges that are out of proportion to their numbers or their entitlement.

The land-rights issue is a sham. It is a misuse of public funds on a large scale. I have mentioned previously that one-seventh of the country is in the hands of the Aborigines. Very few individual Aborigines, except possibly in Queensland, have title to any land. The Federal Government talks about handing land over to them, but it does not give them title to anything. One-seventh of this country is a massive area, and the majority of it is freehold. Why cannot the Aborigines have freehold title? Aborigines have made claims that, if approved, would increase that area to over one-quarter of Australia—27 per cent. That is a further misuse of funds.

Current funding is \$584,297,000 a year. That does not include the amount of money provided to the Aboriginal community, or those claiming to be part of that community, as unemployment benefits, family allowances, special schooling fees, free taxis to and from school, other welfare payments, or retraining or other programs targeted at individuals. The department has 560 full-time public servants servicing Aborigines. In addition, last year mining royalties of \$28,817,565 went to the Aboriginal community. That type of entitlement is not available to anybody else in Australia.

In New South Wales, Aborigines also receive 7½ per cent of all land taxes, which in the year ended June 1987 amounted to an extra \$25m. No other group of the Australian community is entitled to that type of funding.

Earlier Mr Goss, the Leader of the Opposition, spoke about superannuation entitlements. In New South Wales, a former Minister, Mr Jackson, was not only able to resign when he was under suspicion and fingered for misuse of his authority, but also received his full superannuation entitlement. He was subsequently charged and found guilty. He still has all of that money that he received in superannuation. If that is not a crooked, maladministration of entitlements, I would like to know what is. That is not being done in this State and this Government will never do it.

I return to the matter of Aborigines. Rorts and misuse of funds have occurred in other areas. On 26 January this year a large number of Aborigines were in Sydney—and so there should have been. However, how many people are aware that those Aborigines were in Sydney through the courtesy of the Federal Government, which again misused tax-payers' funds? The Federal Government provided buses, petrol money and, in some instances, taxis from a \$7.5 million grant to fund programs on that date that would present an imaginative and distinctive focus for celebration of Australia's Aboriginal

heritage and the achievements of the Aboriginal people. It was once again a blatant misuse of funds—funds that were not available to anyone else. Anyone else who wanted to go to Sydney on 26 January, the 200th anniversary of the arrival of the First Fleet, had to pay his own way.

I turn to legal aid——

An Opposition member interjected.

Mr McPHIE: The honourable member would be interested in the matter of legal aid.

Aboriginal people and those claiming to be connected with them—and there are probably a few on the Opposition side—have 67 legal aid bureaus for their own personal use throughout this country. 1.4 per cent of the Australian population has 67 legal aid bureaus, employing 94 solicitors, 101 field workers and 150 other staff, and they have the absolute gall to say that they are understaffed and to ask for more staff! It is one of the biggest rorts out.

One rort, which could well come before a Federal Court, is involved in the determination of Aboriginal identity. I do not think that any honourable member would begrudge help being given to the genuine Aborigines, the real descendants of the forefathers of this country. I refer to the full-bloods. They are the ones who really deserve help. I am sure that everyone would agree that their entitlements have been misused. If one is not a full-blood, one is a half-blood; one is half Aborigine and half white. People other than full-bloods are claiming benefits. Under the law, anyone who claims to have direct evidence of Aboriginal ancestry, no matter how slight, can claim to be an Aborigine and receive entitlements. Those people are misusing the entitlements, and they would comprise the majority of that 1.4 per cent that I have been talking about.

Many people who for all other practical purposes are white are Aborigines under the relevant Act, and they gain Federal benefits. Those people are rorting the system; they are the ones who are misusing the system, creaming off the top what should be going to the genuine Aborigines, for whom everyone has a genuine sympathy and whom everyone would like to see receive help.

Mr Ardill interjected.

Mr McPHIE: Members of the Opposition support a fair go, just as I do. That is all people want. People want to receive fair treatment. They want fair distribution of taxes, a fair go and help for the people who need it, not continual help for anybody who gets on a bandwagon and misuses funds. No wonder the Thursday Islanders are screaming out and wanting to secede from Australia. They are not receiving their just entitlements either, despite what the Queensland Minister is doing——

Time expired.

Education

Mr HAMILL (Ipswich) (11.39 a.m.): Over the last few months honourable members have heard the Premier going on ad nauseam about his vision of excellence. The matter that I wish to refer to is an area in which the Speaker is very interested, that is, education and how education fits into this vision of excellence of the Premier.

Mr Austin: Pick it up and read it.

Mr HAMILL: The honourable member may look at the notes.

Since the change in Government administration last year, the Government has acted in only two areas of education. The first was the shelving of the Education Act Amendment Bill, which was pushed through this Parliament in the dying days of the Bjelke-Petersen administration. The second, of course, was the \$4m that was restored to recurrent expenditure after the Cabinet meeting in January this year.

If that is the response to the crisis in education, I suggest to all honourable members that that response has been totally inadequate. It has been totally inadequate because of the chaos that this Government's deliberate policies have perpetrated upon the community of Queensland.

It is important to recognise the enormity of the chaos that has beset the education system. Effectively, \$84m was taken away from the budget for primary, secondary and pre-schools in last year's State Budget. A freeze has been placed upon the number of teachers in this State. Class sizes have increased because enrolments are up and effective teacher numbers are down. The effect of the abandonment or downgrading of specialist programs is detrimental to the whole of the education system. Massive cuts have been made in teacher aide hours. This year, those cuts have had their full effect upon the schools in this State. Significant cuts have also been made to equipment and resources available to State Government schools as a consequence of a 10 per cent real cut in the budgetary allocation for those materials, services and programs.

In short, the Ahern Government has been guilty of gross inactivity in relation to this chaos that all those members opposite supported when they supported the State Budget last year and the swingeing cuts that it maintained in education funding. Despite the talk of visions of excellence, education has received the same low priority to which we became accustomed under years and years of Bjelke-Petersen administrations. Indeed, the perpetuation of the low priority for education is even more dramatic under Mr Ahern because, once again, with all due respect to the Honourable the Minister for Education, the most junior Minister is heading what is now of course regarded as a most junior portfolio in the Ahern Government. The Premier could not even trust him with administering technical and further education, which was shunted off to another Minister. So we have a reduced education portfolio under the most junior of Ministers.

Mr FitzGerald: And you're the Opposition spokesman!

Mr HAMILL: The honourable member is right; and a bit more senior than the Minister.

I could only assume that the Premier has been indulging in one of his little departures into his sense of humour. I suggest that the present Minister for Education is the most aptly named Education Minister that Queensland has had for a very long time. The fact of the matter is that the Queensland Government indulged in a procedure of building up public expectations that centred on a notion of a vision of excellence. The public of Queensland expected that education would receive a better deal under Mr Ahern.

What happened? When Cabinet met on 18 January, the Cabinet stood up for condom vending machines but did not stand up for the rights of our kids to receive a decent education. After a \$84m cut to the education budget, a miserly \$4m was transferred back to it. On all three important counts—honesty, efficiency and fairness, which we expect in the administration of public affairs in this State—this Government has failed education.

After that Cabinet meeting in January, the Government's propaganda was blatantly dishonest. The new Minister did not take long to find himself comfortable with what was at that time called "Johspeak" in this State. At the time, he claimed that the \$4m that Cabinet in its generosity was putting back to education would employ 718 additional teachers. I stress the word "additional". Obviously he intended that this gesture would pacify parents and teachers who were complaining bitterly about increased class sizes and inadequacy of staffing. It was undoubtedly meant also to be a sop to the hundreds of teacher graduates who had satisfactorily completed their courses and who were now finding life on the unemployment queues in Queensland, despite the fact that their knowledge and their expertise could be well put to use in Queensland's class rooms.

What was the truth of the matter? I am pleased that the Minister for Finance is interested, because he ought to appreciate that the truth of the matter was that the

Government was not talking about 718 additional teachers. What this Government was doing was recognising that 718 fewer teachers were employed in Queensland schools at the beginning of this year compared with the position in the middle of last year. All that the Government was doing was pursuing the same policy direction announced in the Budget, namely, that there would be a freeze on teaching positions. The Government was trying to bring up the number of teachers on the pay-roll to the level that it had promised last year. It was not providing for additional places. Consequently, teacher graduates were to be employed only as replacements of teachers who had resigned or retired. It was a glaring admission of the inadequacies of the budgetary arrangements to provide for teacher salaries that caused the Government to inject an additional \$4m. It behoves the Minister to recognise that fact.

During the Budget debate last year, the Minister stated that the Budget was well produced. From a perusal of the financial details of the Budget, I can assume only that the Minister was referring to the work that was done by the Government Printer in the production of the Budget papers and certainly not the work that was done by the Treasurer and this Government in producing the shoddy figures that are contained therein.

Budget cuts in relation to ancillary staff led to the loss of teacher aide hours. Funds that were set aside for teachers' salaries represented a 1.7 per cent increase in real terms. However, the Government should have realised that right across the board there would be at least a 2 per cent wage increase this year and an additional 4 per cent second-tier component based upon productivity. The truth is that the Education budget was totally deficient. No provision was made within the budgetary framework for the additional costs consequent upon the subsequent 4 per cent second-tier wage increase.

The Government's handling of education has been wholly inefficient. Education funding cuts have resulted in people who have considerable expertise, which could benefit the entire educational system, being farmed off back into the class room. Although that may be all right for the classes that they teach, that represents a loss of expertise to the entire system.

As I have mentioned, the non-employment of adequate numbers of teacher graduates has added to the loss of expertise in the class room. Is it not ironic that, during the first year of the Ahern administration, 60 000 Queensland schoolchildren will be taught in oversized classes within the definition of Mr Ahern's select committee on education and the policy that this Government adopted to ensure that class sizes would meet those recommendations by 1986?

This Government's education policies do not meet the community's basic standards on what is expected from a Government that is concerned about fairness. It is not fair to teacher graduates who entered their courses and satisfactorily completed those courses in good faith based upon quotas that were established in consultation with the projected needs of the Education Department. Those graduates now find themselves unwanted and uncared for by this Government.

This Government has not been fair to teachers, who must contend with oversized classes and the attendant problems of stress and discipline simply because this Government has not fulfilled the commitment that it made last year to freeze teacher numbers, to ensure that teaching staff numbers are maintained at pre-existing levels and to ensure that the class-size policy is fulfilled.

The Government has not been fair to parents. Parents and citizens associations will obviously have to meet the 10 per cent funding shortfall in resourcing and equipping schools. They have been bled white already; they do not need that additional impost.

The Government's education policies are not fair to children, whose future is at stake. They have to contend with oversized classes, inadequate staff numbers and delays in finding replacement staff. It is about time that this Government stopped paying lip-service to the needs of Queensland's education system. Education is an investment in human capital. If there is to be a vision of excellence in education, it must be backed

up with cold, hard cash and not with the idle rhetoric to which we have become accustomed from this Government. Education is an investment in this State's economic and social future. It is about time that this Government was prepared to give education the top priority that it so justly deserves.

Education; Federal and State Budgetary Problems

Mr SHERRIN (Mansfield) (11.50 a.m.): I cannot let the comments that were made by the honourable member for Ipswich pass without making some observations. As usual, members of the ALP are nothing more than prophets of doom and gloom.

A number of points that the honourable member made need to be rebutted. He spoke about a rapid increase in class sizes. My information reveals that no significant increases in class sizes have occurred. The early predictions last year were that class sizes would increase because of the stabilisation of the teacher establishment. That has not occurred. None of the prophets of doom and gloom on the other side of the House can point to specific instances in which there has been a blow-out in class sizes. In the majority of cases, those class sizes are over the limit by only one or two students.

The overwhelming number of those children in oversized classes are in classes that, in many instances, have one or two over the limit. I am aware that, in discussions with educators, teachers have voted not to split those classes because it would disrupt the education of the students. In many instances, those decisions have been made by the practitioners—the education professionals—on the spot. It has been a decision made not because of blackmail but on professional grounds.

The second point is that Mr Hamill must have had his speech ready for a debate last year. He spoke about a large number of unemployed graduates. What gall for a member of the ALP to come into this place and talk about unemployed graduates when in Victoria the average wait for a graduate leaving a tertiary institution to go into teaching is now fast approaching three years. Of the 1 800 graduates who came into Queensland's system at the end of last year, 1 500 will be placed in class rooms by 30 June. Yet the honourable member for Ipswich has the unmitigated gall to come into this place and criticise the Queensland Government at a time when southern States with ALP Governments have waiting-lists that extend to longer than three years. He should hang his head in shame.

Finally, the teachers themselves—the professionals in the workplace—have passed a vote of confidence in this Government. The Queensland Teachers Union went to the teachers and said, "Will you consider strike action?" The 27 000 teachers, in the workplace—those best able to know the conditions in the class rooms—rejected that call for industrial action and passed a vote of confidence in the ability of the Queensland Government to make some very difficult budgetary decisions during this year. The 27 000 teachers, not the mouthpiece for the Teachers Union on the ALP side of this Chamber, rejected industrial action.

It is not my intention to spend the time that I have set aside to refute the misinformation promulgated by the Opposition spokesman on education. However, I want to refer to some comments that he has made about education. I am the first to admit that trouble points exist in education in Queensland. The Government admits that. Serious budgetary decisions that will have to be made this year are being considered.

For a brief time this morning I want to speak about some of the underlying problems that are affecting State and Commonwealth Governments as they come to prepare their Budgets for the 1988-89 financial year. It will be seen that many State Governments, not only this State Government, are experiencing problems in delivering services. For example, in recent days honourable members will have become aware of problems that exist in New South Wales concerning the leasing of police cars. Because of budgetary problems that the New South Wales Labor Government has had, police cars in that State have been repossessed by the finance company. One can imagine the situation of a local police officer in a town who goes to get into his car on a Monday morning but

finds that, simply because the Government has run out of money, the car has been repossessed by the finance company.

Mr Henderson: Is that right?

Mr SHERRIN: It is absolutely correct.

As I have already indicated, Victoria also has budgetary problems. Victorian teacher graduates have to wait for three years before they enter the class room. In Queensland some of the graduates are being asked to wait a few months, but in Victoria those graduates are looking at waiting for three years.

To be totally frank and honest, Queensland is also experiencing problems in delivering the desired level of services that this Government, as a caring and considerate Government, wishes to deliver to all Queenslanders. The background to these problems relates to the vertical fiscal imbalance that exists in Queensland. The paradox in the Australian Federal/State financial agreements flows from a constitutional division of responsibilities between the two levels of Government, that of the central Government and that of the State Government. It is not backed up by a corresponding division between public revenue and resources. There is a mismatch. Under the Constitution the States have retained the responsibility for the overwhelming majority of services to constituents but, as will be seen shortly, there is a mismatch in the Commonwealth's responsibility for revenue-raising as well.

State Governments are providing the infrastructure of State development—public services such as education, health, public utilities and public transport—but it is the central Government that controls the major sources for raising public funds through taxation revenue and loan-raising. That is where the mismatch has occurred over the years. Subsequently, those funds are transferred to State Governments.

It is often argued that as a consequence of this financial arrangement, the Australian federal system is, in function, a federal system; but financially it is a unitary or central system, with the State Governments being responsible for the provision of a wide range of public services while being dependent upon Federal Government budgeting to finance them. It could take some time, but I will try to encapsulate some of the history relating to the federal system, because when our forefathers established the Constitution back in 1901 after the constitutional conventions, this mismatch was never envisaged.

Mr Comben: It was back in 1899.

Mr SHERRIN: This mismatch was never envisaged in 1901. The bargain, which was first struck at Federation in 1901, appears, at most, to have been open-ended over the provision of finance between the two levels of Government. At that time, the various colonial delegates agreed only that the given arrangements would prevail until the Parliament otherwise provided. That was the problem that they struck. Most of the financial agreements that have been reached under the Australian federal system have arisen since Federation.

It may be interesting to catalogue some of those financial arrangements. The history of Australian Federal/State financial relationships is one of sharp intergovernmental conflict, particularly in periods of rapid social and economic change. In the 1920s when the economic boom was dislocated by the recession, the States' loan programs and capital works budgets were rearranged. The outcome was the famous 1927 financial agreement that was ratified in 1928 by the referendum. That move brought the States' borrowing powers—their prerogatives to borrow—under central Government control. The economic crisis of the 1930s led to the establishment of the Commonwealth Grants Commission to administer equalisation grants to the poorer States. After the outbreak of World War II, with tremendous demands to raise tax revenue, income tax powers that had previously been held by the States were transferred to the central Government—an assumption of power that was subsequently upheld by the High Court and reaffirmed in 1957 after a further State Government challenge.

Mr Braddy: You can always take it back.

Mr SHERRIN: That is a great point. The States would take the power back if there were a vacation of the power by the Commonwealth Government. It would be no use adding State powers on top of Commonwealth powers. If there were a vacation by the Commonwealth Government of its powers and means, the State Governments would walk in and take them back but would not put States' powers on top of the Commonwealth's powers and pass an increased taxation impost on to Australian citizens.

The emerging imbalance between the rate of development among the various States between the 1950s and 1960s led, under both Liberal and Labor Governments, to a tremendous increase in the provision of section 96 specific purpose grants by the Commonwealth Government. The interesting point is that over the years the grants have increased, although there has been a general decrease in the general tax pool return to the States. Now, a very large proportion of taxation revenue received by the States is provided under either tied or specific purpose grants. Many of them are made in constitutional areas in which the Commonwealth Government has absolutely no prerogative.

Of course, that is not the case in many overseas countries. In Canada, a rational development has occurred in which the State Legislatures have the power to levy taxes on their own constituents. In the United States, there is a corresponding match between Federal and State Government functions and powers. The inherent problems associated with State Budgets in the Australian Federal/State relationship flows from a constitutional division of functions between the two levels of Government which is not backed by a corresponding division between public revenue and resources.

Time expired.

MATTER OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Unemployment

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I wish to report that pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 137, I have received the following brief written statement from the honourable Leader of the Opposition—

“In accordance with Standing Order 137 I propose that the following matter of public importance be submitted to the House for discussion: that urgent action is required on the part of the State Government to overhaul its economic and financial management practices in order to deliver jobs for the 130,000 Queenslanders who are unemployed.

In support of this proposal for a debate on what I consider to be a matter of supreme public importance I would submit that the management of the Queensland economy is a primary responsibility of the government of Queensland. The unemployment rate is a most significant indicator of the condition of a State's economy. Queensland has consistently recorded the highest unemployment rate of any State over recent years. The relatively recent election of a new leader of the State Government and the appointment of a new Ministry makes it imperative that the Parliament of Queensland be granted the opportunity to discuss the new Government's approach to this issue. Queensland's unemployment crisis demands our State Government's most urgent attention.

Yours sincerely,

WAYNE GOSS, M.L.A.
LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION”

I presume that the honourable member has the necessary support for this proposal?

Not fewer than five members having risen in their places to indicate approval—

Mr SPEAKER: I call the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr AUSTIN: I rise to a point of order. Standing Order No. 137 states—

“At any time during the discussion a motion may be made by any Member ‘That the House do pass to the next business.’”

I move—

“That the House do pass to the next business.”

Question put; and the House divided—

In division—

Mr Burns interjecting—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have no option other than to warn the honourable member for Lytton under Standing Order No. 123A.

Later in division—

Honourable members interjecting—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Chamber to come to order.

Mr Burns: This is your new vision of excellence. You won't talk about the unemployed and the economy.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have already warned the honourable member for Lytton once.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am not prepared to have a debate with the honourable member for Lytton.

AYES, 43		NOES, 40	
Ahern	Lester	Ardill	Milliner
Alison	Lingard	Beanland	Palaszcuk
Austin	Littleproud	Beard	Schuntner
Berghofer	McCauley	Braddy	Scott
Booth	McKechnie	Burns	Shaw
Borbidge	McPhie	Campbell	Sherlock
Burreket	Menzel	Casey	Smith
Chapman	Muntz	Comben	Smyth
Cooper	Neal	D'Arcy	Underwood
Elliott	Nelson	De Lacy	Vaughan
Fraser	Newton	Eaton	Warburton
Gately	Randell	Gibbs, R. J.	Warner
Gibbs, I. J.	Sherrin	Goss	Wells
Gilmore	Simpson	Gygar	White
Glasson	Slack	Hamill	Yewdale
Gunn	Stoneman	Hayward	
Harper	Tenni	Innes	
Henderson	Veivers	Knox	
Hinton		Lee	
Hobbs		Lickiss	
Hynd	<i>Tellers:</i>	McElligott	<i>Tellers:</i>
Katter	FitzGerald	Mackenroth	Davis
Lane	Stephan	McLean	Prest

Resolved in the affirmative.

MARINE PARKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 27 October 1987 (see p. 3552).

Mr COMBEN (Windsor) (12.10 p.m.): Before addressing the Bill, I wish to say a few words about the late Dr Graham Saunders, previously Director of National Parks in this State. It is a tragedy that such a young man should be taken in the way that he was. He was respected on both sides of this House. I personally had great faith and confidence in him. It is sad to have watched him fight an eventually fatal illness so bravely and to have died an heroic death. He came back to work, as many honourable members saw on the last occasion that we debated national parks legislation here. He sat in the lobby and, with his advice to the Minister, was able to make a major contribution to the debate at that time. He was a humane and a capable administrator. He was a member of my own Anglican Church, a dedicated Christian, and he lived his life by the tenets of that church. I know that all Opposition members join with me in extending our sympathies to Esme, his wife, and his children as well. The cause of environmental protection was obviously promoted in his years as director. It was unfortunate that he had the Government that he had to work with, but as director he certainly carried on a very capable job and will be sorely missed in this State.

The Bill that is being considered today will amend the Marine Parks Act 1982 with respect to two principal matters. Firstly, responsibility for administration of marine parks will be transferred from the Co-ordinator-General to the Minister for Environment, Conservation and Tourism and also to the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. Secondly, the amendments will simplify the processes of declaring marine parks in this State.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister made very few references to marine parks. However, he devoted several pages of his speech to affiliated matters. He referred to some Great Barrier Reef islands, to Wistari Reef, to intertidal areas reserved in the Hinchinbrook Channel and to fisheries reservations. It is interesting to note that not one of those areas is covered by a Queensland marine park. The truth is that in Queensland today there are only two marine parks. The central section of the Townsville/Whitsunday marine park is established and is in the central Queensland coastal area. The Pumicestone Passage marine park was only recently declared. It is west of Bribie Island and well known to most members. What the Minister may have trumpeted in his second-reading speech as his Government's successes in marine park protection and marine environment protection is very little for him to be proud of in this region.

At the time of the original declaration of the Great Barrier Reef marine park, a deal was struck between then Prime Minister Fraser and then Premier Bjelke-Petersen. That deal allowed the Great Barrier Reef marine park to reach the low-water mark along about 60 per cent of the Barrier Reef's length. However, about 26 coastal areas were specifically excluded. The Great Barrier Reef marine park comes to within three miles of the coast for about 60 per cent of its length, but the rest of the coastal area from the three-mile mark up to the high-water mark is still not zoned in any protective way. Two of those coastal areas have been protected. However, the exclusions were supposed to be protected by mirror State legislation reflecting the main tenets of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Act, which was a Federal Act. What do we see after 10 years? The exclusions are still in place, with no real legislative cover for those areas. Some of the areas are now specifically gazetted as being Queensland ports. Port areas that should be covering 10 square kilometres of land are actually covering some 200 kilometres in some areas. I cannot understand why some of those areas are still excluded.

Repulse Bay, which is in the central region, is covered by the Whitsunday marine park. It has one of the largest oil-shale deposits under it. I would have thought that the Government would have been at great pains to exclude any sort of zoning from that area. However, it is within one of the two marine parks. Yet areas such as the Burdekin

River delta, which will be of no importance for anything apart from environmental concerns, are still ungazetted and not covered by the legislation.

Similarly, the coastline from Townsville to Lucinda is not going to be used for anything else and will have few benefits apart from environmental ones. Yet the Co-ordinator-General and the former Premier did not see fit to declare such areas as marine parks.

My first plea is for the Minister to use the Act that is being amended today and to declare at least some more of those 26 excluded areas. If that is done, the Minister will be showing some sort of good faith, and the transfer of the Marine Parks Act from the control of the Co-ordinator-General to the control of the Minister's director will in fact mean something for conservation in this State.

A proper zoning system is needed within marine parks. The two parks that have already been declared have zones. However, if one considers the Pumicestone Passage marine park, one finds there is no indication that the zonings have improved the management and environmental protection of Pumicestone Passage. Most of that area was already covered by a system of fish habitats and wetland reserves. If one looks carefully at Pumicestone Passage, one finds that there is no greater protection for any of those areas. There are zonings that are designed to be fish nurseries, which will exclude anglers, commercial and recreational fishers. However, in fact all of those things were done previously. So where is the benefit?

The Government can point to Pumicestone Passage and say, "We have done a marvellous job. That is a marine park." However, the actual changes in status mean nothing. They are words on pieces of paper that cost a lot of money to gazette. Nice glossy pamphlets are produced for the Minister's information, but there is no change to the conservation of that particular area.

When one considers the recent problems on Bribie Island, the destruction of mangroves in two areas there, one starts to realise the real need for a proper marine park and protection of the hinterland by the immediate declaration of a national park. Five months ago the Minister was quoted on the front page of the *Caboolture* newspaper as saying that that park up there would be declared in four months. Five months have elapsed. My information is that the park is still at least three months away from being declared. There is obviously a need in that area for a totally integrated environmental strategy protecting the passage, its commercial fishing potential, its great economic benefits, its recreational benefits and, of particular importance to me, the environmental aspects of that area.

If the mangroves up there continue to be destroyed, obviously the fish resource will be lost and the attractiveness of Pumicestone Passage will also be lost. It is the fervent hope of the Opposition that the Marine Parks Act will not be a means by which the Government is able to point to apparent protection of the environment when in fact it is protection in name only. I am afraid that that is what this particular legislation will do.

I am particularly concerned because the State legislation that is being amended today does not mirror the Federal legislation in the same way as the other two Acts, the Federal and State Acts which were complementary and which were passed at about the same stage as this Marine Parks Act, covering offshore mining and offshore drilling. Both of those Acts mirrored perfectly the Federal legislation, so that even if some areas were not covered by the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Act or by the Federal legislation in regard to offshore mining and offshore drilling, at least there was coverage in the State legislation saying that it will be exactly the same. It would be accepted that the Minister would use that legislation in good faith, so that there would be an overall pattern of management of all of those areas, where everyone would know what could and could not be done.

When it comes to the Marine Parks Act, it is found that there were substantial changes and that even if all the excluded zones are covered, there is no guarantee that

there will be the same sort of cover for those areas. A matter of particular concern is the public input into the zoning plans. Under the Federal legislation, if an area is to be zoned, there is a call for public input. That public input is considered. When the draft plan has been prepared, that is put up again for public scrutiny and the public again has the opportunity of commenting on what would otherwise be a final plan.

In Queensland, an opportunity has been given for public input, but there is no double go. The Government listens to the public and then does what it has decided to do. The matter is not resubmitted to the public with reasons so that they can have a second bite at the cherry.

The legislation has worked successfully for the Great Barrier Reef marine park in all three of its major sections. Some fine-tuning is now taking place. However, public input is the important part. If the Act is to be used to cover those excluded zones and a large range of our coastline—some 40 per cent of the coastline that abuts the Great Barrier Reef will be subject to this legislation—there is a very important reason and a great need for public input. If the Minister is going to have a vision of excellence, perhaps the first thing he could do would be to start putting some sincerity into this legislation so that we can see that the Barrier Reef areas not covered by the Federal legislation will in actual fact be properly covered.

I would like to take this opportunity to express some concern that the Opposition has about specific issues in Queensland's marine and littoral zone that should be covered by this type of legislation but which often is not the case. These issues highlight the differences between the Government and the Opposition in this place. Opposition members believe that our land, our foreshores, our reefs and our islands should be for the benefit of everyone and all future generations of Queenslanders, whilst the Cabinet and its cronies on the back bench apparently believe that the natural environment should be exploited whatever the cost.

Mr Newton: Be nice.

Mr COMBEN: I am always nice to the Government in this place. One cannot help being nice to the village idiots.

The Government still allows people to destroy mangroves with virtual impunity.

Mr Newton interjected.

Mr COMBEN: The honourable member for Glass House has never been to the Great Barrier Reef. He has never seen the places to which I have referred, and he is content to keep farming papaws on his property near the Glass House Mountains. But he still has to accept responsibility for the actions of the Queensland Government. All members of the Government must take joint and several liability for the actions of the Government.

At present, the maximum fine for mangrove destruction in Queensland is one-tenth of the maximum fine for illegal trapping, but the cost of the destruction of mangroves is obviously enormous. Whole fisheries and mud crab areas can be wiped out by the destruction of mangroves, yet the Government says that they are worth virtually nothing. The Minister for Primary Industries, who has responsibility for fisheries, is to be commended for the provisions relating to illegal trapping and illegal fishing. The Government has the power to confiscate boats and fishing gear. However, our mangroves, which are of far more importance than any individual fish, because they are the habitats of fish nurseries, can be destroyed by people almost with impunity.

The big developers, such as Mike Gore on the Gold Coast, will go along quite happily and knock out many metres of mangroves if they are not aesthetically pleasing. In reality, they will just say, "We will pay the \$80. We will go to the Magistrates Court. We will say, 'Yes, we did it. We are guilty.'" They will pay the fine. In real economic terms, what does that mean to those people? It is a cost of management. It is a totally inadequate and inappropriate penalty. There is a need to increase penalties in those areas.

Later, during the debate on the Land Act legislation, I shall have a great deal more to say about the Lands Department in this State. Although the Minister in charge of this Bill is responsible for conservation and environment, the Lands Department still gives away environmentally sensitive areas that should be preserved.

Recently, advertisements were placed and expressions of interest were called for concerning the establishment of a fish-breeding area on 514 hectares of mangroves and wetlands near Cardwell. That sort of area is obviously important to our conservation needs and to our fish stocks in this State, yet there seems to be no consultation between the Lands Department and the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The melaleuca swamp, which is very important, is up for grabs and will probably be given away in the normal course of Lands Department management. It is beyond me to understand how he can still have a Lands Department that will just say——

Mr McPhie: Quite a lot of things are beyond you.

Mr COMBEN: The only thing that is beyond me is how the honourable member is still sitting on the Government side of the House. It is a result of the gerrymander. However, he will not be there after the latter part of next year, when honesty, openness and fairness will have a place in this State.

I am raising these issues because, last week, an article that ranked as a front-page story in the *Courier-Mail* outlined how the Lands Department can allow someone to freehold land for \$2,000 and then sell it for \$14m. That is beyond my comprehension and certainly beyond the comprehension of the average Queenslander and any aspiring environmental manager in this State. The Minister should be concerned about matters such as that.

This Government is continuing to revoke fish habitat areas in southern Moreton Bay. A submission that recently went to the Minister for Primary Industries recommended the revocation of fish habitats. However, following publicity, that proposal was knocked on the head and was not followed through.

My colleague Mr Burns will be referring to areas in southern Moreton Bay in which fish habitat land has been swapped by developers for other land. The fact that, in the past, the Government has said that fish habitat areas must be preserved seems suddenly to be of no consequence. The Government is now saying, "Because that area will be well developed, we will give you that piece of land. You give us a couple of hectares upstream, which we previously did not want to include in the reserve. However, everything will be all right because we now believe that that development is okay. We must have development, and that development is important to you in the form of concrete boat ramps." Development is often in fairly elitist, tourist resort-style destinations.

Southern Moreton Bay is an area of major concern both to environmentalists and members on this side of the House. However, it is being threatened by a multitude of pressures from hovercraft to urban development. The hovercraft service was criticised recently by a wide range of people such as recreational fishermen, commercial fishermen, bird-watchers and environmentalists. Because people who are paying large amounts of money to travel by hovercraft might spill their cups of tea and coffee, it is apparently not appropriate for the hovercraft service to go along the eastern side of Stradbroke Island. That was the explanation given by Captain David Campbell of Hover Mirage when he was asked why the hovercraft was travelling inside the islands, through Canaipa Passage and over a number of important sandbanks; disturbing the bird life and scaring a lot of matter out of my colleague the honourable member for Lytton. If he is in that area when the hovercraft goes past, the sewerageworks have to work overtime. The hovercraft makes a noise similar to that of a 727 jet.

Mr Burns: It makes as much noise as a 747 jumbo jet going past. It kills the yabbies on the banks and disturbs all the ecology.

Mr COMBEN: The honourable member will have his say in a moment. As he said, the hovercraft travels over the banks, kills the yabbies, disturbs the birds and scares the fish.

The movement of hovercraft in that area is not controlled. Southern Moreton Bay is the basis of a half billion dollar fishing and recreational industry in this State. What is needed in this State is a total strategy.

Although the Honourable Ivan Gibbs has been working with a committee for a number of years, nothing has come out of that committee about the full protection of that very important marine environment in southern Moreton Bay apart from a series of glossy pamphlets that claim that the State Government intends to declare many areas as national parks. However, little of that has come to fruition.

The proposed bridge to Russell and Stradbroke Islands will make both of those islands outer suburbs of Brisbane and will destroy one of the most important recreational playgrounds in this State. The people of Brisbane enjoy Moreton Island, Stradbroke Island and southern Moreton Bay. Suddenly there will be a bridge over to those islands. Its construction is supported by a group of loonies on Russell Island led by a town-planner with not one town-planning principle in his mind. In actual fact, he is in possession of a range of money-making schemes and admits that there could be a conflict of interests, since he owns land on which the building of a bus depot is proposed. He wants the bridge to be built so that buses can travel back and forth across it. How important it would be to his bus service! He does not seem to think that that is in conflict with his supposed professional integrity, no sign of which could I find when he came to talk to me.

The sorts of people who are saying, "We want a bridge." are entrepreneurs and speculators. The great mass of people on both Stradbroke Island and Russell Island to whom I have spoken—and they seem to have formed substantial organisations—are saying, "We don't want the bridge. We bought island land to get away from it. We want our quiet retreat. We don't want a four-lane highway intruding into the middle of our island." That is the conflict that exists. There is still the aspect of the swaps of fish habitats and the hovercraft's movements. What is necessary is a proper strategy for southern Moreton Bay. If necessary, it would be one of the few quangos whose establishment the Labor Party would support. Proper investigation and management of that area is needed.

I personally would like the area above the high-tide mark declared a national park, and that below it, a marine park. I think that that could be done easily. It would be a great feather in any Government's cap. It is unfortunate that the Labor Party will have to wait for 2½ years, when it will be on the Government side of the House, to be complimented for undertaking that sort of scheme.

