

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 24 APRIL 1979

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 24 APRIL 1979

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. J. E. H. Houghton, Redcliffe) read prayers and took the chair at 11 a.m.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Assent to the following Bills reported by Mr. Speaker:—

Queensland Marine Act Amendment Bill;
Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act Amendment Bill;
Miners' Homestead Leases Act Amendment Bill;
Coal Mining Act Amendment Bill;
State Housing Act and Another Act Amendment Bill.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S SEPARATE REPORT

ACCOUNTS OF STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE (QUEENSLAND), THE STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION OF QUEENSLAND AND ELECTRICITY AUTHORITIES

Mr. SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Auditor-General of his separate report on the accounts of the State Government Insurance Office (Queensland), The State Electricity Commission of Queensland and electricity authorities for the financial year 1977-78.

Ordered to be printed.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

RESIGNATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that vacancies exist on the Standing Orders Committee consequent upon the resignations of Sir William Knox and Mr. Thomas James Burns from that committee.

Hon. T. G. NEWBERRY (Mirani—Leader of the House): I move—

“That Dr. Llewellyn Roy Edwards, member for the electoral district of Ipswich, and Mr. Edmund Denis Casey, member for the electoral district of Mackay, be appointed members of the Standing Orders Committee to fill the vacancies caused by the resignations of Sir William Knox and Mr. Burns.”

Motion agreed to.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

Harbours Act 1955-1978.

Racing and Betting Act 1954–1978.

Land Act 1962–1978.

Regulation under the Queensland Marine Act 1958–1975.

By-law under the Water Act 1926–1976.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

DEMOLITION OF BELLEVUE BUILDING

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Labour Relations) (11.6 a.m.):

I should like to write into the record the requirement of the law as regards demolitions and the role of my departmental officers in relation to the Bellevue demolition.

Section 41 of the Construction Safety Act authorises the chief inspector of construction work on application in writing by a constructor to approve of the method by which work is to be done and any construction equipment is to be used.

Regulation 10 (13), which is based on section 41 of the Act, provides that where approval is given pursuant to the provisions of section 41 demolition work may be carried out by mechanical methods then, subject to the following conditions:—

- * A zone of demolition be maintained;
- * No point in the zone of demolition to be at a lesser distance to the point of impact than $1\frac{1}{2}$ times the height of the building being demolished;
- * A person other than a workman not to be permitted to enter the zone;
- * The mechanical device to be located and operated from a safe distance from the point of impact; and
- * The chief inspector may grant a permit for demolition. It is not necessary for removal of windows or the construction of catch platforms under the requirements of the Act for this type of demolition when it is demonstrated that the zone of demolition is adequate for public safety.

That is the position in law and all these requirements were met. The “constructor” was Doug Sim Enterprises Pty. Ltd. of 27 Moore Street, Albion, and on 20 April 1979 that company made written application to the chief inspector of construction work requesting permission to carry out the demolition of a building known as the Bellevue Hotel at the corner of Alice and George Streets, Brisbane, by the use of mechanical means.

The company gave an undertaking in writing to comply with all the requirements prescribed by regulation 10 (13) of the Construction Safety Act. This application was received at 3 p.m. on Friday, 20 April, at my department.

Officers of my department had received oral advice from an officer of the Works Department at about 9 a.m. on 20 April that the contract for demolition had been let to Doug Sim Enterprises Pty. Ltd., with an intimation that the demolition was to be carried out by mechanical method at about 11 p.m. that night; as a result of that advice, an inspection was carried out at the site at 11 a.m. on Friday by a senior inspector of construction work.

Section 38 of the Construction Safety Act also requires the constructor not to commence any construction work that is notifiable work unless he has first notified the chief inspector as prescribed. This form, together with the prescribed fee of \$80, was also received at the same time as the letter referred to above.

Section 39 of the Act requires such notification to be given in the prescribed form to the chief inspector at least 24 hours before the time when it is intended to commence the work. In this instance the constructor did not give the required 24 hours’ notice in the prescribed form and consideration is being given to prosecuting the company for a breach of section 39 of the Act. However, in view of the fact that section 40 of the Act may afford some defence to this breach, I have asked my department to seek the views of the Solicitor-General before proceeding with any prosecutory action.

Following the inspection of the site by inspectors of construction, work approval was issued by the chief inspector at 5.30 p.m. on Friday for the work to be carried out provided such work was in accordance with regulation 10 (13) of the Construction Safety Regulations.

The chief inspector, accompanied by the senior inspector and another inspector, was on the site at 11 p.m. that night, all remaining on the site till 3.40 a.m. on Saturday. From that time onwards inspectors rostered themselves so that there was one inspector on the site at all times until 2 a.m. on Sunday morning.

Media statements of damage to a machine and narrow escape from injury to a driver were completely incorrect. The facts are

that a portion of the building that had been demolished collapsed on the extreme end of the jib of the machine, doing some damage to the hydraulic hoses, but no portion of the falling debris reached any area adjacent to the operator's cabin.

I am advised by my officers that during demolition the requirements of the Act were carried out by the contractors in a safe and workmanlike manner with good mechanical equipment and efficient operators. I should also add that my department strictly adhered to the requirements of the Act in its issuing of a permit and is to be congratulated on the supervision throughout the night and until the following day of operations on the site.

Mr. Speaker, I table a copy of the constructor's application and the approval given by the chief inspector.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the documents on the table.

METHODS OF CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC
BUILDINGS; AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Minister for Works and Housing) (11.12 a.m.): I make a further ministerial statement to finally dismiss the accusations of the Leader of the Opposition that I supplied false information to the House when replying to a question on 10 April 1979.

It is apparent that the honourable member is trying to save face by changing his story. It is significant that for the first time he now refers to the copy held by him as being a draft report and not a copy of the actual Works Department report submitted to the former Auditor-General.

The draft report, although marked "Confidential", was only a working document for use within my Department of Works. It was a draft report, and the remarks quoted on Transport House represented an opinion of a departmental officer—a draft report that was subsequently rejected by a special departmental committee that reviewed it—and it definitely did not represent the views of my department. As stated previously, the views of my department were contained in the genuine report submitted to the then Auditor-General, part of which was as outlined in the "Certified True" copy which I tabled on Tuesday, 17 April

1979, and as stated in my answer on Tuesday, 10 April 1979, in relation to Transport House.

I do not propose to table the remainder of this confidential document. However, if the honourable member will table the complete document in his possession and disclose the source from which he obtained the stolen property, I will give consideration to tabling the genuine document forwarded by my department to the then Auditor-General.

No doubt the House would be aware that the Leader of the Opposition was previously a contractor and would be an expert in any malpractices within the building game, but I can assure honourable members that the Government takes all precautions to avoid such practices being introduced into contracts let for building works.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that no evidence has been submitted to substantiate that I have supplied "false information" to the House, and as the Leader of the Opposition has now admitted that he was only quoting from a draft report and not my department's official report submitted to the then Auditor-General, I ask that the honourable member withdraw his remarks that I supplied false information to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has heard the submission made by the Minister. I ask him to withdraw the remarks.

Mr. CASEY: I seek leave to make a short personal explanation in relation to this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable gentleman to withdraw the remarks, and I will then deal with the matter of the personal explanation.

Mr. CASEY: I seek leave to make a personal explanation now.

Mr. SPEAKER: I might give the honourable member leave, but before doing so, I ask him to withdraw the remark.

Mr. CASEY: In his remarks, the Minister referred to the fact that I commented on a draft report. I did make comments in relation to a draft report. If the Minister finds that anything I have stated, other than my comments in relation to the draft report, is offensive, I withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I shall now deal with the other matter raised by the honourable member. Is he asking for leave to make a personal explanation?

Mr. CASEY: Yes.

(Leave granted.)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CASEY (Mackay—Leader of the Opposition) (11.16 a.m.): In his ministerial statement, the Minister for Works and Housing clearly indicated that within his department there are two reports relating to various works, including Transport House and other contractual works undertaken by his department over the years. It is clear that they relate also to various buildings that were purchased by the Government and came under the control of the Department of Works as inspecting authority. The draft report that was compiled by his department, to which I referred in the House on 18 April, came to me from a source outside the Public Service.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. Is the honourable member in order in making a speech on this subject?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is making a personal explanation. I have granted him leave to do so. I do not want a speech.

Mr. CASEY: As I was about to mention, I referred in my personal explanation on 18 April to a draft report that clearly reflects the opinion of the Works Department in relation to the standard of buildings purchased by the Government and criticism of the Government in relation to the way in which certain transactions were carried out. The remarks within that report then became some of the recommendations in the Sewell report, which was submitted to Cabinet. I am quite happy to accept the Minister's invitation to table the draft report, and will do so when he tables his draft report and also a copy of the Sewell report.

Mr. WHARTON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—I have asked for a withdrawal of the remark. What the honourable member has said since has not detracted in any way from the value of the evidence that I have submitted to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Minister asked for a withdrawal of certain comments and they have been withdrawn. As far as I am concerned, the matter is finished.

DEMOLITION OF BELLEVUE BUILDING

Mr. GYGAR (Stafford) (11.18 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That this House condemns the precipitate and unannounced way the demolition of the Bellevue Hotel was commenced on the night of Friday, 20 April 1979."

In moving this motion, I emphasise to the House that it relates not to the fact that the building was demolished, not to the fact that it was pulled down—that is an entirely separate issue—but to the way in which it was pulled down, to the methods that were adopted and to the incidents that occurred on that night.

Mr. Wright: What? Do you want to use a shanghai or something?

Mr. GYGAR: I welcome the interjection, as it indicates quite clearly that the honourable member has absolutely no concern for what occurred on that evening.

Mr. Wright interjected.

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

Mr. GYGAR: As honourable members may well be aware, I am somewhat irate about what occurred on that night. Because I was there and saw what happened, I must be.

I saw a semi-trailer driven through a crowd and a policeman, in the execution of his duty, knocked down; I saw a young woman also run down by a semi-trailer. I saw a group of people arrive at that building in a way that is reminiscent of some of the worst pages from the history of the fall of the Roman Empire.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The next member who interjects will be dealt with under Standing Order 123A.

Mr. GYGAR: I welcome the interjections, Mr. Speaker, because they show where honourable members stand on this issue.

I do not think the motion requires extensive debate or elaboration on my part. It speaks for itself. I invite every member to indicate his attitude to the methods and procedures that were adopted to bring this building down.

If it had to come down there were other better, less precipitous, less hasty ways of doing it, ways that had more respect for the dignity of human life and, I believe, more respect for public property. Any honourable member who cares to walk past that building site this morning will see the wreckage of parking meters, and traffic signs and traffic indicators that were either destroyed or badly damaged by this inept operation.

I do not intend to speak at length. I want to allow other honourable members an opportunity to demonstrate to the House, and to the people of Queensland, whether or not they stand for or against this type of operation. The decision is theirs, and the public will judge them accordingly.

There is, however, one group in this Parliament with which I sympathise. Its members will be unable to support this motion, even if they feel inclined to do so.

Mr. Jones: That is the Liberal Party.

Mr. GYGAR: I point out to the interjector that in all probability members of the Liberal Party will be the only ones in this House who will have the opportunity to vote exactly as they feel. By now, undoubtedly the Labor Party has cracked the whip over its members and, as is usual and as has been the case in every division in this House since 1957, every member of the Labor Party will do what he is told and vote how he is told.

The members of this House with whom I sympathise are the Liberal Cabinet Ministers. Under the principle of Cabinet solidarity, they are obliged to support the Government. They are obliged, as members of the Government, to support all actions of that Government. I do not attack them in any way for having to vote on those lines. I should hope that the public of Queensland will be acquainted with the fact that, as members of the Government, they are obliged to support that Government or get out.

Mr. Hinze: Aren't you a member of the Government?

Mr. GYGAR: The honourable gentleman asks if I am a member of the Government. Of course I am not. As everyone who has studied this subject knows, the Executive Government of this State is in fact the Cabinet. I am a member of the Liberal Party which is in coalition with

another party and which supports that Government. But I am not a member of the Government. Members of Cabinet are, and therefore they are under an obligation. They have no choice in this matter; their duty calls on them to support it. I recognise that duty. I sympathise with them and I know—and everyone in Queensland should know—how they will vote. I recognise that fact quite clearly.

The question that this motion poses is quite clear; it is unequivocal. It is this: do members of this House support, or not support, what occurred in Brisbane around midnight on Friday? That is the question they are asked. Let the people of Queensland see how they vote on the issue.

Mrs. KYBURZ (Salisbury) (11.23 a.m.): I have pleasure in seconding the motion because I believe that now is the flash-point for the coalition parties. I do not know whether or not those members who chose to deride the honourable member for Stafford were present when those iniquitous events took place on Friday night or Saturday morning. If they had been there, I am sure that some of the events that took place would have totally and absolutely shocked them. Some of the criticisms that have been levelled at this Government in the past now stick—and they stick like dung on rotten walls.