On the subject of southern Moreton Bay, and more particularly Moreton Island, it is interesting to note that the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation has now completed its recreational study of Moreton Bay and has detailed a number of sites which it believes should be the sites for four major tourist developments—of the Sanctuary Cove style—on Moreton Island. Although the Premier has said that he intends declaring the rest of Moreton Island a national park, the concept of privatised national parks can again be seen coming into the Minister's portfolio. Moreton Island cannot be a national park and at the same time have four major resorts. It is not envisaged that they be small camping areas or a collection of half a dozen log cabins. In actual fact, what is being suggested is the development of major, multimillion dollar resorts, which many people will visit. It would be interesting to know how the Minister intends to solve the potential conflict between national parks and those sorts of areas. I understand that within the National Parks and Wildlife Service there are bigger plans ahead for privatisation; that a number of Q-parks are planned and some fairly well-advanced plans are in hand for destroying the corporate identity of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. It will be interesting to see the Wildlife Service transferred to the Primary Industries portfolio and the National Parks Service to the Tourism portfolio. It will be an interesting split of the service.

Mr Muntz interjected.

Mr COMBEN: It will be interesting to have the Minister's response to that. I would appreciate it if he would put to ground those rumours. Some very interesting documents are also in existence. If the Minister will not table some of them, I will be happy to do so over the next few days.

I will now deal with other parts of the marine and the littoral environment. As a whole, the Queensland coastline is not generally protected. Only 11 per cent of it has any conservation status. That compares with some 35 per cent of the New South Wales coastline. That State's Government plans to raise that to about 43 per cent. This State's most fragile and valuable resource is constantly under threat. One has to go no further than the other side of the Brisbane River to see how land along the river bank is being given away. That is happening all the way along the Queensland coast. Even land that was originally left as an esplanade under leasehold arrangements is often given to a multimillion dollar developer for virtually nothing. The most recent example is the Line Hill property in north Queensland, which I have already mentioned, which was freeholded for \$2,000 but sold for \$14m only two months later.

Barrier Reef islands are always under threat. A threat to Lindeman Island came and went, but another one is starting. At the present time, although Lindeman Island's status is not to be changed—nor will it be sold—the development that is proposed in the corner of the island under the special lease, which was originally given for a children's playground, is quite horrendous. The resort that is planned and the number of people expected to go there are really as offensive as the original Lindeman Island fiasco two years ago. It seems that the media are not always interested in that story, but I know that many conservation groups, academics and other people concerned with offshore islands have been saying for several months that the Lindeman Island farce has to be exposed. The Government has to come to grips with that matter very quickly and should find out exactly what is proposed under that special lease. It is a matter of grave concern, but the Minister is not saying anything publicly. I believe he is scared that what happened last time over Lindeman Island will happen again when people realise the extent to which the environment of Lindeman Island will again be challenged by the number of tourists visiting the island under what will effectively become privatisation. The Minister has found a way of using privatisation without selling the national park. Therefore, the issue is not as popular in the media as it could be. Nevertheless, a number of people are gravely concerned.

In summary, the picture I am painting is that the marine environment and other areas covered by the Bill are far from being as safe and secure as was indicated by the Minister. The Minister spoke about "many areas", whereas in actual fact few areas are covered by marine park legislation. Although a fundamental tenet of this Bill is that marine areas will be better managed and will be under the control of the Director of National Parks, the perception of Queenslanders is that that is not so. The people are scared of Government intervention in all areas of the environment, regardless of how hard-working the directors and staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Service may be or how well they go in to bat for one view, which is generally an environmental and conservation awareness approach, and regardless of how hard they try. The decisions that finally count are those made by the Government, and they are decisions that still destroy the natural environment of this State. In this State it is not sufficient to simply place areas in a marine park. Such a move does not give adequate protection. It is ironic that the Fisheries Management division has given better protection to marine areas in this State than the marine park concept has been able to give.

Members of the Opposition have great reservations about the whole concept of marine parks, but we can do nothing except support this legislation because it represents an improvement. To a certain extent, the Minister has streamlined the declaration of marine parks, which is obviously to be commended. Responsibility for those decisions has been transferred to the director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, who is the expert on these matters in this State, and that is to be commended. Although the Opposition is unable to protest against the legislation over all, it believes that the legislation does not go far enough and that much more could be done.

There is a need for environmental protection and a conservation strategy in this State. Eventually, that will occur in Queensland—as it has occurred in every other Australian State. Queensland does not seem to be moving towards that position. When it does happen, I will be sitting behind the seat presently occupied by the Minister, when Wayne Goss becomes Premier and when honesty, efficiency, fairness and fair Government will rule in this State. At that time, the major issues of the day will be debated in this House and public participation will be availed of in all such matters as are being debated today. Public participation will be even greater for marine park declarations, and the declarations will mirror the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Act. When those things happen—and when the conservation movement is acknowledged as an important and integral part of the environmental protection movement; when it is given the money to operate properly; when environmental impact studies are required—that will be a great day for Queensland. That is the day that I and other members of the Opposition look forward to.

In the meantime, the Opposition will accept the amendments moved by the Minister for what they are worth. However, I point out that the amendments do not go nearly far enough. The Minister has not given any real priority to the protection of marine areas, but the legislation is a step in the right direction.

Mr VEIVERS (Southport) (12.40 p.m.): Before commencing my speech, I wish to refer to the sad passing of Dr Graham Saunders, who was one of the most respected conservationists in Queensland and in Australia. In my opinion, he was the ultimate conservationist, and the people of this State and of Australia are saddened by his death. This warm and very charitable man will be missed. All members on the Government side of the House extend their sympathies to the wife and family of this very great man. He was a great worker. He was often seen sitting in the lobby of this Chamber.

A sound system of marine parks is based on wise and equitable management and conservation of this significant marine and estuarine environment of Queensland, whilst ensuring reasonable access to and usage of these areas. No other State in Australia has a greater responsibility for the protection and stewardship of significant marine estuarine areas than Queensland. In fact, more than 90 per cent of all marine and estuarine protected areas listed in Australia are to be found within or adjacent to Queensland. So much for the ramblings of the honourable member for Windsor. I do not know what he was prattling about, because in the long run he ended up supporting what the Government is trying to do. He spoke for approximately 30 minutes, but I could not make too much out of his speech because he merely kept on knocking. He then finished his speech by stating that he totally supported the legislation, but that the Government probably could have gone further. That is the man who said that he will be sitting on this side of the House. God help Queenslanders when that happens!

Mr Henderson: The only way he will get here is to switch parties.

Mr VEIVERS: Yes. The honourable member for Mount Gravatt is correct. The only way he would get over here would be to switch parties.

This indeed is an enviable position and should go a long way towards silencing those self-proclaimed experts who are quick to criticise this Government's commitment to responsible management of Queensland's natural and cultural heritage.

I draw the attention of honourable members to the fact that an even greater proportion of Queensland's marine and estuarine areas is being actively investigated for inclusion in Queensland's marine park system through systematic resource assessment of important areas, in conjunction with a comprehensive program of public participation and consultation. In fact, substantial progress has been made towards the preparation of draft zoning plans for proposed Queensland marine parks extending from Cape York to Cairns. Other areas under consideration include parts of southern Moreton Bay—where the honourable member for Lytton goes fishing—which is one of Queensland's most important estuarine systems. This area is renowned for both its recreational and

fishing opportunities and is also an essential part of the coastal habitat for migratory waders.

Mr Comben: What are migratory waders?

Mr VEIVERS: Migratory waders walk in water. It is a pity that the honourable member for Windsor does not walk in deep water.

Also Queensland has more than 300 offshore islands that have to be managed in association with the declaration of marine parks. Most of these islands are in the Great Barrier Reef and are surrounded by the Commonwealth's Great Barrier Reef marine park and complementary State marine parks. The Queensland and Commonwealth Governments have agreed to establish complementary marine parks that will provide for mirror zoning plans, where necessary, in order to avoid confusion between overlapping administrative responsibilities and in the minds of the members of the public.

Accordingly, Queensland's marine parks legislation has been amended to reflect the Commonwealth legislation and to provide for the transfer of responsibility for the legislation to the Minister for Environment, Conservation and Tourism and the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service. This clearly makes sense, since the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service is also responsible for managing island national parks, many of which are surrounded by marine parks. After all, many of our offshore island national parks have been identified as supporting important breeding seabird colonies, some of which are globally endangered.

Mr Comben: Can you name one?

Mr VEIVERS: The roseate tern is one. As a matter of fact, in marine terms, the honourable member for Windsor could nearly be classed as the one and only bearded clam.

Therefore, not only is the complementary management of Queensland and Commonwealth marine parks ensured, but also the complementary management of Queensland's marine parks and island national parks is ensured. That is highly desirable. The Minister responsible for national parks, the Honourable Geoff Muntz, is to be commended on his many initiatives that have ensured these arrangements for fostering sound management and the protection of Queensland's very extensive marine and island estate.

Mr Comben interjected.

Mr VEIVERS: At the conclusion of his speech, the honourable member for Windsor said that the Government was doing a good job, but he is still trying to interject.

I believe that our conservation task is to ensure that all marine and estuarine areas of great significance are included in our marine parks.

Mr Gygar interjected.

Mr VEIVERS: I only hope that one day a bullet-proof vest can be made, but that the honourable member for Stafford is in one when it fails.

It is the responsibility of all members of Parliament to work towards ensuring that as many people as possible get the opportunity to experience at first hand our wonderful marine parks and, therefore, help to promote a broader community awareness of the conservation responsibilities and objectives to which this Government is firmly committed. After all, the management and protection of our marine environment relies greatly on continued public support.

This means that all members should have little hesitation in supporting strongly the sound initiatives promoted by this Government to help meet this challenge. Marine parks play an increasingly important role in protecting and conserving our marine environment to enable continued usage of them for tourism, recreation and fishing.

The Bill indicates a commitment towards a co-ordinated and commonsense approach to the management of Queensland's marine parks. I believe also that it clearly reflects

this Government's continuing concern for the proper management of the extensive marine and estuarine areas along the coast of Queensland, including the Great Barrier Reef region and Queensland's offshore island national parks. Any suggestion that any other view should be taken does not address the truth of the matter, which is that the Government's policies reflect sensitivity to the environment and a clear recognition of the importance of marine and estuarine conservation.

Mr Comben: There are only two of them.

Mr VEIVERS: As the Bill clearly reflects the Government's continuing and vigorous commitment to the protection of Queensland's marine and estuarine environment for the benefit of all Australians, I support strongly the proposed amendments to the Marine Parks Act. The member for Windsor would know nothing about that.

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (12.49 p.m.): In speaking to the Bill, it would be remiss of any member not to note with sadness the passing of Dr Graham Saunders. His diligence and enthusiasm were well known to everyone. He was an administrator, a conservationist and a good man. He was a public servant in the truest sense of the word. His passing is a sad loss to the people of Queensland and also to his family. My colleagues in the Liberal Party join with all other members of this House in expressing our condolences and sorrow at his untimely and premature death.

In this debate I feel I should do as the Minister did and spend about 2 per cent of the time to speak about the Bill and then go on to other subjects. I think the idea of zones is an outstanding approach to the management of national parks, particularly marine national parks. If one thing is clear in marine parks, it is the variation that occurs within them. As the Minister and his officers have rightly said, things that could be readily permitted in one zone would be catastrophic in others and therefore must be prohibited.

The proposal to allow those zones to be introduced so that things can be done in varying degrees in varying places is a sound one and one that I am sure will receive the support of everyone who is interested in conservation. However, once one introduces these zones, with the mixture of prohibited and allowed activities, the problem of enforcement arises. I regret that that is where the system will fall down. Enforcement and proof of prohibited activities from one zone to another requires a comprehensive scheme of surveillance, which is something that we do not have in this State or, regrettably, in this nation. One of the disasters that must be sheered home primarily to the Federal Government—the State Government has a role to play—is the area of coastal surveillance. It is woefully inadequate, carried out by rank amateurs who are underequipped, underpaid and underskilled. If the Queensland Government and the nation wish to be serious about our marine resources, urgently something must be done to ensure that there is proper surveillance of marine areas so that people who do not comply with the law know with certainty that they will be detected and prosecuted.

Some of the activities that are taking place around the waterways of this State at present make it quite clear to all observers that virtually a person can get away with blue murder, be it illegal fishing in the Brisbane area and Moreton Bay, drug-running, gun-running and other smuggling activities around the Barrier Reef and the coast or the destruction of marine resources by foreign fishermen who have no regard for the future of the resource or any responsible approach to its management.

I urge the Minister, if he is serious about the preservation of our parks, to take up in the strongest possible terms the matter of surveillance and enforcement with his Federal colleagues and to work on a co-operative plan. He should not merely go down there and bucket them and tell them that they are not doing enough. He should try to work with them to come up with a plan that will ensure the adequate surveillance and enforcement of provisions designed to protect the marine resources of this State.

I note also in his second-reading speech that the Minister made remarks about the requirement to manage the area between the high and low-water marks. He emphasised its importance. It will be fascinating to see the Minister do that in all areas, particularly

when he and his department—I consider that the department did it under duress—have already allowed the principle that the Minister asserted so strongly in his speech to be departed from in the case of Daydream Island. With the Minister's consent, the area that he acknowledged to be of great delicacy and importance between the high and low-water marks was handed over to the island proprietor. It is quite a contradiction of all of the established principles of maritime and riparian law under our legal system. However, one of the Minister's mates wanted it, so he got it. I hope that there will never be a repetition of that sort of nonsense in this State, because it will make a total lie of what the Minister has said in his second-reading speech about having any sort of responsible approach to that very delicate intertidal area that, above all, needs the closest management.

I turn now to the subject of marine parks and marine resources. We must look to the management of all of the parks that fall close to our seas and on which the seas have an impact. It relates particularly to the islands. A sinister development in the management of national park resources by the Government is the little experiment that it is carrying out of granting special leases under the national parks legislation for the development of tourist and other facilities within national parks. Never let it be said that this Government does not learn from experience; it does. It learned a lot from the Lindeman Island experience. The problem is that the lesson was not that it should not put tourist developments in national parks; it was that it should never be stupid enough to bring a national park revocation before the Parliament. If it did that on notice, it would not only have to face the wrath of the public and of the members of other parties in this House, but it would also end up having a back-bench revolt.

I predict with certainty one thing. Queensland will not again see the revocation of national parks for the purpose of development of tourist resorts. However, that is not to say that tourist resorts will not be developed in national parks. All it means is that now it will be done by way of special leases. I think that his snide, underhanded method of attempting to avoid public and parliamentary scrutiny is a condemnation of this Government and makes a total lie of its commitment to be an open, honest Government of integrity.

I invite the Minister to tell honourable members why, if he is going to do these things on Penrith Island, he does not revoke the national park. If the Minister is fair dinkum, why does he not give the bloke a lease so that he can develop the tourist facilities that he wants to develop? Why hide behind these special lease provisions, which were never designed to be used for these purposes anyway? If the Minister wants this carbon copy development of the one that was thrown out in regard to Lindeman Island to come up again, why has he not got the courage to face this Parliament and the people of Queensland by revoking the national park? Why does the Minister not come out in the open, demonstrate what he is doing and face the consequences? It is because it destroys the Government's ability to do these little underhanded deals in secret, in private, behind closed doors and without having to face the scrutiny of this Parliament, the newspapers, the other media or the public.

What honourable members are witnessing at the moment is a try-on by the Government to see if it can get away with it so that it never again has to go through this revocation procedure. If these try-ons on Penrith Island and Lindeman Island succeed, if the Government gets away with it, then all of the national park islands of this State are at risk. The classification of a national park in Queensland will be meaningless.

A national park is supposed to provide perpetual protection, unless Parliament intervenes to revoke it. However, honourable members will see national park status reduced to nonsense in this State. It will mean nothing because if at any time any of the Ministers or the National Party's mates slide up and want to do something in a national park, they will get a special lease removed from the scrutiny of this Parliament and hopefully—in the Minister's thoughts and the Government's thoughts—from the scrutiny of the people of Queensland.

There is no need for it. If the proposals are okay, if they are in keeping with the land on which they are to be built and they will not damage the natural resource, why has the Government not got the courage to come before the Parliament, state it openly and prove it? There can only be one reason and that is that the Government has a lot to hide, either in the way the developer was selected—perhaps in regard to his antecedents and friendships—or the impact that the development will have on the land itself; the impact that it will have on the national park. If this Government has a vision of excellence that is 40/40, why will it not come out and do what it says it is going to do, that is, to be honest, open and accountable? There is only one way to do that if the Government wants to develop a national park, and that is by revoking the national park. Every time the Government avoids that open, honest course of action, it merely portrays itself as being the same old mob as before, knee deep in cronyism and dirty deals, with absolutely no commitment whatsoever to freedom of information in this State or to openness, integrity or honesty.

Mr Newton: Now, now.

Mr GYGAR: I have just noticed that I have caused a bit of an upset on the Government side. I have used some dirty words. I apologise to the members of the National Party. I realise that freedom of information is a dreadful concept and one that they will not come to grips with. I can guarantee that freedom of information legislation will never be introduced by this Government. I feel sorry for the members of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, who have to put up with all of the overrulings and overridings that they get. The Government must know for certain that those things would be revealed if ever there was freedom of information legislation.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.30 p.m.

Mr GYGAR: Before the luncheon adjournment I drew attention to the grave dangers that face all Queensland national parks if the Government continues with its plans and its present practice of granting special leases under the National Parks and Wildlife Act to allow tourist developments in national parks.

Mr Gately: Why?

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member asks, "Why?" There is laid out a mechanism that when an area is declared a national park it is presumed that it is going to be preserved as a national park ad infinitum. A small area was made available for minor developments under the National Parks and Wildlife Act by allowing special leases to be granted for small things, such as a kiosk on the edge of a very large national park or other facilities that would boost the usage of the national park and in fact make the national park more accessible to the people of this State. Instead, we now find that the Government is desperately seeking to avoid the proper parliamentary procedures of a revocation order over a national park when it wishes to allow major development. That is exactly what is happening on Lindeman Island. The first time round the Government was forced to surrender because of public pressure and because of the threat that some of its own back-benchers would cross the floor——

Mr Gately: You live with the fairies.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member should check the press and read the statements made by people such as his colleague Mr Henderson and the former member for Toowong, Mr Bailey, who was reported on the front page of a newspaper as saying, "If the Government tries this, we will vote against it." The Government learnt its lesson well, but unfortunately the lesson it learnt was not that it should not try to put major tourist developments in national parks; the lesson it learnt was that it should never bring a revocation order before the Parliament if it could get away with doing it some other way. That is what is happening, and it is simply not good enough.

If the Minister believes that there is a need for more tourist development on islands adjacent to marine national parks, I suggest that he should come clean with the people

of Queensland. A total management plan for these islands should be developed region by region. If the Government thinks that Penrith needs developing, then the Government should do it in the context of a Mackay regional development plan. If the Government thinks that more activity is needed in the Whitsundays, then it should prepare a Whitsunday regional development plan. It should produce the plan, show it to public, convince them that it is in the best interest of the State and then come before the Parliament with the necessary revocation orders so that the development can be proceeded with. However, at the moment, the pace at which national parks are being lost and at which developments are being made seems to be guided solely by what sort of deal is being offered and by which mate of the National Party on which day. A total management plan is needed. If such a plan is not developed, there will continue to be bitter wrangling that will ultimately end up in a major court case against the Government.

I remind the Minister that special leases can be granted only for the purposes of the Act. What is intended for Lindeman Island could hardly be said to be promoting the conservation and preservation of our national parks—the conservation and preservation of other things, perhaps, but certainly not the national parks—and there is ample scope for the seeking of injunctions against the granting of those types of leases. That is not the way that it ought to happen.

I agree with the Minister's contention that there is a need to look again at how that land is managed and that there is a need for balanced development between tourist use, day trippers, accommodation and preservation of national parks, but one does not arrive at the appropriate mix by snipping off one island at a time and then trying to slide through a special lease outside of parliamentary scrutiny; it is done by the development of regional management plans that are open, public and debated in the Parliament. Although there is a solution to the problems, the present approach by the Government is just adding weight to the arguments of those who distrust its motives and who think that it is anything but honest, open and accountable.

As to the preservation of marine parks and our marine resources—the Minister's department should be looking at other long-term problems. Big things happening in the world can have an impact on Australia. I hope that some very serious study is being carried out on issues such as the ramifications of mining effluent coming down from Papua New Guinea into the Torres Strait and into other nearby areas. The mining companies that are involved say that they have plans that will prevent any chemical pollution of the waters, but that leaves wide open the question of increased siltage and increased suspension of particles in the water. It certainly leaves wide open the subject of the effect of heavy metals.

The last thing that is needed in Queensland is another Minamata outbreak in the Torres Strait. I hope that the Minister and his officers are paying very close attention to the ramifications and implications for Queensland of heavy gold-mining and other mining in the rivers of Papua New Guinea that flow into the Torres Strait and into Queensland marine national parks. Because of the nature of the waterways that are involved and the nature of the mineral discoveries that are being made, that is a matter that needs fairly urgent attention. Suspensions are bad enough; but if marine national parks are going to be flooded with heavy metal effluents, something must be done about it now before it becomes a problem. The Minister's department, in combination with other departments, could well engage in a foreign aid program—for want of a better word—by offering their expertise and assistance to the Government of Papua New Guinea to ensure that those problems are fully considered before mining leases are granted.

I turn now to the crown of thorns starfish. Everyone seems to have been ducking and weaving on this issue for about 15 years. During that period Dr Robert Endean and Dr Kikkawa of the University of Queensland have been howled down, booed and hissed, called harbingers of doom, scaremongers and many other names. It seems that with every passing day those two doctors seem increasingly to be proved correct. The crown of thorns starfish problem is obviously not going to go away. The excuse that it is one

of those natural things that will ebb and flow does not wash any more. There must be a concerted, solid approach to the problem, with no secrets. The prognosis of Drs Endean and Kikkawa about the potential devastating damage that could be done by the crown of thorns starfish should be taken on board and something permanent should be done about it.

Some of the things that were mentioned in the most recent annual report of the Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority would be laughable if they were not serious. For example, I had to read the conclusion that fences can be put around interesting reefs to preserve them from the crown of thorns starfish three times to make sure that it was not a joke. I can imagine divers putting up barbed-wire and chicken wire fences around reefs so that the crown of thorns starfish can be kept out.

Mr Comben: A little plastic one. It's a serious proposition. It's about the only answer they've got so far.

Mr GYGAR: If the honourable member for Windsor believes that that is a serious answer, then it must have been a pretty stupid question.

Surely there are better solutions to the problem than putting chicken wire fences around reefs to stop the crown of thorns starfish. Virtually daily in this House, Ministers claim that the Great Barrier Reef is an enormous natural asset, and they are right. They talk about how it underpins the Queensland tourist industry, and they are right. They also talk about how unique it is, and they are right. Something should be done to ensure that the Great Barrier Reef will still be there for our grandchildren to enjoy.

Mr Comben: You just ruined a good speech. The rest of it was excellent. It has been there a long time.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member says that it has been there a long time. Many things that were around for a long time have ceased to exist in the last 100 years.

I do not believe that all wisdom lies in this generation. Our greatest responsibility is to hand the world on to our children in better shape than we received it in from our parents. These sorts of things must be taken on board. Drs Endean and Kikkawa are recognised as the world authorities on this issue, and they are worried. If they are worried, so should we be. In view of the dramatic importance of the Great Barrier Reef, not just for its aesthetics and World Heritage value but in terms of the dollars and cents that it means to this State, we should be pulling out all stops to ensure that the criticisms of those eminently qualified world experts are taken on board and are not shoved aside simply because they are found by this Government to be inconvenient this year or this month.

The National Parks and Wildlife Service does a magnificent job, straining under limited resources and, regrettably, at some stages limited support from the Government. I congratulate it on the job that it has been doing. The Marine Parks Act Amendment Bill is basically innocuous. I believe that it will be supported by all members in this Chamber. The ideas that it introduces in relation to zoning are excellent, if properly managed. However, I draw the Minister's attention to the fact that it is useless to introduce zones in areas where things are prohibited or allowed if adequate follow-up enforcement and surveillance facilities are not provided to ensure that, when the correct decision is made, that decision can be properly and adequately enforced by the expert officers in the Minister's department.

Mr BURREKET (Townsville) (2.40 p.m.): Firstly, I endorse the comments that were made by honourable members concerning the passing of Dr Saunders. I am pleased to see that the legislation that he spent so much time developing is being introduced.

The Great Barrier Reef is the largest complex of reefs and islands in the world. It is the breeding ground for a number of rare and endangered species such as the roseate terns, turtles, dugongs and humpback whales.

The history of the Great Barrier Reef is something about which we know very little. We do know that in the early days of the founding of Australia the Great Barrier Reef was the graveyard of many ships. Very little was known about it, and today very little is known about it. That is why it is so important that legislation be introduced to protect the Great Barrier Reef, which is often classed as the eighth wonder of the world.

Confusion still exists—and the previous speaker referred to this—about whether the attack on the crown of thorns starfish is the right or the wrong way of combating the problem. However, I do endorse the work by the director of the marine park authority, who says that all aspects of the ecology of the Barrier Reef must be looked at in a scientific way.

The reef also supports an important commercial and recreational fishing industry and is rapidly becoming a premier tourist destination. There is no doubt that the big attractions of going to the north—ones which I think will entice many people to that area in the years to come—are not only the reef itself and the magnificent view that is seen when one puts one's head under the water, but also the wonderful fishing opportunities and the tourist industries that are starting to develop close to the reef and on the reef. The increasing availability of high-speed catamarans will allow quick and comfortable transport to areas that were once generally inaccessible to visitors.

Moreover, Queensland has recently become the principal commercial fishing State in Australia, further indicating the importance of this industry by way of income generation and job creation. Recreational fishing on the Barrier Reef also makes a significant contribution to regional coastal economies in Queensland. The demand for the reef's resources is increasing dramatically, and new industries such as commercial mariculture are being established. Balancing these demands for limited resources is essential to ensure conservation and protection for the enjoyment of future generations of some of the most outstanding marine environments in the world. That aspect was mentioned previously.

In response to this challenge, the State Government has implemented a legislative and administrative framework to ensure balanced use of these resources in accordance with sound conservation and management practices. In fact, two of the earliest marine parks established in Australia and also the world were declared by the Queensland Government, encompassing the reefs around Green and Heron Islands. Both of those island resorts are now among the most frequently visited tourist locations on the Great Barrier Reef.

Further extensions to that tourist development can be seen. A floating hotel is now in place on the John Brewer Reef off Townsville. That in itself will be a spectacular development of the use of the Great Barrier Reef's resources.

Mr Comben: How did it look after the cyclone?

Mr BURREKET: I understand that the cyclone caused no major problems to the floating hotel. One of its moorings was moved by the wind and the surge of the sea, but in general no major problems occurred.

The developers of that floating hotel have already had demands made on them to establish a number of these floating hotels in locations all round the world. The developers have indicated quite clearly that at this stage they have no wish to build another floating hotel until they have had a good look at the effects of the existing floating hotel off Townsville. I do not think that this is a case in which people should rush in and build more floating hotels. I applaud the intentions of the developers to have a very good look at the effects that the floating hotel off Townsville will have. There is no doubt that in time many more of such tourist facilities will be built round the world in other areas similar to the Barrier Reef.

Queensland marine parks have now been established over most of the Great Barrier Reef and are administered on a day-to-day basis by the State's conservation agency, the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service. The day-to-day management is best

handled by one agency, such as the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service, which is already responsible for similar management arrangements for the Great Barrier Reef marine park that was established under Commonwealth legislation. Such complementary practices and administrative arrangements are provided for by the Marine Parks Act. The proposed amendments to that Act are outlined in this Bill.

The Bill specifically transfers administrative responsibility to the Honourable Minister for Environment, Conservation and Tourism and the handling of day-to-day matters to the Director, National Parks and Wildlife Service. It clearly makes good sense that both the island national parks and the marine parks which often surround them are administered by the one authority in a co-ordinated and responsible manner, as provided for in this Bill.

It is our responsibility as members to ensure the protection of important marine areas, such as the Great Barrier Reef, and of the many wonderful, natural and cultural features through responsible management practices and wise administration. The Bill provides for achieving this goal. Honourable members should also be aware that extensive areas of Queensland have already been included in a series of Queensland marine parks. Such areas include the Townsville/Whitsunday marine park and the Capricorn-Bunker marine park in the Great Barrier Reef region, as well as Pumicestone Passage marine park which is adjacent to Bribie Island.

Contrary to some of the comments that have been made, this is obviously a credible effort in legislation by the Government, which should be praised for its strong commitment to safeguarding Queensland's marine and estuarine heritage. I have no doubt whatsoever that this legislation and the work being done by the Queensland Government will be heralded as one of the most progressive marine park systems in the world.

I commend Queensland's Minister for National Parks, the Honourable Geoff Muntz, for his many initiatives in ensuring the proper management and protection of Queensland's very extensive marine estate.

Mr BEANLAND (Toowong) (2.48 p.m.): I wish to place on record my support for the comments made by the honourable member for Stafford in his expression of condolences to the family and friends of Dr Graham Saunders on his untimely passing away. I am sure that he will be sadly missed, not only by his friends and his family but also by the entire national parks network.

Queensland is fortunate indeed that it is endowed with some of the finest—if not the finest—beaches and the finest islands in the world. It is in this regard that the Bill is so vital. Not only is it vital in relation to management, development, preservation and recreational use of the islands, but also a great deal has been heard from the Premier in relation to the vision of excellence that he has for this State. Nowhere better will he be able to show Queenslanders his vision of excellence than in the protection of Queensland's coastlands, beaches and islands. To date, although Queensland has a geographic and physical vision of excellence, the people are now waiting for the Ahern Government to follow through with legislation. These amendments to the Act allow for that vision of excellence to be carried through. Nowhere will there be more conflict with Bjelke-Petersen's business-as-usual approach than in this new attitude and approach that will need to be brought into effect if the vision of excellence is to be brought about in this area of government. The Government's handling of this issue will test the whole Government in relation to Queensland's coastal regions.

The Integrated Resort Development Act is still on the statute-book and represents one of the greatest threats to Queensland's coastal regions. No attempt has been made by the current Government to revoke that Act. Until that happens, it will be business as usual.

This Bill introduces a new system of zones that are similar in some ways to the current local government town-planning zones. There are reasons for doing it in this way, and I support the Minister's proposal. The Bill will enable a number of activities to be carried on in the various zones, and these will vary from place to place. Not only

is it important that there be a system of zones and that the program be set up, but also it is vitally important that there be an enforcement procedure to go with the program and that the Minister have sufficient officers and legislation to ensure that the enforcement is carried out. Like many other people, I will believe that this Government is doing something in this area and that its view and attitude towards the handling of these issues has changed, when I see its actual performance. The records of the previous two Governments left a great deal to be desired.

Much mention has been made about the fact that these amendments will bring many benefits to the tourism industry. This is true, especially in relation to the Great Barrier Reef. It is one thing to have the legislation, but it is another to put that legislation into effect. Prime examples of that can be seen when one looks at the Moreton Bay region and the islands that make up the bay. The Moreton Bay region is a recreation area not only for Brisbane but also for the whole of south-east Queensland. Firms such as Cameron McNamara Pty Ltd and Gutteridge Haskins and Davey Pty Ltd have carried out major studies into the coastal management and strategy between the New South Wales border and Noosa. These studies have been carried out at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars, and I challenge the Government to bring into effect a development strategy plan along the lines recommended by one of these strategy studies. The work has been done, but the documentation itself sits in the Premier's Department gathering dust. I am talking not merely about one or two documents or books but about huge piles of documentation which is the result of work that has been carried out by leading consultants in this State on behalf of the State Government. What has been seen for the hundreds of thousands of dollars of tax-payers' money that has been expended in this area? Nothing!

That is why I point out clearly to the Minister that, whilst the Liberal Party is fulsome in praise of the legislation, it looks forward to seeing the way that the Government will handle these issues, its performance and action. The people of this State will cast their verdict based on the Government's action.

In relation to Moreton Bay, the Government and the Premier were expressing thoughts about building a bridge across Russell Island or Peel Island on to North Stradbroke Island. It is all very well to talk about bridges, but what about a development strategy plan for North Stradbroke Island and the other islands first? It is easy to talk about building bridges, and certain things will follow from that. The more difficult part is to implement a development strategy program for the whole Moreton Bay region to protect not only this magnificent recreational, fishing and boating area but also the fish habitats and the various other recreational uses to which the area is put.

Although the Government has designed all of the strategies and talked about all of these plans for well over a decade, nothing has been forthcoming. The Premier is once again proposing the construction of a bridge to Stradbroke Island, yet no development strategy plan is in place, and I understand that there is not likely to be one.

Nowhere is that sort of thing more pertinent than the southern Moreton Bay region, that huge expanse with its magnificent tidal wetlands, its mangroves, salt-marshes and seagrasses, which form the basis of the feeding area for Moreton Bay, the river estuaries and other coastal waters. The Minister in charge of the Bill before the House has spoken about that area and the Minister for Transport, the member for Albert, has made utterances about the area, but to date the Government has produced nothing concrete.

Honourable members know how cheap and easy it is to produce reports. All the Government has to do is simply sign the tax-payers' dollars away, produce another report and put it aside to gather dust. However, it is much more difficult to carry out the strategies contained in reports. Time and time again in relation to Moreton Bay, and particularly the southern Moreton Bay region, the Government has failed to carry out those strategies.

I notice that the member for Southport has left the Chamber. Before the luncheon recess I heard him say a few words—perhaps I should say I heard him read a few words—about the Bill before the House. I would have hoped to have heard a very

sincere contribution from the member for Southport because he represents the Broadwater, where an enormous amount of development is occurring. I had hoped that he would have had a great deal to say about the proposals before the House. The Government's performance in relation to the Broadwater leaves a great deal to be desired. Because the Government is proposing extensions to Sovereign Island, it is continually in the news. Day after day concern about the Broadwater is being expressed by a number of leading conservationists and leading botanists in the community who are concerned about the effects that development will have on the marine life and on the recreational uses of that area.

If the Ahern Government is to show us its vision of excellence and put the wheels back on the green and gold bus, as the Premier is fond of saying, here is a challenge, one that to date the Government has not been able to take up and one that it has refused to take up, even though it has had more than 100 days in which to do so. Even though the Bill is the first item on the Business Paper today, the proposed amendments are not necessary to ensure that the Government takes up the challenge.

The Liberal Party throws out the challenge to the Minister and his department and it looks forward to the protection of the coastal regions of Queensland and to their development under the guidance of proper strategy plans of which all Queenslanders can be proud so that the coastal regions can be used for recreation and so that we can encourage development and tourism.

Mr NEWTON (Glass House) (3 p.m.): I have to say that I was saddened by the tragic passing of Dr Graham Saunders. His knowledge and expertise will be missed by the committee of which I am a member. I worked closely with the members of that committee and I, for one, enjoyed the benefit of his advice on the many trips around Queensland that the national parks committee undertook. Marine parks were included in those trips. In his contribution the honourable member for Windsor asked Government members how many areas of Queensland they had seen. Through my involvement on the committee, I have seen much of Queensland.