So far as I am concerned a lot of questions have to be answered. We have not heard the answers because in so many ways the Premier backs away; he back-tracks and changes direction, and he unmitigatedly bends the truth. I have considered the tack by which this Government will now try to change direction. Probably it will call out its wild dogs in their hunting packs, who will yap around our heels and start barking about what they see us doing or not doing. The fact is that we are concerned about the manner in which the demolition took place. We went there at half past 10 at night, totally unconvinced that anything was to happen. I went there because I could not believe it. I had heard rumours around the city.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mrs. KYBURZ: It is all very well for National Party members to crow, laugh and jeer. Did they believe that the stealthy, sly, snide manner in which that demolition took place was to occur? Do they now believe or disbelieve that in fact Simsmetal has been coerced into signing a letter to say that it

made the decision on when the demolition would take place? We have not heard that statement refuted. We have not heard a lot of statements refuted.

I should like to know why the Commissioner of Police seemed to be totally unaware that in fact additional police had been rostered on duty from 12 o'clock midnight on Friday until about 2 o'clock on Saturday afternoon. In fact, almost 200 policemen were at that site at 3 o'clock in the morning. Where were the policemen from the remainder of the city? What were they doing? Why, at 4.30 in the morning, were there lines and lines of police when, at that time, only about 50 people were still there? Everyone had gone home in utter disbelief.

There is fear in this city, and the fear in this city is occasioned not precisely by the demolition of the Bellevue but by the way in which it was done. I am totally concerned that people see that the way in which that demolition was done was as a result of the decision of one man.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mrs. KYBURZ: They can shake and they can nod.

I realise what happened in the joint party room and I realise the way the Premier neatly, carefully and slyly points the finger back. But it does not go over the heads of the intelligent people in this State. The manner in which the Premier has tried to divide this State, has tried to divide the attitudes of people in this State, has exacerbated the differences between the country and the city, and has exacerbated the political differences of people in this State, has not gone over the heads of the country residents of this State, because, slowly but surely, they are hearing of the deceitful way in which this Government governs this State. Whether or not we actually have to go round the country more and tell people what is happening, I do not know.

I feel extremely fearful for those good members of the National Party, those members who I believe have principles. The unfortunate aspect is that those members are being covered in muck and slime that is being perpetuated by certain members of the Cabinet who do not share their autocratic decisions with the remainder of them.

I ask: Why do we bother with a Cabinet of 18 men when one man can make the decision, when one man obviously had already made the decision two weeks ago?

Why do we bother with a joint party meeting, a joint party meeting which was obviously a charade, an absolute, total charade? As far as I am concerned we are tired of being the puppets of the Premier and this puppet theatre is about to pack up and go home.

Mr. Hinze: When are you going home, Rosie?

Mrs. KYBURZ: I accept the interjection of the Minister for Local Government because I understand that he would be extremely gratified to see the thorns in his side, albeit a large side, disappear from this House. He has, on occasions, displayed good nature; the other displays have not been so good natured.

It is not, however, a personal matter. I realise that this whole issue will be turned into one of total, unmitigated, vicious attack. I know the way that members of this Government think and I know the way that the Premier's mind works. He will muck-rake, he will do everything he can to discredit not only the Liberal Party but all other people who criticise him.

I have not yet heard that the Premier has made statements about the Very Reverend Dean George, but it will surprise me if by the hour Dean George has not been branded a Communist, a radical or something else. In fact, it will absolutely astound me if he has not. But why would the Premier bother doing it today? He will simply be able to say, "I said what I think of that man six months ago."

He has used this sort of personal denigration against his critics again and again and again, and it is time that we did not sit silently by and allow it. It is a tragic state of affairs that in fact the Government has not been able to sit still and listen to its critics. But my main concern with this issue is the future of democracy.

In the latest issue of "The Sunday Mail" the Premier was reported as having made a statement that began, "We're here to govern", which was so typical of the man. The whole crux of the statement was that he does not care what anybody else thinks. He has made up his mind. It does not matter that we are supposed to be a Parliament; it does not matter that we are supposed to represent our electorates; what matters is that two weeks ago the Premier made up his mind that the Bellevue was going to come down. I believe the Premier made

up his mind two weeks ago when the Bellevue was going to come down. I also believe that he made up his mind two weeks ago that in fact there would be hundreds of police there to enforce an illegal demolition.

I have yet to see a demolition permit. At 1 a.m. on Friday night I asked Superintendent Voigt to allow me to see the permit. He had to push through three lines of police to speak to me. Both Opposition and Government members were present, and we asked the inspector from the Works Department to show us the demolition permit. His answer was rude, to say the least. I am treating him kindly when I say that because, after all, he is only a public servant. However, he refused to discuss the matter. He refused to show us the demolition permit. In fact, he said he did not have one to show us, and even if he did he would not have shown it to us.

We then asked an officer of the Police Department to enforce the law as far as demolition permits are concerned. Superintendent Voigt was placed in an embarrassing position because he realised that any action he took would in fact—

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mrs. KYBURZ: Well, it would not be against the Government, but it would perhaps militate against his future in the Police Force; it is as simple as that. Furthermore, the fact that there were so many Special Branch officers mingling with the crowd was, I believe, a very important factor in the crowd's remaining so level-headed. After all, some of them were embarrassed to be there. We had conversations with some very sane young police officers, who said that they were sorry to see this happening but that it was their duty to be there. They were incensed at the way a truck roared into the crowd and knocked people over—and they were ordinary, conservative people. I know that attempts will be made to paint the people there as various things, and members know it. They will be ratbag conservationists, Communists, radicals and any other damn label that the Premier happens to be able to come up with for those who do not suit his brand of Far Right-wing politics. The point is that there were some very conservative people present. I recognised at least 15 professional people from the city. Dean George was there—

Mr. Frawley: That's a great recommendation! How many boys did he have with him?

Mr. K. J. Hooper: What a filthy thing to say about a respectable man of God. How dare you!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Archerfield will cease interjecting.

Mrs. KYBURZ: Despite the derision of that "gentleman", I was going to say that Dean George was there not as a member of the church but as a private citizen who was very concerned about what was going on. To a person, all of us there were quite overcome at the way in which the whole incident demonstrated to us the fact that there is a need for fear in this State. There is no doubt that the heavy-handed autocratic dictatorship, and the way in which it is being perpetrated in this State, have to be pointed out to the public again and again and again, and we will do it. If this motion today is hurting anyone or anyone's feelings, or making anyone prickly, he had better get ready for more pricks.

I guarantee now that this Government will be too afraid to keep this House sitting for very long, because something like this will happen again and again and again. We are not going to allow it to go on. So many things have been said by the Premier over the last few days, and that is unfortunate, because I believe that in fact he genuinely believes that what he is doing is right. There is no doubt about that. But the thing that concerns me is the manner in which his decision-making processes occur.

He has said many things on television. He gave a Press conference yesterday afternoon and told the reporters that they were stupid. He told another reporter that he should get back to short pants, because he asked a question that the Premier did not like. I think that that is a very interesting way in which to point up one's personality. The Premier also said in the particular report to which I have referred—

"We are here to govern, to make decisions, and once our decisions have been made, they will be carried out."

I object to the term "they". The decision to demolish the Bellevue at 12 o'clock on Friday night was not made by "them". I also call into dispute the way in which the contract was let. That work was not awarded by correct tendering. Tenders are called to allay any suspicions of conspiracy or the handing over of money or favours being given. I am trying to say this nicely,

but it is dashed hard to do so. The point is that the contract was awarded by telephone on Thursday. I believe that the Works Minister did not order the contract to be let—and I have only his word for that. I believe that in fact he was instructed to order the contract to be let.

On Thursday, there was also a flying Cabinet minute, which allowed for the expenditure of \$40,000 for the demolition. Why was the decision made to carry out the demolition so rapidly? Why could not it have waited for a few weeks? Why could it not have waited so that people could have realised slowly but surely that the plans for the parliamentary precincts in fact might have satisfied them in the end.

There is no doubt that there was a deliberate attempt to ram through precisely what the Premier had already decided two weeks ago—and I would be very happy to hear him refute that. As I have said before, I do believe that there is very little point in Cabinet because, after all, if the other members of the Executive do not have their say why do they bother to be consulted when in fact they are just going to be railroaded by numbers?

The other thing that concerns me is that in fact the word "democracy" in this State is dying a slow, painful, lingering death from a malignant cancer. In fact, the Government is here to carry out the consensus of the majority of the population and not to do or not to do what it sees fit at a particular time. There is no doubt also that divisions have been deliberately created in this State to show people in the country and in the city what each party believes they ought to be shown.

I have realised that there is a great feeling in North Queensland that the National Party has let down the people there. There is equally a great feeling that in fact there are many caring members of the National Party, and I have at times spoken up for them whenever and wherever I could. It has given me a great deal of pleasure to visit their areas, because they are genuinely concerned about the interests of their electorates.

There is no doubt that there has been a deliberate attempt to perpetuate the mentality of divide and rule, and that mentality is used in simplistic statements which are, of course, guaranteed to take in the nincompoop non-thinker. Fortunately, there are now too many educated people to tolerate that absolute hog-wash. There are also too many people—

and they are all over the State—who are seeing through, and seeing very clearly through, this veiled curtain of dissent.

The fact is that, because there are so many caring members of the Government, it is sometimes difficult to explain to those members precisely what has been occurring. Of course, it behoves the National Party to make its own decisions about leadership. I am concerned about the manner in which the decision was taken for the demolition of the Bellevue on Friday night. It was totally, unashamedly undemocratic.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The following motion has been moved by the honourable member for Stafford and seconded by the honourable member for Salisbury:—

"That this House condemns the precipitate and unannounced way the demolition of the Bellevue Hotel was commenced on the night of Friday, 20 April 1979."

The matter is now open for discussion.

Mr. CASEY (Mackay—Leader of the Opposition) (11.42 a.m.): The motion now before the House is very unusual and comes from a very unusual source. Let me say at the outset that there is one point on which I differ very strongly from the honourable member for Salisbury, who said that the action of the National Party over the week-end was something that disgusted the people of Queensland and that the National Party had let down the people of Queensland. I strongly dispute that comment because the action of the National Party was predictable and I believe that it was the members of the Liberal Party who let down the people of Queensland last week-end. Thank goodness there are some members of the Liberal Party who do have a little intestinal fortitude and who speak up on this issue; but the major responsibility for last week-end's action must indeed lie fairly and squarely at the feet of the leader of the Liberal Party and the other members of the Liberal Party in the coalition. Perhaps I should use the term that I have used recently—the Joh-alition.

It is desirable to have this debate in the Parliament this morning because it brings the sad, sneaky affair across the road out of the midnight shadows of Alice Street and onto the floor of this Assembly, where it rightly belongs. It is now brought into the daylight, and all members should be given an opportunity to take part in the debate on it. I sincerely hope that the National-Party-controlled Government does not follow its normal

practice of trying to apply the gag on such an important motion. Today, all members should be given a chance to show their contempt for a form of Government that orders in bulldozers and sledge-hammers under police guard, while the city sleeps, to smash our heritage and flatten our rights of dissent. The shame of the Bellevue is the shame of this Government, and its loss is Queensland's loss.

Last week, in sections of the National Party and Liberal Party there was fanatical impatience to violently bash and blast this historic building from the landscape of Queensland. This is the building that the Government's own consultants described in 1974 as "a charming, uniquely Australian design, built in the 1880s".

Those consultants—the Brisbane architects, Lund, Hutton, Newell, Paulsen Pty. Ltd., assisted by the Chicago planners, Skidmore, Owings and Merrill—went on to say—

"Over the years, successive owners went to great lengths to prevent the destruction of the original architectural character."

What those past owners spent generations in preserving, this Government in a few hours over the week-end savagely and arrogantly tore apart. Its actions can be described as nothing short of moonlight political vandalism and this alley-cat style of government is something that members should censure in the strongest possible terms.

Within 60 hours of a private decision arrived at by the joint Government parties—I stress "joint Government parties"—the wreckers were ordered into the Bellevue, under the direction and guidance of the greatest wrecker of them all—"Wharton the wrecker", the Minister for Works and Housing.

We had the midnight spectacle of assistance in the destruction given by Deen Bros., a firm that has been accused in the courts of this State of various charges. Recently publicity was given to the slave-labour camp that it conducted and to other activities. The members of the firm were the only persons the Government could get hold of to carry out its destructive mechanism.

It is pointless for the Government to try to blame the contractors for the timing of the demolition. We all know of the manner in which Works Department contracts are allocated. We all know of the way in which specifications—if they were adhered to—are

followed. We all know that special approval must be obtained to carry out such work outside normal hours.

The truth is that the clearance order for the destruction of the Bellevue was required from the Works Department, not from Deen Bros, Sim Enterprises or any other contractor. As we heard this morning from the Minister for Labour Relations, this approval did not come until 5.30 on Friday afternoon, at a time when it was too late for anyone to organise any public protest against the way in which the Government was conducting its affairs and activities.