The honourable member for Windsor mentioned glossy maps. The main purpose of the exercise is to inform people where the parks are so that they can visit them. He also stated that to his knowledge there were only two marine parks. I would have thought that the Opposition spokesman on the environment would have mentioned the areas that have been gazetted and those that will be gazetted in the future such as the Green Island marine park, the Capricorn-Bunker marine park and the Pumicestone Passage marine park. The Government is proposing to establish marine parks extending from Cape York to Cairns to complement the marine parks in force for the same region under Commonwealth legislation.

Mr Comben: There are only two declared under this legislation.

Mr NEWTON: The Opposition may yell and scream about it, but everything will be taken into consideration and it will all come about in time. The Government should not rush these matters. In regard to the national park on Bribie Island, if no development is carried out the land will still be there in the future. I wish to put everything into perspective before that national park is developed. I remind the honourable member for Windsor about that.

The honourable member for Windsor should be aware that the Great Barrier Reef is not the only marine ecosystem of great importance along the Queensland coast.

Mr Hamill: You are not reading this, are you?

Mr NEWTON: I have to refer to notes to ensure that the message gets through to the honourable member.

Queensland is fortunate to be blessed with some of the most diverse estuarine and wetland areas in the world, areas which play a vital role in maintaining many valuable fish stocks and providing the basis for extensive recreational activity and community

enjoyment. Many of the State's important marine and estuarine areas also encompass extensive intertidal areas and habitats adjacent to the coast that are not necessarily within the Great Barrier Reef region.

Mr Hamill: Did your secretary write this?

Mr NEWTON: I have to use notes so that honourable members opposite can understand what is happening.

A particular case in point is the Pumicestone Passage marine park in my own electorate. In fact Pumicestone Passage marine park represents the first marine park declared outside the Great Barrier Reef region.

Pumicestone Passage marine park and its zoning plan were simultaneously gazetted in January 1986. The zoning plan is very simple and consists of a single General Use zone.

The main purpose of the marine park is to provide for reasonable use and enjoyment of Pumicestone Passage whilst ensuring conservation and protection of the marine environment.

Mr Vaughan: What are the boundaries of the Pumicestone Passage marine park?

Mr NEWTON: I will come to that shortly for the benefit of the honourable member.

Usage is carefully regulated to ensure that these objectives of the park are achieved. The following sorts of activities are allowed in the park—

- recreational and commercial fishing;
- operation of vessels;
- collecting, research, mariculture and tourist facilities are also allowed by obtaining a permit.

Pumicestone Passage supports one of the most important fisheries resources in Queensland.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr NEWTON: The honourable member for Lytton will have his turn later.

Pumicestone Passage is also one of the most important recreational amenities in sheltered waters for metropolitan Brisbane. As I have noted on many occasions, many people enjoy the environment on a nice sunny day. Many people visit the area. Pumicestone Passage is also of great scenic amenity because of the sheltered waters and backdrop of paperbark forests—I refer to them as tea-tree swamps—and the Glass House Mountains. I have not witnessed a better view than looking towards the Glass House Mountains from the Pumicestone Passage. I am proud to be the member for Glass House, even though the Glass House Mountains are not in my electorate.

Because of extensive wetlands that provide a habitat for internationally important migratory birds, the high conservation value of Pumicestone Passage has long been recognised. I have visited those swamps and seen thousands of those birds. It is just incredible. The southern geographical limit of the black mangrove occurs in Pumicestone Passage, and I do not think that the member for Windsor realises that.

The passage is important for its cultural heritage as well as the biological features that I have already mentioned. For instance, the Pumicestone Passage area includes numerous archaeological and historical sites indicating evidence of Aboriginal occupation and early European settlement. I think that the member for Lytton would know that the Aboriginals set many traps in the passage to catch fish. I hope that on one of his many trips to Bribie Island the member for Windsor takes note of those traps. They are still visible when the tide goes out. These are but a few of the features that caused Pumicestone Passage to be declared a marine park. I think that the member for Windsor does not realise that the Government does consider ways to improve our marine environment.

The marine park will be further complemented by an adjacent national park and environmental park on Bribie Island, and the member for Windsor should note that. Clearly this is a sound strategy that will allow co-ordinated management of an important recreational waterway and fish habitat in conjunction with valuable land-based recreational areas on Bribie Island.

I am aware that many members of the Opposition do not like to see development that can create jobs. The member for Windsor knows that the piece of land on the southern part of Bribie Island to which he referred was always earmarked for development and that the piece on the northern part of Bribie Island was always intended to become part of a national park. That will be done.

Mr Comben: You said four months, five months ago.

Mr NEWTON: It will happen. As I have said in the past week, once a bit of business has been dealt with the area will be gazetted.

This proposed complementary management approach is essential for long-term protection of the area, since the environs of Pumicestone Passage and parts of Bribie Island represent the only large areas of natural vegetation and wetland habitat remaining along the coastal plain of the Moreton region. That will be retained for eternity.

It is very important to appreciate that the local economy of the area is founded on tourism and recreation and hence is closely linked to the well-being of the Pumicestone Passage marine park. Therefore, if the long-term conservation of the passage is to be ensured, it is important that the lands abutting the mainland side of the passage be retained in an undisturbed state. This could, of course, require the resumption of some blocks. Some blocks will have to be resumed to hold more wetlands on the mainland side of the island, and the member for Windsor should be aware of that. I have visited those areas as well. As I said, this could require resumption of some blocks and would clearly test the resolve of local shire councils to support and protect the marine park. I have got that support from both the Landsborough Shire and the Caboolture Shire.

Honourable members will recall that the local councils vacillated for quite some time before rightly supporting this Government's proposal to establish Pumicestone Passage marine park. There is a great group in that area now called the Estuarine Development Group. That group is carrying out very important research in the area. I hope that the member for Windsor acknowledges that group. I have done a lot of work for the group, such as setting it up in offices. This challenge was vigorously taken up by this Government and the result is clearly evident in the declaration of Pumicestone Passage as an important and popular State marine park.

I am particularly confident that our system of State marine parks will continue to expand throughout Queensland, because of the significance of many areas and the fact that the multiple-use concept applied to such parks encourages the use and enjoyment of these areas by a wide range of users, including fishermen and tourists. I have referred to the Estuarine Research Group.

I commend the Minister, Geoff Muntz, for his many initiatives in ensuring the proper management and protection of Queensland's very extensive marine estate.

Mr BURNS (Lytton—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (3.11 p.m.): I have noticed the growth in the number of members who are now concerned about the marine environment. It is pleasing that a large number of members have joined Opposition members in expressing some concern about the future of the marine environment in this State. When I first began speaking about fishing, marine parks and the marine habitat, I noticed that it was supposed to be a bit of a joke at my expense that fisherman Tom was concerned about going fishing and not so much about the matters before the House. It is interesting that a new group of people is showing interest in this matter.

I am concerned about the structure of the marine habitat itself and the protection of habitat areas. The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority is an example of what can be done if an authority needs to zone areas so that people cannot use particular

areas or areas that need to be set aside for replenishment. For example, areas in the marine park may be defined as zone A or zone B. The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority then gives people an opportunity to make submissions and to participate in the zoning itself. That is the important point.

Over a period of time I have been involved on behalf of amateur fishermen on matters affecting the areas under the control of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, such as the time when the Cairns area was zoned and then when the authority worked further south down the reef. On each occasion, people such as Wendy Craig and Richard Kenchington have turned up at fishing club meetings and been prepared to listen to the locals and return to hear their complaints when the zoning maps have been produced. Even though people may not have obtained the result that they wanted, if they found themselves having to accept a compromise, they felt that they had participated; that they had a chance to have their say. Through that chance I think that most of us have learnt to appreciate and accept some of the zonings that we would not have accepted if they had been handed down by some authority in Canberra or Brisbane. It is very important that, whatever we do, we do it in the same way as the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority has done in the past.

I am a critic of some of the decisions that the authority has made, but I cannot be critical of the provisions for public participation. I, too, agree that there is a need for enforcement. I sometimes wonder why we continue to pass many laws in this place. One rarely sees a Boating and Fisheries Patrol officer. One very rarely sees anyone policing the laws out on the reef. When the authority sets aside an area and says, "This area is only for fishing or diving, this area is only for fishing with lines, this area is for net fishing and this area is a multiple-use area.", who is daily out on the reef to see that it is observed? How many people have been convicted of being in those areas against the law? How many people are caught illegally fishing with nets in our streams and creeks? The report of the Boating and Fisheries Patrol has about eight or 10 lines at the bottom on that subject. Very rarely are people caught breaking those laws. Members sit down and pat themselves on the back. When it is all said and done, no-one knows that the laws have been passed. No-one ever reads them. As far as the people in the community are concerned, the fisherman goes about his business of doing what he has been doing for the past 20 years because nobody is ever there to inspect an area or to catch him breaking the law.

A few weeks ago, when I was in Western Australia, I found that every fishing shop had available a free set of regulations. If a fisherman went into the shop to buy his bait, he could pick up a copy of the State regulations governing the size and type of fish, crabs and crayfish that could be caught in that State. To obtain a copy of Queensland's regulations, Queenslanders have to buy a Boating and Fisheries Patrol book, which costs about \$3. The regulations are stuck at the back of that book. Very rarely is the ordinary bloke able to find out the rules. In Queensland, if anyone travels to the cities and towns adjacent to the reef and asks about the zonings of the Great Barrier Reef marine park off the coast, most of the people would not know about them. Most people do not know the areas of the Great Barrier Reef marine park that have been zoned. In fact, they do not know much about it at all.

It is unfortunate but true that many glossy brochures and maps are produced. However, what is needed is a very cheap map that can be handed out to people who are using the reef or bay and its facilities in order to make them aware of the problems and rules that exist. There is nothing more practical than handing a map to a person who is going out on a boat that day or who is going to use the reef in some way.

I am concerned about reef resorts. As I understand it, the floating hotel on the John Brewer Reef was not cyclone proof at all. I understand that, during the recent cyclone, some of the windows on the bottom two floors of that hotel were blown out and that people have already been told that they will have to come back later because the bottom two floors of that hotel were flooded. I am not so much concerned that that hotel was damaged in the cyclone, because that is a problem for the developers; I am

concerned that people believe that hundreds of holiday-makers can be brought into an area year in and year out without some degrading or downgrading of the reef occurring.

I turn now to the fire that occurred recently on Green Island. Where did all the muck and the rubbish that was washed away by the hoses go to? I would bet that it was not contained on the island, picked up and carried away. As with every other fire that occurs, it would have been washed into the gutters, the drains and out onto the reef. Every time a development occurs on a reef island and every time a floating resort is taken to the reef, hazards and dangers are created for the reef.

The Great Barrier Reef is one of the most valuable assets in this world. We should ensure that it is protected. I do not want to prevent people from visiting the reef. I want people to be able to see it. However, I am concerned about the dangers that these visits create. I am concerned also that, because that floating hotel has been set up on the John Brewer Reef, every second developer in the world will want to establish one as well. At present, plans for about half a dozen of those hotels are floating around. The one at Fitzroy Island is currently the subject of argument.

I understand that the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority and other authorities have said that nothing will be done for a couple of years until it has been established that the floating hotel at John Brewer Reef is okay. I am concerned whether that period will be a couple of years or a couple of months. The main point is that we have started that type of development and I do not think that we will be able to stop it. I believe that, in my day, I will see a long line of floating hotels along the reef. Many areas of the reef have never been touched. They have only been seen by people in boats on day trips. People will be living in those areas and, as is the custom, picking up one or two shells each. One has only to walk around Green Island or Lady Musgrave Island to witness the tourists who visit those islands on day trips picking up half a dozen shells and putting them in their bags.

Every week-end on the low tide, Vietnamese people can be seen walking around the mudflats of Moreton Bay picking up everything that moves. If honourable members believe that the environment cannot be harmed, I invite them to visit the Wynnum area with me. If they do so, they will see approximately half a dozen Vietnamese families—and I am not being racist when I attack those people; it is their way of life; it is what they do in their own country to find food—going out with 4-gallon buckets picking up every living thing. When I am out catching worms and I turn over living things, the Vietnamese are standing beside me. They are quicker than the seagulls. They put moves on their buckets and away they go. Not a thing moves on those mudflats at Wynnum. Every living thing has been picked up. All of the periwinkles, mussels, etc., are gone. I do not know what they are called, but things that look like the soft part of a razor-back shell are also picked up by the Vietnamese people. Even the seagulls will not pick them up. All of those living pieces of the environment are gone.

I do not know what the end result of all of that will be, but I know that fishing is dropping off in those areas. Everybody is complaining about it. The very same sort of thing is occurring in all of those reef areas that people visit. It would be great to be able to move those camping areas around, but once establishments are made permanent, reef hotels put in place and once camp grounds and resorts are established on islands, a problem is created.

Heron Island is supposed to be an ideal place for university students and others to study the reef. What happened last year? The owners wanted to build a boat harbour. They brought in a dredge and dredged the entire harbour area. All of the sand and silt was pumped up onto the edge of the island, and as the tide came in much of that residue was washed back over the reef. That was there for all to see. Television cameras went to the area. Photographs were taken and everybody could see it. I believe that I still have some black and white photographs of that disaster area in my office.

The very same people on Heron Island who are studying the reef in the reef appreciation areas and making a living from the reef say that the tourists must also be looked after and that a marina must be built so that the high-speed catamaran has a

place to berth. Once a resort is built, the degradation of the reef commences. I do not know the answers, but we must find them.

The very same problem exists with the hovercraft in Moreton Bay. The reason why the hovercraft does not go outside is that, although the boat can stand it, the passengers cannot. They will spill their drinks. Because the passengers do not want to spill their drinks on the hovercraft, that vessel goes right across the sea-grass flats, across out of Schulz Canal, around the compass adjustment buoy, right around St Helena, Mud and Green Islands, down past Peel Island, across near to Coochiemudlo, down through the Canaipa Passage and into the Jumpinpin region. Mates of mine who participate in fishing competitions have told me that, for three hours after the hovercraft has passed, not a fish moves in the water around them. They have also told me that the hovercraft is dangerous, that it flies along at 25 knots and that, because it has no keel, as it begins to turn it slides across the water. The hovercraft-operators have told me that that is not a worry at all; that all they can do is drop the power off and the hovercraft sinks back into the water. I would not like to be in a dinghy when it did that. I hope that one day when I am down at Jumpinpin that does not happen to me.

The point is that a decision was made that all of that area can be threatened because passengers' drinks would be spilled if the hovercraft went outside. I do not think that the operators are making a buck out of going from Cairns to Port Douglas and I do not think they are making very much on the Gold Coast run. The reason why hovercraft have been stopped from going up the river from Expo to Lone Pine is that they would annoy some of the silvertails up in Angus Innes' area.

All along the route to the Gold Coast people are becoming annoyed. The environment is being destroyed. On the sandy flats around Macleay Island and Red Rocky Point at the mouth of the Logan River, the yabbies that are being pumped are coming up dead. That is occurring on the low, shallow flats over which the hovercraft travels. The oxygen weed comes up in swirls behind the hovercraft as it is sucked up or pressured down and pushed off the sand banks, then it floats to the top.

The QCFO, the sport and recreational council, most of the amateur fishing clubs and all of the people who live in the affected areas are against it; but everyone is forced to cop it, because it is progress.

Mr Mackenroth: Christopher Skase.

Mr BURNS: Christopher Skase. It is the shuffling of the white shoes. It is back to the old white-shoe shuffle again. He is a new white-shoe operator, another one of Ahern's white-shoe brigade.

The point about it is this: all of these developments occur in places where the Government has carried out studies. It has undertaken studies in Moreton Bay, southern Moreton Bay and Jumpinpin. Fancy dodgers are distributed by the National Parks and Wildlife Service and others stating that those areas are being studied and protected. Who is protecting them? These hovercraft trips are happening day in and day out. When the authorities are written to, they say that they cannot do anything about it. In fact, the only person who was showing some interest in it, as far as I was concerned, was the bloke who managed the hovercraft.

On the Gold Coast, people will decide by voting whether there will be a sewerage outlet into the bay, which could allow sewage to be washed around to the beaches. Up at Kawana Waters a vote cannot even be obtained on the issue. It reminds me of the old story of the fellow who said, "I am not swimming, boss. I am only going through the motions." That is what will happen on some of those beaches when the equipment breaks down. The point is that those decisions should not be made in a tourist State which talks about providing numerous jobs. Many people will come to Queensland for holidays. The Great Barrier Reef and the marine environment that is available are the reasons why a great majority of them visit. The reason they come is the pristine states of those areas. Who wants to holiday at a sewage farm? The Government should

encourage people to visit, but at the same time it should provide some security for the area itself.

In Queensland the developers seem to have the idea that, if they have an idea, they look for an area that is beautiful, they go to the Government and, without providing much of their own money, they come up with a proposal to get some Government land and a bit of water that they can turn into a canal or a marina. They put forward a proposal that the Government should help them to beat off the local opposition—the environmentalists, the greenies and everybody else who is trying to stop them—and that everyone should bow down and do it for them.

Years ago I had a plan—and Bill D'Arcy, when he was tourism spokesman, also had a plan—that all along the coast, one day's sailing apart, a marina should be built. People who are not great sailors should be able to sail out of Brisbane and, after a day's sailing, they should be able to reach another marina, safely anchor, tie up their boat, connect up to the 240-volt electricity or the gas and go and drink at the local boozier or do whatever they want to do and be safe enough to move from one place to the other. The next day they could sail on again. That seems great. If the Government had planned for that sort of proposition right along the coast, it would set aside those zones and call tenders for people to develop the marinas. Has anyone thought of the number of people who want to build marinas and where marinas are being built in Queensland today? In Moreton Bay approximately 10 are being planned. Each Saturday morning the boating and fishing columns in the *Courier-Mail* contain half a dozen ads for empty marina berths that are now available.

Just think about it for a moment. There are all those marinas down around Southport and the Spit. Moving up the coastline, there are those at Runaway Bay and then opposite the mouth of the Coomera River. There is a little one that collapsed on South Stradbroke Island. Tippler's Passage is next, and someone wants to put one in near Rudi Marr's. There is a marina at McLaren's Marine and someone wants to put one on Ephraims Island. There is one at Raby Bay. Someone wants to put one in at Amity Point and at the mouth of the Brisbane River at Fisherman Islands. Moving farther north, someone wants to put one in at Boondall and at Pine River. Someone wants to put marinas in at Bribie Island, Burrum Heads, Carlo Point and Tin Can Bay. Even farther north along the coast, someone wants to put marinas at Trinity Inlet, Muddy Bay and Airlie Beach.

Mr Mackenroth: You could do the trips in 10-minute intervals.

Mr BURNS: Ten-minute intervals are a bit short, but I reckon a trip of about two hours would be made between some points.

Most of the people involved in establishing marinas are demanding that the people of this State should give them some public water—give them some of the bay—and allow the habitat to be destroyed. They say to me, "Only a little bit of habitat, Tom. Oh, it is only 5 acres, 10 acres or 15 acres. It is only a little bit. Why shouldn't we be allowed to do it? We'll cement the edges. We'll plant trees and we will make it very nice. We will put in a bar, a restaurant and an international hotel and Queenslanders can use all of these things. We will create jobs, but you just have to give up a bit of your environment."

The Government has to give a bit of the Barrier Reef, a bit of the mangroves, a bit of the sea-grass flats and a bit of the worming banks for this, that and the other one. It is supposed to be great, marvellous! Yet no-one adds up how much is being taken. I wrote a letter to the Minister and asked him whether he could tell me how much water had been given away or allowed for development in the last 10 years. I received the usual answer; he could not tell me, or at least that was the end result. The same situation applies to mangroves. Government records are unable to go back more than a few years to identify mangrove destruction. I point out, when honourable members are discussing marine parks and a marine environment, that mangroves are part of the environment.

It is time that the Government said to itself that it should have a plan to protect the marine environment right along the coast.

A plan has to be established, and that is why I would support any Bill that provides for some sort of zoning or establishment of a marine park environment. The Government has to have a plan to show the areas to which the general public can go and do some fishing or whatever they want to do. I think also that the zones should be able to be changed and areas moved. The Government should make provision for areas to be replenished; in other words, the Government should close off an area so that people are not able to go there for a period. It is somewhat similar to the argument surrounding Fraser Island and Moreton Island. I do not believe that there should be large, permanent establishments on the islands. The camping areas should be movable.

For three or four years, people should be allowed to camp in an area, for instance, near Eager's Creek or at Blue Lagoon, but thereafter they should be taken down to Reader's Point or to an area in the lighthouse reserve. After an area has been under attack for a substantial period by the people who visit the area, the facilities should be moved to a different area so that the environment is allowed to be replenished and the vegetation can grow again, enabling the area to recover from the problems of people pressure. The previous area is given a chance to live again. If that type of planning does not occur, a decision to establish a permanent area will result in what has occurred at Heron Island, Green Island and some of the other areas where marinas or resorts are being established. How crazy it is to be in the middle of the Great Barrier Reef and sail around the corner, heading into the breeze, and find a highrise building stuck up on Hamilton Island where, I'm told, sewage is being pumped into the bay. That is what is called "development".

Mr Comben: That is a problem that keeps bobbing up and down.

Mr BURNS: Yes, it does keep bobbing up and down.

When protection of the marine environment is discussed, an issue that concerns me is protection of the spitfire banks that are in the middle of Moreton Bay. They are only sand banks, but they are most valuable to Moreton Bay. The honourable member for Glass House, Bill Newton, talks about Bribie Island. The amateur fishing council, QAFCA, has decided that the section for amateur fishermen in the State championships that has been held at Bribie Island since time immemorial will not be held there this year because of the lack of fish. The Queensland Amateur Fishing Council members are blokes who go to Bribie Island with their creels, in teams, and fish along the beaches. It is not the fault of the fishermen; it is the fault of members of Parliament. Collectively, we as legislators have been the ones who have been voting in this Parliament and passing legislation.

Nothing has been done to protect Bribie's fishing. A respected body that has been around for longer than since the turn of the century has decided that the area is not viable for fishing any more. That area is 30 miles from Brisbane. The daylighters were pumped out of an area near the Spitfire Banks for the establishment of the Brisbane airport and, before Fisherman Islands was developed for the port, the spoil was taken out of the river and dumped into the bay. This Government is not worried about the environment. It dumps all of that rubbish. Sand castle competitions used to be held on some of the sand beaches, such as "Mudgate" and in my electorate at Wynnum. Now the beaches are mud and the mud has come from most of the spoil that has been pumped out of the river and carted out to sea in the dredge. When the dredge gets to the spoil grounds, it empties and drops all the spoil to the bottom. This spoil washes back——

Mr Newton: We have not had a good wet season to wash the mud away.

Mr BURNS: The honourable member for Glass House does not know what he is talking about. The honourable member can visit the area with me and I will give him a fork. If the honourable member was able to dig one forkful of mud, he would find

that there is soft, slushy mud on the top and underneath there is good, hard sand. The sand has been there for decades, but it has been covered by the spoil.

I believe that Spitfire Banks should be left alone. Denison Resources wants to sand-mine that area. Like every other member in this House, I look after my own, and Moreton Bay is my fishing area. Not one person I know who is interested in Moreton Bay would not be against that development or the other stupid development in the nice, soft area at Amity Point, where Nick Girdis wants to develop a marina. Developers want to establish marinas dotted around in some of the last very good fish-breeding areas. These have to be preserved. If the mangroves and roots are dug away and all the live animals and shellfish are taken away, there is nothing left for the little fish to feed on. When one talks to people in other areas, such as the tuna fishermen and the blokes from South Australia who are fishing outside Cape Moreton, one finds that they want to come into Moreton Bay and take the fish to use for bait. That should be stopped. The fish that they want to catch for bait will be caught on Spitfire Banks, which are part of the bay that I want to protect.

I support any move at all to zone and restructure the laws protecting our marine environment in this State. It is a shame that for so long the Government has allowed people to pick away piecemeal at these areas and destroy what I believe is a most magic resource. There is no other State or nation in the world that has such magic places on its doorstep. Along the coast from the gulf to the Great Barrier Reef and further south, it is a wonderland which is full of fish, crabs and other marine life. All those things attract tourists. All the fun and enjoyment that one could ever have is there. If this Government continues to allow people to pick away at these areas, it will be to our detriment and shame in years to come.

Hon. G. H. MUNTZ (Whitsunday—Minister for Environment, Conservation and Tourism) (3.33 p.m.), in reply: I thank all honourable members for participating in this debate, particularly those who are in support of the Bill. At the outset I wish to pay a special tribute to the late Dr Graham Saunders on behalf of this Government, the department and the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service. The late Graham Saunders was truly nature's gentleman. He was a man who had the respect of all the staff in his department, all honourable members of this House and all Queenslanders. There is no doubt in my mind that he will go down in history as a truly great conservationist. The Government extends to his family, his wife, Esme, his sons, John and Ian, and his daughters, Louise and Rebecca, its sympathies and support in the years ahead.

Dr Graham Saunders was a very professional man in his approach to his work. He spent 34 years in the service and was the founding director of the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service in this State. In addition, his approach in his personal life set him aside as one of the great men of this world, because he lived by what he preached. Through his Christian principles, not only did he serve this State and Government but also he set an example to all those who had the opportunity and privilege of knowing him. I was one of those people who knew him on a professional level and personal level, and he will be sorely missed. If ever there was a man in the service of Queensland who deserved an award for excellence in the area of conservation, it was the late Dr Graham Saunders.

The member for Windsor, who is Opposition spokesman on conservation, prattled on about a wide range of matters that had nothing to do with the Bill before the House. He managed to make his usual criticism of the Government, but I believe this Government has an unparalleled record in the management of marine and coastal areas that is really a model for the rest of the world. Of all the protected marine areas in Australia, 94 per cent are along the Queensland coastline. If the Great Barrier Reef marine park is removed from that consideration, Queensland still has 40 per cent of the nation's protected marine areas.

The criticism of the member for Windsor is wrong. He is quite inaccurate. For example, he said that Queensland has only two marine parks, the Townsville/Whitsunday

park and the Pumicestone Passage park. Obviously, he does not know the facts. Marine parks have been established at Green Island—it was the first in Australia to be proclaimed—and the Capricorn-Bunker marine park. He also overlooked the fact that three other major proposals have been on public display for some time and will be proclaimed in the very near future, namely, parks at Cape York and Cairns and in the Mackay/Capricorn area.

The honourable member for Windsor also mentioned that the Bill does not exactly mirror Commonwealth legislation. The simple fact is that the Government's legal advisers are well satisfied that this legislation contains the most efficient approach for the management of marine parks. He also mentioned the structure of the Environment, Conservation and Tourism portfolio and said that it was rumoured that the section dealing with national parks would become part of Tourism and the wildlife section would go to the Department of Primary Industries. That is an incredibly irresponsible statement for a member of Parliament to make. It is simply not true; it is a complete fabrication. That will not happen. In the structuring of my portfolio I am looking at the Premier's vision of excellence, which quite rightly he has mentioned so often, and bringing together all the areas of conservation and all the areas of environment under one umbrella so that the resources can be used to the best advantage to serve the people of Queensland and of Australia and to eliminate any duplication of services. As members have already indicated in the debate, the potential is enormous.

The member for Windsor made some disparaging remarks about the Government's vision of excellence. The closest that Labor will come to that is what might be called a "pizzling" of excellence at the forthcoming New South Wales election. That will be when the people of New South Wales, supported by the people of Australia, tell the Labor Government of New South Wales and the Australian Labor Party that their actions are just not on.

The member for Southport, Mick Veivers, who is the chairman of my parliamentary committee, made some very interesting points about the tourism and recreational values of southern Moreton Bay. The Government recognises the potential of that area for both tourism and recreation. However, there must be a balance in the development and conservation of the recreational potential of that area. That is one of the Government's major initiatives. In his capacity as the member for Albert, my colleague the Honourable Ivan Gibbs has played a leading role in ensuring that that initiative comes to fruition in the very near future.

The member for Stafford supported the system of zoning used in marine parks but pointed out the problems of law enforcement in offshore areas. That is nothing new. The Government is working with the Commonwealth to find the most efficient surveillance system possible. It is a matter of balance. Surveillance, particularly offshore surveillance, is costly in all areas. What the Government must do is ensure efficient and maximum use of the available resources in both vessels and manpower.

The member for Stafford also wanted the implementation of regional management plans, but he did not mention the service is busy doing just that. In fact, it is well advanced. The National Parks and Wildlife Service drew up a well-known plan that led to the establishment of the biographical regions. That led to studies for the establishment of a system of national parks in each region. The Government regards that as a regional representation of national parks and flora and fauna across the State. It is committed to that representation right across the State and not merely in isolated areas.

The member for Stafford mentioned the crown of thorns. He is knocking the experimental research methods that are being carried out. He stated that the chicken-wire experiment highlighted how expensive the control of the crown of thorns really is. Over \$3m has been spent on research already. The answer has not been found at this stage, not even by the honourable member's friends who received a portion of that funding.

I thank the honourable member for Glass House for his contribution. He has a strong personal interest in conservation and in Bribie Island and the Pumicestone

Passage. He has been at the forefront in ensuring that that area is preserved for future generations. He has had ongoing discussions with my departmental officers and myself and is committed to the preservation of that area. He is also committed to maintaining a balance between development and preservation of that area. That area is important not only to his constituents but also to the people of Brisbane. That area and the Moreton Bay area provide a haven for the boating and fishing fraternities. Those areas provide a Mecca for recreational pursuits for the entire south-eastern corner of the State.

The member for Townsville, Mr Burreket, would appreciate the interface between tourism and conservation. He has been the leading force in Townsville's efforts to catch up with other areas of Queensland in the tourism stakes. For too long Townsville has sat back and watched other centres, such as Cairns, reap the benefits of tourism. In his capacity as alderman on the Townsville City Council, the member for Townsville has been the real driving force in ensuring that things are at last starting to happen in Townsville. The development on Magnetic Island, the Breakwater Casino, the Four Seasons floating hotel and the Barrier Reef Wonderland are all projects that this Government, with the support of the local member, Mr Tony Burreket, has supported totally.

The member for Toowong added little of substance to the debate. He criticised the Government over the southern Moreton Bay area. As I mentioned, the Government has that well in hand. It will set aside major reserves in that area.

The member for Lytton, Mr Burns, spoke at length about enforcement. He displayed his lack of understanding of the level of enforcement that is occurring. He either never does anything wrong or is very lucky. However, honourable members recognise that he is a dedicated fisherman. He criticised the Government for not informing the people about marine parks. However, I take his constructive comments on board. A great deal of effort goes into supplying public information. It takes time to get the message across to users. For that reason, enforcement takes second place for some time when a new area is zoned. Surveys of users have been carried out and they show that there is good knowledge of zoning provisions once a plan has been in place for a few years.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Motion agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 16, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr Muntz, by leave, read a third time.

INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE TRAINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 16 September 1987 (see p. 2659).

Mr VAUGHAN (Nudgee) (3.47 p.m.): In his second-reading speech, the Minister said that the amendments proposed by this Bill are as a result of a review of the requirements necessary to administer the various events associated with the engagement of apprentices, signing of indentures, etc.

As I understand it, these amendments are the result of an investigation of the apprenticeship-processing system of the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission in South Australia. Having regard to the attitude usually adopted by the Minister and the rest of his Government colleagues towards the other States, it is no surprise that he does not want to admit that he has adopted a system operated by a Labor Government.

The Industry and Commerce Training Act, which was introduced in 1979 and which replaced the Apprenticeship Act, has been amended six times, the last amendment being passed in a previous sitting of this session. As the Minister has indicated, the amendments proposed by this Bill are designed to more effectively and quickly handle documentation and administration relating to apprenticeships.

Unfortunately, the explanation of the contents of the Bill given by the Minister when he introduced it are extremely sketchy and give no real indication of what the Bill actually does. Whether this has been done on purpose or whether the Minister thinks a more detailed explanation is unnecessary, I do not know. However, I believe that, for the information of interested persons now or at some time in the future, it is desirable that a reasonable explanation of the contents of a Bill, and in particular the reasons behind the amendments, should be given by the Minister.

The amendments set out in the various clauses deal with very important phases of an apprenticeship. They deal with the probationary period, the indenture of apprenticeship, transfer of apprentices, cancellation of the indenture, variation of the indenture and other associated matters.

Unfortunately, many employers—in fact, too many—are ignorant of their obligations in relation to the engagement of an apprentice. All too often employers are found to have employed a person in an apprenticeship calling without having made an application to take on an apprentice.

The Act provides that persons desiring an apprenticeship and employers who want to take on such persons as apprentices must make application to the Industry and Commerce Training Commission or regional advisory committee before employment commences. I emphasise “before”. They must make the application before employment commences.

However, because of the incidence of employers employing persons as apprentices before an application is made, the Act provides that the names of persons can be recorded in the register of apprentices even if applications were made after the person was employed. In fact, as far as I can ascertain, the Act is silent as to when employment can or should actually commence.

Since the Act provides that an application should be made before employment commences, employment should not commence until the application is approved.

The Act provides that a person can be employed for a period of three months on probation. The probationary period which was included in the period of apprenticeship can be extended to a maximum of six months.

The Bill provides that the service of a probationer may be terminated during the probationary period by the giving of one week's notice by either party or the payment of one week's pay or forfeiture of one week's pay in lieu by the respective parties. Where notice of termination is given less than a week before the end of the probationary period, one week's wages is to be paid or forfeited, as the case may be.

The Bill also provides that an indenture must be signed prior to the expiration of the probationary period. However, such indentures are of no effect if the probationer is dismissed during the probationary period. As the employer and the apprentice are now the only parties to the indenture, the commissioner having been excluded by this Bill, for the record I think the Minister should explain the reason for this.

Again, because many employers neglect to inform themselves of their obligations when engaging an apprentice, the Bill provides that persons employed beyond the period of probation are deemed to be apprenticed even though the indenture was not signed prior to the completion of the probationary period.

The Act provides that an advisory committee or the commissioner can transfer an apprentice temporarily or permanently. A provision in the Bill allows the commissioner, upon application by all the parties, to transfer an apprentice.

A new provision in the legislation allows the commissioner to cancel an indenture if requested to do so by the employer, the apprentice and the guardian, if any. The Act at present allows variation of the terms, etc., of an indenture by mutual consent of all parties. The Bill provides that any variation of an indenture has to be approved by the commissioner.

The Bill amends that section of the Act which requires the employer within 30 days of the termination or transfer of an apprentice to furnish a certificate to the commission or a regional advisory committee setting out full particulars of the time served, training received and proficiency attained by the apprentice. The amendment now only requires the employer to advise the time served by the apprentice.

Again it would appear that employers have been tardy in forwarding the information previously required, so their job has been made easier for them. It is to be hoped the employers concerned comply with the new requirements.

Regarding the repeal of those provisions of the Act dealing with proficiency awards, I must say that I have always been opposed to those provisions which reduced the period of the apprenticeship where a standard of proficiency was attained. I favoured the old scheme where an apprentice was paid a 5 per cent bonus if his examination results averaged 75 per cent or more.