The Government claimed that the contractor decided on the 11 p.m. start. It claims it did not decide, as the Minister for Labour Relations said, at 5.30 in the afternoon. If the contractor made the decision and ordered his workmen onto the site at that time, who ordered the police onto the site at that time? Are we to believe that the contractor also ordered the police in at that time?

Another aspect I want to draw to the attention of the House is that this contract is alleged to involve the sum of \$40,000. If that is so, such a contract must have the blessing of Cabinet before it can proceed. This morning we were told that a Cabinet minute was circulated on Thursday and that it was signed by a number of Liberal Ministers in the Johalation who gave their blessing to this work. As I said earlier, a Works Department contract of this nature specifies that the work shall be carried out during normal working hours. Such a contract can be varied only by the approval of either the Minister for Works or the permanent head of the department. I feel quite sure that on this issue the permanent head would not have given his approval. He would have been aware of its political ramifications. I say unhesitatingly that that approval could have been given by only one person, that is, the Minister for Works and Housing.

Mrs. Kyburz: He was not here.

Mr. CASEY: It certainly was not given by the contractor. If the Minister was not here, we can only assume that it was the Premier who gave approval. He is the only one who could supersede the authority of the Minister on this matter.

Mr. Hinze: Sherlock Holmes.

Mr. CASEY: No matter what the Minister for Local Government, other Ministers and members of the National Party may care to

say about this action, which they support, there is no question that it was an arrogant and political action that was typical of so many others that have been taken by the National Party, which could not care less about the city of Brisbane—its past, its present, or its future. The Liberal Party, which supports it, is nothing more than a passenger in the coalition Government of Queensland.

Of all the stories that I heard over the week-end, the one that I became sick and tired of hearing was that the Treasurer, as Liberal leader, was again shocked and appalled. A few weeks ago he was shocked and appalled in London when the decision was made to abolish road transport fees. But when he returned to Queensland he agreed with the Government's action. While in Perth over the week-end, he was shocked and appalled about what happened at midnight on Friday, but when he arrived back in Brisbane, he was prepared to knuckle under to whatever the Premier and other National Party Ministers decided on this issue.

I say to members of the Liberal Party today, "Make up your minds; you cannot be in a coalition Government and in Opposition at the same time. Make up your minds where you are going; be in one or the other." The first challenge to be met by the Liberal leader is the decision he has to make on where he stands on this issue. He must make up his mind; that is the way politics are run and organised, and that is how it should be. He has to make up his mind one way or the other. He cannot have a foot in both camps. He cannot be on both sides of the fence on every occasion when he believes that issues are unfavourable to his supporters. I think that the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads would agree with my comments.

Mr. Hinze: I would not agree with you on anything.

Mr. CASEY: I thank the Minister very much. It is very good to know that I do not have him on side.

It is obvious that the Treasurer, as leader of the Parliamentary Liberal Party, and his Liberal Ministers are always obedient to their National Party masters. We are led to believe that the Parliamentary Liberal Party as a whole—that is, the eight Liberal Ministers and the 16 Liberal back-benchers—had no knowledge of the impending destruction until the last moment. I do not accept that, par-

ticularly in the light of what has been said by some Liberal members today. Nor can we believe the alternative, that is, that certain Liberal Ministers and members were informed, but that they neglected to pass on their knowledge to their leader, who was away in Perth. Is that the alternative? That is what the leader of the Liberal Party tried to indicate to us.

I think that in Parliament today we should get a straight answer from the Treasurer, as leader of the Liberal Party—a political leader who pretends to be No. 2 in the coalition Government. He should state unequivocally whether he knew that this contract for demolition, which required Cabinet sanction, had been let to Sim Enterprises or that this information also was kept secret from him. It appears to me, judging by the Treasurer's statements, that he, as No. 2 in the Government, knows very little from time to time about what is going on in the coalition Government.

As I said earlier, the Premier is quite predictable. He is predictable in his aggressive contempt for the environmental ambitions of Queenslanders. He is quite unrepentant for his part in the sneaky devastation of the Bellevue. This Premier, whose ideal in conservation is oil drills on the Barrier Reef and sand-mining in the coloured sands, suddenly over the week-end proclaims himself as the judge and jury of our heritage in this State. The Bellevue is the latest episode in an alarming decline in Government standards that has been accelerating for some time without any reproach from the Liberal Party except an occasional lame objection from the Treasurer, usually when he is safely outside Queensland.

The Liberal Party in this Parliament is not only unable but unwilling to stand up for the principles that it cynically professes. It is prepared to abandon our heritage and desert the people of Queensland rather than offend the Premier of this State. It is prepared to abandon our heritage in this way as it did through its Cabinet members and so many supporters of the Liberal Party over the week-end.

"The Courier-Mail" this morning contains a letter headed "Liberals fail on Bellevue". It was written by the vice-chairman of the Toowong Liberal Branch, who is Mr. C. D. Gilbert, I understand. The author not only disowns his own Liberal member,

the Minister for Aboriginal and Island Affairs, but also the remainder of his parliamentary colleagues.

As I said, this is the latest chapter in what is a frightening fall in the normally accepted standards of government in Queensland. It is one that came out very clearly to the people over the week-end. We in this Parliament have brought forward example after example. Maybe they have not permeated through to the people, but the way in which the Bellevue was destroyed over the week-end was a clear indication to the people of Queensland of this frighteningly poor standard of government. There is the Port of Brisbane contract, which we have been talking about and which was let against expert advice on the basis of a report that cannot be released by a committee that cannot be named. A similar story applies to Tarong, where an expert report compiled over years on the submissions of more than 20 departments or subdepartments was overturned.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will come back to the motion.

Mr. CASEY: I could go on, and refer to the street march laws. We found plenty of people coming in over the week-end and blocking off the streets of Brisbane to suit the purposes of the Government. Time after time when the street march issue was raised—even when people applied for permits to march along what are normally deserted streets on a Saturday afternoon—the Premier and the Government said, “No, you cannot have a permit, because you will be disrupting the traffic.” Yet this Government, to carry out its devices, moved in over the week-end and completely blocked off one of the major city blocks to all traffic. That is indeed typical of the way in which this Government has been operating.

Liberal Party members here today must show without any sidesteps whether the Bellevue is the last straw or whether the perks and lurks of coalition captivity are preferable to pride and principles. It is no good their slinking away today with all the old complaints and excuses. This is their chance to let the National Party, in particular the Premier, know in the bluntest possible terms that enough is enough. This is the time to take the stand to let him know that his Government is answerable to the people through this Parliament—not divinely exclusive of both of them as he believes.

No Parliament with an ounce of conscience can tolerate a situation in which the police are ordered into the streets by the Government in the heart of night to legalise the political vandalism of our heritage. We learn now that, in the disorganised haste and destruction, industrial safety laws in relation to scaffolding were abused and valuable Brisbane City Council traffic equipment damaged. Police, under Government orders, held back protesting Queenslanders as the contractors tore down the walls of this building, which design consultants in 1974 said reflects “the graciousness of another era”.

What kind of Government is that, a Government that, in its own actions, is prepared to completely disregard the law? It is certainly not the way of life that we used to enjoy and treasure in our State of Queensland and I believe that it is not the way of life that Queenslanders want for the future. The Bellevue is down and gone—it is finished and the books on it can be closed—but its destruction and the sneaky, despicable way in which it was carried out, must be declared by this Parliament today as the symbol throughout Queensland for the campaign to bring clean, decent government back to our State.

The Premier appears to imagine he is the National Trust of Queensland and the Liberal Party, through its leadership, is willing to permit him the luxury of his delusions. Are there to be more “Bellevues”? Are there to be more examples of Government savagery against our historical assets in the depth of the night?

In this sorry, shadowy affair the Government has sanctioned wilful destruction, damage to local authority equipment and, as I mentioned, the flagrant abuse of its own industrial safety laws.

The response of the Premier, and even the Minister for Labour Relations, to these matters has been to congratulate the contractors on their wreckage, even though they broke laws which section 4 (3) of the Construction Safety Act 1974 clearly says bind the Crown. At this stage we in the Opposition are investigating this matter, and I intend to raise it officially with the Justice Minister.

We may perhaps be the first to test the recent controversial amendments to the Justices Act by going to the Minister for Justice and seeking leave to commence a prosecution against the Minister for Works and Housing as nominal defendant for the Government in this matter. He is the man

whose department has been responsible for this destruction and he must be nominal defendant for the breaches alleged in this instance. The other people involved may have to be connected with him as well. Then we will be able to see whether this Government, which cynically claims that the law applies equally to all, is prepared to apply the principle to which it pretends to adhere.

The Opposition believes that the destruction of the Bellevue, in particular the snide, shadowy way in which it was executed, has shocked the State. On that point I would agree with the honourable member for Salisbury. I have been in country areas all over the week-end, and I can say that the destruction of the Bellevue has shocked the whole State. It has brought home to Queenslanders the violent manner in which our State is being governed, without tolerance, without appeal and without reprieve.

It is sad that, as we approach the 1980s, the State is headed by a Government that, instead of meeting the challenges of the future, seems intent on erasing the memories of the past—in the case of the Bellevue, the 1880s. The events of last week-end—those hours of midnight madness—brought a shadow of shock over our entire State; I believe over Australia as a whole.

Today Parliament has the chance to show that it is the supreme representative body of the people of Queensland, to show its disgust for the architects of the Bellevue destruction and to express its alarm at a Government that even the member for Townsville said last Sunday was taking this State "down the road to Moscow-type rule". The Opposition hopes that from the ruins of the Bellevue the fight will grow to get rid of the political vandals who wrecked it.

I do not believe that the motion moved by the honourable member for Stafford goes far enough. Consequently, on behalf of the Opposition, I move the following amendment—

"Add the words—

'and demands—

'(1) A full explanation from the Works Minister of all events last week up to the actual start of destruction just after midnight on Friday associated with this political destruction of the Bellevue Hotel, including the name of the Government officer or Cabinet Minister who authorised the demolition exercise.

'As part of such report, this House demands also from the Minister complete details of the way and timing in which this contract was let; the number of companies invited by his Department to tender and how the Deen Brothers—a firm recently suspect at top Police level in regard to what was termed "slave camp" industrial activities—came to be part of the demolition team.

'(2) That the Works Minister table all reports and other documents that prompted recent decisions by Cabinet and the Joint Government Parties on the fate of the Bellevue Hotel. In view of reports as late as last Friday of confusion between the Premier and his Deputy on the issue, such documents should include the exact wording and intent of the decision of the Joint Government Parties.

'(3) A full report with plans from the Works Minister of the alternative proposals, including location and design, for the announced new building to bear the dismantled iron lacings of the Bellevue.

'(4) A complete explanation from the Treasurer of the obvious lack of either communication or influence of the Liberal Party that exists within the coalition Government in that this destruction could be ordered politically at Cabinet level allegedly without his knowledge.'"

I have moved that amendment because I do not believe that the motion goes far enough, or spells out sufficiently loudly and clearly the fact that we as a Parliament are entitled to receive a lot more information about what happened to the Bellevue. It is all very well to have the short motion moved by the member for Stafford, which just says that we condemn this or condemn that, but I believe that it is necessary for the Parliament to spell out clearly and strongly to this arrogant Government what the Parliament requires from it—the information that we desire to be tabled and the stories that need to be told and are as yet untold about the destruction of the Bellevue building.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (12.6 p.m.): I second the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition and, in doing so, naturally I support the motion and the amendment. The Queensland public has now seen this Government in operation as the Opposition

has seen it in operation for many years. It is refreshing to see that some members of the Government parties are now aware of the type of Government that they support. Naturally, we are very happy to see that not only have they voiced their opinion publicly outside this Chamber; they have also come into the Chamber and said these things. I believe that other members of the Government will take this opportunity to let the public of Queensland know where they stand. Although the motion condemns the Government and its action, I believe that the people of Queensland are entitled to know more of the history of this sorry episode that came to pass in the early hours of Saturday morning.

I think that the people of Queensland want to know first hand from the Minister for Works and Housing the part that he and his department played in this matter. We also want to know of the plans that were put to the joint parties' meeting. The mover and seconder of this motion did say that they were at that meeting. However, it is obvious to me that after what happened on Saturday night and what has happened since, they believe that they were not told certain things at the meeting. I believe that they and other members of the Government parties are not aware of the details of the redevelopment project that the Government has in mind. In fact, I do not believe that there is any redevelopment programme that can be put before this Parliament. The people of Queensland want to know what is going to happen.

I was astounded to discover that the Treasurer of this State—a man who was backed by his colleagues when he opposed the previous Treasurer for not carrying out their wishes—apparently did not know how much the demolition was going to cost. Also, he apparently has no idea how much the new concept is going to cost.

Just recently, with a wave of the hand, the Premier said, "We are going to give the transport operators \$5,000,000 back." Where is the money going to come from for this redevelopment? How much is it going to cost?

Mr. Hartwig: It will cost \$27,000,000.