As we are dealing with legislation relating to apprenticeships, it is opportune to refer to the level of unemployment in this State, particularly the level of unemployment of young people, which in the view of the Opposition has reached a dangerous and very unsatisfactory stage but which apparently is not having a great deal of impact on the Government. Recently I took over Opposition responsibility for this portfolio. I have noted the various comments made by people in the industry, particularly those in the building industry.

In the *Courier-Mail* on Saturday, 6 February this year, on page 19 under the heading "State looks to skills boost to lift economy" it is stated—

"The State Government has ordered an inquiry into developing multi-skilled tradesmen in Queensland."

Mr Burns: Not another one?

Mr VAUGHAN: Yes, another inquiry.

Good Heavens, if the Government by this time, particularly with the present Minister, has not reached a stage at which it knows the position or does not know what needs to be done to solve the unemployment problems in this State, particularly those affecting young people, there is something wrong. We do not need another inquiry; we need some action. Several inquiries have been undertaken. Recently another inquiry was announced into employment in this State. As the Leader of the Opposition said, an inquiry was conducted three years ago. The reports that appeared in the press should be of serious concern to people throughout this State.

Mr De Lacy: Do you think the inquiry is just a substitute for making a decision?

Mr VAUGHAN: As far as the Minister and the Government are concerned, it certainly is.

The Government wants to have an inquiry about everything. However, if a particular inquiry does not bring about the required results, the findings are pigeon-holed, and if the inquiry does come up with the answers to a particular problem, the Government uses the excuse that insufficient funds are available to implement the findings of the inquiry. So the problem just goes round and round.

I turn now to an article that appeared on page 5 of the *Courier-Mail* on Wednesday, 27 January of this year, which carried the headline "Labor scarce as builders report boom". At a time when it appears that there will be a shortage of labour, a building boom is approaching this State. Another article that appeared in the press stated "Builders

'must boost training' ". A further article on Thursday of last week stated that the building industry faces an acute shortage of tradesmen. That comment was made by the union.

I recently perused the apprenticeship intake statistics for Queensland and I was appalled at the sharp reduction that has occurred since 1981. This Government has done nothing to counter that reduction. In 1981, 167 apprentice brick-layers were taken on. However, by 1987 that figure had fallen to 40. The Queensland Master Builders Association and the Building Workers Union are predicting a shortage of building tradesmen. Why would there not be a shortage when, in 1981, 167 apprentice brick-layers were taken on but, by 1987, the figure had dropped to 40?

In 1981, 867 carpenters were taken on, but in 1987 the figure had dropped to 332, representing a significant decline. It is no wonder that the building industry is going to experience some problems. The painting apprentice intake fell from 161 in 1981 to 87 last year, while plumbing apprentices fell from 342 to 176.

What is going on when the Queensland Department of Employment, Education and Training, which releases these statistics, estimates that the current supply rates from formal apprenticeships will not meet the required levels of tradespersons and that an increase in the number of skilled migrants will be necessary if labour availability in all major categories of the construction trade is to adequately meet industry needs in the short term? That is a shocking indictment on the system. A situation has developed in this State in which we have the highest rate of unemployment, the highest unemployment amongst young people, yet we are talking about bringing in skilled migrants to meet the shortfall. On the one hand we have the highest youth unemployment while on the other the employment department is predicting severe shortages of skilled tradespersons. The Government should have moved to correct that imbalance and boost the apprenticeship intake.

I am in possession of some statistics relating to the recent apprenticeship intake, which state—

"Recent apprenticeship intakes have fallen from the peaks of 1981 and 1982, which will result in a commensurate decline in output and an increasing labour market imbalance in the industry."

Those statistics deal with brick-layers, carpenters, painters and plumbers—people in the building industry to which I have referred.

An analysis of the statistics reveals a gradual decline from 1981. For example, in 1981, 167 brick-laying apprentices were taken in, in 1982 the figure was 121, in 1983 it was 38, in 1984 it was 73, in 1985 it was 59, in 1986 it was 51, and in 1987 it was the magnificent total of 40. The same sort of figures apply to painters, plumbers and carpenters.

The document goes on to say—

"Based upon this Department's trade workforce estimates, current supply rates from formal apprenticeships will not meet the required levels to maintain stocks of tradespersons, given that a training rate of 5-6% is estimated as the required supply rate to replace losses through wastage."

It details the trade training rates for Queensland in 1987.

In relation to the trade of brick-laying, the document shows that the number of completions was 39, the work-force estimate was 3 400 to 3 800 and the approximate rate was 1.1 per cent. That is a figure which is shockingly lower than the estimated figure needed to meet our requirements.

However, one of the most indicting statistics on this particular document is that which refers to the importation of skilled migrants. The document states—

"While an increase in the number of skilled migrants to this State could partially offset shortfalls in local trade training, it is obvious that the combined low level of supply of trade labour will fall below industry demand while construction activity remains at present, and anticipated levels."

It is a shocking state of affairs to see under the heading "Settler Arrivals by Skilled Occupation—Queensland" that in June/July 1985 only 17 brick-layers came into Queensland, but in 1987, when this State trained only 40 apprentices, 42 skilled brick-layers were imported into Queensland from overseas. Forty Queenslanders were trained, yet 42 were imported. Despite that, Queensland has the highest unemployment statistics in the nation. It has the worst figures of youth unemployment.

The Minister is racing round the State, sticking out his chest wherever he goes and saying what a great fellow he is and what a great job he is doing in relation to apprenticeships. He talks about work skills and all that sort of thing. However, Queensland has a shocking record in the non-training of apprentices. I would like to hear what the Minister has to say in response to those shocking figures, which I believe are an indictment on this Government. All the inquiries in the world can be conducted, but unless something is done to bite the bullet in relation to the training of our young people—the training of our future tradesmen—in the not-too-distant future Queensland will face a shortage of skilled tradesmen. I will reserve any further comments to the debate on the clauses.

Mr FRASER (Springwood) (4.03 p.m.): It is a pleasure to participate in this afternoon's debate on the amendments to the Industry and Commerce Training Act. The amendments proposed in the Bill emphasise the Government's intention to keep the apprenticeship training system under review, and I want to concentrate on advances which have been made in the apprenticeship training section. The amendments proposed in the Bill are designed primarily to increase the efficiency of the administration system and also to recognise off-the-job training in conjunction with on-the-job training.

With the ever-changing employment trends in industry caused by advances in technology, several new trades are emerging. Changes in economic circumstances have forced many traditional trade-based employers to diversify or to specialise in order to compete on the open market, which, as we all know, is very competitive in present times. To keep pace with these trends within industry, the Queensland Government has given industry the encouragement to take up the training arrangements it needs to ensure that sufficient skilled workers are available to fill the new jobs that emerge in the present atmosphere. Members would be aware that over recent years, on the recommendation of the Industry and Commerce Training Commission, the Minister has introduced a number of new apprenticeship callings to complement these changes in industry. For instance, the growth of a highly sophisticated motor industry has resulted in the need for qualified specialists to keep up to date with changes in technology in certain areas of that industry. The commission addressed this problem and an apprenticeship calling in motor vehicles with fuel injection was begun.

The building industry is one industry facing changes resulting from new technology, products and management techniques. As a result, most builders must specialise to operate efficiently and to survive in the industry. Carpenters are now seen specialising in discrete areas only, plasterers performing work that 10 years ago did not even exist, and a multitude of small specialist work gangs operating on building sites across the country. To cater for this, the Minister has introduced portion of trade apprenticeships in the building industry. Apprentices can now be indentured to learn formwork, second fix or framework as a part of the trade of carpentry. This flexibility will allow many employees to take on apprentices in a portion of the trade only whereas previously they would have been unable to do so. I believe that many young people entering the workplace—unlike the times when most members of this House left school and people went into one career—have to look at two or three different career paths in their life-time because of changing technology in most industries today. A similar arrangement applies to wall-fixers in the plastering trade because young people can specialise in one section. Because of the cost factor, it has become obvious that the traditional fibrous plasterers of old are a dying race. The fibrous plasterer is being replaced by specialists who today rely on the mass produced plaster board to finish off construction jobs.

These are examples of innovative training arrangements that are designed to meet industry needs and they demonstrate the flexibility of the Government in meeting the training needs of industry. By adopting this approach, these improvements in the number and type of trade callings are now to be matched by improvements in the administrative arrangements which support the apprenticeship system.

I am pleased to have been kept informed by the Minister of advances in apprenticeship training. Now, with these changes to improve administrative processing, the Government is continuing in its approach to reduce delays in apprenticeships.

Finally, to keep pace with the ever-changing needs of Queensland industry for skilled tradesmen, flexibility must be built into the apprenticeship system. The Queensland system is moving towards this flexibility.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (4.08 p.m.): I am pleased to support the Bill. The Minister has taken on the responsibilities of the Industry and Commerce Training Commission with a degree of enthusiasm. The Minister was an apprentice; he knows and understands the role of the master/apprentice relationship and the need for supervision of that role in this State by Government agencies as well as by employer and employee organisations. As all honourable members would know, apprenticeship exists for two major reasons: one is to avoid exploitation of young people, which was characteristic of past centuries; the other is at the same time to ensure that apprentices are trained to meet the needs of the community to a standard that the community requires. Those matters are supervised by the commission, which works very hard indeed to ensure that work is maintained to that standard.

The only thing anachronistic—if it is anachronistic—about apprenticeship is the word itself. The name “apprentice” tends to give an appearance or some sort of indication that it is something belonging to a past era. It does not matter what the name is, provided that the definition of the Act and the way the scheme is administered are adhered to. I am sure that the young people involved can put up with the name that is considered by some people to belong to a past era. The new word that is coming in is “traineeship”. Trainees in various areas of skill are being encouraged—and supervised, I am pleased to note—in conjunction with apprenticeship. However, a very special relationship exists between the apprentice and the master. While it is not as intimate as it was in previous years, that special relationship needs supervision and monitoring. The checks and balances that exist are provided in the interest of the apprentice and the community, and also to ensure that the master meets his or her obligations.

Enormous changes have taken place. Many years ago, a review was conducted by Mr Anderson. Major changes were made at that stage in regard to the supervision of apprenticeship. Included in the changes that have occurred in recent times is one that I regard as very suitable, and that is the transfer of the administration of TAFE colleges from the Department of Education to this Minister's portfolio. I am sure that he will be better able to link training with education and a strong industry base. I hope that this will be taken advantage of.

It is true that training at TAFE colleges gives the appearance of being very much a part of education. However, it is education with a special purpose and not all education within the community should come under the administration of the Education Department. The departmentalisation of education has been a characteristic of the Australian community and there has been a tendency to put all forms of education under one head. In fact there are many areas of education in the community which have never been considered to be the role of the Education Department. There is one very obvious example that most honourable members would be familiar with, and that is the training of jockeys. They are still called apprentices and do not come under the control of the ICTC, but nevertheless they are governed by legislation passed in this Parliament. That legislation is associated with the Racing and Betting Act and the rules of racing.

Mr Lester: We had an interesting time today. The first apprentice farrier in Queensland shod a horse.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: That is the first for some years, because there used to be a lot of them.

Mr Lee: A dying trade.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: My colleague is known for being able to shoe a horse.

I congratulate the authorities for encouraging that trade. In recent years cooperage is another trade which has been neglected, but this trade is coming back into its own for reasons other than were originally intended. This is a very valuable trade. A multitude of trades in the community should be watched. The previous speaker mentioned fibrous plaster workers. There has been a great shortage of people learning that trade. Another trade that comes to mind is stonemasonry. A great deal of work has been done in recent years to encourage people into that trade. Currently in this country there is a move towards heritage and the restoration of old buildings and, even though this is a relatively young country, there will be work for many years to come for young people trained in the trade of stonemasonry. This trade will give them secure employment for the rest of their lives.

These things should be kept in mind and the ICTC should watch over them. The Minister, with his enthusiasm for these matters, will take a leading interest. However, as there always is with any worthwhile endeavour, there are a couple of problems. The group apprenticeship system has worked very well indeed. It is a great solution to the problem experienced by a multitude of small employers who were having difficulty retaining their apprentices because their overheads were such that they found it financially difficult to employ an apprentice.

The group apprenticeship scheme has worked very successfully, although I am told that in some areas there is a shortage of applicants for apprenticeships. I hope that will be corrected. Generally small employers find it extremely difficult to provide the necessary breadth of training and, because they have a small number of employees, to support an apprentice. I know that the ICTC has gone to great lengths in an attempt to overcome that difficulty. Many parts of this State are remote, and if an employer has a small business and is also in a remote area, there is limited opportunity for a range of work and for apprentices to take advantage of the block release system to obtain theoretical and academic training. The small employer, or for that matter, any employer, cannot provide this training and in many areas of the State special problems arise for young people attempting to learn a trade of their choice.

I know that the Minister is concerned about that problem because, as I understand it, he was apprenticed to a small employer in the baking trade. I am quite sure that he gained as much experience as was possible from his employer, but, had he been in a larger centre with a greater range of work, he might have gained an even wider range of experience.

Mr Smyth: That's why they keep voting for him, because he can't bake bread.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I can assure the member for Bowen that the Minister used to be able to bake bread. I presume that, after a crash course to bring him up to date, he could still do it, but I am sure that these days he has interests apart from baking bread.

I make a plea from the small employer to the Minister to try even harder to find ways of assisting him or her to take on apprentices and to give them support. Many small employers have complained to me, as no doubt they have to the Minister, that, because of the pressures and the rules that are applied to them, they are reluctant to take on apprentices, even though they want to. One of those rules requires apprentices to be released for block training. Ways have been found to overcome part of that problem, but in some callings that training cannot be done without; the apprentices must attend their academic and theoretical training.

Other problems can occur when an employer goes out of business for whatever reason. The officers of the ICTC go to an extraordinary amount of trouble to try to

place with a new master apprentices who lose their master under those circumstances. Very often the apprentice is faced with the difficulty of physically moving from one part of the State to another and sometimes to an employer with attitudes different from the master he has just left.

Similar difficulties will continue to arise in the administration and the supervision of apprenticeships in this State. Apprentices are genuinely concerned about these matters and, in a State of our dimensions, they still require special attention.

Tribute should also be paid to the big employers of this State who take on apprentices with a deliberate intention of trying to assist in the training of people in the industries within which they work, knowing full well that they will not be able to take on those apprentices when they become journeymen—they are advised accordingly—and also knowing that they are making a contribution to the education and training of these young people and a contribution to the community at large. Mount Isa Mines takes on as many apprentices as it can, particularly in Mount Isa itself, where it has special arrangements for the supervision of apprentices which is of a very, very high standard indeed. Yet that company knows full well that it will not be able to retain all those apprentices when they have qualified. The same applies to the State Works Department, the Railway Department, Utah and many other substantial employers in this State which are making a major contribution.

Unfortunately, when the time comes for the apprentices to graduate, very often their position is misunderstood. In fact, some people deliberately misunderstand the position and say that apprentices should have been guaranteed employment by their employers. For those people to criticise the employers for that is not fair because the trainees and the apprentices and their parents knew perfectly well that there was no guarantee of continuity of work in those establishments. However, the young people wanted to be trained and had the opportunity—one might even say they had the right—to ask to be trained. If they are qualified and if they have merit, they are given that opportunity. I am pleased to see that many thousands of people in this State, many of whom are now in business on their own account in their callings, were trained under those circumstances, knowing full well that they would have to find another employer when their apprenticeships were finished. There is nothing wrong with that. Those employers are particularly to be commended.

I do not know whether the system is still operating successfully, but there have been what have been termed surrogate employers who have stood in for others as far as responsibility is concerned to make sure that people do obtain their apprenticeships. That system was successful. I hope that it is still available in some of the remote areas of the State.

The changes in the legislation are quite minor but they do help the flexibility of the supervision of training. I hope to hear from the Minister in the near future as to his policies in regard to the new responsibilities that have been added to his portfolio in relation to the academic side of training and education in this State to ascertain whether young people are being given the optimum opportunity to get the jobs of their choices. So much is structured in the community that sometimes people are structured out of employment.

Queensland is in the serious situation of having the highest level of unemployment in Australia. The 1 300 or 1 400 unemployed people in my electorate come from families who have lived there for a long time. They are not people who have suddenly crossed the border from the south or have flown in from New Zealand. Their families have been there for many years. They are mostly young people. They are unemployed because they are seeking to be trained. They do not want to be floating from job to job. They want a career and a vocation. Even though many of them have qualified in all other respects, they are not admitted to institutions for training. The TE score set-up in Queensland is contributing to the situation in a most unexpected way—perhaps unexpected some years ago and now better understood. Thousands of young people seek to enrol in various tertiary institutions in this State, but they do not know their TE scores and

have no idea whether they will be admitted or not. They then apply for enrolment and are told that they will be advised. They are given options of what they want to do.

Mr Hinton: That is being corrected.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: It is not being corrected. A statement has been made about it but no correction has been made. That is where the Government makes mistakes. It made statements about the problem, but it has not been corrected.

Last year and the year before that, approximately 25 000 to 30 000 young people were seeking to undertake tertiary education. The remarkable thing is that they qualified for tertiary education but, because of the quota system and the TE score system, which is manipulated, they were told, "Very sorry, no place for you in tertiary education in this State." However, they can obtain tertiary places in other parts of Australia. They are offered places in New South Wales, Tasmania and Western Australia, but not in Queensland.

Mr Hinton: The Federal Government is discriminating against tertiary education.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: That is absolute rubbish. I am not here to defend the Federal Government. It makes its own mistakes and also contributes to this problem. The problem arises because the young people do not know their TE score before they have to decide the direction of their tertiary education. When they are advised that they cannot obtain tertiary places in this State, although they are advised at the same time that they can get into tertiary education in other parts of Australia——

Mr Hinton: There are not enough places, that's the problem.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Of course there are not enough places. But why should not people know before they apply for enrolment that there are not enough places? Why should they not know in September or October that there are not enough places so that they can make the necessary adjustments?

The Federal Government and the State Government are responsible for the lack of tertiary places. The State Government is just as responsible as the Federal Government. Money has not been provided so that these young people can be admitted to tertiary education. Between them the Federal and State Governments do not provide enough tertiary places but the young people have to make a decision not knowing their TE score. They have to make a decision in the dark. Then in January they are told that they cannot be given a tertiary place in this State.

At considerable cost to their parents many young people get places in other States. However, most of them cannot. Many young people obtain temporary jobs and undertake all sorts of casual work to fill in time and then, at the worst time of the year to be seeking work, they go along to the employment agencies to try to find permanent work. It is these higher standard young people who are being thrown onto the scrap-heap in January. If those young people knew in September or October that their prospects of obtaining a tertiary place in January were nil, whatever the reasons for the lack of places, they could then make a choice as to what job alternatives were available to them and still have the opportunity of further training and education. September and October are the best times of the year to be seeking work; January is certainly not. It is all back to front.

A few weeks ago the Minister stated that the Government is reviewing the situation. Honourable members will see whether in 1988 a more intelligent approach is adopted in relation to this matter. If that happens and the young people about to leave school know all the options available to them, including whether or not they have a possibility of receiving a tertiary education, I firmly believe the number of unemployed people in January/February next year could be reduced by some thousands.

In my electorate it is a tragedy to see bright young people who have qualified for tertiary education not only not being admitted to tertiary education but also not being able to find any job at all in the community apart from casual work.

The Minister now has some of the responsibility for tertiary education in this State. He did not have it before. He now has a wonderful opportunity of matching tertiary education opportunities with the young people who want to accept the challenges of further education and training in the many industries and callings over which he has administrative responsibility.

Mr HINTON (Broadsound) (4.28 p.m.): It is my pleasure to support the Minister and these amendments to the Industry and Commerce Training Act. As the member for Nundah has just stated, the amendments are only minor but they are important. They will certainly help to streamline the administration of training and apprenticeships in Queensland.

I will comment on some of the statements that have just been made by the member for Nundah. He was quite right in saying that there has been a problem with TE scores and with young people not being aware of where they were going, what TE score they would get and what the TE score requirements were in regard to their particular course. It is a problem that is being addressed by the Government. The Minister has given an assurance that this year's Year 12s will know what their TE scores are before they have to make their choices.

The member for Nundah said that because of this problem thousands of people are unemployed. I am sure that that is not the case. The plain fact is that there are not enough tertiary places in Queensland, and that is because the Federal Government has discriminated against this State in the allocation of education funds. That is the nub of the problem. You cannot fit two into one. If there are more people seeking tertiary education places than the number of available places, obviously a problem will arise. That is the position.

I have a daughter who is in Year 12 this year. This year the problem will be resolved. In other words, the students will know their TE score before they have to apply for their courses and they will know what courses they can get into. I might add that today, because of the lack of tertiary places, a much higher score is needed in Queensland than in southern States to get into the same type of course. This again comes back to the fact that Queensland is being starved of tertiary funds.

I commend the member for Nundah for his support for bringing TAFE into line with industry and community involvement under the control of the Minister now administering the portfolio, Mr Lester. It is a very good move. Only last week I was privileged to inspect the Rockhampton TAFE college. It surprised me to learn, having listened to the comments by the member for Nundah about the shortage of places, that at the Rockhampton TAFE college there was a shortage of students. The Rockhampton TAFE college was looking for more bums on seats, if I could put it that way, rather than the other way round. In fact, Queensland is not starved of those places, as it might have first appeared from the suggestion by the member for Nundah.

TAFE colleges are excellent institutions. I was very privileged to sit in on a meeting of the council of the Rockhampton TAFE college and to listen to some of its deliberations. I am very pleased to report that our councils advising the TAFE colleges consist of people from local government, industry, educational areas and the general community. This gives a wide range of experience to the TAFE colleges and obviously contributes very much towards their good running. It is the Government's intention that these TAFE colleges be far more autonomous in the future and far more responsible within themselves for the education that they provide.

The Industry and Commerce Training Act was first passed in 1979 and replaced the Apprenticeship Act. Over the years, the Government has passed amendments which meet the needs of industry and apprentices and which improve the administration of training. As I have said, this Bill simply streamlines the administration of apprenticeships and training.

I cannot help commenting on some of the statements made by the member for Nudgee. Some of them are very pertinent. Although I was not quick enough to write

down all the figures that he quoted, I was able to write down some of them. He said that in 1987 there were only 332 apprentice carpenters. The honourable member may correct me if I have written down the figures incorrectly. He said that from 1981 the number of painting apprentices dropped from 161 to 87 in 1987. I think that he said that the number of plumbing apprentices fell from 347 to 176. I scratched my head and said, "Now why would that be?" The answer is fairly obvious—they were all in the building industry. What has happened to the building industry? Why would people be encouraged to enter the building industry when over the last five years of the Hawke Labor Government the building industry has gone from a state of thriving to a state of collapse? We are only just now seeing some resurgence. There would obviously be less attraction for people going into those areas of employment in the building industry when there is such a huge well of unemployment in that industry. The high interest rates and a dereliction of enthusiasm for building in this country, brought about by the Canberra Government, are the problem, not a lack of training facilities as my friend from Nudgee would lead honourable members to believe. It is the economy that is the problem, not a lack of facilities in Queensland.

Some members may question the value of these sorts of nitty-gritty amendments that are contained in the Bill and wonder how they will, or indeed if they can, contribute to improving the apprenticeship system. It is my contention that they can. I shall cite a couple of examples.

What is more important, though, is that this Government cares enough to keep improving the system rather than making wholesale chops and changes. The Federal Government is all too prone to chops and changes. If honourable members think back, they will recall the RED scheme and the CEP scheme. Both have come and both have gone. Of course, there was good in both of them, particularly in the Community Employment Program. A great deal of the money for that program was virtually misappropriated into weirdo schemes involving gays and lesbians, and money was being channelled off to trade unions, which was a waste of those funds. That is one reason why that particular program has not continued. Of course, after the CEP scheme we heard Mr Hawke's cry during the election campaign that people would have to work for the dole. I wonder whatever happened to the work-for-the-dole scheme that he was going to put forward. I suggest that the unions soon killed off that idea.

I assure honourable members that those problems will not occur with Queensland's apprenticeship system. The proposed amendments to the legislation are designed to improve and streamline the administrative procedures that are associated with apprenticeships and are in line with this Government's policy of reducing Government requirement while protecting the rights of all parties involved in the apprenticeship and training systems.

These amendments will enable the probationary period to be incorporated in the indenture. The current process of allotting an apprentice on probation and then preparing and signing the indenture after the probationary period of three months is time consuming. The proposed amendments will enable indentures to be signed immediately by all parties without affecting the parties' ability to terminate or extend employment of the apprentice during the probationary period. This will reduce the workload and will also reduce delays in issuing indentures. I am sure that honourable members will support the Government's efforts to improve efficiency.

By continuing this approach, by these amendments the Government recognises the importance of the employers' and apprentices' rights in terminating employment during the probationary period. The entitlements of the parties in the past were not clear, and the proposed changes clearly outline the wage entitlements that are due to an apprentice where no notice or insufficient notice is given by either party. Furthermore, the proposed amendment relating to signing of indentures by the commissioner has been removed, although all rights of the relevant parties are protected by the legislation.

These amendments are just two examples of the Government's commitment to assisting industry in its dealings with Government departments. The Honourable the

Minister has frequently told me how important it is to listen to the training needs of particular industries. Of course, that is what this Government is doing with its TAFE colleges and the advisory councils to those colleges. That is what the Minister has done in this particular case. In that way, with the co-operation of the employee bodies the training effort can be increased and industry will benefit from the link between training and the increased productivity that will be forthcoming.

I believe that the amendments will assist industry to increase its training effort and provide more young Queenslanders with the prospect of obtaining an apprenticeship or traineeship.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (4.38 p.m.): I join this debate with some sadness. It is clear from the amendments that are proposed by the Minister that the Act is not working.

I intend to demonstrate that the current trends in apprenticeship numbers indicate that major deficiencies exist in the present system. I intend also to outline the poor record in training that this State Government has, together with the lack of support by the Premier for initiatives that have been proposed by the Minister over a period. I will be mentioning those matters and considering new approaches.

Firstly, I wish to mention some of the comments that were made by the honourable member for Broadsound. He stated that the main reason for the current problems is that the Queensland Government or Queenslanders are discriminated against by the Federal Government. I wish to put on record that, every year while the Federal Labor Government has been in power, the proportion of new tertiary places that Queensland received has been greater than its proportion of Australia's population. Queensland has 16 per cent of the Australian population, and in one year it received 26 per cent of the new tertiary places that were provided in Australia. So let us not blame the Federal Government all the time. We must consider what this State Government is doing. It spends only two-thirds of the Australian average on TAFE education. In primary and secondary schools, it spends 10 per cent less than the Australian average.

The honourable member for Broadsound went on to say that the building boom has now gone and that has been a major factor in the reduction of apprentice numbers. I will provide some figures and statistics—they are in addition to those provided by the member for Nudgee—to indicate that other areas are also missing out.

The honourable member for Broadsound criticised harshly one other aspect of the schemes. The RED scheme and the CEP scheme should not have been criticised. Those schemes contained some deficiencies, but, because of criticism by people such as the member for Broadsound, they no longer exist. Because of those schemes, many local authorities were able to provide for their communities lasting facilities that would not otherwise have been provided. I would like to congratulate the local authority in my electorate for participating in those schemes.

The Minister's annual report for 1986-87 showed that great difficulty was being experienced in relation to apprenticeships. Under the heading "Vocational Training in Queensland" the report states—

"For the year ended 30 June 1987, 5 090 apprentices were allotted to employers. This represents a decrease of 644 allotments in 1985/86.

. . .

This year's intake is consistent with the long-term trend in intakes."

That intake indicates a decrease in the number of apprenticeships being undertaken in Queensland. That is not a good long-term trend. I believe that the trend should show an increase.

The report also states—

"The number of 'out-of trade' apprentices registered with the Division at 30 June 1987 was 87 which represents an increase of 21 in the number at 30 June 1986."

That again is a very disturbing trend, and a trend that will, as a matter of importance, have to be changed if young people are to be trained in different skills.

I now seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* a table showing the total apprentices employed in the major trades between 1977 and 1987.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have inspected that table.

Leave granted.

TOTAL APPRENTICES EMPLOYED IN THE MAJOR TRADES 1977-1987

Trade	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
Boilermaking	1 374	1 267	1 276	1 453	1 846	2 198	2 122	1 895	1 415	1 138	1 089
Fitting & Turning	2 130	2 050	2 023	2 135	2 338	2 363	2 236	2 156	1 791	1 626	1 592
Fitting (DHEE)	575	588	645	729	849	908	891	898	779	728	736
Motor											
Mechanic	2 478	2 260	2 250	2 373	2 441	2 431	2 240	2 148	1 880	1 800	1 831
Sheetmetal											
Working	336	323	348	394	404	438	412	387	360	386	413
Electrical	2 813	2 560	2 415	2 531	2 755	2 859	2 954	2 885	2 465	2 359	2 210
Carpentry & Joinery	2 638	2 175	2 012	2 156	2 471	2 553	2 371	2 340	1 948	1 733	1 610
Painting	487	406	379	454	486	483	450	478	413	437	409
Plumbing & Draining	1 004	942	895	942	1 035	1 048	994	943	790	756	700
Panel Beating	539	495	513	529	482	461	414	407	398	401	378
Cooking	280	329	368	474	559	666	687	785	802	901	939
Cabinet Making	495	424	445	536	561	624	577	549	487	482	508
Hairdressing (Ladies)	1 173	1 221	1 370	1 589	1 748	1 841	2 011	2 270	2 274	2 467	2 435
Other	3 958	3 740	3 751	4 167	4 398	4 594	4 248	4 081	3 504	3 369	3 451
Total	20 280	18 780	18 690	20 462	22 373	23 467	22 607	22 222	19 306	18 583	18 301

Source Department of Employment, Vocational Education and Training: Summary of Apprenticeship Stats.

Mr CAMPBELL: That table enforces further the figures that were cited by the member for Nudgee. In 1987 the total number of apprentices employed in the boiler-making trade was 1 089. The figure peaked at 2 198 in 1982. The 1987 figure represents a reduction of 50 per cent on the peak of 1982 and it shows the very poor state of the number of apprenticeships in that trade. Most trades reflect a similar trend. For example, the number of apprentices in the motor mechanic trade peaked at 2 478 in 1977. A decade later the number was down to 1 831. That indicates that in two trades which are not associated with the building industry—and I say that for the information of the member for Broadsound—great reductions have occurred in the number of apprenticeships.

Many other industries, mainly in the metal trades, show similar trends downwards. In only two trades—cooking and hairdressing (ladies)—has the trend increased. A decade ago, in 1977, 280 young people undertook an apprenticeship in cooking. The number has now increased to 939, which is a very significant increase. A similar trend can be seen in the hairdressing trade. The number of people undertaking apprenticeships in that trade increased from 1 173 in 1977 to 2 435 a decade later in 1987.

Although the numbers undertaking apprenticeships in those two trades have increased, all other areas have shown significant reductions, so much so that the overall number of apprentices, which reached a peak of 23 467 in 1982, is now down to 18 301. Five thousand fewer young Queenslanders are being apprenticed today than were being apprenticed in 1982.

Mr Speaker, I now ask leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* a table showing the new commencements of apprentices in all major trades for each financial year.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has passed the table on to me.

Leave granted.

New Commencements in Major Trades for each Financial Year

Trade	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
Boilermaking	418	317	298	418	492	706	710	317	292	263	347	293
Fitting & Turning	601	557	528	546	605	722	697	416	444	377	483	435
Fitting (DHEE)	166	179	159	176	242	290	244	164	201	208	199	194
Motor Mechanic	639	774	557	618	624	694	657	388	492	512	526	472
Sheetmetal Working	96	93	89	126	109	120	126	77	84	102	149	134
Electrical	701	794	700	618	747	862	907	638	595	568	645	567
Carpentry & Joinery	575	620	538	509	579	867	746	383	513	477	479	370
Painting	108	125	139	117	157	161	139	85	159	125	139	87
Plumbing & Draining	223	294	259	207	238	342	313	177	175	202	235	176
Panel Beating	158	161	138	158	123	108	132	84	101	112	137	89
Cooking	96	107	151	151	179	223	251	202	269	313	343	380
Cabinet Making	127	142	126	138	174	173	223	95	120	134	182	128
Hairdressing (Ladies)	297	419	466	511	520	600	646	574	771	736	769	712
Other	1 062	1 044	969	1 029	1 233	1 323	1 354	767	946	944	1 029	1 053
Total	5 267	5 626	5 117	5 322	6 022	7 191	7 145	4 367	5 162	5 073	5 662	5 090

Source Department of Employment, Vocational Education and Training: Summary of Apprenticeship Statistics.

Mr CAMPBELL: I thank honourable members.

This table is even more disturbing because it shows the number of new apprentices going into the different trades. Some of the trends are very disturbing. It can be seen that 710 apprentices started in the boiler-making trade in 1982. In 1987, only 293 started. In 1981 a peak of 722 was recorded in the number of young Queenslanders who undertook their first year of apprenticeship in the fitting and turning trade, but last year only 435 did so. In the carpentry and joinery trade, a peak of 867 occurred in 1981, but the figure dropped in 1987 to 370. Fewer than half the number of young Queenslanders undertook the first year of an apprenticeship in the carpentry and joinery trade compared to 1981. The only two trends that improved are in the cooking and hairdressing trades.

Overall, a reduction has occurred in new commencements of apprenticeships this year compared to peak periods. Only 5 090 undertook the first year of an apprenticeship last year whereas in 1981, when the peak occurred, 7 191 started. The statistics show a very disturbing trend and indicate that young Queenslanders are not being trained.

I can also show by statistics that the percentage of Queensland youth being trained as apprentices is not the same as percentages in other parts of Australia. I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* a graph that shows the total for Queensland as a percentage of the Australian total for the youth labour-force and new apprentices.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have seen the graph. I will have to consult with *Hansard* to make sure that it can be incorporated.

Leave granted.



Mr CAMPBELL: I thank honourable members.

The graph shows the result of the lack of incentives and facilities that Queensland is providing for its youth. It shows also that in each of these years from 1978 to 1986, the number of new apprentices was always a lower proportion as a percentage of Queensland's labour-force when it was calculated as a proportion of the total throughout Australia. For example, in 1978 when the percentage of the Queensland labour-force as a percentage of the Australian total was 15 per cent, Queensland only recorded slightly more than 11 per cent of the total number of new apprentices for that year. In 1986—the last year for which I could obtain these figures—when Queensland had 17 per cent of the Australian youth labour-force, this State had only 12 per cent of the commencement of apprenticeships. This trend shows that Queensland is not providing facilities to apprentices to the extent that other Australian States have. It is very important that the Government takes action immediately.

Economic indicators for January 1988 show that Queensland has a very serious youth unemployment problem. In December 1987, the unemployment rate for Queensland youth was 27.9 per cent. In other words, more than one in four of Queensland's youth was unemployed. It is very important to make the provision of jobs for young people a priority.

The present Minister has been concerned with providing more jobs for young Queenslanders, but he has not been supported by the rest of the Cabinet. I go back to

1984 when Mr Lester acknowledged that action should be taken. I quote from the *Sunday Sun* of 12 August 1984—

“State Employment Minister Mr Vince Lester, said it was time Queensland spent more on programs to help young Queensland people get jobs. He said the money should be spent on long term projects that taught young people a skill.”