Mr. HOUSTON: The honourable member seems to know more than many of his colleagues know. It would be interesting to hear from the Treasurer where he thinks this \$27,000,000 will come from.

The Opposition has moved the amendment because it believes that this Parliament is entitled to know what project is contemplated for the Bellevue site. Of course, the people of Queensland are well aware now that the Government will make a statement one day and the next day go off on a completely different tack; it will change its mind overnight. Of course, the reasons for the change of mind are never made public. Now there is an opportunity for not only the Liberals but also the National Party members, in particular the back-benchers, to come out and support the motion, particularly the amendment, so that we can, once and for all, say to this Government, on behalf of the people of Queensland, "You have got to come clean; you have got to tell the public what you have in mind." It is not good enough just to knock something down. Is the Government going to leave the Bellevue site in its present condition?

Mr. Gygar: If you want to find out the answers, why aren't you asking questions instead of engaging in empty political grandstanding?

Mr. HOUSTON: I will ask some questions. I noticed that the honourable member's motion was political grandstanding. Let us not run away from what his motives were, Mr. Speaker. Just to condemn a Government, to criticise it and then walk out and say, "I am clean. I have cleaned my conscience. I have done what I said I would do", is a very different thing.

Mr. Yewdale: He withdrew his threat to resign.

Mr. HOUSTON: He has not resigned. The Liberals are always going to resign. I have seen quite a few who were going to do so.

Mr. Camm: You didn't have to resign. You were kicked out of the leadership over there.

Mr. HOUSTON: Yes, that is right. I lost the leadership. It was done democratically, and it was above-board. I am still in Parliament. The honourable gentleman will never attain the heights that I have attained in this Assembly—that is, become a leader of a party. I am very proud indeed to still serve the Labor Party and to have served under Mr. Burns, Mr. Casey and Mr. Tucker while they have been leaders of the party in this Chamber. So let there

be no argument about my loyalty to the party that I serve and that I trust I will serve for some years to come.

However, that is not the issue before honourable members now. The issue before the House is the Bellevue and how and why it was torn down. Can any honourable member say that, in his memory, any other building has been torn down in such circumstances or with such speed? As I was driving along Coronation Drive today, I noticed another building being demolished. From memory, I think it was a building associated with the old tram sheds or tramway workshops. Some other honourable members may know the building to which I refer. It is being demolished and scaffolding has been erected for that purpose. The roof has been taken off and the top floor has been demolished, just as many other buildings in this State have been demolished. I imagine that much of the equipment inside was recovered and sold through the ordinary trade channels.

But what happened with the Bellevue building? I do not profess to be an architectural expert, but the stories that we heard about the condition of the exterior of the building indicated that it would fall down at any time. Those honourable members who were there in the early hours of Saturday morning or on Saturday afternoon will know what a fight the building put up to stay erect. The walls withstood a tremendous pounding before they finally collapsed.

Mr. Akers: They had to fight it to knock it down.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is right. Any person looking on would firmly believe that the outside construction of that building was very strong. In fact, at one stage a dome-shaped part of the roof structure was hanging virtually in mid-air, defying the efforts of the contractor to force it down. As one of my colleagues so rightly puts it, it was staying up there against the force of gravity. So no-one will ever convince me that the outside walls of that building were in anything but first-class condition and could have been used for any number of purposes. I do not want to enter into a debate about whether or not it should have remained there; but the fact is that it was given no chance to stay there once the Government finally, through the joint parties, made the decision. The question is: how many years ago was the decision made to knock it down?

Mr. Hartwig: Ten years ago.

Mr. HOUSTON: Again I accept the interjection of the honourable member, who I know would be speaking on behalf of the Government. Years ago, when the decision was made, the policy was adopted of systematically and gradually letting the place deteriorate so that the inside became uninhabitable, and allowing the outside to appear to be in disrepair. I use the word "appear" because the evidence now indicates that the exterior was in fact sound.

Let me turn now to the demolition itself. As I said, I have never seen a building anywhere demolished in such a way. In fact, it is surprising that the Government did not go the whole hog and use charges of dynamite or other explosives to blast it down. But perhaps it was somewhat fearful that this new building that we now occupy might have been damaged. It would have been terrible if the penthouse on the top floor had been damaged! The fact is that the next-best method was used.

I can recall that the Bellevue contained a number of air-conditioning units. Surely they were not all burned out and useless. They were recoverable items.

Mrs. Kyburz: Basins and light fittings, too.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is right. The fittings in the various rooms were still quite serviceable and were saleable.

Mr. Katter: My light fitting didn't work.

Mr. HOUSTON: That was only because of the honourable member's inability to make it work.

The fittings in most of the rooms were usable and saleable. Furthermore, the building contained many doors that would have been of use to persons interested in the restoration of buildings and fittings. A number of persons in business buy old-type fixtures for their buildings. As well, many of the windows were stained-glass leadlights and could have been recovered and used again. If all of these fixtures and fittings had been recovered and sold, the cost to the Government of the demolition would have been lower than it was. However, apparently the order went out, "Get there, knock it over, get it down quickly. It doesn't matter whether you ruin everything in the building. It will only become rubble." To say the least, that is not good business practice for a Government or anyone else.

But why the haste? What was the reason for it? We know that with street marches and gatherings the Government uses its iron

boot by way of the Police Force. I suppose that in this instance, because it was public property and not the public, the Government adopted the same attitude. It brought in the Police Force while the wreckers got on with the job. There is no justification whatever for having the job done with such haste.

As for the Government's claim that the job was done in a hurry in the interests of public safety—why isn't the demolition of every other building in the State carried out in the same way and at the same time of night? To my knowledge, no other building in Queensland has been demolished at that hour of the night and under such circumstances.

I remember being in Parliament when the Government, in introducing a Bill, stressed the need for safety in the demolition of buildings. I was quite surprised to hear the Minister concerned make his statement earlier today. The Bill contained a clause stating that the requirements applied to the Crown. In other words, safety involves not only the safety of the human being but also the protection of public property. That is all part of the deal and that was the argument used by the Government when it introduced the appropriate amendments. Because the safety of the human being and public property is paramount, the Opposition supported those amendments.

The clause that was passed by the Government, with the agreement of the Opposition, gave the chief inspector certain discretionary powers. These could be applied in the event of an extraordinary emergency such as an earthquake or a fire that left a building damaged to such an extent that it was unsafe to let it remain erect. The chief inspector was given the power in such circumstances to allow the normal requirements to be dispensed with. At all times human safety and protection of property were to be part of the deal. On this occasion very little thought could have been devoted to the protection of public property. Within a few feet of the walls on which the machines were operating there were parking meters and traffic light controls.

Mr. Akers: We used to have them; they've gone now.

Mr. HOUSTON: They were there at 11 o'clock on Friday night.

Whether or not the Brisbane City Council controls them, they are public property. Now that they are damaged, a policeman has

to stand on points duty. In the old Parliament House, I well recall honourable members on both sides complaining about the hazards at the corner of George and Alice Streets. Many a speech was made about the dangers caused by lack of traffic lights, and that was before the freeway was constructed.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: It is easy for someone from the country to say, "Brisbane is only the old capital." That reminds me of Queensland's attitude to Canberra. It is the capital of Australia, but, judging by the Government's attitude on many occasions one could tend to believe that it is a foreign city or country. In the light of the approach of country members, it is evident that they look upon Brisbane as a foreign city. They are not concerned about whether the damage done will become a burden to be carried by the city ratepayers.

This issue is just one big joke to National Party members, but I assure them that to the people of Brisbane and other thinking people throughout the State it is no joke at all. As I said at the outset, what has been done demonstrates publicly once again the type of Government in power in Queensland. It is not prepared to be above-board and do things openly so that the public may see what is going on.

When the transport operators decided to block the roads, it did not take long for the Government to meet them and make decisions in their favour. On this occasion its attitude is different.

A little while ago the Leader of the Opposition referred to the street march issue on which the Government of the day said, "We cannot allow street marches because we cannot allow any of our streets to be cluttered up by people on Saturday afternoon." Honourable members will recall that, following a Saturday afternoon street march, a young policeman resigned. He resigned from the Police Force and then left the State. Many others would do likewise but because of unemployment, which is rife under this Government, they are not game to do so. If other positions were available, many of them would be pleased to leave. On that Saturday afternoon many people were arrested immediately they left the city square. Yet last Saturday afternoon a whole street was cut off to pedestrians. They were not allowed to walk on it.

On Saturday afternoon I came from the Botanic Gardens to walk towards Elizabeth Street, only to be told by a very courteous, young policeman that I could not do so; that I was not allowed to walk on the footpath up George Street between Alice and Margaret Streets. Who gave those orders? No-one was working on the Bellevue site. When I walked up the street, I found a line-up of policemen waiting there. It could well have been taken for the Charge of the Light Brigade or the Blue Brigade. The point is that they were there. Isn't that in contrast to the Government's actions in other directions?

Let me say finally to the Minister for Works and Housing that he has, on behalf of his Government, an obligation to the people of Queensland to answer the questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition in his amendments and also to lay on the table the reconstruction plans. The Treasurer should demand to be told the estimated cost of such a proposal. Let us call an end to this type of Government. If that requires that certain Liberal members should rise and express an opinion, that is the price that has to be paid.

I say to the Liberal members, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, that the time has come when, as members of a political party, they cannot afford any longer to raise their hands whenever the Premier or the National Party decides; no longer will the people of Queensland accept the proposition that they are members of the minority party.

In the Federal House one or two Independents or three or four members of a minority party have, at times, held the balance of power to the extent that they virtually decided what legislation would be introduced. They had the control of the development of our nation. The Queensland Parliament has 24 Liberal members and, for reasons best known to them, they will not realise that if they wanted to be strong they could hold the balance of power in this Parliament. Then we would perhaps see some of their legislation and some of their ideals and principles come forward.

I support the Leader of the Opposition. I ask the mover and seconder of the motion to accept the amendment. It is in tune with the motion but goes further and makes sure that certain Ministers present the information that every Queenslanders is entitled to.

Motion—That the words proposed to be added (Mr. Casey's amendment) be so added—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 22

Blake	Shaw
Burns	Underwood
Casey	Vaughan
D'Arcy	Warburton
Fouras	Wilson
Gibbs, R. J.	Wright
Hansen	Yewdale
Hooper, K. J.	
Houston	
Jones	
Mackenroth	<i>Tellers:</i>
Milliner	Davis
Prest	Kruger

NOES, 54

Ahern	Kippin
Akers	Kyburz
Armstrong	Lane
Austin	Lee
Bertoni	Lester
Bishop	Lickiss
Bjelke-Petersen	Lockwood
Booth	Miller
Bourke	Moore
Camm	Müller
Campbell	Neal
Doumany	Newbery
Edwards	Powell
Elliott	Row
Frawley	Scassola
Gibbs, I. J.	Scott-Young
Glasson	Simpson
Goleby	Sullivan
Greenwood	Tenn
Gunn	Tomkins
Gygar	Turner
Hartwig	Warner
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Wharton
Hewitt, W. D.	
Hinze	
Hodges	
Hooper, M. D.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Innes	McKechnie
Katter	White

PAIR:

Scott

Bird

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn honourable members that the bells will ring for only two minutes for the next division on this matter.

Mr. AKERS (Pine Rivers) (12.44 p.m.): The Leader of the Opposition has done today precisely what he did last Saturday. He has tried to totally delude the very honest and respectable people of Queensland, who felt very strongly about the demolition of the Bellevue building. He came in as a late starter. He was not the slightest bit interested before and said virtually nothing publicly, and very little privately, that I know of, until it suddenly became an issue and the Press started to play it up.

Mr. CASEY: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member for Pine Rivers is making accusations against me that are entirely untrue, as is shown by the Notices of Questions containing a question of which I gave notice in this Chamber last Thursday,

and also by public comments by me both in the Press and on television last Thursday. I find them objectionable and ask for their withdrawal.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition finds the remarks objectionable. I ask the honourable member for Pine Rivers to accept his denial.

Mr. AKERS: I accept his denial, Mr. Speaker.

This matter has been going on for much longer than that, and people were caring much earlier than last Thursday. The honourable gentleman was a late starter. After the Leader of the Opposition came into the public meeting on Saturday, walked up and demanded that he be given a position on the list of speakers, he got up and made the most political speech that one could imagine. Everybody present was totally disgusted with him. He did not say one thing about the value of the building.

Mr. Jones: He's going to say it now. It's worth nought now.

Mr. AKERS: He should have said it long ago. His amendment is another example of his johnny-come-lately efforts. It is hopeless and the people of Queensland will see through it. They will see that he is trying to jump on the political bandwagon. One of the statements in his amendment is wrong, as are some of the comments that he made during his speech. No matter how strongly Government members feel on this issue, they could not possibly have supported his amendment. It was complex and contained matters that have nothing whatever to do with the motion moved by the member for Stafford, a motion that has the support of many Liberal back-benchers.