The report then went on to state—

“Since last year the State Government has allocated \$100,000 to youth employment schemes, compared to \$16m in Victoria and \$30m in New South Wales.”

At that time the Minister was trying to get more money.

A similar situation arose in 1987 and again the Minister went to Cabinet. A report in the *Courier-Mail* of 18 March 1987 states—

“The Ministers urged the Government to spend more to cut unemployment, which is higher in Queensland than in any other State.

They urged that more more than \$18 million be spent immediately on employment, training and industry incentives—areas where Queensland lags other States.”

The article also states—

“The Queensland Government spends \$2.40 a head on employment and training incentives—less than half the second lowest-spending State.

Tasmania spends \$13.90 a head, New South Wales \$8, Victoria \$5.80, South Australia \$7.10 and Western Australia \$5.30.”

After the Minister put up this proposal to spend \$18m, Cabinet decided to establish an interdepartmental committee to report back within a month. No-one knows what that report said, but nothing happened as a result of it. The Minister asked Cabinet for \$18m and only \$3.5m was allocated in the next Budget. He was not given the help he requested from Cabinet.

Now a new Premier has come along and said that he is concerned about unemployment and will implement an autopsy into unemployment. In 1985 there was a task force, in 1987 there was the report and Cabinet submission and now there is an autopsy. I quote from a newspaper article dated 23 February 1988—

“The Premier’s decision on the investigation follows his pledge on taking office that unemployment would be a priority.”

I ask: why did the new Premier not support the Minister back in 1987 when he requested \$18m and was not given anything? What about all the other Ministers who were present? Did they not give him any support? That is a major failing. The Minister was not given the necessary support to enable him to help the young people of Queensland. He has been duded for four years and has got nothing and now some of the people who duded him all that time will be the great saviours. Where have they been for the last four years when Queensland has had the highest unemployment of any State in Australia?

I turn now to look at alternative methods of improving the apprenticeship scheme. Yesterday Mr Frank Steckel, who is a Professor of Industrial Education and Technology in the United States, spoke to people at the TAFE college in Bundaberg. He outlined what was done in the United States of America. That country has a totally different concept. Young people are given the skills and they then go out into the work-force and find an employer. Before young people in Queensland can acquire trade skills, they have to find an employer. That is one of the major problems.

In the United States of America not only are young people allowed to undertake part-time training at technical institutes—just as the apprenticeship system in this State works—but also they do not have to be employed while they are acquiring their trade skills. This is the problem. More than 200 young people applied for the 10 apprenticeships

offered by the Bundaberg Sugar Company. That means that, because nobody will employ them, more than 190 young kids missed out on the opportunity to learn a trade.

The American system is very interesting. Their system puts a great deal of time and effort into making the acquisition of a trade an important aspect of employment. The process commences in primary schools, where a program called the Awareness Factor enables children to take pride in the jobs undertaken by their parents. At junior high the children go into what is called an exploration period, which enables them to consider all the types of jobs available to them. They are told not only about the professions but also about trades. I would guarantee that, if our high school students were asked what job they wanted, they would say that they wanted to be a doctor, an engineer or a teacher and that not many of them would want to become electricians, plumbers or carpenters. That attitude has to be changed.

When American children go to high school they are made aware of skill development, which enables them to develop the required trade skills. When American children leave high school they go into the 13th year, which is known as their vocational year, and the 14th year, which is the technical year. In other words, they can learn their skills through full-time education.

All the alternatives have to be considered. Young Queenslanders should be allowed to gain skills in the trades and then find an employer—that is, a job. Because it is holding back their development, the Government has to change the concept that young people have to be employed before they can gain skills.

I wish to touch on matters that cut across TAFE and the Department of Industrial Affairs. Although young kids fulfil all the TAFE college requirements to gain a machinery operator's certificate, they are not given the certificate because the course is not recognised by another division within the Minister's department. If the Minister wishes, because the matter is causing a lot of concern, I will raise it with him later.

I am very concerned about the number of resignations that are rumoured to be taking place in TAFE colleges. I am wondering if everything is okay and whether something needs to be done.

Today I have covered a number of aspects of apprenticeships. My first point is the cause for concern about the cost of apprentices to small employers. The member for Nundah spoke about how much support should be given to the large employers, who are doing a good job, but I am concerned about the small employers who, under the present system, cannot afford to train apprentices. In actual fact, it can cost a small employer more to employ a third-year apprentice than a tradesman. If more apprentices are to be employed, that has to be changed.

My second point is that the Government should consider what professor Steckel said, that is, that young Queenslanders who want trade skills have to be allowed to gain them before they find employment rather than having to find employment before gaining the skills.

My third point is that the Government should move further and more quickly into computer-managed learning and that the group apprenticeship scheme, which has been so successful, should be further developed.

The other point that I raised in 1987 concerned day release. Many small employers cannot afford to have their apprentices away for seven weeks at a time. If industry changes over to computer-managed learning, perhaps the day release scheme can be implemented and apprentices can be available more often to employers.

Another point is that more incentives should be provided for employers so that they can afford to employ apprentices.

My last point is that the Government has to take a lead by employing more apprentices. At present a very low number of people are participating in apprenticeships and traineeships. More work has to be carried out in that area. I hope that the Minister can take action on some of those suggestions in the interests of our young people.

Mr SHERLOCK (Ashgrove) (5.01 p.m.): I wish to touch on a number of points. I take up some of the latter points made by the member for Bundaberg in relation to promoting training for young people. During the course of my address, I will also refute some of the statements and figures that he quoted earlier.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister indicated that the amendments were minor. However, as other members have said, they are important, especially in the provision of employment opportunities for young people. He also said that the changes in technology and the economic environment have highlighted some of the needs to provide a smoother machinery for apprenticeship training for industry and commerce, and a smoother bureaucratic machinery as well.

I vividly recall my own apprenticeship days. I trained under an apprenticeship system as a pharmacist in central Queensland.

Mr White: So did I.

Mr SHERLOCK: My colleague the honourable member for Redcliffe and I both recall signing the indentures in the early 1950s. Those indentures remained in place in Queensland until the 1960s. They refer to the duties of apprentices, which include the trimming of the lamps, attending the hours of business regularly and spending the sabbath on quiet cultural pursuits—a bit different from today. Of course, in those days the indentures provided that all of our courting had to be done on Sundays. Indeed, one could not contract matrimony without the approval of one's master. These are different times indeed.

Referring to the comments by the member for Bundaberg, I recall that in those days one did not receive training in advance; it was received in the apprenticeship indenture period, but one often paid a premium for that privilege. Although it was illegal, it was quite common practice—certainly in my profession—that many apprentices received very little in the way of return in wages, but they paid or their families paid for the privilege. Thank goodness that those days are gone.

Mr White: I was paid £2 12s. 6d.

Mr SHERLOCK: The member for Redcliffe mentions that in the first year we were paid £2 12s. 6d. I remember vividly the day that I received a £1 a week rise.

Mr White: An honest day's work.

Mr SHERLOCK: An honest day's work for an honest day's pay.

Mr FitzGerald: You are making up for it now though, aren't you?

Mr SHERLOCK: I will take the member for Lockyer's interjection. Many of the members in this Chamber would agree that our incomes decrease when we come here. I think that the member for Mount Isa mentioned that only a few months ago in this place. A number of us could recount that experience. Nonetheless, it is a great life and on days like today we enjoy it thoroughly.

The matter of apprenticeships has been touched on before. The member for Nundah mentioned that the Minister is now responsible virtually for a large part of tertiary education in this State. I am talking about TAFE colleges and apprenticeship training. That is entirely true. Education is not only education for life, although that is important. Expo is approaching. Its theme is "Leisure in the age of technology". Education is all about the business of living, but it is also about the business of getting a job. It is about the quality of life and happiness and contentment with one's lot. It is certainly about self-esteem and self-worth.

My heart aches for those young people whose self-esteem is being dried up at the very grassroots, in our secondary schools, not merely at the end of Year 12 when they come to make the decision to go into an apprenticeship or find a job or a tertiary place in what is a shrinking market. Only a quarter of the young people in this State who

qualify will go into tertiary positions this year. The rest of them are virtually thrown on the scrap-heap of life at a time when their self-esteem needs to be built up.

The self-esteem of students in Year 10 and, indeed, earlier years than that, is being destroyed. Mounting pressure is put on students at an early age—ages such as 13 and 14—to make decisions about their future life that they hope will enable them to gain a TE score that will get them into a tertiary institution and somehow—mystically—get them a job. If this Bill helps in any way at all to create more apprenticeships and helps more young people to get apprenticeships in today's changing environment, that is a good thing.

I mention the review that these amendments touch upon, the review that is possible since the Minister introduced the earlier Bill last year. I certainly applaud that. As one who has been in business for 30 years, one who has been the sole proprietor of a small business that grew into a number of businesses, I can speak with conviction and experience about the need to decrease the bureaucracy, the amount of paperwork that a small-businessman, a small proprietor, a small factory-owner, a small manufacturer has to put up with. Let us leave that sort of thing to those who are best equipped to do it and let the small manufacturer, the small retailer, get on with the things he does best, that is, making things that create wealth, retailing or operating his shop or whatever it is and helping to create business and jobs. Let us cut down the paperwork and make it simpler. I applaud those facets of this Bill that do that in regard to apprenticeship training.

I touch upon the matter of probation because I have some strong feelings about probation in any facet of employment. I always say to people who I employ that I think it is a great idea that I, as the employer, and they, as the employee, have a chance to look at each other during a probationary period. At the end of that time, if the employer and the employee do not like each other, then they should call it quits while they are still friends. We spend such a large amount of our time at work that it is important that we enjoy what we are doing. That is beneficial not only to the employer and the employee but also to the industry and certainly to the consumer.

I am pleased to see in this Bill the opportunity for a probationary period for apprentices. I think that it is particularly important that young people have the opportunity to learn to relate to those in the work-force in what is for them a strange environment indeed.

I commend the Minister for placing in this legislation the ability to count that probation as part of the indenture period. That is a very practical stride forward and one that young people will accept and relate to. I seem to be commending the Minister quite a bit on this Bill. I do commend him on another facet of the Bill, that is the availability of a tradesman's certificate to the apprentice at the appropriate time. I think that that is a very, very good thing indeed. It depends upon the rate of learning of the apprentice and a whole range of things but certainly the skills and the ability of an apprentice at a certain stage in his training need to be recognised. I think it is great that young people in particular are looking for recognition of their skills and ability. There are many tasks that they can do now. Young people are resources not only for the future but also for now.

I think that sometimes we underestimate what their resources at this time really are. Of course, it could be argued that experience is worth something, too, and so it is. Certainly those of us who are more senior in this place would probably pursue that line of argument. I am sure that Mr White is worth far more now than £1 12s. 6d. a week—

Mr Beard: At least double.

Mr SHERLOCK: The honourable member and I can pursue that argument in another place.

I turn to the point that legislation that produces a tradesman's certificate and will recognise the competence of these young people who are apprentices is a very good

thing indeed. Gone are the days, I would hope, when apprenticeships and apprentices were seen as a cheap labour-force. I believe that much has been achieved in industrial relations by this Government and the former coalition Government in this State in the last two or three decades towards ensuring that industrial conditions are better now for apprentices than they were 30 years ago, or before that. That is important because it builds up the esteem of young people. I have referred to the drying up of that esteem and so on. However, there is much about young people that is positive, so it is important that we encourage them.

I touch now on the matter of the ability to transfer apprenticeships from one employer to another. Whilst it is only a small thing, I think that it is extremely practical that in times of tight economic circumstances this is allowed in the Bill. Honourable members should not think that it cannot happen to us. When I was a boy in central Queensland during the Depression—I was indeed just a tiny tot—I recall my Dad telling me that he was an apprentice pastry-cook. He had spent some two years in training and lost his position when the local baker went out of business. It is very important that young people have the ability to take their indentures elsewhere and that some employer be able to take them on. I am pleased that this Bill provides that ability.

Let me reflect for a time on why we wish to improve apprenticeship training and its administration in this State and why we wish to employ more apprentices. This matter was referred to by the member for Bundaberg. Other members have spoken about the lack of tertiary places. I refute the figures that the member for Bundaberg cited during his contribution to this debate. It is an irrefutable fact that at present Queensland has the lowest participation rate in tertiary education in Australia. Although Queensland has 16 per cent of the population of Australia, its participation rate in tertiary education is a mere 10.3 per cent. This figure compares with 13.1 per cent in New South Wales, 15.1 per cent in South Australia and a massive 23.9 per cent in the ACT. All honourable members know that of the 27 000 students who completed Year 12 last year in this State only about 7 500 students will achieve a tertiary place. We all know that as a result of a direct misappropriation of Federal funding of tertiary education in Australia, Queensland receives only 14½ per cent of the total Commonwealth grant for universities, while it receives 15.7 per cent for CAEs and only 14.3 per cent for TAFE colleges, which is one of the responsibilities of the Minister. All of those figures should be considered with the fact that Queensland has 16.6 per cent of the population of Australia.

The figures show quite clearly that to bring Queensland's tertiary funding into line with that of the other States on a population basis, Queensland's universities would need an extra \$24.8m, the CAEs would need an extra \$7.6m and the TAFE colleges would need an extra \$2.9m. These figures are calculated from the Commonwealth Budget Paper No. 4 in the current year, which is 1987-88.

By its policies the Federal Government has indeed encouraged young people to remain at school longer. That is an excellent idea. Queenslanders have responded to that call to such an extent that Queensland has one of the highest retention rates in this country in our secondary schools. We were reminded that just 10 short years ago 40 per cent of students remained to complete Grade 12. That figure is now almost 60 per cent of students, which compares with a national average of about 50 per cent. We find that students are turning to alternative courses in their secondary education.

I shall quote some other figures that are of interest. I am referring to tertiary education, apprenticeship training and TAFE training. Some figures I have to hand indicate that at the University of Queensland this year a student would need to be in the top 1.5 per cent in student ratings to get into medicine. To get into physiotherapy, a student needs to be in the top 2 per cent; and in the top 5 per cent to get into occupational therapy. A student who wishes to obtain a place in the faculty of law at the QIT, which is next door to Parliament House, needs to be in the top 4 per cent of students in this State. To obtain a place in a course such as communications a student needs to be in the top 5 per cent of students in the State. A person who wishes to commence a course in optometry in 1988 needs to be in the top 5.3 per cent. These are

unreal expectations of students. Some people believe that one does not need a high score—that high place in the ratings in this State—to move into some of those professions. I do not deny that a sound education and sound preparation in terms of a rating in a secondary school are necessary before one enters professions such as those that I have mentioned. However, I am concerned that the expectations are unreal. I am concerned about the average young Queenslander who wants to make a living in the work-force by learning basic skills and crafts.

Why do we need more apprenticeships? I have touched upon the lack of availability of tertiary places. Three-quarters of those students who are completing Year 12 do not have places to go to in tertiary institutions.

A shortage of competent craftsmen and tradesmen exists in commerce and industry. It has been said that some of the trades and crafts in those fields will be the trades and crafts of the future. People such as plumbers, technicians and mechanics will hold down jobs that will be very much sought after in the future.

Why do we need more apprenticeship training? The reason is that the unemployment rate in this country is so high. Queensland still ranks as one of the worst States in Australia in terms of unemployment. At present, unemployment in Queensland is running at a shade under 10 per cent. It is no better than it was a year or two ago.

On a number of occasions the Minister has stated that he is creating job opportunities. Other honourable members who have contributed to this debate have claimed that that is not happening at a fast enough rate.

This National Party Government does not have the runs on the board. It is long on rhetoric but it is very light indeed on performance. Of the 10 per cent of people who are unemployed at present, 25 per cent are young people.

Mr Sherrin: Who wrote this?

Mr SHERLOCK: I write my own speeches.

The situation in relation to tertiary training and employment creation is so serious that many private secondary schools are considering alternative courses for their students in Years 11 and 12. Perhaps the State system could take a leaf out of the book of the non-Government schools. I ask the Minister for Education to consider that aspect.

Last night I attended a major secondary school in my electorate. Approximately 200 people attended a meeting at which they were told about the options that were available for students facing Years 11 and 12 this year. I learnt that, at the Lourdes Hill Catholic school in this State, alternative courses are being offered in all sorts of practical subjects including home economics, crafts and work experience in particular. In the course of a year it is proposed that students will undertake six individual weeks of work experience in different locations throughout the city of Brisbane and they will come away at the end of those courses with skills and crafts that can be used in their future lives. More importantly, those students are provided with a folio of experience in the work-force. I suggest to the Minister that that often means more to an employer than a tertiary score of between 600 and 900. Those young people are putting runs on the board in terms of the jobs that they are undertaking. They are demonstrating their competence, their ability to get on with adults in the work-force, and that they are keen to do something positive.

The school that I attended last night was Mount St Michael's at Ashgrove. It is also considering courses such as manual arts, fashion and diet. It is placing students in work experience streams a week at a time in all sorts of fields. It has a proven track record of placing students in clerical positions, the tourism industry and in apprenticeships and so on.

I commend the thrusts of the Bill that encourage apprenticeship training and, in particular, make it easier for that to be administered. I repeat that we should not be pulling the plug on the motivation of young people at a time in their lives when we should be fanning that motivation to white heat. We are throwing away on a scrap-heap

much of the resources of the young people of this State, not only in terms of their training but also, importantly, in terms of their motivation, their self-esteem and their absolute enthusiasm to get on with the business of making a living, of getting about and learning something about life. If the Bill helps to encourage all of that, we in the Liberal Party support it.

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Affairs) (5.22 p.m.), in reply: I thank all honourable members for their interest in and their genuine contribution to the debate. The Industry and Commerce Training Act's role in guiding industry towards successful fulfilment of Queensland's training needs is central in today's climate of striving for greater international competitiveness.

The need of industry has been kept very, very much in mind, and the efficiency of the Act's administration has been improved by changes contained in the amendments. I believe it has been necessary—and I am sure honourable members will agree—for the establishment of a legislative framework that will be sufficiently cost efficient to help address industry's training needs now and into the future and thereby enhance the competitiveness of Queensland industry.

Recent amendments to the Act have had the effect of extending training into the various non-trade areas through, for instance, the development of traineeships, the need to respond quickly on a regional basis, and the streamlining of various administrative and procedural processes within my department. This Bill will further improve the operations of the Act. The important areas addressed by the amendments relate to a further need to streamline and speed up administrative procedures. The amendment Bill will further enhance the State's ability to provide for effective training systems.

I will now refer to the comments that were made by the various members. The member for Nudgee raised the question of reasons for changes to the Act. The changes maintain the full protection of the apprentice under the Act and they merely streamline the processing. Obviously, they have been fully discussed in the Industry and Commerce Training Commission, which includes members from industry, the departments——

Mr Vaughan: How about telling us here why you are doing it.

Mr LESTER: That is just what I am doing.

Mr Vaughan: Well, you haven't yet.

Mr LESTER: I have just started my reply. I do not quite know what is wrong. I am not interested in having a fight with the honourable member. I think we have a common interest and we want to try to sort it out.

The honourable member also raised the issue of whether employers are aware of their obligations under the Act. Queensland now has some 47 field officers to look after the apprentices and trainees. That is a better ratio than that existing in any other State. Not for one moment am I saying that it cannot be improved, but compared with other States it is better.

Mr Vaughan: It does not matter how many officers you have got out there; the problem is that it is still going on.

Mr LESTER: If the good member would be prepared to allow me to sum up, together we might try to overcome some of the difficulties. He also raised the question of unemployment for youth and the intake of apprentices. He has selectively used the statistics for 1981 and 1982. In fact, because of the resources boom, record intakes have occurred. By looking at a longer term it will be seen that the average intake over the last 12 years was about 5 500 per year. This financial year the intake is expected to exceed that. Having said that, I still concede that we all have to do a heck of a lot better, but it is not quite as bad a position as was painted.

As to the matter of when employment should commence—section 106 restricts employment of persons under the age of 21 from employment as an apprentice. What

I am saying is that the commencement starts with employment on tradework and applications should be lodged in the particular field.

The commissioner is excluded by amendment to the Act. What that means is that provisions exist under the terms of the indentures for the commissioner to exercise his powers under the Act. All that is intended is to try to save the time that is necessary to facilitate easy movement. I do not believe that the commissioner's signature is absolutely necessary but, under the Act, he still has jurisdiction, so there is no real difficulty. As I see it, that is an administrative matter.

Honourable members raised the question of apprenticeship training for brick-layers. It must not be forgotten that in the Work Skill Olympics, both in Osaka in Japan and in Australia recently, Australian entrants won gold medals for brick-laying. Two brick-layers were actually part of the Gold Coast regional team. I think I should be totally honest and inform the House that they come from just over the border. They were not Queenslanders, but they chose to come into the Queensland regional team for the Work Skill Olympics. It is interesting to note that on two occasions in succession, Australia has won gold medals for brick-laying. In fact, Paul Braisen, who won in Osaka, Japan, was the first Australian to ever win a gold medal at the Work Skill Olympics. On that occasion, Australia won another five medals and was placed seventh in the world. On a recent occasion in Sydney, Australia won 12 medals. Four gold medals were awarded to teams from Queensland. I think that honourable members can be very proud of Queensland's young people. Australia was beaten only by Korea and Taiwan; placed seventh in the world; beat countries such as Japan and West Germany, and many other top-line countries. In spite of everything, Australia is getting very much better and is becoming competitive on the world stage. To think that the only gold medals that were won were awarded to Queenslanders is obviously some indication of the system that operates in this State.

I think it should also be stated that both sides of the industrial fence have been somewhat reluctant to change in the brick-laying trade. I am a little concerned about why they have been reluctant to change. I have asked industry to advise me further and have been heartened to discover that the industry is thinking of establishing a training fund to prop up brick-laying in the building industry. It is important. Obviously, more work has to be done in that area.

I thank the honourable member for Springwood. He made a very interesting speech on broadly based matters as far as apprenticeship training is concerned, and made comments that relate to the area of his electorate in Springwood and Logan. I thank the honourable member very much.

On this occasion—as always—the member for Nundah gave quite an interesting address on apprenticeship training in general and brought to the attention of the House some of the ideas he had in his day and some of his ideas for the future. For his part in the exchange program after apprentices have been trained, he should be commended. I thank him also for supporting recent changes, particularly as TAFE has been brought into line with the Industry and Commerce Training Commission. Really, what the Government has done is introduce employment into this area and it will concentrate very heavily on providing opportunities. Obviously, the Government has to do that.

Apprenticeships, traineeships, TAFE colleges and rural colleges will all be brought together under one department. I believe that this has a good deal of benefit to offer. The Government has a number of ideas that will give industry and employee groups a much greater say in what goes on in TAFE training. The Government also intends to give Queensland's colleges a great deal more autonomy. A great deal of work has been done in this field along the lines I have mentioned. Legislation will be introduced into Parliament in the future, but I think everyone would understand that the Government needs to take its time and do the job properly.

One change that I would like to implement quickly is the idea that TAFE colleges be given the capacity to form partnerships with business operations in order to train people. A very small amendment might be required to this Bill to cover the functions

of the Industry and Commerce Training Commission to facilitate that move until such time as the other Act is prepared. It is in everyone's interest that that be done.

The honourable member for Nundah raised the issue of youth unemployment. Many young people wish to go on to higher education. Queensland has been underfunded by the Commonwealth for many years. I will raise the matters of concern with my colleague the Minister for Education. Recently we attended an Australian Education Council meeting in Melbourne and these issues were very much to the forefront of the discussion. In fact, the Federal Minister for Education, Mr Dawkins, has conceded that he has to do better for Queensland.

The honourable member for Broadsound made quite a contribution to the debate. He referred to making the apprenticeship system more efficient and to the Rockhampton and District College of TAFE. He is on the consultative committee of that college and he mentioned the role that he plays on that committee. Obviously he will play a major part in the future of the college. In recent times he has raised with me the fact that more courses will be provided in the Yeppoon and Emu Park areas. The Government wants to help the people in the Capricorn Coast area.

The honourable member for Bundaberg had many comments to make and provided this House with graphs on the apprenticeship intake numbers. Because of the boom that occurred at the time, 1981 and 1982 were unusual years when it comes to apprenticeship intakes and they cannot be used for a comparison. Over the last 10 years apprenticeship intake numbers have averaged out at around 5 500 and the latest figures show an annual intake of 5 888, with increases over the last month in all trade groups, including building, electrical, metal, vehicle construction, food and others. This is a good step forward and I hope that it continues. It is not possible to compare the total number of apprentices employed, because over the last 10 years the average length of the apprenticeship has shortened. This is due to prevocational traineeships and other reasons. The group apprenticeship scheme has had some bearing on this matter and, while I do not want to make an issue out of it, the scheme is important because it provides the employer with the opportunity to partly train an apprentice. I hope that the stage is not reached at which an employer thinks it is not necessary to take an apprentice on for the full four years, or whatever period is involved, believing that he or she does not have to worry too much because the group apprenticeship scheme can be used. I am not being critical of the scheme, but it needs to be kept in mind that in the future this scheme should be looked at.

I comment on the fact that the honourable member for Bundaberg—who has gone to a great deal of effort in the preparation of his speech and whose heart is in the right place—has compared the efforts of the Queensland Government with those of other States. The graph shows that the number of apprentices commencing in Queensland is generally below the Australian average. This is a national phenomenon relating to the fact that there is less manufacturing in Queensland.

Queensland's manufacturing base is about 11 per cent of the national average. If the State does anything at all, it should try to increase its manufacturing base. That cannot be done simply. It is very easy for people to stand in this place and deliver a heap of rhetoric that it can be easily done. The facts are that some industries find it more convenient to locate in Sydney or Melbourne. However, industrial relations in Queensland have improved, workers' compensation rates here are certainly much more attractive and injuries at the place of work are reducing by approximately 7 per cent per annum. In those ways Queensland is becoming a more attractive place for manufacturing. The Government will have to work very, very hard on this and do what it can to attract industry to the State.

I believe that the Bond University will have a significant effect. In the New England and Silicon Valley areas of the United States of America, the private universities have homed in on industry and have proved successful in the development of new technology. So the Bond University could be a useful adjunct to the manufacturing base of the State.

The State also has a number of people employed in the primary sector. Although the State produces vast amounts of primary goods, it needs to manufacture from their by-products. Unfortunately our coal is being shipped out holus-bolus. It is used in the manufacture of products that Queensland buys back. We are becoming sales people and primary industry producers. The State must increase its efforts in manufacturing.

The member for Bundaberg also commented on the funding for employment programs. The general thrust of the Queensland Government is to support industry and employment growth through lower taxes, workers' compensation, pay-roll tax and so on; so it is not right to say that the Government is achieving less than other Governments in a particular field. Other factors have to be taken into account. If everything was averaged out, Queensland would be no worse off than any other State. However, the Government is considering all these things to see what can be done.

The member for Bundaberg also spoke about changes to the apprenticeship system and made particular reference to the USA. My latest information is that the United States is very envious of the apprenticeship systems in West Germany and Australia. In fact, US trade skills have a low status, and industry in that country has substantial problems caused by low-quality trade work. Certainly in recent times the Work Skill Olympics have proved that beyond all doubt.

Where did the United States come in the Work Skill Olympics? I should refresh the memories of honourable members on this subject. The Work Skill Olympics are the world championships for apprentices and trades people up to and including the age of 21 years, so I do not believe that the comments relating to the United States are relevant. The quality of apprentices in Queensland is better, and by a long, long way. The statistics prove that. That is not to say that there is not room for further improvement. I will not be totally happy until Queensland wins the Work Skill Olympics outright. It is recognised by all authorities that Queensland is the State that really got behind the Work Skill Olympics. That has provided the momentum for the other States to get in to try to match Queensland's performance. I do not advance that as an argument; it is a fact.

The member for Bundaberg also raised the cost of apprenticeships. The way is always open for employers and unions to approach the Industrial Commission about wages. Recently I allowed some changes to the block release system, but they have not as yet been taken up by employers. That is something into which I will put more effort if I can.

The member for Ashgrove commented a great deal about the pharmacy trade. He gave a general run-down on employment for young people. I thank him for his efforts.

As members are tabling documents today—certainly the member for Bundaberg has tabled information to show that the Government is not as good as it could be—I wish to table some information to show that it is better than he expected. I ask honourable members to study what the Government has done. The document I will table has running totals showing that an improvement has been recorded in the building area, the clerical area, the metal area and the food and other areas. Honourable members will find that, across the board, the intake for February of last year was 1 041, whereas this year it was 1 285. That shows an improvement in all the areas I have mentioned. It is just another way of putting the statistics. Statistics can be used by anyone for whatever reason they want. For his purposes, the statistics used by the honourable member for Bundaberg would be right. However, for my purposes, my statistics are right.

I conclude by saying that all of Australia can do better in employment, trades skills and so on. Queensland can also do much better. To improve, we need a co-operative, hard-working effort. Certainly the break-up of the new department provides much expertise. It is using employers, unions, educators and anybody else who is useful. I hope that in 12 months' time the Government is a long way down the track towards its goal.

Whereupon the honourable member laid on the table the document referred to.

Motion agreed to.

Committee

Hon. V. P. Lester (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Affairs) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—

Mr VAUGHAN (5.44 p.m.): I hark back to the comments I made in my contribution to the second-reading debate. The Minister gave me an explanation as to why the reference to the commissioner as being a party to the indenture is to be deleted. However, I make the point that the Minister's second-reading speech was very brief. His speech contained hardly any reasons why the amendments are proposed. In fact, the member for Broadsound gave a better explanation of the Bill than the Minister did.

In section 66 of the Act, which relates to "Indenture of apprenticeship", the following has been a long-standing provision—

"(b) The parties to an indenture shall be—

- (i) the employer:
- (ii) the apprentice and, where the apprentice is under the age of 18 years, his parent or guardian; and
- (iii) the Commissioner."

After all these years, suddenly the Commissioner of the Industry and Commerce Training Commission is no longer to be party to the indenture. It is incumbent upon the Minister to provide a better explanation than the mere statement that it is for the purpose of streamlining the procedures, particularly since it has been in the Act for all those years that the commissioner has in fact been party to the indenture. If it will streamline the procedures, perhaps the Minister should spell out what the procedures will be.

Mr LESTER: In my reply at the second-reading stage, I went to a fair bit of trouble to explain matters as fully as possible. The indenture still operates under the Act, with all the protection of the Act. It is as simple as that. If the commissioner does not sign, it simply cuts out three stages in the process. I refer to mailing and so on. One of the reasons for this amendment was that complaints were received about the time that processing took under the Act. The commissioner is still responsible. I do not really see any problem with it.

Mr Vaughan: So it is just to streamline things?

Mr LESTER: That is all.

Mr Vaughan: To save three mailings?

Mr LESTER: One comment that has been made in the past is that things have been slow in this area: that even at the end of the apprenticeship the commission has been slow in giving the person his certificate of completion. That is what it is all about. It takes away none of the legalities. In fact, the commissioner is very much responsible, certainly no less so than before.

Mr Vaughan: What will the procedures be now for the signing of an indenture? It must come to the commissioner somewhere along the line. It just means that the commissioner does not put his signature on it. I cannot grasp how it speeds it up. The indenture must come to the commissioner.

Mr LESTER: All the honourable member has to do is wait and see how it goes. If it is not working properly, obviously the Government will look at it again. It is as a result of comments that have been made over quite a period of time. The Government has tried to streamline matters, speed things up and be more businesslike.

Mr Vaughan: All I am saying is that, under the legislation as it stands, the indenture that has to be signed at present by the employer, the principal, the guardian and the commissioner must at some stage come back to the commissioner; so what is the difference? What is the point of the commissioner's not putting his name on it? How much will be saved?

Mr LESTER: Let me put it this way: it comes to the Industry and Commerce Training Commission, it is checked, the allotment advice and indenture are forwarded, and one copy is held by the Industry and Commerce Training Commission.

Mr Vaughan: So all that has changed is that it does go to the commissioner but he just does not sign it?

Mr LESTER: Yes.

Mr Vaughan: You have saved a lot of time, haven't you?

Mr LESTER: Yes.

Clause 5, as read, agreed to.

Clause 6—

Mr VAUGHAN (5.47 p.m.): Clause 6 amends section 70, which deals with the transfer of apprentices. Section 70 (1) states—

“The industry and commerce advisory committee concerned or, where there is no such committee for the apprenticeship calling in question, the Commissioner may transfer temporarily or permanently . . . ”

The point I make is that it refers to the industry and commerce advisory committee. What the Bill does is insert a new section 70 (2A), which states—

“The Commissioner may, upon the application of the present employer of an apprentice, a proposed new employer of that apprentice, the guardian . . . transfer.”

It refers to the “Commissioner”. It leaves out the reference to the industry and commerce advisory committee. All I want to know is why has the reference to the industry and commerce advisory committee been left out?

As I recall, several amendments ago the Government went to great lengths to include the industry and commerce advisory committees, to give them more jurisdiction and to give them more involvement. The Bill is saying on the one hand that the industry and commerce advisory committee may transfer an apprentice or, if it is not available, the commissioner may transfer an apprentice. On the other hand, however, when all the parties agree to the transfer, the industry and commerce advisory committee will not be considered. The commissioner may act alone.

In the debate on the previous clause the Minister said, “We are going to cut corners and save a lot of time by now having the commissioner sign the indenture.” The Industry and Commerce Advisory Committee will be by-passed and where the transfer is a voluntary or agreed transfer, the matter will go to the commissioner. I just cannot see the logic in that. I think that there is a contradiction between what the Minister is doing in clause 6 and what he advocated in clause 5.

Mr LESTER: All I want to say to the honourable member is that the authority has already been delegated to the commissioner.

In the other area, if both parties agree, why should we have to wait a long time for the committees to meet and for them to go through all the processes before a matter is formalised? It can be done very quickly if the commissioner has the power to do it if both parties agree. Surely there is no problem if both parties agree.

Mr Vaughan: So it is not going to go back to the local advisory committee? The local advisory committee is not going to be involved at all?

Mr LESTER: The committee could be informed of it. There is no reason why it cannot be informed, but if both parties agree, surely to goodness we can streamline it. In the past, it could often take quite a while for some committees to meet. The honourable member knows as well as I do that they do not always meet as regularly as they should.

Mr Vaughan: No, I know, but your argument in a previous debate in this Chamber was to by-pass the procedures and give the local advisory committees more say. You are reversing your argument.

Mr LESTER: I believe that the legislation will work well this way.

Clause 6, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 10, as read, agreed to.

Clause 11—

Mr VAUGHAN (5.52 p.m.): Clause 11 provides for the repeal of and substitution of a new section 83. I realise that the Minister said that the whole idea was to streamline the procedures laid down in the legislation covering the handling of documentation, etc., dealing with apprenticeships. It is proposed to delete the present section 83, which deals with the certificate after termination of apprenticeship or transfer of an apprentice. The present section 83 states—

“... within 30 days after the termination or transfer, furnish to the secretary to the Commission or a regional advisory committee, a certificate in the prescribed form setting forth the time served by the apprentice with him, full particulars of the branch or branches of the apprenticeship calling in which the apprentice has received instruction and the proficiency attained.”