The real issue is the way in which the Bellevue was demolished on the night of 20 April, following what has happened over the past few months. Just as the fall of the Alamo raised the spirit of the State of Texas, I hope that the fall of the Bellevue will raise the spirit of the people of Queensland. I hope that they will begin to take action. They can make a start by getting on to their local members. I warn National Party members, especially the ones in electorates close to Brisbane, that by laughing as they did at the members for Salisbury and Stafford, they are misreading public opinion. They should care about what is happening.

The demolition of the Bellevue is the final crunch in a whole series of events. It comes after the decision made in relation to the powerhouse at Tarong—which was another example of the total lack of democracy in Queensland; after the decision to abolish road maintenance fees—which was arrived at when half the Ministers were absent; after the decision in relation to the new port—which, if nothing else, is amazing; and after the Premier's direct refusal to allow members of this Parliament to have the usual parliamentary committees that review parliamentary expenditure and the actions of the Government.

The destruction of the Bellevue is more than the demolition of an historic building; it is the latest in a series of blows to democracy in Queensland. The situation must be reversed. I ask all members of the public to tell their local member that they are not happy with the present situation. I make a plea particularly to country people, who, because of the limitations on the Press that is available to them, get only half the story.

The full story, however, is getting through to them. I have received calls from people in most of the National Party electorates who are absolutely disgusted with their members and their decision. I know that a lot of the members are not themselves happy; they have expressed dissatisfaction to me. I ask them to take action. It is not the Liberal Party that keeps the leader of the National Party in his position; it is the National Party back-benchers.

Mr. HARTWIG: I rise to a point of order. The decision was carried at a joint coalition party meeting by a 99 per cent vote. And the honourable member was there. He's a dingo; that's what he is.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Callide has no point of order.

Mr. AKERS: I ask the honourable member to withdraw his comment that I am a dingo. It shows no thought whatever for parliamentary propriety.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Because of the noise in the House, I did not hear the comment, but if it was made I ask the member to withdraw it.

Mr. HARTWIG: It gives me much pleasure to withdraw that word.

Mr. AKERS: The fact that the honourable member took the point of order also shows that he was not listening to what was said. I said that National Party backbenchers keep the Premier where he is. Members of the Opposition and the others who denigrate the Liberal Party for not standing up should be taking note of who keeps the Premier where he is.

I assure the House that, in the past, I have given the Government very solid support, but from now on it will be getting support from me only when I feel that it is right to give it.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Why don't you resign? You beat your breast, but you have no intestinal fortitude.

Mr. AKERS: The honourable member would love to have me out of this place, as would a lot of other people, too.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable members for Salisbury and Brisbane Central under Standing Order 123A.

Mr. AKERS: Just after midnight on Friday, I experienced tremendous fear for this State. When I stood on the footpath in William Street and watched the convoy of heavy trucks roar in, charging into the crowd, with hundreds of police protecting them, and saw the gates being locked after them, I thought that that could happen only in a country run by somebody like Idi Amin—not in Queensland where, in the past, I had stood up for freedom and democracy. I did not think that that could happen in Queensland, but it did. Every person who was near the Bellevue site on Friday night was scarred for the rest of his life by what he saw. I will never forget it—and I will not forgive it.

The whole exercise was totally unnecessary. Attempts to demolish the building proved that the advice on its unsoundness and unsuitability for restoration was totally wrong. It was supposed to be completely termite-ridden, with rotten timbers throughout, but no evidence of that was found.

Mr. Burns: And a bulldozer and a crane could not pull a piece of the wall down.

Mr. AKERS: That is precisely so. I watched what happened; they had to struggle with it.

Either the advice tendered to the Government was given by totally incompetent persons or the Government instructed the advisers what advice had to be given. I believe the second proposition to be true. Because the Premier's mind was already made up, a feasibility study was not carried out into the building's restoration. As a result of the Premier's clear statements made before the joint parties could make a decision many other members had their minds made up beforehand.

The Bellevue building could well have been restored. One of the only legal reasons given for its demolition was that restoration would have meant that the veranda posts would have been on the gutter line. Government spokesmen in favour of demolition of the Bellevue said that the city council's by-laws could not be complied with. That would be the first time that the Government has ever tried to comply in any way with local authority by-laws. The difficulty could well have been overcome by moving the gutter out about 3 feet and eliminating about 15 parking spaces. That would have made everything safe.

Mr. Goleby: What about the entrance to the freeway?

Mr. AKERS: Entrance to the freeway would have been in no way restricted. The whole trouble lies in the closed minds of people like the honourable member for Redlands. He must know that people in his electorate have been ringing me up all week-end asking, "Why on earth can't we have a Liberal down here?"

There was no need to demolish the building, and certainly no need to do so with the haste in which it was done. The building was quite safe structurally. The Charters Towers Court House, which had stood for about 60 years in a totally derelict state, was restored by this Government. I tried to raise that matter in the joint party meeting and it was totally whitewashed. But it was in the country and not in the city, and that made the difference.

There was absolutely no need at all for the rush to demolish the Bellevue. The work could have been done at virtually no cost at all to the taxpayers of Queensland if proper and reasonable action had been taken. In my opinion, the materials in that building were worth much more than the cost of the contract let to demolish it. The building contained thousands of dollars worth of cedar

doors, cedar mouldings, air-conditioning units and glass, such as curved glass, fixed flat glass—

Mr. Hansen: Lead-lights.

Mr. AKERS: Lead-lights, the lot. There was a tremendous amount of material in the building. When one lump fell on Saturday, I saw a light fitting still swinging in the breeze. Everything like that is worth money. Everything was wantonly destroyed by this Government, through the action of the Premier in issuing this instruction late on Thursday to get the building down.

I learned from someone in the Works Department that the basis of the contract was some estimates received some time ago, so that the Government could be advised on the cost involved. Late on Wednesday afternoon or early on Thursday, the people who gave the estimates—the very few who were asked to submit estimates; there was no public tendering—were asked to confirm their estimates in writing. When the estimates were submitted in writing, it was found that very few people were given the opportunity to tender, but the scheme went ahead with explicit instructions.

According to the "Telegraph" today, Deen brothers are quoted as saying that they were given instructions to get the building down over the week-end. They are very proud that they pulled it down in 25 hours. They should be totally ashamed of themselves for even touching the building and going against public feeling in Queensland, just as the Premier and those responsible for the decision should be ashamed. There is a tremendous sense of fear throughout Queensland at present.

Mr. M. D. Hooper interjected.

Mr. AKERS: If the honourable member does not feel it, other people in his area feel fear about what is happening and the total ineffectiveness of the ordinary person to have any say in what happens in this State. We have this sort of winner-take-all attitude of the Premier and the National Party; the Premier especially. He says, "We are here to govern." He is quoted in the paper as saying that, and I am certain that it is true because I have heard him say it repeatedly. His attitude is, "If we win, even by one vote, we have total overall control for three years. That shows a total lack of any idea of what democracy is all about. But that is what we have and we have to stop it. I hope that the fall of the Bellevue will be the beginning.

Part of that fear results from the action taken on Friday night. Something like 300 police were there. Most of them were very reluctant to be there. They were sent there to allow the totally unnecessary desecration of the heritage of Queensland. They did not want to be there; certainly most of them did not. I can assure the House that one of them enjoyed himself very much. He is Sergeant Ball. What he did is a good example of the reason why people in this State fear the present situation. They fear that police are being used and are being encouraged to do things that they should not do.

Many of the people who were present the other night were very respectable, sane people in the community. One of them was the deputy chairman of the Pine Rivers Shire Council, Councillor Peter Campbell. He wanted to leave the site. He walked along William Street to get to his car, which was in George Street. The police refused him access and abused him.

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

Mr. AKERS: Before continuing with the saga of Sergeant Ball and Councillor Campbell, I would like to place on record that during the luncheon break the honourable member for Callide apologised to me for the comments that he made. I will explain later how I interpret not his intentions but the meaning of his actions.

Before the luncheon recess I was discussing the actions of one Sergeant Ball, a uniformed policeman. As he is a sergeant, he is a fairly senior police officer. I do not know how old he is, but I would put him in the 45 to 50-year-old bracket, perhaps a little older. On early Saturday morning, he behaved in a most disgusting manner. I am afraid he behaved in a way that would shock the people of Queensland and cause the fear that I suggest is present among them.

After Councillor Campbell had been turned back, he had to come back past me, and he told me that the police had refused him access to George Street. He then walked along William Street. The person who was with me, a lawyer, turned to me and said, "That policeman is following Mr. Campbell." I said, "I don't believe it." He said, "He is." So we followed, too, just to see what the story was. When we got into Margaret Street, Sergeant Ball turned round and looked directly at us. He obviously knew that we were behind him. When Councillor Campbell reached the corner of George Street,

the police on duty there allowed him to move to the other side of George Street and then down towards Alice Street. A number of people had done the same thing just a few moments before.

Sergeant Ball went up to the police on duty there and spoke to them. One of the policemen went with Sergeant Ball and the other policeman, an officer named O'Gorman, intercepted me and the man who was with me. Because he was in plain clothes I do not know his rank, but he refused us permission to walk along George Street, even on the other side where other people had just been allowed to go. We were forced to go right down Margaret Street to Albert Street and then come back up to Alice Street. When I got up to the corner of Alice and George Streets, there was Councillor Campbell surrounded by police.

I found out afterwards what had happened. Sergeant Ball had followed Campbell for nearly a quarter of a mile. If members measure the distance, they will find that it is at least 400 metres from where Campbell spoke to me to where Sergeant Ball caught up with him. He was not rushing behind Councillor Campbell. In fact, he caught up with him at the only dark spot around here, which is under the trees on the corner of Alice and George Streets. Sergeant Ball started questioning Councillor Campbell and eventually grabbed him and pushed him up against the fence.

It would be bad enough for this to happen to anyone. There may be some excuse for it—I do not say there is—if this was someone who was a known criminal or a person who had abused the police. But this was the Deputy Chairman of the Pine Rivers Shire Council and, I might add, the nephew of a Minister of the Crown. Yet this is the way the police acted. The only reason why nothing more physical than that happened is that a woman happened to walk up Alice Street and interrupted what was going on by saying, "I saw that." The young policeman who had moved with Sergeant Ball, and who was with him at the beginning of the melee, said to him, "Let's get out of this. Leave it alone." He left; he was a very wise young policeman. But Sergeant Ball persisted with his actions, so another person who, in the past, has totally supported the police has now lost faith in them. And all because the police were used to support what went on here the other night.

This is a totally immoral use of the Police Force. That sort of action is being encouraged; it is being forced onto the police.

The younger policemen know that this is happening. They see it happening, and they are disgusted. Very soon, we will have a very, very unhappy Police Force. This happened just after a 30-ton truck had ploughed through the people, knocking down a woman and a young policeman. It was disgusting. It was only because of the actions of the young policemen in actually shoving people out of the way, forcibly pushing them extremely hard and knocking many of them down, that the truck did not run over more of them. This was encouraged by the urgency to implement this crazy decision to get the building knocked down.

There were women in evening gowns and other expensive dresses and men in suits. There were not people in jeans; there were people who matter to this Government and who hold high positions in the community. There were people to whom the Premier would normally listen.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. AKERS: Every person matters to me. Do not try to twist my words.

One policeman grabbed me by the front of the shirt and shoved me back into the crowd. When I told him what I thought of him, he said, "I told you to move on." There was no way in the world that he had spoken to me. He just reached into the crowd and shoved the people back.

An Opposition Member: Why weren't you arrested?

Mr. AKERS: The only reason I was not arrested was that a Special Branch policeman stood in front of me. It is disgusting that that could happen.

The member for Stafford has moved the following motion—

"That this House condemns the precipitate and unannounced way the demolition of the Bellevue Hotel was commenced on the night of Friday, 20 April 1979."

It is a token motion that explains the feelings of everybody in Queensland who is thinking at all about what this Government is doing. I believe that this is a motion that every back-bencher in this Parliament can support. The members of Cabinet are bound by the Westminster system to vote against the motion. I accept the very, very difficult position in which Liberal Ministers find themselves. I accept that every Minister must stick with the Cabinet because, as important

as this motion is, the only alternative is for them to vote against the Government. That would allow the Opposition to become the Government in this State, and that is totally abhorrent to me. If Opposition members were to become the Government, we would see no better actions from them. In fact, we would see even tighter control because, in spite of all the talk today from honourable members opposite, not one of them has ever crossed the floor to vote against the Labor Party.

An Opposition Member: That is rubbish!

Mr. AKERS: I ask the honourable member to name the last Labor Party member who crossed the floor.

Mr. Jones: That is not a defence.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Cairns not to interject.

Mr. Frawley: They even give 3½ per cent of their salaries to retain their endorsements.

Mr. AKERS: Not of their own wish, I assure the honourable member.

The whole episode on Friday night was a continuation of things that are not good enough for Queensland, and I am demanding that the Government take some notice of what people are thinking and saying and bring democracy back to this State.

The derision that we hear heaped on Liberal speakers in favour of this motion is the sort of derision that is being heaped on people who dare to question the actions of this Government. I totally support the motion, and I hope that every back-bencher will do likewise.

I return to the point concerning the apology to me by the member for Callide. The reaction of the honourable member is an example of the divide-and-rule tactics of the Premier. They have to be stopped, and they will be stopped if the back-benchers in the National Party, in their own party rooms—they need not do it here—begin taking some strong action.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Archerfield.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER (Archerfield) (2.26 p.m.): In entering this debate, I want first

to express my disgust at the gutless mob of Liberal Party curs. Three of them have stood up here today—

Mr. AKERS: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. That was far from the time allowed to me. I had another 24 minutes after the recess.

Mr. Wright: You sat down.

Mr. AKERS: The bells rang, Mr. Speaker, and you nodded to me and I sat down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I will accept responsibility. The honourable member had until 2.39.

Mr. AKERS (Pine Rivers) (2.27 p.m.): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The only other comment I wish to make is that the person in this Parliament who is most totally and vehemently opposed to Communism is doing the very thing that is going to encourage Communism in Queensland. The suppression, frustration and fear now evident among the people of Queensland is the very thing that has occurred in every country where Communism has taken over. It has given the Communists the opportunity to make the people rise against the people who create that fear and frustration. I ask the Premier to take notice of that and begin listening to people, begin letting people have some say, and get rid of the winner-take-all attitude.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER (Archerfield) (2.28 p.m.): It is extremely difficult to begin again after having my speech interrupted, Mr. Speaker. I reiterate what I said in my opening remarks. In entering this debate, I express my disgust at the gutless mob of Liberal curs on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. GYGAR: I rise to a point of order. I find that term offensive and ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Archerfield to withdraw the term. I will not tolerate nonsense of that type. If he does not withdraw it, I will not allow him to continue.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I withdraw the word "curs" and substitute the word "wonders", Mr. Speaker.

The Liberals are not prepared to stand up and be counted on this issue. They have about as much backbone as a filleted spineless jelly fish. I listened to the three speakers from the benches opposite—the honourable member for Stafford, the honourable member for Salisbury, and the honourable member for Pine Rivers. It is quite significant that all these honourable members hold extremely marginal seats and it is very much on the cards that they will not be in this House after the next State election. They are prepared to stand up in the Chamber today to rat on their party to get cheap political publicity in the community in an endeavour to hold their very shaky seats.

Mr. Austin: What are you doing at the moment?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: What I am doing at the moment is trying to put a case on behalf of the people of Queensland in relation to the demolition of the Bellevue building. I should like to say, too, that I support the sentiments expressed so capably and eloquently by my leader earlier today.

Last week, an act of political and cultural vandalism was performed by a Government of uncouth Philistines by demolishing the former Bellevue Hotel. They allowed an integral part of our national heritage to be wantonly destroyed in the middle of the night.

The subcontractors who performed the demolition—the Deen brothers—were referred to earlier in the debate by my leader. I make it quite clear—and I say this categorically—that in my opinion the Deen brothers are criminals, and that they were very lucky recently to be acquitted of a number of serious crimes.

Mr. Wright: They have friends in Cabinet.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: Of course they have friends in Cabinet. It is quite obvious why they were granted the contract to demolish the building. If justice was paramount in this State, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Powell: Are you sure that the Deens who did the demolition are the ones you were talking about?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I will take that interjection; it is the first intelligent interjection I have heard from the honourable member for Isis. He is spot on. They are members of the family that was charged by the police with numerous offences of allegedly conducting a slave camp at Belmont. As I was saying, this family of thieves and rogues should be in gaol. I would suggest that the Deen family would even thief the beard of the prophet or a Sikh's turban. I am told by my colleague the member for Brisbane Central that on Friday night one of the police officers said, "It would probably be a good thing if the building collapsed onto the Deen brothers."

The decision to demolish the Bellevue was made as recently as last Wednesday at a meeting of the joint Government parties. Two days later, in a midnight foray, this historic building was being demolished by the scabby Deen family.

The questions I would pose to the Minister for Works and Housing are—

- (1) When were the tenders called?
- (2) When were they accepted?

This whole business smacks of a sweetheart agreement entered into by the Minister for Works and Housing without adhering to the proper system of tendering.

Mr. Davis: Do you think he put in to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I have heard rumours around the ridges that, in an endeavour to hold his position in Cabinet, he did make a sizeable donation to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation.

Mr. WHARTON: I rise to a point of order. That statement is incorrect and I ask for its withdrawal.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order; I ask the honourable member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I withdraw it.

I think most honourable members would agree that, under this corrupt and decadent Government, deals such as this are becoming commonplace. Is it any wonder that the reputation of the Bjelke-Petersen Government reeks with dishonour and corruption?

The Leader of the Liberal Party, Dr. Edwards, cannot escape blame for his responsibility in the disgraceful saga of wanton corruption. By endeavouring to wash his hands of this sorry and sordid affair, he is endeavouring to emulate Pontius Pilate. In the House he wrings his hands like the poor man's Uriah Heap and tries to put the blame on the Premier. It is well known that he accepted the decision of the joint parties to demolish the Bellevue. He and his Liberal Cabinet colleagues were in collaboration in this evil conspiracy.

Mr. Akers: How do you know that is well known?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: It is well known around the ridges. As a matter of fact, in reply to that interjection by the member for Pine Rivers, he told me that in the lobby this morning.

Mr. AKERS: I rise to a point of order. I find it objectionable that the member would think that I would say that about my leader and that I would talk to him about it. I ask him to withdraw that comment.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I withdraw it, even though it is true. He did say it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will withdraw the remark without equivocation.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I withdraw it.

Last night on the television programme "Today Tonight", Dr. Edwards squirmed and tried to get out from under in making a puerile attempt to emerge from an extremely smelly situation smelling like a rose. The performance of the junior Minister for Works and Housing, who is known as "Wharton the wrecker", also leaves a lot to be desired. His performance on T.V. last night was lamentable. He didn't have a clue on what he was talking about and he showed a complete lack of knowledge of his portfolio. He failed to answer simple straightforward questions put to him by the interviewer.

An Opposition Member: He couldn't get a word out of him.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: That's quite right. It's the only time I have heard him mute.

The Minister for Works and Housing has been a willing tool of the Premier in allowing the midnight marauders to hit the place in the best traditions of Attila the Hun. This is another one of the Premier's horror shows in which the people of Queensland lose a little more of their heritage.

Mr. Bertoni interjected.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: It will be interesting to see whether the member for Mt. Isa gets to his feet this afternoon and contributes to this debate. The word has gone around the lobbies today that the Premier, through the Government Whip, has already instructed the members of the National Party that they are not to speak to this motion.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I rise to a point of order. I want that remark withdrawn because I am going to speak, and I am a member of the National Party.

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

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: This morning I heard an interjection in which a very scandalous and scurrilous remark was made about one of the leading churchmen in Brisbane, the Reverend Dean George. When the honourable member for Salisbury mentioned Dean George, the member for Caboolture made the scurrilous comment, "Did he have his boys with him?" I leave it to honourable members to put their own connotation and interpretation on that scurrilous interjection. Dean George is one of the most respected churchmen in Brisbane. It does the member for Caboolture little credit to cast a reflection upon his character.

Honourable members will recall the introduction of the midnight legislation concerning the Iwasaki Yeppoon project, by which a large portion of our heritage was given to

that ageing Japanese warlord. The sacrilegious demolition of the Bellevue building by the corrupt and decadent Bjelke-Petersen Government has sounded its death-knell. The people will impose judgment at the next election and sweep the National-Liberal Tory coalition into political oblivion.

Mr. Jones: Do you say that Cabinet Ministers would have been aware of the demolition arrangements but did not tell back-bench members on the Government side what was going on?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: That is true.

This morning the Minister for Labour Relations made a Ministerial statement. This is his first day back after an illness, from which I hope he has recovered completely. When he stood up I could see that his heart was not in his statement. Quite obviously he was acting under instructions. While many of the Liberal Cabinet members did not agree with the decision, they did not have the intestinal fortitude to oppose the Premier.

The speech made by the honourable member for Salisbury today heralded the disintegration of the National-Liberal coalition. That cannot be denied. Coarse comments were made when the honourable member for Salisbury spoke this morning. I have no brief for the honourable member but, as a lady, she should be afforded courtesy by some of the uncouth National Party members.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I take that as a reflection on the Chair. I am not prepared to accept that statement. The honourable member for Salisbury had every right to take a point of order. I did not hear any scurrilous remarks. I take the statement by the honourable member for Archerfield as a reflection on me, and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: With respect, Mr. Speaker, you beat me when you rose to your feet. I was going to say that you were excluded.

Honourable members may be laughing, but in all seriousness—

A Government Member: Seriousness is not evidenced by the smile on your face.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: It is the smile on the face of the tiger.

So far as I am concerned the honourable member for Pine Rivers is just a paper tiger. He has no intestinal fortitude. Today he rose to his feet in an attempt to justify himself in the eyes of the electors in his very shaky seat. After next election the member for Pine Rivers will not be here, and the House will certainly be none the poorer for his passing.

Mr. Powell: If he is a paper tiger, are you a cardboard replica?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: That is a rather silly, inane interjection.

Mr. Akers: You have not made one sane comment in the whole of this debate. This is a very important matter and you are treating it frivolously. You don't give a damn.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Pine Rivers. The honourable member for Archerfield will come back to the motion.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I have not been off it, Mr. Speaker, but I have been distracted by the inane interjections of the member for Pine Rivers.

The sacrilegious action that took place in the early hours of Saturday morning will be long remembered by the people of Queensland. When the next election is held, the electors will seek retribution, and this Government, I repeat, will be swept into political oblivion.

Mr. INNES (Sherwood) (2.38 p.m.): Nobody who saw the demolition of the Bellevue building last Friday night could be surprised at the lack of dignity in this debate, nor could they be surprised at the lack of respect shown to the people speaking, particularly to those who completely properly and understandably demonstrated some emotion on the subject. Nobody who attended the public meeting last Saturday afternoon could be surprised by the concern expressed by the Leader of the Opposition in words such as "sad" and "sneaky", nor by his obsession with the words "people who can make up their minds".

It is noteworthy that in the last six or seven years while the Bellevue matter has been under discussion, and during the last four months while the Save the Bellevue Committee has been pursuing a public course in a totally responsible fashion, not one peep, not a bleat, has come from the Opposition. Not until the decision was made last Wednesday did we get a question asked in the House which allowed the Leader of the Opposition to say that he said something on this subject before the demolition of the Bellevue building. If the decision had gone the other way, he would have been complaining about the lack of filling of pot-holes in some part of his electorate. It was a cynical opting out on a matter of importance to a great number of Queenslanders. Now he gets up and bleats about our heritage. Where was he last week? Where was he before last Wednesday? Where was he before last Friday?

An Opposition Member: Where were you?

Mr. INNES: I was at every fund-raising function held by the Bellevue committee. I spoke in the joint party room

and I spoke in public. And I do not represent a marginal seat; I represent a seat which can be held quite comfortably from the A.L.P. and other parties.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: What a vain peacock you are!

Mr. INNES: One of the pin-stripe prima donnas, and proud of it. The worry that the people of Queensland have, the worry that thousands of decent—

Mr. K. J. Hooper interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Archerfield under Standing Order 123A for making persistent interjections.

Mr. INNES: I am about to speak of a group of persons with whom the honourable member for Archerfield will have no familiarity. They are the thousands of decent, honourable Queenslanders who were concerned with this matter. They are distressed. I should have liked all of those people who have registered their protest to have been in the gallery of this Parliament today to witness the behaviour of their elected representatives who have been interjecting or talking about a matter of very significant public concern.

Let me put my position quite clearly. Firstly, and notwithstanding my own publicly taken attitude to the maintenance or restoration of the Bellevue, let me say that a decision was made, and I abide by that decision. I put it to the House that if the decision had been taken on the open floor of this Chamber, it would have been to demolish the Bellevue. It is not one that I would have spoken for, but I accept that that decision would have been made.

The issue of last Friday night is quite different. About 50 per cent of the hundreds of people who have telephoned me said that they were not all that concerned about the Bellevue; what upset them was the way in which the Bellevue was demolished. It was demolished with indecent haste. It was demolished without warning to the users of the public roads of Brisbane, and without proper warning to the democratically elected institution, the Brisbane City Council, which had an interest in the roads around the Bellevue and in certain parking meters and light installations which are worth many thousands of dollars.

It was a decision implemented in stealth. The concern of the people of Queensland is that other traditions and heritages might well be removed by stealth—quickly and without warning to the people who hold them dear. Can we find illustration of that type of action in the government of Queensland in recent times? Have there been decisions in which the Opposition has taken part?