The proposed section 83 states—

“... within 30 days after the termination or transfer, advise the secretary to the Commission or a regional advisory committee, of full details of the time served by the apprentice with him.”

I take it that the Minister will probably say that the reason for the change is to streamline efficiency or procedures. I want to know why “full particulars of the branch or branches of the apprenticeship calling in which the apprentice has received instruction” has been left out—why the employer is not required to furnish that information—and why “the proficiency attained” has not been included.

In the electrical trade, when an apprentice electrical fitter or mechanic makes application for his Electrical Workers and Contractors Board certificate, if he does not have a satisfactory statement as to the experience he has gained in the trade and the areas of the trade in which he has been trained, it could very well be that he will not be issued with his certificate of competency by the Electrical Workers and Contractors Board. The Minister is saying that all the employer has to do is forward details of the time served. If anybody would have any idea of the time served by the apprentice, it would be the Industry and Commerce Training Advisory Committee. I reiterate the point I made previously that in the new provision the Minister still refers to “advise the secretary to the Commission or a regional advisory committee”. I hark back to the point that I made previously that in previous debates the Minister said it was important to have the regional advisory committees involved. Again there is an inconsistency in the legislation.

The Minister said that he wanted to save time by not having the commissioner sign the indenture even though the indenture came back to the commission from the employer and the guardian. However, the regional advisory committee is involved, because it is advised of the full details relating to the time that was served by the apprentice with the employer. We seem to be going around in circles in relation to what the Minister wishes the Industry and Commerce Training Commission to be involved in. Either the Minister wants everything to come back to the commission or he wants

the regional advisory committees involved. The question is to what extent the Minister wants them involved.

Mr LESTER: In the past, a problem has existed in that, when an apprentice has completed his time, enormous delays have been incurred in getting the apprentice's termination fully finalised with a certificate. The Government has considered the options that are available to speed that process up. The Bill clearly states—

“... advise the secretary to the Commission or a regional advisory committee, of full details of the time served by the apprentice with him.”

In the past it has been shown, particularly if employers and apprentices have parted on bad terms, that the information that is provided by many employers is not altogether meaningful. I am sure that the proposed amendments will improve the situation and will save a lot of complaints.

Mr Vaughan: What is the position if an employer fails to return that information?

Mr LESTER: Obviously the employer is contacted. This provision will speed things up. We are including it in the Act, because if it is not in the Act problems are created. If the employer fails to provide the necessary information, he has to answer.

Mr Vaughan: Hasn't he got to answer now?

Mr LESTER: Yes, but we are making it more definite.

Mr Vaughan: You are not requiring him to send back the same amount of information; but if he does not respond—the same as if he does not respond now—you have got to take the same steps.

Mr LESTER: We want to obtain a lost-time certificate from the apprentice. That is another area of concern.

In the past, we have found that these matters have taken a while to sort themselves out, particularly if somebody slips up on what he is doing. That has always been a cause of considerable delay.

As the Minister responsible, I have received umpteen complaints about the time that it takes the department to process an application after somebody has completed his apprenticeship or transfers. This Government has attempted to introduce initiatives so that that problem will be more quickly addressed. That is in the interests of apprentices or tradespersons in particular.

Clause 11, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 12 to 17, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr Lester, by leave, read a third time.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.

QUEENSLAND PERFORMING ARTS TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 6 October 1987 (see p. 2824).

Mr BURNS (Lytton—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (7.30 p.m.): In the last eight years, under the control of the National Party, the arts industry in Queensland has become highly politicised. This Bill further concentrates political power in the hands of the Minister. He will be able to put his National Party toadies in and give them jobs so they can peddle their influence in the trust, as they have done in many of the other

areas recently. I am concerned, and I need to ask a few questions, about the Bill in relation to the amendments to sections 6, 7 and 8. The provisions of the existing section 6 state that in relation to members of the trust one shall be the Director-General of Education or his nominee and not fewer than four of the other members shall be persons who are knowledgeable and experienced in the performing arts. It is now intended that nine shall be appointed and one shall be the departmental head, one shall be the director of the trust and the other seven shall be appointed by the Minister after, as I said, they have done a bit of lobbying and toadying to get there. And we should be told the reasons for the changes.

Section 8 refers to certain members to go out of office. I know that in his second-reading speech the Minister said that those people are to go out of office because of the conflicting terms of office, namely, four years and three years, etc. However, it seems to be that that gives him the right to sack everybody and start again, and he will be sacking everybody whom he does not like—although, to be quite truthful, I see some people there whom I do not like, either.

Mr Austin: Don't be unkind.

Mr BURNS: I have to be unkind sometimes.

I always thought that continuity in office was a valuable thing. I thought that the four year, two year plan was a good idea because it meant that there would always be some continuing members of the board. If, for instance, there is a change of Minister administering the board and he decided to change seven of the nine people on the board, a completely new board would be set up and there would be no continuity of members. To me, that provision is valuable and important.

The other thing about the Performing Arts Complex is that it is very costly. I think that what has happened is that the Government has built a Taj Mahal type of operation and as a result the ordinary community groups cannot use it. I have a friend whose choir wanted to book the Performing Arts Complex, which they did. They had to charge about \$16 a head for the cheapest seat in the house. The annual report of the Queensland Performing Arts Trust speaks about the ability of community groups to become involved. But when the complex has to be hired at such a fee, it seems to me that the only people who it really helps are those financial snobs of the art world, the Edleys and others. It does not do very much for legitimate local community organisations which have to pay far more than they can really afford to use the complex itself.

Very briefly, on behalf of the Opposition, I must express its concern at this latest move to place the art world under the direct control of the Minister and his National Party friends. I know that he has handed responsibility for the portfolio over to the Premier, but I know that Mr Austin will be in there manipulating in his normal style. I must say that if I were the Opposition spokesman on this Bill, I would be opposing it. However, on behalf of the Opposition, I will not oppose it tonight.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (7.33 p.m.): The Liberal Party supports this Bill. However, during the passage of a Bill of this nature some aspects of it ought to be debated. While on the surface the Bill looks as though it is abolishing some statutory bodies or boards and combining them under one roof, which I think is a good thing, some things do cause worry, particularly when one considers the whole responsibility of providing services to these constituent bodies, not only individually as they exist in Brisbane but also throughout the State.

One aspect that is a worry and should be looked at is that many operations that are set up by communities throughout the State in localities, towns and cities to collect memorabilia, to develop their own art galleries, their own museums and their own collections—some of which are historical, some architectural, some purely cultural—do languish for want of support. It is true that they get financial support from local government and from the State Government, but a great deal more is required. They need expert advice and help. I do not know how many members of this House have visited some of those local groups and inspected the work that they are doing. It is

certainly very impressive. They need an enormous amount of resources to help them maintain what they are doing—whether it is a collection or an art gallery.

Most people do not really know the amount of maintenance work that is required to preserve heritage. It is true that this Bill deals only with the administration at the top. I would hope that in the centralising of all these facilities under one umbrella, the small individual efforts by people in the remoter parts of the State, such as the provincial cities and even in the suburbs of Brisbane, will not get lost in the system. The bureaucracy that is created as a result of this Bill will tend to think in big terms.

I am sure that all honourable members would support—at least I do, anyway—

Mr Scott: Goodness me, you can see why you're no longer the leader.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Where has the honourable member been—up in Cape York?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Booth): Order! The honourable member for Cook! That is a very foolish interjection.

Mr Scott: I've just seen Sallyanne. I can see you shine.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The honourable member for Cook obviously has been watching more than the television. He has been somewhere else, which has given him some Dutch courage.

Many of the people involved require help by way of resources. They need resource help particularly in regard to the maintenance of what has been collected. They also need professional advice. I hope that the body that has been created as a result of this legislation will in fact pay some attention to giving those particular bodies that specialist advice. I will have more to say on that subject when another Bill is debated later on in respect of the State archives.

A very urgent need exists for these people to get resource help. I would hope that the body that is being created by the legislation will consider a resource centre for the assistance of many of the smaller bodies in the community that are contributing so much to Queensland's heritage.

Mr BEARD (Mount Isa—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (7.38 p.m.): I seek the indulgence of the House for approximately three minutes to put in a plea from the people in the bush. Mr Scott from Cook—or Mr Cook from Scott—will have to support me on this one. It is beautiful to see the Cultural Centre on the south bank. I do not think there is anyone in Queensland who is not proud of it.

Mr Scott: What has Mount Isa done for the environment, other than the big chimney?

Mr BEARD: Mount Isa has provided wealth to enable the honourable member to travel round on bitumen roads throughout the gulf and go to Karumba and visit all those nice places.

An Opposition member interjected.

Mr BEARD: I do not have time to talk to bushies from the ALP. Mr Scott is the only one who has ever been past the tram terminus.

What Queensland has on the south bank is something that everyone in Queensland can be proud of. I have no doubt at all that Queensland can only afford one huge Cultural Centre. Unlike the United States, this State is not closely settled. We cannot have a Grand Old Opry that the people of Nashville in America have and we cannot have an opera house similar to the one that is in Manaus in Brazil, in the middle of the jungle. Therefore, the people of Mount Isa have no unrealistic aims about grand cultural centres being built in regional centres.

However, in return—and bearing in mind what the people in remoter areas of the State contribute to it—they would like to see rather more visits from cultural groups,

symphony orchestras, ballet companies and theatre groups than they are getting. I realise that I am talking about big money and I do not think country people are unrealistic; but a lot more can be done, particularly as many of the arts in this State are sponsored by organisations that have won wealth from the outback. I am speaking about MIM Holdings Ltd and the Utah Foundation, which have made wealth from the remoter areas of the State and have indeed contributed through sponsorship of orchestras or ballet companies, or by visits of theatre groups, or in holding competitions for individual artists with overseas trips as prizes—all of which have added to the artistic growth in the State. In return, I think the people in the outback region could expect a little bit more for the wealth that is gained from those areas.

As I said, the people of the outback accept that there are difficulties and that in a big State such as Queensland, which is sparsely populated, the concept of centres of excellence where resources can be situated must be accepted. The people from the outback can visit and see them when they are on holidays. I share the concern of the honourable member for Lytton, because when I come to Brisbane and there is a show on at the Queensland Cultural Centre that I wish to see, I have to fork out between \$28 and \$30 to see it. I accept the principle that the user pays, but it is a pity that a number of people in this State do not have the opportunity to see as much theatre as they would like.

On the same subject, the people in the north and remote west of Queensland are saddened by the proposed cuts in ABC funding. The people who live beyond the reach of the main capital cities are very concerned about the possible cuts in funding to the ABC because that service has done much to build up the cultural values of Australia. It would be a shame to lose this service and the decision to make cuts in funding is not at all popular. The answer involves money, and at this time, the provisions of extra money will be difficult.

I hope that when the Minister is appointing the trustees he will consider the appointment of maybe one or two people from country areas so that at least country people will have a voice on the board. That is the very least that the Minister can give consideration to.

The Liberal Party supports the Bill, as stated by the honourable member for Nundah, and I merely wished to put in a word for those who, like you Mr Deputy Speaker, live past the tram terminus.

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Nicklin—Leader of the House) (7.41 p.m.), in reply: I thank all honourable members for their contributions to this debate. This Bill involves machinery provisions and holds no great political connotations as suggested by the honourable member for Lytton.

The cost of hiring facilities at the Cultural Centre is not the same as hiring local community halls for church groups. The establishment costs for that facility were enormous.

Mr Burns: It is for the snobs.

Mr AUSTIN: The honourable member for Lytton says that it is for the snobs and I have to disagree with him. When one attends a facility such as the Cultural Centre one sees many people from the community enjoying the performances. It is obvious from the comments made by the honourable member for Lytton that he has never visited the Cultural Centre. I notice that he has not responded to that point. He would not know. I suppose the honourable member for Lytton will let all the community groups in and charge them nothing, like Mr Unsworth with his entertainment centre in Sydney. What a load of rubbish! I view with some concern the suggestion that the Department of the Arts has done very little for community groups throughout Queensland.

Mr Burns: Which one of your mates from Buderim is getting this job?

Mr AUSTIN: I assure the honourable member for Lytton that at this stage it is not proposed to change any member of the existing board. I cannot speak for the future

because I am not the Minister who is directly responsible for the administration of this legislation.

The Department of the Arts provides an enormous service to the community of this State and that service is not recognised by members of the Opposition or members of the media in southern States. Often Queensland experiences criticism from members of the southern media about the cultural activities in this State. They have suggested that Queensland is a cultural backwater. The people from the southern States do not want to recognise what is happening in this State. I recall an article in the *Bulletin* a short time ago about a company by the name of Dance North. Not once in that article was there any recognition of the fact that Dance North is sponsored by the Queensland Government. In fact the article referred to Queensland as a cultural backwater and that the Government of this State was doing nothing. There are facilities available—

Mr R. J. Gibbs: That was the night you doubled as Nureyev in those ballet tights.

Mr AUSTIN: Thank you.

The division provides financial assistance for community groups and grants are offered to the arts organisations which comply with the guide-lines and on the basis of programs designed to develop the arts and make the arts accessible to all Queenslanders. The level of grants ranges from \$100 for the smallest country and community groups up to \$1m for professional companies.

I believe that there is not one other State Government in this country that is providing the assistance to the arts that is being provided by the Queensland Government. It is simply not true to say that assistance is not given to people outside urban areas. I will give the House an idea of the sorts of groups that are receiving assistance: the Queensland Arts Council, the Queensland Ballet Company, the Queensland Band Association and the TN Company. The list goes on and on. I would be delighted to supply to all honourable members a list of the magnificent contributions that this Government makes to the arts in this State.

I thank honourable members for their contribution to the debate. I commend the Bill to the House.

Motion agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 15, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr Austin, by leave, read a third time.

MOTOR VEHICLES CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Transport) (7.48 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles Control Act 1975-1985 in certain particulars and for a related purpose.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr I. J. Gibbs, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Transport) (7.49 p.m.): I move—

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

On 1 May 1987, the Supreme Court of Queensland handed down an appeal decision which had an important bearing on the application of public liability insurance to the

operation of unregistered motor vehicles, including fork-lifts, in places where access by the public is permitted. The determination of liability by the court in the fork-lift truck driver's favour for his injuries indicated a need to review the Motor Vehicles Control Act.

The original intention of the Motor Vehicles Control Act was to control and regulate the use of recreational vehicles, but the court decision revealed that the scope of the Act extended further than originally intended.

The Motor Vehicles Control Act governs the operation of vehicles in public places, while the Motor Vehicle Insurance Act provides an avenue of compensation for accidental bodily injury resulting from incidents involving motor vehicles.

The Motor Vehicles Control Act defines a public place as a place of public resort open to, or used by, the public as of right. It also includes—

- (i) a place for the time being used for a public purpose, or open to access by the public, whether on payment or otherwise;
- (ii) a place open to access by the public by the express or tacit consent or sufferance of the owner of that place, whether the place is or is not so open at all times; and
- (iii) a place for the time being declared by Order in Council to be a place for the purpose of the Act.

However, this does not include a track which at the material time is being used as a course for racing or testing motor vehicles and from which other traffic is excluded during that use; or indeed a place that is a road within the meaning of the Main Roads Act or of the Traffic Act. Therefore, it became apparent from the court judgment that the application of the Motor Vehicles Control Act was broader than originally intended by the Government.

The effect of the judgment was that any vehicle operated in a public place for purposes other than recreation should be registered under the Main Roads Act and a recreational vehicle should be registered under the Motor Vehicles Control Act. Any vehicle not registered under either Act would be interpreted as an uninsured vehicle for the purposes of the Motor Vehicles Insurance Act. Of course, fire-engines, or any machinery designed specifically and used solely for road-making or road maintenance, and cutting grass or foliage, are excluded from the requirement to be registered, and this is specifically stated in the Act.

The Bill therefore provides amendments to the Motor Vehicles Control Act to empower the Governor in Council to exempt particular classes of vehicles or particular places from the operations of the Act. It is proposed that application of Part 2 of the Act relating to recreation vehicles will be restricted to motor cars and motor cycles and their derivatives being used for recreational purposes in public places. By Orders in Council under the Act specific areas such as golf courses, showgrounds and areas being used for commercial or industrial purposes could be excluded from the operation of the Act.

The Bill also provides a retrospective provision necessary to maintain liability under insurance contracts previously entered into. This provision will ensure that public liability insurers do not avoid liability for matters which were presumed to have been covered by their contracts. Discussions have been held with the Insurance Commissioner and the Insurance Council of Australia and they support these proposals.

I would also point out to honourable members that a working group involving the various relevant Government departments and local authority representatives has commenced a review of the operations of the Motor Vehicles Control Act with a view to developing a strategy for the management and use of motor vehicles off-road.

I commend the Bill to the House and look forward to honourable members' contributions.

Debate, on motion of Mr Prest, adjourned.

CARRIAGE OF DANGEROUS GOODS BY ROAD ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Transport) (7.55 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road Act 1984 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr I. J. Gibbs, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Transport) (7.56 p.m.): I move—

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

The principal objective of this Bill is to update and standardise the legislation which provides for the safe transport of dangerous goods in uniformity with the requirements of other Australian States.

Honourable members would remember the concern from all sides of the House which prompted the existing legislation. Since it was introduced, I can say that despite the substantial increase in the quantity and range of chemicals and fuels on our roads, the incidence and severity of accidents involving dangerous goods has dropped.

The existing legislation is based on the April 1984 edition of the *Australian Code For The Transport Of Dangerous Goods By Road And Rail*. This edition and the recent revision of the code have been endorsed by the Australian Transport Advisory Committee (ATAC) and accepted by all Australian States and Territories. The code was revised to accommodate changes in industry practice, technological innovations and revisions of other transport codes with which it is required to harmonise, for example, international maritime and air transport. The revision of the code has caused licensing and insurance aspects of the existing legislation to be outdated.

The amendments will allow standardisation with this and future revisions of the code and thus continue our commitment to uniform requirements for the transport of dangerous goods throughout Australia. In addition, the amendments will eliminate difficulties which have been experienced over the past three years and allow procedures to be streamlined to improve administrative effectiveness.

I will now deal with the Bill's main aspects; firstly, standardisation of our legislation with the code. I have already mentioned the importance of each State and Territory adopting uniform requirements for the transport of dangerous goods. Experience, based on comparison of the existing legislation and the recent revision of the code, has shown that uniformity will be best achieved by eliminating from our Act those sections which duplicate aspects of the code. The elimination of this duplication will ensure that the interpretation of our legislation will align with both this and future revisions of the code. This approach will ensure that Queensland has fulfilled its commitment towards ensuring uniformity across Australia, both now and in the future.

To this end, the references to shipping documentation and the prohibition of mingling of explosives and flammable goods are to be eliminated. In each case, the relevant sections of the code are called up by regulation and adequately control these requirements. Similarly, the amendment will eliminate from the legislation all definitions which are duplicated in the code. It is proposed to add the definition of “road” taken from the Traffic Act 1949-1985 to clarify and limit the application of this legislation to public thoroughfares.

Secondly, the amendments include a mechanism to vary the requirements for vehicle-licensing and insurance. The licensing of vehicles which convey dangerous goods

has proved to be an important weapon to ensure the elimination of unprincipled and rogue transport operators from this industry.

Currently, the criteria for vehicle-licensing are based on a table in the code. In the recent revision of the code, the table was varied and is no longer suitable for our licensing purposes. The amendment will allow the criteria for licensing to be varied independently of the code. Similarly, insurance levels required for this high-risk transport are considered of such importance that control needs to be exercised separate from the code. The amendments will allow the level of insurance to be varied.

Thirdly, the amendments include a provision to increase the maximum penalty under the regulations. Currently, the maximum fine for a breach is \$500 plus \$10 for each day it continues.

This penalty does not reflect the serious consequences of some breaches, for example, driving an unsafe bulk tanker of petrol or packaging toxic and dangerous chemicals in leaky and unsafe drums. It is proposed to increase the maximum penalty to \$2,000 and \$100 for each day the offence continues. This will bring the penalties into line with those applicable in other States, which range from \$2,000 to \$4,000 and from \$200 to \$1,000 for each day the offence continues.

In addition, the amendments include items of an administrative nature which will streamline procedures. These include clarification of the commissioner's power of delegation, evidentiary provisions, recovery of appeal costs and the extension of the power of exemption to include all persons involved in the manufacturing, consigning or transport of dangerous goods. Currently, the Minister or the commissioner can grant exemption to vehicle licence-holders only and is unable to grant relief to other members of this industry, as required by the code.

Lastly, the amendments will provide for the inspection of a high-risk vehicle category, namely, bulk dangerous goods vehicles in the four to eight tonne class. This class of vehicle is currently inspected by private approved inspection stations, but, since it requires specialist inspection of both the tank and the vehicle, it is proposed that they be inspected by specially trained departmental inspectors. The amendments will also ensure that new vehicles which convey bulk dangerous goods are similarly inspected to ensure the load containment complies with the required standard and avoid the serious consequences of a tank failure.

The amendments are important to ensure that dangerous goods vital to the maintenance of our life-style and economy are transported safely on the roads of Queensland. They will also ensure that such transport complies to the one uniform standard applying throughout Australia.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Prest, adjourned.

ELECTRICITY AUTHORITIES INDUSTRIAL CAUSES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 12 November 1987 (see p. 4159).

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (8.02 p.m.): Mr Speaker—

Mr SPEAKER: I call the honourable member for Wolston.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: Mr Speaker, how dare I not recognise your presence in the chair! You add such aplomb and dignity to it.

The Bill is one that is certainly not acceptable to the Opposition. The Bill has become notorious as an extension of the situation that occurred in Queensland in 1985 when very dramatic circumstances affected so many workers and their families in

Queensland, namely, the SEQEB dispute. In one way the Bill will be welcomed by myself, by members of the Labor Party and, I am sure, by thinking members of the Queensland public. It seeks to repeal or to withdraw the state of emergency that still exists within the industry itself. That is certainly welcomed. However, that is the only section of the legislation that one could say is an indication of the marvellous new direction set out by Premier Ahern in his so-called vision of excellence.

As I look around the Chamber I note, with interest, the Deputy Premier sitting on the back bench. He is sitting there with bated breath, waiting to move on the Premier's jugular at the first opportunity. Of course, he does not realise that everybody is a wake-up to the leaks that he is providing out of the Fitzgerald inquiry, and it is certainly not doing him much good. In making a side reference to the Fitzgerald inquiry, it is of some interest to me to note that the Minister in his second-reading speech said—

“. . . the Electricity Authorities Industrial Causes Act was at that time, and still is, seen as permanent and substantive legislation designed to create a separate industrial tribunal for the electricity supply industry and to recognise that people . . .”

That is one of the basic reasons why the party that I represent in this House will continue to oppose legislation of this nature. It is still a direct attack on the proper industrial procedures of this country that have been honoured and respected and have been effective industrially over many years in all States, including Queensland. That represented a very deliberate move at that stage to remove the responsibility from the recognised State Industrial Commission and set up a separate body. The interesting point is that it was set up and chaired by none other than Judge Eric Pratt, who is known fondly among his colleagues on the bench as Judge Eric P. Ratt.

Mr FitzGerald: You're not casting aspersions on the judiciary?

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I know that it is a dreadful thing for one to cast aspersions on the judiciary, which is such a respectable group of people.

The fact is that this is one aspect that is going to remain within the legislation. That leads me to ask a very important question, which I hope that the Minister will respond to in a responsive and responsible manner. I refer to the creation, following the SEQEB dispute, of what was known as the Power Workers Association. It was with great interest that one noticed recently in the media that, very quietly and without any public announcement, the Government sneaked a decision through Cabinet—

Mr Tenni: No, I don't do that, Bob.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: Yes, you did. The Government sneaked through Cabinet a decision to withdraw funding from the Queensland Power Workers Association.

A number of enterprising people found out that the Government had carried out that very subversive, quiet act. The Government stopped the funding.

Mr Tenni: That's better.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: It is a matter of semantics.

It has never been explained to the Queensland public why the Government allowed a Power Workers Association to be established in this State. The Government used that organisation as a virtual scab union—a strike-busting group of people—to try to break the backs of legitimate workers within the power industry. The disgraceful aspect of the whole exercise has been this: how much of Queensland tax-payers' money did this Government contribute to support that so-called Queensland Power Workers Association and, ultimately, what was the reason for the Minister's taking to Cabinet a recommendation to withdraw that funding? I will tell honourable members why, and the Minister can give them his version.

Mr Tenni: I've got you real worried.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: It has not got me worried.

This is another one of those underlying boys' club situations; the clique that has ruled this State for years; the cabal of knights; the Moores, the Bjelke-Petersens and all of those people whose names have been mentioned in recent weeks. The Queensland public is becoming a wake-up to them. How much of Queensland tax-payers' money was spent in funding that group of professional strike-busting scabs?

I wish to repeat a further relevant point that I made on the very first day that Mr Ahern became Premier of this State; the day on which the appointment of a new Speaker of this House was debated. I refer to none other than yourself, Mr Speaker. The point that I made at that time was that here was a Premier who was posturing—and still is—as a man of vision, a man of the future, with that almost sycophantic way in which he appears on television with a habit of extending his right hand out in front of him as though grasping for support from the public and the back bench of his own party. At that time the Premier appeared on television—either on that evening or some days afterwards—celebrating the birthday of a member of his own family—one of his own children.

I wish to repeat what I said in this House at that time. I thought, "What an incredible hypocrite this man is." He was a Minister who sat in the Bjelke-Petersen Government and presided over the financial and social destruction of some 1 100 families in this State, families that today have broken up because of financial pressure and because of internal pressures within the family. Some families were made up of three and four kids, who represented years of loving relationships between wives and husbands.

There were also workers who, because over a period of time they had worked as responsible people within the power industry, thought that at some time in their life they were going to be able to retire on a reasonable superannuation payment. Instead they were sacked and today many of them are penniless. Many of them had to leave this State. They have never been given the right to collect their superannuation. Some of them to whom I have spoken personally have told me that the brutal impersonal treatment that this Government meted out to them has cost them up to \$100,000.

As I said, this is part of this new vision of Queensland, this vision of excellence. I make the same challenge to the Premier tonight as I made to him on the day that we debated the motion of confidence in the Government, that if he is in fact a compassionate human being, if he is a person who is genuine in relation to the statement that he made at the outset of his appointment as Premier of this State when he said, "This heralds in a new era of industrial relations.", and he indicated that he wanted to work closely with the trade union movement in this State, then I would say to him that the proper and correct course of action for him would be to show a compassionate approach to those people and, as a very minimum, restore their superannuation rights.

The fact is that clauses 3 and 4 of the Bill contain amendments which will substitute the appointment of the tribunal for the Minister or commissioner, as appropriate, as the authority to whom appeals may be made by employees who have allegedly participated in a strike and been penalised accordingly by the employer. One should continue reading the Minister's speech notes because I believe they are extremely pertinent. They state in part—

"... and still support—has brought some concerned comments in the Commonwealth Industrial Commission and also has been claimed to contravene ILO conventions which contain forced labour provisions."

The simple fact still remains that it does not matter what the Minister does to try to cover up, amend or repeal sections of this legislation. The Government has in fact now been recognised worldwide for the dreadful, despicable group of people that it is. It is a group of people who industrially do not understand the problems faced by workers at job level. The Government does not understand the way in which trade unions in this country work. It does not want a co-operative approach. It has been exposed for that. It does not matter how this legislation is changed. The simple fact is that whilst there will be set up a tribunal which is distinctly different in so many ways from the recognised Industrial Commission in Queensland, and dealing with the electricity industry

only, the Labor Party is aware, of course, that that tribunal will not be an impartial body. It will not be a group of people who are fair-minded and who are prepared to sit down and consider the cases of people as individuals. It will be a shotgun at the head situation—a loaded shotgun. One has only to look at some of the accusations flying around in Queensland today about the Government's past interference in judicial appointments in this State to realise that the point I am making here this evening is absolutely correct.

The party that I represent—the Australian Labor Party—will never accept the circumstance in which working people are stripped of their right to make up their minds at job level on whether they want to participate in strike action or not, regardless of whether they are involved in the electricity industry, the footwear industry, the manufacturing industry, the food industry or the transport industry. It simply does not matter.

Another repugnant part of the legislation refers to contract labour. On past occasions my colleague the honourable member for Nudgee has debated most effectively in this Parliament the Labor Party's attitudes and views in relation to contract labour legislation. The members of the Labor Party will not support legislation that is put before this House to bind workers to a contract in any shape or form. It was with quite some amusement that I recently read of the package deal that SEQEB was offering to employees to sign the contract. If my memory serves me correctly, over a five-year period, a plateau increase in wages of 11 per cent was guaranteed. One only had to go back and look at the Industrial Commission decisions in this country over the past five years to realise that, based on those judgments and also on movements during the previous five years, and adjusting for CPI increases, the simple fact is that any person who signed one of those contracts guaranteed that he lost at least a 4 per cent increase in wage and salary entitlements over that five-year period. Any person who is currently employed in the electricity supply industry and signs one of those contracts needs his head read.

The points I have made tonight are no different from the position adopted by my party and followed since 1985 in respect of this legislation. I believe it has been one of the most disgraceful exercises and one of the most unpalatable and diabolical exercises in industrial relations and bloody-mindedness that has ever been known on the part of a Government—except, I suppose, for Governments in countries such as Chile and some of the other South American countries.

There will be a time when people on the Government side of the House will realise the dreadful damage they have done to people in the State of Queensland.

Ms Warner: They know it now.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: They know it now, and they stand condemned by their silence tonight. They were very gung-ho under the Bjelke-Petersen administration. As the cobweb of mystery and facade of respectability is torn from them every day of the week, they are becoming more vulnerable. The Queensland public has seen them for what they are.

This legislation is a clear indication that there has been no change; that the 13 Ministers who still participate in this Government are 13 Ministers of the previous 18 Ministers who were part of the Bjelke-Petersen administration; that they are still there. They all stand condemned by the sins of this legislation. Members of the Opposition oppose it. I believe that thinking Queenslanders are now starting to see through the fabric of this Government. I believe also that another 18 months will prove our actions absolutely correct.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (8.19 p.m.): The Liberal Party supports this legislation, as it supported the original legislation.

Mr Scott interjected.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Yes.

Mr Scott interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The honourable member should settle down.

The original legislation covered two Bills in particular. Although in his introduction the Minister referred to the Electricity Authorities Industrial Causes Act, in fact the bulk of the legislation is concerned with the Electricity (Continuity of Supply) Act.

Mr Scott interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Cook under Standing Order No. 123A.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: It is about time. His behaviour is most unusual and he has obviously been in unusual company.

This is very sensible legislation because it removes the emergency provisions. One of the provisions that are being removed is one that the Liberal Party sought to have removed at the time the legislation was introduced into the House. That provision related to the unfettered right of direction by the Commissioner for Electricity. The Liberal Party sought to amend the Bill at the time of its introduction into the House to ensure that the commissioner did not have an unfettered power of direction. The Liberal Party agreed that he should have power of direction over his own employees and contractors to the commission, but he should not have power of direction of those persons who are outside his normal control. The Liberal Party was prevented from moving that amendment by a gag that was placed on it. The Liberal Party warned the Government that such a provision in the legislation was not only unnecessary, but also contrary to the spirit under which this Parliament and the people of this State are governed. I am pleased to see that this amendment, among others, is now being removed.

I will recapitulate some of the events that took place at that time. The Opposition—which is a little ashamed of its opposition to this legislation—continues to be hoist with its own petard because of its doctrinaire approach. The Labor Party claims that legislation of this type should not be on the statute-book. It claims that there should be no abolition of the right to strike in emergency or essential services. The ILO, a body representing Governments of all nations in the world, approves of legislation of this type, as long as there is an efficient method of solving disputes. This is provided by the complementary legislation.

The Liberal Party supported the Act in its passage through the House for the setting-up of the new tribunal. However, my criticism is that when the new tribunal was established, the Government did nothing to change the award under which these people worked. The effect of it was to translate the existing award into the new tribunal and the only alterations related to the provisions covering the right to strike. When the new tribunal was established, the Liberal Party expected the Government to implement the changes that it claimed were desirable in that industry through the tribunal. After the legislation was passed through the House the Government made no move at all to change the award under which those people worked. Honourable members should remember that the people who turned the power off were not the people who were dismissed. The people who turned the power off were employed in the power stations and not one of them was dismissed.

Mr Lickiss: In fact they got a rise.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: In fact they received a rise in pay for staying there after the strike was over, even though they caused the problem and turned the power off. Not one of these people was dismissed and nobody who encouraged that strike, no union organiser or official, was prosecuted—as could have occurred under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act—for disobeying and inciting people to disobey an order of the Industrial Commission. The Liberal Party levelled these criticisms at the time, and they still stand. The people who caused the problem and turned the lights out were

not penalised in any way. The people who were penalised were linesmen, post-hole-diggers, truck-drivers and tree-loppers—people who were not involved in the supply of power.

Mrs Nelson interjected.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Whatever. All those people were penalised and the people who turned the power off went untouched in that dispute.

The Liberal Party supported the legislation to set up a new tribunal and introduce a new atmosphere and new attitude to the handling of industrial problems in essential services. The Liberal Party is grossly disappointed that the Government, having set up the new tribunal, has done nothing about those who turned the power off or turned the power down. Out of the alleged thousands of people who were put out of work, the net result is that just more than 250 employees were dismissed.

Mr Scott: Why have you never said this publicly?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I have. I said it in the debate at the time. I know that the honourable member for Cook does not listen carefully to the debates in the House and very rarely attends. When he does, he makes speeches during the contributions of other members.

The Liberal Party welcomes the changes proposed by the Minister as sensible. In fact, the part of the legislation that is being repealed has virtually not been invoked. The Minister explains that they were emergency provisions and, therefore, should not remain on the statute-book any longer than necessary. Let me say this: those provisions were defective. They were not effective and were not used or implemented by the Government. That is the main reason for their being removed from the statute-book.

At the time the other criticism by the Opposition was that the Government was setting up a special tribunal to deal with one industry. In Australian industrial relations it is not uncommon to have special tribunals for industries. Victoria has nearly 400 tribunals to deal with particular industries. The Coal Industry Tribunal as set by the Commonwealth and New South Wales to look after the coal industry of New South Wales and Queensland is another example. I might say that it ought to be abolished because it holds Queensland to ransom. The sooner it is abolished the better.

A tribunal was set up especially for the airline industry and tribunals have been established for the Commonwealth public service and the waterfront. So it is not unique to have special tribunals dealing with only one industry. The Liberal Party still welcomes a special tribunal for this industry but it asks the Government, as it is party to awards, through its various agencies to appear before these tribunals to put the view of the Government before them and not walk away when issues arise.

The legislation is very sensible and the Liberal Party supports the amendments.