It is no wonder that this Parliament is held in disrepute. The members of this House act like a pack of jackals whenever

anything of importance is debated in this Chamber. There are many things about which people have been concerned. Democracy is like justice. People not only demand justice; they demand that it be seen to be done. People want democracy in this State. It is not merely a matter of having one man one vote, or whatever the local formula is for that principle of democracy. They want to see the Executive act with dignity, with some honour and with openness, and they want a chance to contribute.

There are other matters which concern people, and this was, for many, the last straw. We heard a disturbing statement today that, because of some particular interest, judicial officers, or persons in equivalent positions, will be rearranged to overcome certain problems that people have had with the decisions of the umpires, properly appointed according to the law, in relation to certain travelling allowances. We have a history of the pushing of decisions from independently elected or appointed boards or committees through a series of special committees, or a series of appointed persons, until finally the decision that somebody wanted is achieved.

I predict that this year we will probably see some decision made relating to Moreton Island. We started off with a \$200,000 or \$300,000 inquiry by A. A. Heath & Partners Pty. Ltd. and, when they set down certain strategies, a public inquiry costing hundreds of thousands of dollars was duly constituted, which the people of Queensland, particularly those from the metropolitan area, were invited to attend. They all went in good faith, and at great cost to many. All sides contributed to a decision made by Mr. Neville Cook and Sir David Muir, with Mr. Sid Schubert having to retire. One would have thought that those umpires were impeccable, but apparently the decision that was properly arrived at in that case was not suitable. It is therefore being laundered through the necessary departments until some decision, which no doubt will not be the decision recommended by the committee of inquiry, is arrived at.

So let us go back to the Bellevue. I think it is now public knowledge—I say this only because it is public knowledge—that there were differences of opinion in the joint party room last week. It is now public knowledge that a proposal for a sunken garden and a \$400,000 subway, which would no doubt delight the plonkos and perverts of this town, to take the place of the Bellevue, was castigated in the joint party room. I think it is fair to say, as it was later revealed, though not by the Premier at the initial Press conference, that those emotions had been expressed. It was also later revealed that a compromise had been arrived at which involved the rejection of a modern seven-storey monster towering over the stately buildings that would remain and the investigation of a facsimile or replica which would retain the facade of the Bellevue.

What did the Premier tell the Press at his initial Press conference after that meeting, when any fair assessment of what was conducted would have included those matters? He said only that the Bellevue was to be demolished, which has been his stated opinion for years. Can anybody therefore wonder at the anger and concern felt by members of Parliament and members of the public who learnt that the primary interest and instinct of the Premier to demolish the Bellevue was to come into reality on the night of Friday last—the eve of Hitler's birthday!

People feel concerned because the dominant will of one person is seen to be the prime moving force through a whole series of events in this State. On Sunday this same person came back to Archerfield crowing about certain Liberals who had the audacity to speak out about this matter. I point out that I am not talking about the Bellevue. I did not go there to picket against the destruction of the Bellevue. I want there because I could not believe that the demolition would take place at that time of night. Can anybody wonder, then, that I am somewhat angered by the Premier's assertion, "Oh, those Liberals! They'll run away from another fight." The man shows no humility on any occasion; he shows an overbearing arrogance, and I publicly say that there is one Liberal here representing the seat of Sherwood who is not going to walk away from any fight anybody calls on.

Mr. Sullivan: Why don't you grow up and measure up to your responsibilities?

Mr. INNES: Yes, we have heard the interjections. We heard them hurled at the member for Salisbury, the member for Pine Rivers and the member for Stafford. Provided that everybody has a fair say and makes a fair contribution to the decisions that are made, nobody will worry about the decisions. Provided the decisions are fairly reported, people will abide by them and accept joint responsibility for them. We are rising today not just to express the feelings of some Liberal back-benchers. We are rising to express the feelings of concern in this community, which are reflected in the hundreds and hundreds of telephone calls, letters and statements from all parts of the community suggesting that this is the last straw, or one of the straws in a series of events that offend their sense of a moderate liberal democratic State. I do not mind abiding by a decision, provided the people who contribute to that decision are given a hearing and listened to with respect, and provided the decision is made fairly, having regard to people's opinion, and is not based on any sectional or political motives.

I do not want to delay this debate. I think the main point that has been made in it is that the manner of doing things is often as important as the question whether they should be done. That is what is realised by the people of this city and by some members of this Parliament. We ask for

responsible, honourable, dignified and tolerant government. The Government, or the Executive, had no reason to fear at the end of last week that the people making up the Bellevue committee would do anything other than what they had done in the preceding months, that is, act with restraint in a totally non-partisan and totally responsible fashion. The people involved in the issue tended to be the older rather than the younger members of the community.

I predicted that the argument that would be advanced this week would concern the danger of union black bans. In the past, the Government, quite rightly, has protected the trucks that have been driven through daylight pickets on the wharves. I agree that black bans or green bans or any union bans should not override the decisions of a lawfully elected Government. But no such emergency existed last Friday night.

I have heard it said that the contractor decided that the demolition would take place at that time. Did the contractor organise the flying Cabinet minute? Did the contractor's demands result in other members of Cabinet, particularly those representing the metropolitan seats where the people would be affected and would be more emotionally involved, not being told about the matter? When I practised law last—and I practised it for 10 years—I understood that the person who let the contract dictated the majority of the terms. I find it extraordinary for a strong Government to suggest that the decision as to the timing of the contract was dictated by the contractor.

I rise to give my total support to this motion and to make a declaration that my proposed course of action in this House will involve making a contribution in debates of this sort and scrutinising all Executive actions as well as legislation.

Mr. DAVIS (Brisbane Central) (2.54 p.m.): As the member who represents the district affected, I rise to support the motion. Some Liberal members, including the member for Sherwood, have said that the Opposition was not in favour of retaining the Bellevue. I point out for the benefit of the Johnny-come-lately over there that in 1974 I was in conflict with one of my colleagues, the member for Sandgate. We both went into public print on the matter. I am referring, of course, to the former member for Sandgate, Mr. Dean, not the present member. He was in favour of destroying the Bellevue; I was in favour of retaining it. I was a member of deputations on the matter, and the former Leader of the Opposition, the honourable member for Lytton, and I attended the big rally that was held in 1974 in support of the retention of the Bellevue. I even supported its retention while I was not a member of this Assembly.

I must mention in passing, Mr. Speaker, that when the State election was held three months after that meeting in 1974, the matter was not raised as an issue. Many of the

groups that supported the retention of the Bellevue deserted the cause when an early State election was held.

I agree with all the sentiments that have been expressed in this debate. The honourable member for Lytton and I were present on Friday night, and I am satisfied that quite a number of the people who were there did not really believe that the Government would go ahead in the middle of the night and bring down the building. It was rather heart-rending, Mr. Speaker, to see the trucks roll off the freeway and pass through the crowd so that the demolition work could begin.

I am pleased to see that the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police is in the Chamber. Although it seems to be difficult to have police made available for ordinary work, there does not seem to be any problem in providing police to assist the Government to do things that will not assist the people of this State. I do not know how many police were present on Friday night, but probably there were about 100 round the building, including about 20-odd members of the Special Branch. Why must Special Branch police always be involved?

I will not be so critical of the Liberal members of this Assembly if they do what they say they intend doing; but I will certainly criticise them if they are hypocritical and do something only when television cameras are present. They will be judged on their performance.

I agree that the honourable member for Salisbury was very upset. She was really frightened by the action of the members of the Special Branch and the way in which the police handled the crowd. I was not over-impressed by their actions, either.

Some questions must be asked about how the demolition work came about. I should like the Minister for Works and Housing, the Premier, or whoever was in charge of the demolition, to tell me when tenders were called. We have read in the newspapers, Mr. Speaker, that tenders were called over the telephone. That seems to be a fine way of calling tenders for a \$40,000 job, which is the figure that has been mentioned. In addition, of course, there will be the money owed to the Brisbane City Council.

Mr. Vaughan: It was a cost-plus job.

Mr. DAVIS: It was a cost-plus job. There were no advertisements in any of the newspapers, of course. It has also been strongly rumoured round Parliament House that on 3 May some of the furniture from the Bellevue is to be sold.

Mention has been made of safety regulations, and on Friday night I spoke to some of the officials of building workers' organisations. I remember—you would remember also, Mr. Speaker—when deaths occurred on the S.G.I.O. building and the Act was changed to provide for a better building code. If I

remember correctly, three or four deaths occurred on that building. We went through all the rigmarole of introducing safety features, yet on Friday night we saw people clambering up to put ropes round windows so that they could be pulled down. Those people were not wearing hard hats. I thought that was one of the principal provisions in the amending Bill. Although I have never had much involvement with building regulations, I know that if any truck driver goes onto a building site, he sees a sign saying, "Hard hats must be worn" or, "Safety helmets must be worn". No safety helmets were worn on Friday night. A safety inspector has the right to stop demolition if he thinks that is necessary.

Mr. Frawley: You would not need a hard hat. You are dead from the neck up.

Mr. DAVIS: I advise the honourable member not to be so stupid. He has already made a big fool of himself discussing Dean George, and we will ensure that the public hears about what he said. The honourable member is a member of the National Party and grovels to the Premier. I advise him to keep quiet.

A lot of publicity has been given to the alleged infestation of the Bellevue by the West Indian termite. In the near future the South East Freeway will be closed for a couple of days while a huge cocoon is placed over the Parliament House building so that it can be fumigated against termites. A question that was raised at the public meeting, and one to which I want an answer, is: Did the Minister for Works and Housing tell Mrs. Marshall of the Save the Bellevue Committee that West Indian termites had infested the building? If they had, it was a nice old way for the Government to go about curing the problem! It knocked down the building and had the timber from it carted away to various dumps on the north side of Brisbane. If the timber is infested with termites, any person who, like me, lives in an old wooden house will be concerned.

Mr. Sullivan: Do you think they will get into your head?

Mr. DAVIS: Oh, don't be stupid! That is the type of remark I would expect from the Minister, who grovels to the Premier. If ever there was a tool for the Premier, it is the Minister for Primary Industries.

Today it was revealed to me that the Department of Works and Housing was so quick in having the demolition people bowl over the Bellevue that the groundsman's three or four brand new mowers that were stored at the back of the Bellevue together with his equipment were destroyed. He did not even have a chance to remove them.

This action on the part of the Government will make the people of Brisbane realise what we on the Opposition side have been saying for years—that this Government is weak. It will be interesting to see whether

the Liberals, who when no T.V. cameras are present are sounding very heavy on this issue, will support our call for a decent Government in Queensland.

In his speech the member for Pine Rivers stated that the meeting on Saturday was attended not by the usual rent-a-mob but by persons dressed in suits and long dresses. They want something better in this State and they will not take lying down this type of conduct on the part of the Government.

The Opposition will support the motion. At the same time we want the people of Queensland to know that, by not supporting our amendment, Government members, and the people of Queensland, have lost something more.

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG (Townsville) (3.4 p.m.): I rise to support the motion and I am rather intrigued by the inclusion in it of two words—"precipitate" and "unannounced". When I was a small lad before World War II, this type of thing occurred in countries such as Germany, Italy and Russia, where precipitate and unannounced raids were made at night and people were wafted off into concentration camps and their houses closed up. Unfortunately, that type of atmosphere is becoming all too common in this State of ours. Precipitate and unannounced movements will be made, either legally or by force, to incarcerate something or some person.

I came down from Townsville to see the Bellevue on Saturday night. At the scene I did not see the usual type of person who attends an environmental rally. I did not see the shoeless, bearded, long-haired, grubby kids; I saw concerned middle-aged people, standing around quietly as if at a cenotaph. That was the atmosphere that pervaded the scene on Saturday night. They were deeply touched and emotional about the whole business. They could see no rhyme or reason in why it was knocked down so brutally. There are no other words for it; it was knocked down brutally and destroyed completely. Some kids were even taking away bricks and pieces of timber.

When I walked down the road, a policeman said to me, "You can't go down here, son." I looked at him and said, "I am old enough to be your grandfather. I am going down here whether you like it or not. I am a member of Parliament." He then stood aside. If I had not been a member of Parliament, I am quite certain that I would have been hustled off the footpath very unceremoniously. Most probably I would have been in trouble, but, just quietly, he would have been in trouble, too.

The motion is aimed at making the people of this State aware of the depth of feeling in the community against the autocratic rule assumed by the National Party leader. Today, when the motion was proposed, I heard derisive laughter from Government members. If it had come from the Opposition, I could have understood it, but I could not appreciate its coming from National Party

members. They should hang their heads in shame. If we have enough courage to stand on our feet, they should have enough decency to listen to us. They should grant us the right to be heard.

In the past few years while I have been a member of Parliament, certain things have made me feel sorry I ever entered Parliament. In one way Parliament has become a laughing-stock; a sounding-board for comics. Members deride and abuse the Press, and the Press simply shows them to the public in their true form. They are like a lot of performing puppets who do not give any thought to human beings, who are the most important part of our nation. They give little thought to our heritage. One of our old buildings simply disappeared because no-one thought enough of it. Members simply thought it should be knocked down; that it was full of white ants. It is almost like euthanasia of our old buildings. In any other country old buildings are preserved. The people walk around and say, "Here are our 13th Century buildings." But what happens in Australia? We bury everything with a damn big bulldozer; some obscure little Bill passed at night-time gets rid of them in the morning.