Mr FITZGERALD (Lockyer) (8.28 p.m.): As has been said by other members, the provisions that are to be repealed were emergency provisions that have not been used. The Government deserves some praise for repealing legislation that has not been used and that workers in the community wish withdrawn. In fact, it is with some pride that I stand here and say that I believe that much of the legislation should be repealed.

Mr Comben: You bullied them.

Mr FITZGERALD: The honourable member for Windsor says that the provisions were in the legislation to threaten and to bully.

Mr Comben: Of course that is what they were there for. You say you haven't used them. The people were scared by them.

Mr FITZGERALD: The honourable member for Windsor is saying that even though the provisions were not used, they caused some anxiety in the work-force. I simply say that the industrial legislation that came before the House during that electricity strike

early in 1985 marked a watershed in industrial relations in this State. I have no doubt that honourable members opposite will agree with me on that.

At that time the cost of electricity was continuing to rise. Since the passage of that legislation, the management of the electricity industry in this State has completely changed. Those who wish to work in the industry are working in it and those who did not wish to take their leave of the industry and went elsewhere. Provided they were not using their industrial muscle and blackmail tactics that they thought they could get away with, they had every right to leave the industry if they did not like the hours or the pay. However, what they did was organise a strike.

Honourable members know as well as I do that the cause of the electricity industry strike was a couple of union representatives who were going downhill on their own stumps. They were losing influence in their own union and decided to make one last stand—like Custer's last stand—to prove their might. What happened? They led the union into one of the most disastrous industrial routs that any union-leader has ever taken his union. What is more, when the Government's action was tested in the ballot-box in 1986, what happened? There was resounding support for the action that the Government took.

Mr Austin: His name was Dinny Madden.

Mr FITZGERALD: Yes, I know that his name was Dinny Madden. He was going downhill.

Mr Austin: They call him "Dinny Who" now.

Mr FITZGERALD: That is right. I had to be reminded of his name by the Minister because I was starting to forget it. The electorate of this State passed judgment on the actions of the Government, and the Government was given its total support. Honourable members know—I agree with them—that it was a very agonising time for those workers. I had many friends who were in the industry.

Mr Vaughan: You've got none now.

Mr FITZGERALD: Many people in the industry recognise their right to work.

Ms Warner: Only the scabs.

Mr FITZGERALD: The honourable member for South Brisbane said that there are only the scabs in the industry. She is calling all those people who are working in the industry scabs. I do not believe that. They are proud people and they have been through a traumatic industrial experience. I support and pay tribute to those people who are working in the industry now. They are working and providing electricity for the State. They are providing an essential service to the State. It is well recognised in the community that they provide an essential service. They deserve the rewards for their labour. I support the workers, particularly those in my own electorate. I have got to know them quite well and I believe that they are doing an excellent job.

Mr Vaughan: What do you think about SEQEB's latest contract, the latest con trick?

Mr FITZGERALD: I understand that the workers have a free choice to accept the contract or not. I do not believe there are any stand-over tactics. The honourable member for Nudgee is complaining that it is a Government stand-over tactic. I do not agree with him. He does not believe in free choice. He is a union representative who does not believe in free choice.

Mr Vaughan: What do you think about it?

Mr FITZGERALD: I believe that the workers themselves have to make a choice whether they accept the contract or not.

Mr Tenni: One week's work——

Mr FITZGERALD: The Minister is pointing out some of the provisions——

Mr Vaughan interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Nudgee will have time to make his own speech later.

Mr FITZGERALD: I support the legislation. The provisions that are being withdrawn from the legislation need to be withdrawn. The Government believes that it does not need to exercise those provisions of the Act. I believe that the legislation will have wide community support. I support the Bill.

Ms WARNER (South Brisbane) (8.34 p.m.): I do not wish to go over in any great detail that very sad period in history in which 1 100 men were sacked from the electricity industry.

Mr Tenni: They were not sacked.

Ms WARNER: They were sacked. They were locked out. They were dismissed. The Minister can call it what he likes. It was a travesty of justice at the time.

I will reiterate what the dispute was about. It was about jobs. It was about contract labour and the loss of jobs in the electricity industry. It was about the right of the people working in that electricity industry to protect their work conditions. What happened? Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, the then Premier, came in on his charger and said, "Right, I am going to use this opportunity to fundamentally change the nature of industrial relations in this State." That was his stated claim at the time. He was going to make a big change, cause a revolution, if you like, and the 13 people who are now Ministers of this Government have to live with the legacy that Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen left behind—a legacy of shame, of embarrassment, of pain, and of hardship for the people of Queensland.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Ms WARNER: So it seems.

What this Government is now trying to do is distance itself from those excesses and abuses. So now honourable members have before them this little piece of legislation which is neither fish nor fowl, which on the one hand tries to justify what happened in those sad days, that is the sacking of those people—it legitimises it—but on the other hand says, "But we are a little bit sensitive about the fact that people down south think that what we are doing is immoral, unconscionable and quite unjust. This legislation is just to keep those people happy."

In his second-reading speech the Minister said, "Even though they are not right and we know they are not right, we are going to repeal some sections of the Electricity (Continuity of Supply) Act. However, we will leave bits of the Electricity (Continuity of Supply) Act, and the bits that we will leave are the bits that justify the position that we took at the time, which was the dismissal of the 1 100 men."

The rest of that Act, which is now being described as a piece of emergency legislation, is being repealed. That emergency legislation—even though at the time it was claimed not to be that; it was claimed to be the great leap forward, the way of establishing fair play, justice and God knows what in the electricity industry and prevent the right to strike, which indeed it did—has been thoroughly condemned by every right-thinking person who believes in democracy and who believes that the right to strike has to be preserved within a democracy otherwise there is a tendency towards a totalitarian State. That is what the Opposition said at the time, and that is the position that the Opposition sticks to.

This pathetic little amendment before the House does little to allay anybody's fears about the erosion of democracy in this State. It does remove the worst excesses of the

Electricity (Continuity of Supply) Act but it does nothing to restore in any meaningful way the democratic right to strike or the democratic right to an impartial tribunal. The impartial tribunal is the Industrial Commission, not the Electricity Authorities Industrial Causes Tribunal, which was set up under this Act. That tribunal remains, and it is a totally biased body which no worker can have any faith in and which the union certainly can have no faith in.

I return to the Electricity (Continuity of Supply) Act, which has been mentioned in this Chamber on so many occasions. That Act, which is supposed to be simply an emergency piece of legislation, was totally unnecessary at the time it was introduced because, as is said now by the Minister in his second-reading speech, the provisions for a state of emergency under the transport legislation are adequate and there is no need for the Electricity (Continuity of Supply) Act. I put it to honourable members that the only reason for the Electricity (Continuity of Supply) Act was that Queensland had a fanatic as Premier of this State at the time, a fanatic who used this revolting piece of legislation, this absolutely, totally and utterly obnoxious piece of legislation, to cajole, browbeat and intimidate workers in this State. It certainly had that effect. Certainly the Government caused an enormous amount of distress, which has not yet been alleviated, and certainly the Government has destroyed within the electricity industry a decent system of industrial relations. A decent system of industrial relations does not exist within that industry. There are still thousands of men who will not return to that industry because——

Mr Tenni: We don't want them.

Ms WARNER: No, of course the Minister does not want them, because they are men of fairness, men who know their job, men who know what to do.

The member for Lockyer stated that I said that everybody in the electricity industry was a scab. What I have said is that people in the electricity industry who were friendly to his Government are scabs. Let us get the record straight. That is what I said and that is what I am sticking by.

Mrs Nelson: That's nineteenth century rubbish.

Ms WARNER: Nineteenth century rubbish? It happened two years ago, which was hardly in the nineteenth century. That happened in 1985.

Mrs Nelson: What you are saying about scabs is nineteenth century rubbish, and you know it.

Ms WARNER: The word "scabs" is a traditional word. Most of the words that we use in the English language date further back than the nineteenth century. "Scabs" is one of those words.

Mr Scott: They don't want to know the meaning of that word.

Ms WARNER: They do not, because they have no sense of fair play.

At the time, members of the Opposition said that the Electricity (Continuity of Supply) Act could not in itself work. In fact, we were proved right. Section 5 of the Electricity (Continuity of Supply) Act states that a person shall not, either alone or in concert with any other person, obstruct or harass. I was actually arrested under that provision of the Act, as was the member for Windsor, namely, section 5 (c). On one occasion I appeared in the Cleveland Magistrates Court. The evidence that was presented was of such a miserably flimsy nature that the whole case was thrown out. The case was thrown out because I had been wrongly arrested under the Electricity (Continuity of Supply) Act. That Act was a barely legal piece of paper.

Following the other occasion on which I was arrested, which was at the Stafford SEQEB depot, the case was dropped. The charges against most people arrested under that Act were dropped because the High Court deemed that the legislation was incapable of implementation. The police dropped all the charges because the matter became a

huge political embarrassment to them. It has now become such a political embarrassment that the Government is deleting the whole matter from the statute-book. I put it to the Minister that it was wrong then to introduce the legislation and that it is wrong now to keep it on the statute-book. Therefore, I support its repeal. I ask members of the Government to examine their consciences about what they were doing at the time they passed the legislation. The legislation was unnecessary.

I suppose that the Minister would have some lame excuse, such as, "We were only following orders." I also suggest to the Minister that that defence is not acceptable. It was not acceptable at Nuremberg; it will not be acceptable to the people of Queensland at the next State election. The Minister cannot hide behind the fact that he was dominated totally by a person whose sanity could be, and in fact has been, questioned by members of his own Government—the person who was responsible for that sad and miserable part of Queensland's history which led to the destruction of democracy in the electricity industry within the trade union movement. The Minister will blame Sir Joh, but I would say to him, "What were you doing at the time? Were you arguing against him? Did you take up, as we on this side of the House did, the reasonable and decent position on this abominable piece of legislation—a piece of legislation that is being partially left on the books?"

To his credit, the Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Affairs has said that he has some faith in the system of industrial relations in this State and that the Government had been going down a path from which it would depart, that is, that he would now respect the role of the commission. In fact, last year he dropped a number of amendments that would have further curtailed the powers of the commission. That was good, and the Minister is heading in the right direction. However, I would say to him that if he really wants to make a clean sweep of it, he has to get rid of all the obnoxious anti-trade union legislation that exists on the statute-book in Queensland, because what the Government is doing is destroying the trade union movement. That might be exactly the Minister's aim. Is that what he wants to do?

Mr Tenni: Wouldn't the State go ahead then?

Ms WARNER: Does the Minister want to do that? Would he like to destroy the trade union movement? Is that his aim? I am not getting any clear answers. The Government seems to be confused about what it wants to do. I suspect it believes that it would be a good idea if the trade union movement no longer existed. I will regard that as this Government's basic aim. If that is this Government's aim, it is effectively destroying democracy and freedom, and I do not believe that there would be any argument about that from anywhere else in the world. That is the end result of the achievement of that type of aim.

This legislation should not be repealed in part; it should be totally repealed. It is offensive and unbecoming for a Government that claims that it believes in openness and fair play and that has a vision of excellence to still have such totalitarian legislation on the statute-book.

I will not forget what happened during the dark days of 1985. This Government destroyed the lives of 1 100 men in Queensland.

Mr McPhie: You are a disgrace to this Parliament.

Ms WARNER: I believe that the honourable member is going over the top. He has no understanding of parliamentary democracy or any other democracy.

The honourable member for Lockyer claimed that, because they voted overwhelmingly for the Government at the last election, the people agreed with the legislation. That is not the case. This Government received 38 per cent of the vote. That is hardly an overwhelming victory and is hardly overwhelming support for this Government from the people of Queensland. The only reason that this Government has a majority in this House is that it has rigged the boundaries in this State to create a gerrymander. If this State had free elections and a capacity for association at an industrial level, it would

not have the type of Government that it has had to endure for so long. This Government should be ashamed of itself for what has happened. I hope that it has the guts to amend the abuses, the mistakes and the tyranny of the past.

Mr BEARD (Mount Isa—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (8.48 p.m.): Of all the honourable members who have spoken during the debate on this Bill, I am the only one who observed from outside this House the electricity dispute that occurred in 1985. Because Mount Isa's power station operated throughout the electricity dispute, I observed the dispute from the safety of a town in which the electricity was not turned off. I believe that I observed it fairly dispassionately and may have become aware of some of the factors that were involved in that dispute which may have been missed by people who were heavily wrapped up in it.

The honourable member for Nundah outlined the Liberal Party's major objections to the legislation, the amendments that were proposed and the way in which the debate was gagged and guillotined.

At that time an emergency situation was created. The lights had to be turned back on. A small group of people was holding the State to ransom and something had to be done. There is no argument about that. The argument came later when the lights were turned on again and a group of people had been comprehensively defeated; they were down and out. They were not the small number of people who had turned off the lights but other people who were innocently caught up in the dispute.

I welcome the opportunity to pass on some thoughts that I believe represented the views of a large number of people in this State at the time of the electricity dispute.

In the Australian culture, a working man who is working with his hands below what might be known as a staff level generally belongs to a union. Even if he does not belong to a union, it is a well-known tradition that he does not rat on his mates. What I am trying to say is that those people who went on strike may not have personally wanted to go on strike but they had no option if they had grown up in the Australian culture.

Unfortunately, before coming to Parliament our former Premier had led a life of relative isolation. He worked by himself for many years and created his own fortune. He did not experience this Australian culture that I am talking about, and I am certain that he did not understand it. I say that because when those people were comprehensively down and out—defeated—there was a time when he could have said to them, "Okay, you can come back. You can get up. We have beaten you." A person should not be kicked when he is down. Certainly, it is the view of a large number of people in the community that when people who played no part in starting the strike and certainly had no option but to continue on the road they were on, were defeated, they had no way of getting back up. As was said earlier, those who were close to retirement lost superannuation, lost payments—lost everything. They had no opportunity to come back, and they were not given it.

Sir William Knox: They weren't the ones who turned the lights out.

Mr BEARD: They were not the ones who turned the lights out.

The Government shot the Indians and left the chiefs; it shot the troops but left the generals. It missed the ones who started it.

In times of emergency, toughness is often needed—but not intransigence and bullying. In times of emergency, when it is over and people have to pick themselves up again, perhaps a little humanity and compassion is needed rather than vindictiveness and revenge. I am afraid that that is what was seen in this State at that time.

As far as I am concerned, everything I am saying is reflected in my reading of the Minister's second-reading speech, in which I see overtones of a guilty conscience, almost of apology at having to pass this legislation, referring to the way the people down south think about us; that now that the emergency has passed it is no longer necessary for

this legislation to be retained on the books, and so forth. I think there is an admission that far too much power was given—for example, the power of direction to the commissioner. I am certainly delighted to see some amends being made by the repeal of the more unattractive aspects of this legislation. It is a move in the right direction. We must get away from raw, outright confrontation in industrial relations and get back to the jaw-jaw, not war-war, as it is referred to.

I hope that this Bill will do something to remove some of the lasting bitterness which has remained in the community for two or three years, not because the Government put the lights back on—and that was welcomed by the people of Queensland—but because, when the victory was won, the main architect did not have the humanity and the compassion to pick up the human wreckage he left which had no part in creating the war. That could have been so easily done, but it was not. I am glad that the present Government is at least making amends in part for that.

Hon. M. J. TENNI (Barron River—Minister for Mines and Energy) (8.53 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contribution to the debate on the amendments to the Bill. However, I would like to respond to each one individually. The member for Wolston spoke about industrial procedures and all sorts of problems that were caused by the strike.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Don't indulge in these personal attacks. You know how sensitive I am.

Mr TENNI: It will not be a personal attack at all. I merely want to answer as many of the points that the honourable member raised as possible, if he gives me the opportunity.

The honourable member spoke about the Association of Architects, Engineers, Surveyors and Draughtsmen of Australia and the Queensland Power Workers Association and he wondered why a couple of weeks ago the Government stopped any further payments to them. Let me assure the honourable member that the two unions concerned, at the time that that funding was granted to them, were dumped by the ETU.

Mr Vaughan: Did you say the two unions?

Mr TENNI: Both unions. The group of people were dumped and they formed the two unions. They were the men who kept the power on as much as possible and who did all the repairs and maintenance that was necessary. They were the people who tried to keep this State active and tried to keep jobs for the balance of Queenslanders. As far as the Government was concerned, they were great people. The Government gave them sufficient funds to keep them going.

Mr Vaughan: \$200,000 you gave them.

Mr TENNI: It was very close to that figure. The Government kept them going so that they could continue to—

Mr R. J. Gibbs: How many police and nurses could you have paid for?

Mr TENNI: Is the honourable member saying that the people of Queensland did not appreciate the work that those people did by keeping the power on? They played a major role and did a wonderful job for the people of this State. If the Government had paid them \$10m, it would have been cheap compared to the losses that were caused by the ETU and other people involved in the power strike.

Members of the Opposition spoke about men being sacked. No men were sacked at all. All of the men who had gone on strike were offered their jobs back. They were not offered their jobs back only once; they were offered their jobs back twice. The men were given 48 hours to return to work and approximately three months later they were again offered their jobs back, but they refused to accept them. The Government could not go on and on for ever. It had a business to run.

Members of the Opposition also spoke about restoration of superannuation entitlements. A couple of weeks ago, I had one of the union representatives in to see me. I have since confirmed in writing to that union that I am prepared to make a strong recommendation to the Cabinet of this Government that in fact I will endeavour—provided that it meets certain criteria—to pay the \$1.3m that it claims as lost superannuation. There was no loss of superannuation entitlement and members of the Opposition know that as well as I do. Unless people work, they are not entitled to superannuation. However, I said to the union that if it was prepared to pay for losses of the community; the losses incurred by all the businesses—millions and millions of dollars; the losses of all the individuals who had deep-freezers full of food, which was lost because they had no power; and the losses to individuals because motors in their fridges burnt out when the power was going on and off, I would be prepared to recommend to Cabinet that the claim in respect of the member's losses be considered. I cannot be any fairer than that. I cannot say to the tax-payers of this State that they will pay an amount to the union that cost them an absolute fortune and brought about the loss of thousands of jobs for people who were outside the electricity industry.

Members of the Opposition should also represent those workers who lost their jobs because of the action taken by this particular union.

Mr De Lacy: You are not impressing anyone.

Mr TENNI: Well, I could never impress the honourable member for Cairns, and he knows that.

Mr De Lacy: That is right.

Mr TENNI: The honourable member is not impressed by anything. He is one of those who caused the loss of 2 000 jobs in the timber industry in far-north Queensland and came out in the newspaper fully supporting the loss of jobs. He is a man who calls himself a member of the Australian Labor Party—a person who is supposed to support those people—yet he was proud of the loss of jobs in the timber industry and came out publicly about the loss of jobs in far-north Queensland. The honourable member is not game to go to Ravenshoe. He knows that and I know that.

Mr De Lacy: How are you going with the Fitzgerald inquiry?

Mr TENNI: I am going very well with the Fitzgerald inquiry. No-one believes lies.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr TENNI: No-one believes lies, and they were the same sorts of lies as those that caused the honourable member to be mentioned in the diaries. The honourable member has had publicity also. The honourable member is in the Fitzgerald inquiry, too, and his friend Mr R. J. Gibbs is also in it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TENNI: Every member of the Opposition could be in them if they were all doing their jobs and went to see the Police Commissioner.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TENNI: I will get back to the Bill, Mr Speaker.

I thank the honourable member for Nundah and the Liberal Party for supporting the original legislation. I think the honourable member said that legislation of this type should not be on the statute-book. I think the honourable member will appreciate that at that time, a certain stand was taken and that perhaps at that time it may have been very strong. However, it certainly played the part that was absolutely vital to the people of this State.

Sir William Knox: I only referred to the powers of the commissioner outside the commission.

Mr TENNI: I think the honourable member also said that legislation of this type should not be on the statute-book. They were the words he used.

Sir William Knox: That is what the Minister said.

Mr TENNI: The honourable member may be right. I am not arguing about that. All I am saying is that at this stage, everybody knows that the lights are on. Everybody knows that at that time the Government had to take a hard line or this State would not have been able to survive with the attitude that was being adopted by the unions concerned.

Mr De Lacy: The lights are on everywhere. What is the difference in Queensland? What a ridiculous statement—as though it was something unique.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TENNI: It certainly was unique at that stage of the game. If the Government had allowed people such as the member for Cairns, Mr De Lacy, and some of his cronies to carry on the way they were, the lights would never have come back on in Queensland. The Government had to think about all the people in this State—all the people who members of the Labor Party were supposed to represent at the time—from the worker to the big businessman who created the employment. People such as the member for Cairns refused to accept that responsibility and preferred to support a very small minority group. In fact, it was only one person who created most of the problems in this State.

The member for Lockyer made the position quite clear and he has been proved dead right. He said that the cost of electricity was rising. Of course the cost was rising—because of the attitude that had been adopted by the union at that time and the costs that were brought to bear on users of electricity through constant strikes and stop-work meetings, and all sorts of things.

The honourable member said that the workers had the right to leave the industry. They did have that right, and some of them chose to exercise it. Those who chose to leave had other jobs to go to. It is hog-wash to say that the men could not find jobs. Everyone knows that within 24 or 48 hours whilst the strike was on the men were working as part-time drivers on buses and paper carts and doing all sorts of things while everyone else was suffering.

The honourable member for Lockyer referred to Custer's last stand and Dinny Madden. It was certainly his last stand, because I do not know where he is. People say, "Dinny who?" I have never heard of him since that time, and I suppose that he has been dealt with in the correct way. He cost those who stupidly followed him their jobs.

The honourable member for South Brisbane referred to the former Premier of this State, who, in my opinion, did a wonderful job for many years. She said that he changed the face of industrial legislation. Of course he did, but at least he got people back to work and turned the power on so that other people who were put out of their jobs got their jobs back, continued to work and helped in the development of this State. I congratulate the former Premier, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, on the wonderful job that he did in turning the lights back on. If Opposition members go outside and begin to talk about the power strike, the lights being turned off and going back to those days, not one of them will get back into this House after the next election. The honourable member for South Brisbane said that the result of the next election would be affected by that dispute, but I remember her stating in this House, out in the street and on the media that the Government would be defeated at the last election.

Mr De Lacy: To what do you attribute your bad result at the last election?

Mr TENNI: Not only is Mr De Lacy supporting unemployment for 2 000 people in north Queensland, but also he cannot count. I went from 3.21 per cent to 4.4 per cent, and that is not going backwards.

Mr De Lacy interjected.

Mr TENNI: The honourable member does not know what he is talking about.

The honourable member for Mount Isa probably had the best view of the strike, because private enterprise in the form of Mount Isa Mines supplied power to the city of Mount Isa. The people of Mount Isa were very fortunate. They could watch their television and listen to their radios and had no worries about the motors in their fridges burning out and the goods in their deep-freezers going rotten. They did not have the worries that I had in trying to get emergency generators for people on dialysis machines who were half-way through their treatment when the power went off. The honourable member for Mount Isa did not have to suffer that. As a matter of fact, at one stage of the game, I was seriously considering sending two dialysis patients and their home machines up to Mount Isa if the strike had continued much longer, because lives were being put at risk.

Mr Austin: What did Mr De Lacy do?

Mr TENNI: Mr De Lacy did nothing except support the strikers.

The honourable member for Mount Isa referred to the fact that the strikers were holding the State to ransom, and he was dead right. The worst part of it was that they were causing unemployment for many people.

There seems to be a misconception on the part of the Opposition that men were sacked. In fact no men were sacked. Every man had the opportunity to return to his job within 48 hours, and close to three months later the opportunity was given to them to return to work. Naturally the board could not go on for ever and a day offering jobs to men who chose not to return and who did not want their jobs back.

The amendments to the legislation are very sound and fair, and I thank all honourable members for their contributions.

Motion agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 8, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr Tenni, by leave, read a third time.

LAND ACT AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 18 November 1987 (see p. 4544).

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (9.07 p.m.): In his second-reading speech, the Minister said—

“This is a short Bill, which further underlines the Government’s intention and determination to streamline the procedures necessary for the efficient and practical management of the activities of our public administration to meet the needs of our community.

It addresses four distinct aspects of the Land Act, namely—

- adjustment of boundaries of title of trust areas held in trust under freehold title;
- relaxation of provisions preventing some lessees of special leases from electing to have the Land Court determine their reassessable rent;
- providing the option, in respect of cash sales at auction sales for an estate in fee simple, for a deposit to be paid at the time of sale with balance to be paid within a specified period; and

- leasing by trustees of grants in trust or of reserves for a purpose contrary to or inconsistent with the purpose for which the land was so granted or reserved.”

The Bill may be a short one but it covers a wide field because it covers local authorities, which in many instances are trustees for sporting reserves, show societies and all of the other bodies mentioned in the Minister's second-reading speech.

All honourable members know that from time to time problems relating to this legislation have arisen. The Opposition agrees with the changes sought by the Bill, particularly as they relate to local authorities and other organisations that hold land in trust for various organisations such as show societies, race and trotting clubs and football clubs. Sometimes problems arise, particularly in rural areas where people are prepared to work together and share facilities.

In my electorate a management committee that was set up as trustee of a park comprised two representatives from each participating organisation, that is, the trotting club, the racing club, the show society and the shire council. Another organisation wished to use a small area of that land but, because of the wording of the Act, which does not allow trustees to sublease, it was not able to do so. This Bill will rectify that problem. The Opposition is pleased about that. I am dealing with a problem at the moment on which I will be approaching the Lands Department to negotiate. Hopefully, this Bill will help in that regard.

When the legislation regarding the deeds of grant in trust was introduced into this Parliament, I spoke about the problems caused by not defining boundaries. The Minister has recognised that problem and in this Bill is endeavouring to rectify it. However, at present most of the communities involved are well away from the boundaries of their neighbours. Many years ago, perhaps the boundaries were defined. The townships are already built. In his second-reading speech, the Minister said that there will be boundaries defined for roads, residences and other needs in the community such as sporting fields and business houses. These provisions are similar to those in the mining industry under which the miners have to put in a datum peg and take it from there. Perhaps that will be suitable.

In dealing with the Torres Strait Islander and Aboriginal communities of Queensland—I could never see nor understand why in the past the Government did not give them a lease. In many cases the opportunity was available for the Government to grant them a perpetual lease, and they could have developed that land as their own. When a person has title to a perpetual lease, provided he stays within the confines of the law and pays his rent regularly, there should be no outside interference. The Government always has the right, if the need should arise for the betterment of the community or for community needs, to resume part of the lease. I believe that the Government's stance was a way of prolonging the fight that those people had to obtain land rights. Had the Aboriginal communities and the Torres Strait Islanders been granted a normal long-term lease such as a perpetual lease, many of the problems that they have today would have been solved. In many of the communities in which they were fighting for land rights, those people would have ceased to be a burden on the Government. The Government was adopting the Big Daddy attitude that it controlled everything. In many instances I know that the communities made a profit, but money was spent unwisely by the Government to create the impression that those people were dependent on the Government for survival when in actual fact they were not.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister said that he had spoken with those people and the Government's legal representatives had examined the legislation and could see no problem. I hope that is right. I hope that other members will support me in that. They know more about it than I do. The Opposition has accepted the Government's word previously when it may not have been wrong but it was not totally right, either. The Opposition treats that area as a grey area.

The other point mentioned in the second-reading speech of the Minister is the provision to reduce the machinery requirements for the adjustments. All honourable

members appreciate that legislation should be streamlined to make things simple and to the point. When dealing with Government departments, things such as new titles and needs for subdivisions take time, but I am sure that many areas could be dealt with more quickly if the Government adequately staffed the departments with competent men. There are many competent men now in the departments, but they are understaffed. That creates a problem sometimes, because staff members are working flat out and have to be taken from jobs that are only half finished.

Another point is in relation to the annual rent having to be more than \$200 before a party is allowed to go to the court. I have always argued that if the Minister sets the correct rental fee for a leasehold, whether it be special lease or any other type of lease, and provided that it is a fair assessment of the rental, it should stand up even in the Land Court. I see no reason for objecting to going to the Land Court to establish the basis of a fair rental. In many cases revaluations are taking place. They are ongoing and rents are getting high. However, the Government, as the custodian of the land, has the right to receive a fair return on its investment, which should be for the welfare of all Queenslanders.

I turn to special leases. That covers a wide field. Special leases are granted under many different conditions. Certain special leases cannot be freeholded; other special leases can be. Some special leases are granted for a short period. Application is continually made for a longer term lease because financial institutions, such as banks, are not prepared to lend money for any length of time when only a short-term lease is involved. The financial institution wants security for its loan.

This is something that the Government has been examining for some time. Although the Opposition is pleased that the Government is moving in the right direction, I think that a grey area might still exist in regard to special leases. As the Minister said in his second-reading speech, revaluations are continually taking place. Some valuations are increased annually; others are to be revalued every five to eight years, or whatever period the Government finds to be suitable.

I have mentioned subleasing. It is a matter of concern in the smaller rural communities, but perhaps not in the cities because they have been built out. The cities do not have very much vacant land anywhere. In some rural areas, the show society may have 20 or 30 acres, and many are larger than that. Some racing clubs have an area of land that is surplus to their needs or that they need only at certain times of the year—for annual race meetings, for example. In such instances, subleasing is quite in order.

Although I can understand the Minister's reasoning in not having structural dwellings erected, in some cases that I know of it could be all right. I refer to the rural community that wants to build a grandstand for the tennis club or develop a small area just outside the tennis court. If it encroaches upon the trust land, it will be forbidden. In some areas where the racecourses are not used all year round, the football clubs and the cricket clubs may wish to erect a clubhouse. No doubt, as is often the case, further amendments will be introduced should the need arise.

I ask the Minister to give consideration to what I have said and to take my comments on board. I ask him to treat each case individually, as he sees fit, taking into account the needs of the community. Most organisations that wish to take advantage of the trust areas, particularly in rural communities, are real community efforts where people work together and help one another.

I have dealt with the inconsistency of original leases in relation to subleasing. The Minister mentioned that the Public Trustee leases Government buildings. I think that the Lands Department can handle that in areas where there is no Public Trustee.

There has been a change in the leadership of the present Government. Queensland has a new Premier and a changed Ministry. The Minister's portfolio is now called Land Management. I agree with that new title. However, Queensland is a long way behind the other States. I mention a few instances in which I do not think the Government, as

the custodian of the welfare of Queenslanders as a whole, has really done its job in monitoring and being the watch-dog over the distribution of land in Queensland.

People who have reared their families, paid their taxes and honoured their commitments to the community might wish to obtain a small area of State land. I have asked for small areas of land on behalf of some of my constituents. One farmer wanted 10 acres to square up his block and to include a creek that would have been handy to him; but, because it was State forest, the Government would not grant it. However, in the past, big business people or moneyed people who had friends in the right places have been able to obtain large areas of State forest land for their own purposes. I refer to King Ranch, which many years ago obtained 40 000 acres and developed it—

Mr Glasson: That wasn't State forest. That was vacant Crown land.

Mr EATON: It had a lot of timber on it.

Mr Glasson: It was Crown land. I'll fix you tomorrow.

Mr EATON: The first part consisted of 48 000 acres, and then King Ranch ended up with a lot more land near the powerhouse. On Monday, 31 August 1987, the *Courier-Mail* reported—

“Two cattle stations in north Queensland are on sale for \$45 million.

They are Tully River Station, about 35 km west of Tully, and Lyndhurst Station, about 310 km west of Townsville.

Both are owned by the American-based King Ranch company and are being offered as one package.”

I do not for one minute knock the achievements of that company because other companies could have done the same. The King Ranch company spent a great deal of money developing the properties. Tully River station, as it is known, would be the best cattle property in Australia. Although there was not a blade of grass on most of the property, in the middle of a drought the company turned off the last 400 bullocks that had been fattened in the rainforest area that had been cleared. That is an indication of how good that area was. Following the receipt of land, every so often the company would apply for more and the Government would grant that request. When the Government said, “No. You have had enough. You are not getting any more land.”, the company turned around and bought all the land on the other side of the river. The company had the money to buy it in the first place. While it did not own any land other than the Tully River station area, it had a lever to go to the Government every now and then to get more land. This caused a lot of concern in the Tully area. The details are being revealed today. The company had gone through the good times.

Although the two properties are for sale for \$45m, I am told that the company wants \$9m for the King Ranch area bare, with only the improvements that are on it. The Tully River station has an area of 21 287 hectares and is used as a fattening property. It has 23 000 head of cattle. They would be fattening at the moment.

Mr Scott: All their mates, Bill.

Mr EATON: Yes. Developed grass feed lots can fatten up to 12 000 cattle at a time. As I am familiar with the place, I would not doubt that, because of its geographical location, the property could carry that number of cattle. Because of its climate and abundant water supply, the station can also produce sugar-cane, bananas, tea, tropical fruits and vegetables. The Tully River runs through the property.

About three or four years ago the Tully River flats were put up for sale. It was beautiful banana-growing country. In fact, anything, such as sugar-cane or bananas, could be grown on that land. Well over \$1,000 an acre was received for that land. This caused concern among the banana-growers. Everyone knew that the banana industry was running a tight ship. Because everyone thought there was a quid in banana-growing, many other farmers entered the industry. They now find themselves in a situation that was forecast three or four years ago.

Another problem was that all the farms were wiped out during cyclone Winifred. Many additional people entered the banana-growing industry because they thought that bananas would be in short supply. The farmers who had their plantations destroyed borrowed money to replant and to upgrade their properties. Within 12 months they began to operate commercially. It is two years since the cyclone struck, and the properties are now in full production. This has resulted in an oversupply. A few farmers who sent their bananas away before finding a market found themselves having to pay money to have their bananas dumped. One can see how their anger turns on companies such as King Ranch, which sold its land to the banana-growers. Even though the land was not cheap, it was available. The existing farmers thought that the land should have remained for beef production, for which it was well and truly qualified.

Land in the Burdekin was freeholded for \$65 a hectare and then bought back for about \$1,400 a hectare. The land at Silver Plains will be sold, according to the Minister's statement that appears in *Hansard*, for no more than \$5 a hectare. That is less than \$2 an acre. I do not think that similar land can be bought for that price anywhere in Australia.

Mr Glasson: They didn't accept those conditions. I will reveal that to the House tomorrow, for the information of Mr Comben.

Mr EATON: That is fair enough. I am pleased to hear that, because many Australians might be interested in it.

In the sitting of Parliament before Christmas a State forest order was revoked. I agree with the Minister that the land was not what one would call good State forest or good timber reserve. However, it contained an area of 11 000 hectares that could have been put up for ballot. That is what should have happened.

A person had a lease over that land for grazing and agriculture. He was not living on it and working it himself. Therefore, his living would not have been taken away from him. He had other commercial interests that kept him going. The great opportunity existed for the State Government to resume that land, pay that man for any improvements that he had made to it while he had that lease, and put it up for ballot. That would have been an ideal opportunity, because the land would not have been overcapitalised.

Mr McPhie: Be fair dinkum. Come on!

Mr EATON: Before people could take part in the ballot for the Glen Idol blocks they had to have at least \$500,000. Without that sum, a person could not qualify as an applicant for one of those blocks. More than 3 000 people applied for those two blocks, when the main criterion, apart from qualifications and experience, was that a person had to have at least \$500,000. More than 3 000 people in Queensland were able to raise \$500,000. Thousands of young Queenslanders—sons of graziers, farmers and people who were bred on farms by parents who were share farming—would have loved the opportunity to apply for those blocks.

Under the old system with the Labor Government, many people in Queensland got their start through ballots. Many people who won their land by ballot are still in business. In those days, when a block went up for ballot, the Agricultural Bank determined the amount of funds that would be needed to establish a block as a viable proposition. Those funds were then made available to the successful applicant in the ballot. After his qualifications had been checked, that person could go to the Agricultural Bank and obtain the necessary funds to carry on with his development. I am aware of many good people who are National Party members and who are still on the blocks that they won through ballots.

Mr Scott: Do you know what values they put on now—the small amount of land that the Lands Department does subdivide? It is certainly very much commercial rates there.

Mr EATON: That is another sore point.

I have been speaking about the rural sector. This Government is selling agricultural land to overseas interests. It is a place for the moneyed people today; it is not a place for Queenslanders.

I am annoyed that this Government has a policy of selling off its assets to pay off the debts that have been created by its economic mismanagement of this State. Eventually this Government will end up with no assets and no money. Where will we go from there?

All land that is put up for auction is put up in fee simple; in other words, freehold land for a cash sale at public auction. Three options are available. I have some documents here that relate to the sale of residential blocks. One can pay 50 per cent deposit and 10 per cent interest on the balance, 30 per cent deposit, or 15 per cent deposit and 12 per cent interest on the balance.

The Government claims that a demand for such land exists. Because the Government has set high prices to meet its own ends, it is not really servicing the needs of the public at all. Because people are land hungry, the Government is forcing prices up.

Mr Glasson: They are building blocks—Lands Department development.

Mr EATON: I ask the Minister to consider the reserve prices that have been placed on land. The sum of \$24,500 is being asked for the cheapest block. That is supposed to be a house block for a working man.

Mr Glasson: Which one is it?

Mr EATON: I am speaking about Wongaling Beach, which is south of Innisfail.

In Longreach the cheapest block is \$13,200. I am not singling out any one particular area. In Rockhampton the prices range from \$16,000 to \$20,000-odd. In Clermont one block is listed at \$10,000, another at \$13,500, and the rest from \$14,000 to \$15,000. Honourable members might laugh at that.

Mr Glasson interjected.

Mr EATON: The Government has the opportunity of selling them as freehold. This map I have shows Mooloolaba.

Mr Glasson interjected.

Mr EATON: The Government has land that it could give to the local authorities but it holds it back until there is a shortage of supply so that it can receive a high price for it as freehold. That is what is happening. Blocks of land are not being opened up as they are needed. I have worked out some figures. I have worked out the average price of a block by taking a minimum of everything and I have arrived at an average figure of \$20,000 for a block. Under the proposed system, interest will cost \$1,100 for a year. If a \$30,000 house were to be built on a \$20,000 block of land and the block was to be used as security, a person would end up paying \$125 a week. The block and the house would be paid off together.

However, if a block of land could be purchased at its development cost of, say, \$5,000, to that would be added the cost of the first year's rent, the survey fee and legal fees of \$6,000, and then the block would be available for an annual rent. Throughout Queensland there are thousands and thousands of leasehold blocks. I do not know of one town in Queensland——

Mr Austin: How much was the land at Mooloolaba?

Mr EATON: I will kill the Minister's curiosity. In Mooloolaba the cheapest block of land costs \$22,000 and the highest-priced block costs \$25,500.

I will now return to my argument. The Government should make leasehold land available. As I said, there is not one town in Queensland that does not have leasehold residential blocks. They have been there for years. If people want freehold land, they

have the option of freeholding that leasehold land to their family. The majority of home-buyers today are young people with a family who want to own their home. It is every man's right to want to own his own little bit of land and to rear his family in the environment that he chooses. If the Government was to make that available to him, it would create not a boom but an increase in the building industry work-force, because at the moment plenty of builders are looking for jobs. Many young couples want to work—and in some cases, both have to work—to pay the high price for building blocks. My son bought a block of land in Cairns for \$28,000. I asked him how many cane farms he had with it. It is a tiny block. He said that he does not have much to mow. Perhaps my thinking was wrong. I think that all places should be like a farm. I was reared in the bush and that's where I like to be, but I moved into the city.

The Government is doing the wrong thing. It could be playing a role. Once the Government sells those blocks as freehold and once they are paid for——

Mr Glasson: That wasn't a Land Administration Commission block in Cairns.

Mr EATON: No, I know that it was not.

Mr Glasson: Therefore that is what the private sector is asking.

Mr EATON: It is because of the developers. The Government should control the developers instead of letting them come in and freehold land. The Government is playing into their pockets.

Mr Glasson: You have got the socialistic attitude, "We will peg the price of land." That is what you are saying.

Mr EATON: The Labor Party would control it. It would not be doing it for itself, it would be doing it to help the communities, to increase the work-force and to reduce unemployment.

Mr Glasson: Put that in your platform and we will see what chance you have got of getting into Government.

Mr EATON: The only fellows who will worry about the Labor Party are the developers. They are the only fellows that the Government is looking after. That is the difference between the Opposition and the Government. The Government looks after only the developers and the Opposition wants to look after the community. The Government is giving the land to the developers so that they can develop it. Later on Mr Comben will speak about that place in the cape where the developers wanted to go in. They are prepared to pay a high price for the land and then cut it up into blocks.

There are plenty of examples in Queensland where that has been done. In Tully a company wanted land on which to grow tea. Everyone would agree with the starting up of such a project. That company bought Crown land in Tully. It was leasehold land. The company played the game until the land was freeholded and then all of a sudden it discovered that tea could not be grown there so it cut the land up into small acreages and sold it for a fortune. This is what has happened all along. They go to the Government with a pie-in-the-sky project and the Government listens to it and makes announcements of the kind Mr Burns mentioned. How many \$600m schemes have gone on? They amount to announcements that never ever come to fruition. The same thing is happening on a smaller scale with land.

Mr Gately: Mr Wran said he could not run Expo.

Mr EATON: Look at what the Government has done on the Expo site. The Government has not done a bad job and I will admit that. Members of the Opposition do not knock anything unless it is wrong; and if we say it is wrong, then it is wrong. When the Minister is right, I have always acknowledged the fact. Irrespective of whether a person is a Government member or not, I always face up to the facts. In fact, that is the trouble with Government today. Too many fellows in politics will not be realistic

and face up to the facts, regardless or whether they are for a proposal or against it. Until politicians learn to face up to the facts and be realistic, they will never learn to solve the problems.

This is what is happening. The Government is now selling off the State's assets. It will end up with no assets and no money. That is when the members of the public will kick the Government out.

Mr Stoneman: If you had your way, there would be no timber to build a house with either.

Mr EATON: There would be timber if I had my way, but I have not got my way.

I am concerned that because of the downturn in the building industry, builders in north Queensland are looking for work. As was mentioned previously in the debate——

Mr Glasson: Why wouldn't they be in north Queensland?

Mr EATON: Even before the heritage legislation was brought in—if that is what the Minister is referring to——

Mr Glasson: What is in north Queensland is there, thanks to Senator Richardson.

Mr EATON: People have not got the money to buy the land on which to build a house, and that is the problem. It was mentioned earlier in the debate that thousands of young Queenslanders want to buy their own block of land and build their own home, but are unable to do so because of the attitude of this Government.

I can tell the Minister where there is a great deal of Crown land that could be opened up, but what would the Minister and officers of his department say? The Minister would say that there is no need to cut up the land into a number of blocks because only a few will be sold now and again. The Government wants to wait until a shortage of land occurs and then the blocks will sell well. The Government will be able to get the land off its hands quickly. That is why the Government takes this course of action instead of allowing the councils to develop the land a few blocks at a time, while keeping a few blocks up their sleeves. If that course were adopted, the price of land could be controlled.

The price could be controlled fairly and the competition would not be unjust. It is the responsibility of Governments to provide for the needs of communities and to look after communities.

Mr McPhie: That's real socialism.

Mr EATON: It may be socialistic. I am not too proud to admit that I have socialistic ideas. Private enterprise and socialism can work together. They would work in many areas if they were operated properly and in conjunction. The sugar industry is one example. The industry has proprietary mills and co-operative mills and the industry is socialised. I hear no whinges about that; so it can work.

Mr Scott: That primary industries display over at Expo was taken out by a tax on the farmers. They vaunt their private enterprise. It is socialism, pure and simple.

Mr EATON: That is right. That came from the Victorian farmers and it is good to see. I hope it goes well. It only goes to emphasise more strongly the point I make. Private enterprise and socialism can be operated properly by a Government—any Government, it can be Labor or National Party—if it wants to do so. However, because of the National Party's philosophy, Government members want everything to be private enterprise. Government members want to chop it down, saw it up or sell it, and that is about it.

The Government does not want to build up assets for the future or go into long-term planning that will see Queensland into the future, which was the case with

Governments years ago. Members of this Government are all for tomorrow or next week. For some reason, they do not want to plan for the long term. I do not know why, but I suspect it is because of their philosophy.

Mr Austin: Mr Hawke is selling off the farm. What about that?

Mr EATON: Well, that is wrong. I was going to say that it does not matter who does it; it is either right, or it is wrong. It makes no difference whether people are members of the Liberal Party, the Labor Party or the National Party because there is no half way. If the Hawke Government is selling off the farm, it is wrong and I do not care what sort of Government it is. There is a certain way to go about trying to redeem the country from its problems.

It is certainly true that both State and Federal Governments have big problems. I would be the first to agree about that. There are a lot of problems, especially in land matters.

I have informed the House of many instances in which the Government, through its mismanagement, has not placed enough importance on land. I have said many times in previous debates that the two most important portfolios in this Government are land and primary industries. If they are not, then they should be, because if a Government can make a success of those two activities, success in other areas will automatically follow. However, when a downturn is experienced in those two fields or when problems occur, it brings hardship. Everyone would be aware of the effects of a drought on the community and the hardship that results to many people who are not directly involved in primary industries. I reiterate that the two most important areas that the Government should look after are land and primary industries.

The Government must control the land through administration. Other States have started to look more closely at administration. Despite the fact that the other States are more densely populated and were established earlier, I found when I visited some of them that their problems were exactly the same as Queensland's. Because of problems associated with dense populations or a drift of population from the country to the cities, other States are either starting to solve the problems or they have researchers in the field who are trying to find solutions to the problems.

The Queensland Government has enjoyed the good times and has been able to sell its domestic product. It has been able to sell Queensland's products readily because a market has always been available. Merely by making a phone call, people have been able to sit in an office and sell the State's products. Nowadays, people know that they have to work hard to sell a product because if they do not, they will be left behind. That is happening in many industries today. Producers in Queensland, whether they be rural or industrial, are very competent and it is up to both the State and the Federal Governments to find a market for their produce. If a market can be found for the produce, the goods can be produced. The time of plenty has passed and the pressure of competition is beginning. Many Governments are falling behind because they have not kept up with the times and have not monitored the industry, as has been done by overseas countries such as Europe, where there is closer settlement and where the EC was formed. Australia was happy to let the produce sell itself, but now Australia is facing hard times——

Mr Glasson: You cannot quote the European Community to me. That's the greatest disaster of all time.

Mr EATON: I agree with the Minister, but the European countries have looked after themselves and protected their markets at the expense of everyone else. Australia has sat back and said that the European Community cannot go on much longer and that the subsidisation must come to an end. I have been saying that for the past 20 years, but subsidisation is still occurring.

Mr Glasson: Very shortly it won't be any more.

Mr EATON: I am wondering if I should have said it before, but somehow the EC keeps going and at the same time, it is ruining Australia's markets. This is the part that I am crooked about. Our fellows have to bare their teeth and get stuck into them. Britain is a member of the EC. When Australia had markets in Britain, there were long-term contracts and producers could plan. Those days have gone because Britain was forced into the EC.

The land is a great base to start from. Many people wishing to start in industry, even if it is a light industry, need a block of industrial land. It is the Government's job, in conjunction with local authorities, to provide avenues that will enable industries to start. If people build a home, that creates employment. If the price of land can be kept down, plenty of people will take the opportunity to buy it. In these economic times, most people can read the changes that will come about. Things will get tougher. People do not want to commit themselves. In the past many people were able to buy blocks of land and hold on to them until the price went up. The land was bought as a long-term investment. Real estate has been a great money-earner. Alan Bond is a good example. He and many other men have made their money out of real estate. They could not have made that money if they had not got a good deal in the first place and if they were not able to cut up the blocks of land. They had to have the support of local councils, and they had the happy knack of taking people to dinner and doing all the other things necessary to feather their own nests. That has been my concern for a long time.

Mr Scott: You would be quite happy to say that this Government cannot handle this sort of situation at all.

Mr EATON: I do not think so. In today's economic times people are encountering problems.

My other area of concern is the freeholding of leasehold land. Local authorities are dependent upon Government for a great deal of their finance. Further down the track, when the Government is really short of money - is broke - the Government will say, "We get no income from the land. You have got all the land now because it is freehold. The only time we will get any money out of it is through stamp duty. You have the avenues to raise your own money, so put your rates up." Local councils do not like doing that because they are the closest form of government to the people. Local government members are having their ears chewed to make a decision immediately, but there is someone knocking on their door the next morning to complain about it. Honourable members in this House, on the other hand, are thousands of miles away from it. Constituents have to wait until we return home, by which time they have blown off steam and it is not so bad for us. It is better for a Federal politician because he is further away and does not go home for a week. By that time the person has forgotten about it and has chewed somebody else's ear.

This Government goes crook about the Federal Government's cutting down on local government funding, but this Government is becoming tight with local government funding as well. If the Government is freeholding all the leasehold land, no rental is coming in. If the Government had its way, it would sell every bit of land it had and there would be no leasehold land. Once the Government has sold the land and spent the money, it has no assets and no money. The Government should be the main source of revenue for the people of Queensland and the benefits should be evenly distributed to the communities on a non-parochial, or needs, basis. The Government could fulfil their needs rather than their desires. That is the way it should operate. That is what I would like to see the Government do.

The Department of Geographic Information, which was formerly the Department of Mapping and Surveying, is very competent and has up-to-date gear that can do things that years ago were never dreamt of. It should not be very long before a person can walk into any Lands Department office, or, in the bush, into any courthouse, and ask for a map of the local area and be provided with one that shows every block of land

and shows where there are such things as gold, dairying, corn and sugar-cane. I don't know how far the Minister has progressed in that direction.

I inspected the former Department of Mapping and Surveying and was very impressed with its efforts. I know Queensland is a big State and that the work cannot be done overnight. However, for some reason or other the Government seems to be not very keen to produce maps showing vacant Crown land. When I have made inquiries about vacant Crown land, I have been directed to an old map but nobody was sure whether, since the production of that map, some areas have been leased. Some old maps have been written on in pencil. I hope that before too long every Lands Department office in Queensland will have at least one map of the local area—I do not mean only the area of the township—that shows the surrounding farms. I know that that work cannot be done overnight, but I also know that the department has modern equipment that should take it further down the track before too long.

Debate, on motion of Mr Austin, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Nicklin—Leader of the House) (9.46 p.m.): I move—
“That the House do now adjourn.”

Advertising for Local Authority Election, Mackay

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (9.47 p.m.): I draw to the attention of the House, and especially to those connected with the Police and Attorney-General portfolios, a very serious matter connected with the local authority elections in Mackay. These days, because of all of the publicity surrounding the Fitzgerald inquiry, we are quite used to references to corruption in Queensland.

In Mackay, a group which calls itself Progress 88 is running a team of eight candidates for the aldermanic positions in Mackay City and five candidates for the positions of Division One councillors of the Pioneer Shire, which comprises the urban area across the river from Mackay. People such as the Minister for Land Management would be very familiar with the major urban population in that shire.

The group of people who call themselves Progress 88 have been organised by the National Party candidate for Mackay who was defeated at the last State election. I do not wish to bring personalities into this because personal friends of mine are running in that team. They claim that they are non-political. Because I have known some of them all my life, I accept that; but, because of the way in which they have banded together, they are involved in the politics of local government.

In last week's *Pioneer News*, which is a free paper in Mackay, they placed an advertisement which resembles a voting ticket. It carried the photos of all those involved and was very similar to the format of a how-to-vote card. But, lo and behold, in conjunction with their voting ticket they are running a contest in which is offered a free week-end for two at a resort called Latitude 19 on Magnetic Island. I am sure that the honourable members for Townsville and Townsville East would know it better than I do.

The people who run that resort must be a little naive, too, because this is a political advertisement that is intended to obtain votes. It offers an inducement to electors. Section 20 of the Local Government Act states that anything that happens in a local government election is considered in the same way as elections for the Legislative Assembly. However, for elections to the Legislative Assembly, inducements and offers that try to persuade people to vote in a particular way are covered by section 103 of the Criminal Code, which relates to bribery. It states that any person who gives any benefit of any kind for anything to be afterwards done by any elector in order to induce any person to endeavour to procure the return of any person at an election is guilty of a misdemeanour and is liable to imprisonment with hard labour for up to one year. That is the particular offence.

Section 104 of the Criminal Code deals with further penalties for corrupt practices and states that any person convicted of an offence with respect to a municipal election becomes incapable for three years from the date of the conviction of holding any municipal office; and, if he holds any such office, the seat is vacated.

Furthermore, section 101 is titled "Treating". The honourable member for Townsville should speak to the people involved with Latitude 19. That section provides that any person who corruptly before, during, or after an election provides, or pays in whole or part the expense of providing, any food, drink, or lodging is also guilty of a misdemeanour. Even the poor chap who wins the contest, if he, being an elector, corruptly receives any food, drink or lodging on account of any such act or omission is guilty of a misdemeanour and is liable to imprisonment with hard labour for one year. He would receive a trip to Townsville, but it would be to Stuart Prison instead of Latitude 19. That is what this particular group is offering.

There are two good reasons why the police and the Attorney-General must act urgently in relation to this matter. At this time, unless the matter is sorted out and there is some apology, withdrawal or satisfactory agreement with the other candidates, any vote for Progress 88 will be a wasted vote. Anyone entering the contest runs the risk of winning the contest. It is one competition that a person would not want to win, because, if he wins, he is liable to one year's imprisonment at Stuart Prison. He will have a holiday in Townsville, but it will be at Government expense at Stuart Prison. I believe that most members of Progress 88 are unaware of the implications of their participation, mainly because of the naivety of their leader. At a State election he nailed signs on trees and had to pull them down because they had the Mayor's name as reference to them. He was not too happy about that. What a mug he is! He has done it again.

No-one has ever been offered a holiday before an election. I suppose that, as a travel agent, he thought it was a good idea. However, there is a good reason why it has not been offered previously. It is bribery under the Criminal Code and a criminal act in Queensland and every other State of the Commonwealth. The police and the Attorney-General must act very quickly on the matter.

Mr Muntz interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr CASEY: Do you support it?

Mr Muntz interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Gympie.

Animal Care

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (9.53 p.m.): There seems to be cross-fire in the Chamber at the moment. I am not sure if it is a part of the debate or a part of the entertainment.

I wish to speak about animals and the care of animals, whether they be pets or farm animals from which many people make a living. Many people have a great deal of affection for and know how to care for their animals. It does not matter whether they are milking cows, beef cattle or horses that are used either for farm work or in the field of entertainment on the trotting track, the pacing track or the galloping track, the owners of those animals know how to look after them.

It concerns me that at present an extremist point of view is being put forward. That point of view is not accepted by the people who enjoy animals as a part of their everyday working life. I refer particularly to the Fund for Animals Ltd, Australia group that is about to embark on what it claims to be an exciting but certainly far-reaching venture. That group's legal expert has drawn up a new Act—the National Animal Health Act—which will have the most far-reaching consequences for animals and their treatment of any other Act that has ever been passed in Australia's history.

The Fund for Animals was responsible for the drafting and presentation of the Wildlife Protection Act which was passed by the Fraser Government in 1982. That does not provide any great basis to support it. The proposed National Animal Health Act will go much further than that. The Act covers the treatment of all animals in Australia, both domestic and wild. It will be administered by the Federal Minister for the Environment under the National Animal Health Authority. Federal and regional inspectors will be appointed to control the treatment of animals being transported, used in zoos and horse-racing. It will cover the sale of animals and even whether they may be de-horned or de-beaked. Honourable members will now have an idea of the range that that group is expecting to cover.

Codes of practice will have to be submitted on the treatment of all animals and approved by the authority. Under the Act intensive farming will be banned, as will deer-farming, rodeos and circus animals. Circus animals, for instance, will have to be transferred to wildlife parks. No new zoos will be allowed. The importation of animals for zoos will be banned. All new stocks will have to come from the breeding of existing animals within captivity. Hunting will also be banned completely, as will jump racing, hurdling and steeple-chasing.

Another matter of concern is that dingoes will finally be granted status as protected wildlife and lethal control will be prohibited. Anyone who has had anything to do with dingoes or other wild animals will realise how much damage they cause and the danger that they pose not only to the population but also to the other animals that they hunt.

The sale of steel-jawed traps will also be abolished. The fur trade will come to a halt as the importation of furs will be prohibited. Ranching of fur-bearing animals will be banned, as will the trade in their skins. The commercial exploitation of kangaroos and other marsupials will also be prohibited. Battery chickens will be freed. They will not be allowed to be kept in the small areas in which they are kept at present. No de-beaking will be allowed. There is much more. It is said that the next step is to provide copies of the new proposed Act to all the animal welfare groups in Australia so that they may comment on it and revise it according to their advice.

That is just a minor example of what is in store not only for animals generally but for the community as a whole. I want to point out what people are likely to be in for and how much it will affect our treatment of animals generally, whether it be animals kept as pets or animals in the farm environment.

Local Authority Elections

Mr D'ARCY (Woodridge) (9.58 p.m.): Most honourable members are aware that on 19 March elections will be held throughout Queensland for the various local authorities. My own area of Logan City is an area that was created by this Government for political reasons. It has become the second-largest city in Queensland now, with a population of well over 100 000, recently surpassing the Gold Coast and Townsville City.

Logan City was created in the period 1977-78 by legislation. It was a throw-off by the National Party. It consisted of areas that the National Party no longer thought that it could win because of its holdings in the Beaudesert and Albert Shires. What occurred was that these areas were then formed into their own local authority area. As I have said, Logan City is now the second-largest city in Queensland.

The people of Logan City are tremendously proud of the fact that this area that the National Party virtually abandoned is today not only the second-largest city in this State but also finally starting to get some services. Unfortunately, because of the way in which it was designed, Logan City has tremendously high rates. Services were never provided. The Housing Commission was the biggest tenant of the region, and that has not changed.

On and off since the 1977-78 period, the Mayor of Logan City has been Fred Huntress. He has done a tremendous job for the people of Logan. Unfortunately, Fred is suffering health problems to such an extent that he is now in a wheelchair. He has

suffered two strokes. However, he is still standing for election and has promised the people of Logan that he will continue as their Mayor. As the local member of Parliament for the area, I find this quite pathetic. Fred has done a tremendous job for the people of Logan under difficult circumstances. However, he is now in the position in which certain people outside his influence are telling him that he should stand for the mayoralty.

It is not fair to him, to his family or to the city of Logan to continue when he knows, with his past record, that he is not in a position to continue to do the job. The people in the area understand that it is not possible for him to do so, and that is sad. I personally have asked him to withdraw from the race for the mayoralty in Queensland's second largest city. He is in a wheelchair and cannot do the job.

Mr Lingard: You only want Chris Murphy.

Mr D'ARCY: The member for Fassifern should not start, because at present the only other candidates involved from the conservative side are a single-interest man by the name of Golledge who has a development in the city, and Les Dawson, who has many times been a candidate.

Mr Lingard interjected.

Mr D'ARCY: He is a good supporter of the Labor Party. Logan is a city with a Labor base. In 1977-78, the National Party threw Logan off as a Labor city. The National Party said, "Let's get rid of it. It is no good to Beaudesert or Albert."

Finally, Logan city will be a Labor city. It will be controlled by the council with Chris Murphy as the mayor. At one stage, I was the only elected Labor member in the area. Now we have Wayne Goss, the member for Logan, who is the new Leader of the parliamentary Labor Party; David Beddall, who is the Federal member for Rankin; and Mary Crawford, the member for Forde in the House of Representatives. The only other member who encroaches upon Logan is the member for Fassifern, who is a National Party member. The city will change hands. It is a great disappointment to me that Fred Huntress, who has been a good mayor and who had done a great job for the city, will stand again as mayor and will fail.

Time expired.

Development in Bayfield National Park Region

Mr HINTON (Broadsound) (10.03 p.m.): I would like to take a few moments to bring to the attention of honourable members the developments in the Bayfield area north of Yeppoon. State Cabinet has announced the development of a national park, which has been sought for many, many years, and a major sand-mining project by RZ Mines to the north of that national park proposal is the subject of a feasibility study.

Tonight I would like to ask members of the Labor Party for their attitude towards those particular developments. The silence from the Labor Party relative to both the national park development and the sand-mining development has been deafening. Even though the sand-mining project is of not only regional and State importance but also national and international importance—such is the quality of the mineral deposits in that area—I have heard absolutely nothing from the Labor Party. In fact, the deposit is the fourth richest deposit of zircon, rutile, ilmenite and iron in the world and, should the project be developed, it will be one of the largest sand-mining operations in the world.

Mr Sherrin: The factions have not been able to agree yet.

Mr HINTON: The factions will have to get their act into gear because, as the local member, I want to know their position.

The national park proposal consists of about 8 800 hectares of national park stretching north from Corio Bay and covers some of the most beautiful parts of central Queensland. The area has some magnificent beaches. I point out that there is no mining proposal for any of the beaches. The mining proposal by RZ Mines is for the dunes that are

located quite a few kilometres inland from the beaches. If it comes to fruition, the proposal that the mining company has put forward will involve between \$600m and \$800m worth of development in Gladstone, where a processing works will be set up. Two mines will be set up inland from Stockyard Point. As a result, approximately 350 people will be employed at Gladstone and approximately 120 people will be employed on a permanent basis in the Yeppoon area and will live in the town of Yeppoon. That employment is important in an area that presently has 10 per cent unemployment.

If the project proceeds, approximately 300 megawatts of electricity, which is a fairly substantial amount, will be used. When one considers that the Callide A power station in the Biloela area generated approximately 250 megawatts in total, one can appreciate that the project is very substantial.

The project will produce approximately \$90m worth of minerals that, when processed, will be worth approximately \$200m to Australia in export earnings. The entire field contains approximately \$6 billion worth of mineral sands.

We are still wondering whether this project will be supported. Where does the Labor Party stand on this particular issue? Is it for it, against it, or does it not know that the project exists?

The Honourable Martin Tenni referred to Senator Richardson as the Minister for the dole. Senator Richardson visited the site of the project and said that the Federal Government may not grant export licences unless the project was better than anything that he had seen before. That is a fairly negative response at a time when Australia is in great difficulty in relation to export earnings. Senator Richardson is now changing his tune. Not one word has been uttered on the subject by the local Federal member, Mr Keith Wright. Not one word has been said by the honourable member for Port Curtis, whose electorate would benefit from between \$600m and \$800m of development. He has not said one word either for or against the project. The honourable members whose electorates encompass the area, namely, Mr Yewdale and Mr Braddy, have not said one word about the project. No doubt a great deal of the proceeds from that project would flow to their electorates. What is their position? We are still waiting to hear from them. Are they concerned about upsetting the conservationists and people who are seeking jobs? What are they on about? This project is of national and international significance, yet nothing has been said about it.

What does Mr Goss have to say about it? This House should demand from those people answers to that question. Where do they stand on this issue? In that way the people of my electorate and the people of Queensland will know what their position is.

Constitutional Commission

Mr BEANLAND (Toowong) (10.08 p.m.): On 6 October 1987 I rose in this Chamber to warn the Australian people about some of the outrageous proposals put forward by both the advisory committees to the Constitutional Commission and the Constitutional Commission itself. Tonight I intend to take that matter a little further.

Before I proceed, I believe that it is only fair that one considers some of the Labor Party proposals in this regard. I wish to refer particularly to those that relate to the Governor-General. A perusal of the Labor Party's platform, resolutions and rules as approved by the 37th national conference in Hobart in 1986 reveals that the Labor Party wants to destroy the role of the Governor-General.

We are going back to a rehash of that political crisis that faced the Labor Party in 1975. The ALP platform says—

“To define and limit the powers of the Governor-General so as to ensure that he or she acts in accordance with the advice of the Government enjoying the confidence of the House of Representatives.”

That immediately spells out two things. First of all, the Labor Party will radically alter the role of the Governor-General and, secondly, it will destroy any powers that the Senate might have. The advisory committee recommends that the Constitution be

amended so that all powers be exercised by the Governor-General in accordance with ministerial advice only except for reserve powers. I ask honourable members to take note of the words "reserve powers" because no definition of them is included in the proposed Constitution. They are clearly not defined.

Instead, the constitutional advisory committee recommends a statement of practices which would say how reserve powers are to be used. No mention is made of the status of the statement of practices. It is not spelt out. It is quite vague. It does not even say whether it will be contained in an Act of Parliament or simply spelt out in some government regulation or document.

The advisory committee recommends that the reserve powers should be reviewable by the courts, making the Governor-General in fact subordinate to the nation's courts. That would be a totally new role.

Out to stop the Governor-General from seeking advice alternative to that of the Prime Minister are the Labor Party and the Constitutional Commission, which is clearly the Labor Party's stooge.

The committee recommends that following a defeat in the House of Representatives on a motion of no confidence, the Prime Minister—and I ask everyone to listen to this—acting in good faith—one can imagine how a Prime Minister, after he has been defeated on the floor of the House, would be acting in good faith—advises the Governor-General to dissolve the House of Representatives or to send for a person whom the Prime Minister believes can form a Ministry which has the confidence of the House of Representatives, and that the Governor-General shall act on that advice. That certainly puts a lot of faith in the Prime Minister of the day. It leaves totally open to the Prime Minister of the day the option of calling an election or indicating to the Governor-General something other than what is the true situation. That completely freezes out the role of the Parliament and the role of the Senate. It destroys the power of the Senate to reject Bills, which of course is in the terms of the ALP platform.

If one looks at the Constitutional Commission itself, which is the other aspect that I want to address this evening, one notices that the secretary of the Constitutional Commission previously gained notoriety as secretary and director of research of the Australian Law Reform Commission. Back in January 1985, Mr Cuncliffe, the secretary, proposed that free heroin should be supplied to registered drug addicts. That proposal aroused enormous outcry among members of the community, including drug experts, who all wanted to have a piece of Mr Cuncliffe's hide. Not being content with destroying the role of the Australian Law Reform Commission, Mr Cuncliffe, a public servant, took on the role of mouthpiece. He also took on the role of mouthpiece for the advisory committees and the Constitutional Commission. He is going the same way now as he went as secretary and director of research of the Australian Law Reform Commission. He will certainly do the same harm to the proposals being put forward by the Constitutional Commission, proposals that are clearly a complete lift from the Labor Party platform.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BEANLAND: I would not complain about it. Members of the Labor Party know that it comes from their platform. They should be very pleased about it.

Time expired.

Effect of New South Wales Government's Action on Gold Coast Region

Mr GATELY (Currumbin) (10.13 p.m.): I wish to speak about what will happen on 19 March, but it will not relate to local government matters at all.

Mr De Lacy interjected.

Mr GATELY: I do not have anything written down as I do not need it. What I do have, though, are some facts and figures in relation to Mr Cox, the Minister for Public Works and Minister assisting the temporary Premier of New South Wales.

Recently he visited the Tweed Heads area and tried to con the fishermen. They are people who know a bit about many things and are wiser than most politicians would ever think of being. They were wise enough to know that Mr Cox was trying to pull a con. He was trying to con them that he would do what Mr Wran and his friend said some four years ago they would do. They were going to fix the bar at the Tweed. They were going to release the millions of cubic metres of sand that are hidden and held behind the stone wall that is called the Tweed bar and the entrance thereto.

Mr Beard: Public bar or private bar?

Mr GATELY: No. It was in the saloon bar, I think. The truth of the matter is——

Mr De Lacy interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Cairns is interjecting from a seat other than his own.

Mr GATELY: The honourable member does not display any of the refinement of the House, so let him stay there.

The point I make is that many cubic metres of sand is not being deposited on the beaches of the Gold Coast but rightfully should be there. Not only did the New South Wales Government steal the lighthouse from the electorate of the honourable member for Burdekin, but it has also stolen sand from the Gold Coast. The people of the Gold Coast want it back.

Members of the New South Wales Government come up to the Gold Coast every time an election takes place to say, "We'll release it." Someone said that the New South Wales Government should pull down the rock wall. What a brilliant effort! In its next move, the New South Wales Government got one of its little mates in Murwillumbah to say that it would put another opening in a little farther south. I have news for it.

The time has come for the Queensland Government to pull the gloves off and tell the New South Wales Minister that he will not get away with his cheap little con tricks. Thieves are locked up. He will finish up the same way as his friend Mr Jackson if he keeps going. I believe that the State Government should challenge the New South Wales Government in the courts in much the same way as the owner of private land can claim in respect of the effect on his property if somebody changes the levels of a watercourse.

The Premier of New South Wales cannot make up his mind whether he is the "Turramurra Terror", the "Tweed Heads Twinkler", or the "Rockdale Rock-thrower". He tried to con the people of New South Wales by claiming travelling expenses to come up and down every week-end to live in a unit and have a holiday at Tweed Heads. He conned the people of New South Wales. The facts of the matter are that all he did was con the people and take \$8,000—until he was found out. When he was found out, he said, "Oh goodness! I'll give it back." I say to him: give the Gold Coast back its sand and stop the rort that is going on.

Millions of dollars of the Gold Coast City Council's rate-payers' money is being wasted pumping the sand from the seabed back to where it should have been in the first place. The scungy Labor friends of the Opposition are saying to the people of the Gold Coast, "Why don't you spend some money and fix the beaches?" I will tell the New South Wales Government how to fix the beaches. It can fix up the problem by putting in a pumping system that will bring the sand back to where it should be and it can stop stealing Queensland's sand. The people of the Gold Coast are no longer prepared to put up with its conduct. The Premier of New South Wales should get those facts straight. He might also start to spend some of the money that ought to have been spent on the by-pass at Tweed Heads after the Queensland Government committed itself to spending \$3.5m to do its share.

The Queensland Government has done its part; let the New South Wales Government do its part. It should stop telling the fibs that it is telling. The people of the Gold Coast

are no longer prepared to put up with the treatment they are receiving. The people of Coolangatta are no longer prepared to put up with the heavy transport vehicles that are being forced to go through the area. It is time that Labor Governments started to play fair and stopped telling the great fibs that they are telling the people who live in the area, because they will not put up with it any longer.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.