I must ensure that honourable members understand how I feel, and why I feel as I do. This House has lost its power. We are now ruled completely by bureaucracy. A Bill that went through the other night knocked down our rights in this House. The Financial Administration and Audit Act went through without debate. I was the only member on the Government side who debated it, and I was the only Government member who walked across the Chamber to agree with the Opposition. It should not have gone through; it took away the powers of this House. If honourable members do not believe me, they should read the Gazettes wherein they will see that all the staff positions of this House are up for auction. They have been declared vacant. That is typical of the security that this House has; it is typical of the democracy that we have not got.

We are ruled by autocracy—by Cabinet. We even find Cabinet Ministers voting against us. Where does that get the man in the street? It gets him exactly nowhere. It makes him feel as if he is being cheated. It is the road to Moscow in no uncertain manner. The man in the street will vote for something if he knows where he is going, but at present he does not know where he is going. That has been brought about by autocratic rule.

It is about time that Cabinet and the Premier got down to thinking about what other people believe—not what Cabinet thinks. Cabinet should consider what other people want, not what it wants. We want freedom and the right to choose our way of life and preserve our buildings. We do

not want them knocked down just because someone says, "Get rid of them," and that is it, without debate.

This is supposed to be a House of debate. I listened to a dozen propositions by eminent architects, who said that the Bellevue building was worth preserving. The Premier and one or two Works Department officers said, "Don't take any notice of their advice. It is not worth a bumper." I know a little bit about preserving old homes. In the North, we preserve them. We have the Queens Hotel and the old mining exchange in Charters Towers preserved for posterity. In a hundred years' time they will be beautiful monuments to what men did and what men thought. Here we have a horrible hotch-potch of buildings of the biscuit-tin type around our Government precinct. The only thing of any beauty will be the old parliamentary building. It will be like the proverbial shag on a rock, in a sea of modern buildings and sunken gardens. It will be a shame to see.

I was so upset about this matter that I travelled thousands of miles to see what was being done. As I looked at it, I thought what a criminal waste of magnificent timber it was. My room in the Bellevue was an ante-room to an old toilet. That is how I was housed. The timber in the door to my room alone would cost at least \$200. It was Queensland red cedar with the most beautiful grain. And there were hundreds of doors in the building. The skirting boards were 14 in. high and 1½ in. thick. It is impossible today to buy cedar in 30 ft. lengths. There were air-conditioners in the building. The stairways were magnificently done. It would be impossible to get people to build them like that now. All of this was destroyed.

The Government screams about unemployment. Why didn't it get a batch of unemployed youths and say, "Boys, strip that down and we will sell it." We could have got at least \$200,000 out of that building. That would have paid for the cost of demolition. It would have paid the wages of those youths. It would have provided some form of employment. And here we are talking about unemployment. We are not acting to relieve it; we are being destructive in not helping the unemployed youth at all. If they had been able to work on that job, some of those lads might have got an inkling about working, saving money and doing something useful. On the one hand this Government says how terrible unemployment is and how people do not want to work. There was plenty of work to be done in that building. The Government should have ensured that it was done correctly. It wanted to raze the building but it should not have acted like an Arab sneaking in during the night, pulling it down and then moving out.

I agree completely with this motion and I condemn the action that was taken.

Mr. WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (3.12 p.m.): I join in the debate to add to the condemnation that has been expressed by a number of members on both sides of the House of the action that took place the other night. It is quite obvious from the words that have been spoken so far that the issue here is not whether the Bellevue should have been demolished but the way in which it was done.

The Premier has miscalculated the public outcry and reaction to what happened. There has now been a broad and deep community reaction. It is one that surprised many people. It is one, however, that has been noticed by a number of Liberal members. That is a very important point because, as this debate has developed today, we found out that there were ulterior motives behind the stands that have been taken by certain members of the Liberal Party.

A few dissident Liberals today have gone to great pains to blame the Premier and the National Party. I suppose they expect the Opposition to say, "Hear, hear!" every time they attack the Premier because we often do it ourselves. We realise that he is arrogant; that his decisions are ruthless; that when he makes up his mind to do something, he does it; and that he does not care whether there is a consensus and does not believe in consensus government. He has the numbers and he is a numbers man.

While we accept that, I for one will not be supporting any Liberal cry against the Premier on this matter. I say that because the Liberals themselves are the ones to blame. It is the Liberal Party that ought to accept the total blame for the action in this State over the past few years. People can blame the National Party and say, "Yes, that's its policy and it is forcing this issue on the people"; but it is the Liberal Party and only the Liberal Party that has the opportunity to stop the National Party.

Opposition members do not have the opportunity. We have 23 members against the coalition's 59. It is a sheer impossibility on statistics for us to do it. But the Liberals have the numbers. They have the opportunity as well to stop the excesses of the Premier and the National Party. But have they ever done it? What have they done over Cedar Bay, the march issue or any other issue that has come before Parliament in recent years? They adopt an after-the-fact approach. They wait till the issue is blown and then they try to save face. I suggest that this is exactly what certain Liberal members are trying to do today.

Whilst many Labor members have been involved with the Bellevue committees, in the main it has been those in the middle of the road—the Liberals and the conservatives—who have been involved in the Save the Bellevue committees. Now they realise that they sold out their supporters.

They were the ones on whom the blue-rinse set, as they are often called, were depending to make a stand over the Bellevue.

Mr. White: Silver-tails.

Mr. WRIGHT: The honourable member can call them that, but they were the ones who these people thought would make a stand, not just at the point of Cabinet but in the joint parties, because they had this belief—and it seems from what has been said today that it is a false belief—that the decision-making process actually takes place in this Assembly. We start to wonder. But I believe it is still true. If one wants to change decisions, one can do it here, because when the vote is put it is a matter of deciding where one stands; it is a matter of deciding on which side of the floor one intends to stand.

Mr. Gygar: When did you last cross the floor?

Mr. WRIGHT: It is not a matter of whether I intend to cross the floor. I take that interjection because the honourable member for Stafford is on the spot here. He is the man who stated publicly that he wanted to resign. He is the man——

Mr. GYGAR: I rise to a point of order. I take this opportunity to rebut the statement that the honourable member has made. I have never threatened to resign from the Liberal Party though I understand the honourable member could have been misled by media reports into thinking so.

Mr. WRIGHT: I accept the honourable member's explanation. I accept that it could have been only the media reports, but certainly the inference I gained was that the honourable member for Stafford was one who was going to stand up to the Liberal Party and to the coalition. He was the one who was going to make a stand on this issue, as were others. I say that the Liberal Party and, in particular, those Liberal supporters of the Bellevue committee have let down the public. They have let down their party and they have certainly let down the Bellevue supporters, not only in the last few days but in the previous weeks in the joint party room. Everybody knew that it was going to happen. We have known for weeks and weeks that the Bellevue was gradually being allowed to deteriorate. Everything was gradually being shifted out. The mirrors were pulled off the walls. The place was almost gone through with a fine-tooth comb, and anything worthwhile was removed.

Mr. Hansen: What about the air-conditioners?

Mr. WRIGHT: Apparently the air-conditioners were not shifted, along with a few other things that could have been moved. I go along with the statement of the honourable member for Townsville that there were many worthwhile things that could have

been saved. I might add that I made a blue. I left some of my own things over there. I left part of an old Cortina in a back room. I do not know where it is. But I am told there are people worse off than I am. I am told that some of the workmen lost their tools. They left them there on Friday—

Mr. Davis: Three mowers.

Mr. WRIGHT: Another workman left his three mowers there on Friday and they have disappeared. So I am not the only one who has lost out.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: Are you saying that is typical of the Deens?

Mr. WRIGHT: I am not sure if it is typical of the Deens: I just know that those who have lost these things believed that no action was being taken. Most people have known for some time that action would be taken on the Bellevue. With the gradual movement ever since the wrought iron was taken away, we knew that the decision had really been made. My point is that the Liberals have known; the Liberals were the ones who could have changed that decision. They knew they had support over here on the Opposition benches, and if one takes their numbers and ours, adding 24 to 23, one ends up with 47, and that would be enough to defeat the National Party any day.

The other point is that the Liberals supported the demolition of the Bellevue in the joint party room. I have been told by many Government members that in the party room there was this total support, that there was no real opposition from the Liberals. They were in favour of demolition. They were the ones who wanted the Bellevue destroyed.

Now we have the famous barrister, Mr. Innes, rising and twisting straws. That is what he did here today, twist straws, saying that the issue is not that it was going to be knocked down but how it was to be done. But the point is that he supported the demolition; he supported the destruction of the Bellevue. The Liberals voted for it—not the Parliament, not the Labor Party, but the Liberals and the Nationals. They are the ones who voted for it and they are the ones who must take the blame here. It was a joint party decision and the Liberals must accept the main responsibility for it because the Nationals made it very clear where they stood and the Liberals were half-hearted.

Mr. INNES: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member has stated that I supported the decision to demolish the Bellevue. I supported the joint party decision, but my personal decision is well known. I ask for a withdrawal of the statement that I supported demolition of the hotel.

Mr. WRIGHT: I can't withdraw it, as you know, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. WRIGHT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would hate to have him representing me in a court. But we can understand how he acts because we saw the same honourable member react in the same way over the amendments to the Justices Act. Here we have a man of some legal background—a man who has my respect in that legal field, at least—a man who had before him prior to coming into this House complete details about the Justices Act. He knew exactly what this Parliament was going to do, and yet when the public blue arose, what did he do? He said that he was out shopping. He did not have time to be in this House debating very important legislation, and he left his Minister hanging. He left him hanging there. I know how the member for Sherwood works. I know the approach that he adopts in these matters. He is always ready to come out after something has happened and try to make out that he is not responsible. But I think that the public will soon become aware of the honourable member's tactics and take him for what he is worth.

The point is that the Liberals voted for this demolition. They could have stopped it. They could have used the A.L.P. numbers and had a majority of 47 to 35. But it is the Liberals who have sold out the people because they have not been willing to stand up to the excesses of the Premier and the National Party. They have not used their parliamentary power.

Mr. BOURKE: I rise to a point of order. As a Liberal, I object to the honourable member for Rockhampton saying that I was not prepared to stand up. I voted knowingly and willingly for the motion to demolish the Bellevue. I resent the implication that I was not prepared to stand up and I ask that the honourable member withdraw it.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: Where is your point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BOURKE: My point of order is that I was prepared to stand up on the issue and I resent his saying that I was not. I ask that that be withdrawn.

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

Mr. WRIGHT: I shall continue my speech, Mr. Speaker. I love the way in which members opposite suddenly come rushing in to defend themselves now. It is like saying, "It wasn't me, mate; it was the other guy." That is what they seem to do. They certainly did it to Bill Lickiss on that other matter. Now they want to do it to their coalition mates. But that is the way we like it. What they are doing is putting the coalition in disarray. Now we see the crocodile tears. They are suddenly saying, "We didn't really want to do it. We would not have really

voted for it had we known it would happen this way. We didn't want the Bellevue to be knocked down." They are saying, "Oh, yes, we wanted it to be knocked down and demolished, but not this way, not in the dead of night." The people will soon recognise how weak that argument is.

I really believe that there is a plan amongst the members of the Liberal Party to try to save face, because they know that this has gone against them. I do not agree with the way in which Joh Bjelke-Petersen rules this State, but he is seen as a strong guy, and certain people will cop him because of it, but they will not cop the weak-kneed leadership of the Liberal Party or the way in which it is trying to be part of the coalition at the moment. The Liberals know this, and there is a desperate effort here to recover lost ground. The way in which they are going to do it is to allow from six to a dozen Liberals to cross the floor. They will get the headlines. That is something I am not very pleased about at the moment.

Many Labor members of Parliament were involved in the Bellevue issue. Ed Casey was at the rally. Did he get any publicity? Not a word. This happened because it seems that certain other people are involved in this plan to try to recover some of the lost face and the lost political and electoral ground that the Liberal Party has suffered. The members of the Liberal Party will attract publicity. I can almost see the headlines now. They will read, "Kyburz blasts Minister for Local Government", or, "Gygar makes a stand on this matter", or "Gygar is a rebel". We will see this. They will get the publicity, and that is fair enough, but it is strange that the Opposition is always overlooked on these issues. I do not believe that the Liberals deserve publicity, and I say that because they are the ones who created the situation and allowed it to continue, and they know it.

The members of the National Party know it. That is why they have been heckling their own coalition members. That is why they have been interjecting. I think they all realise that it is part of a very subtle promotional programme or campaign by the Liberal Party to advance itself electorally at the expense of the National Party. That is what it is about. We know that certain tacticians in the Liberal Party realise that they have to do something very quickly. This is part of a very subtle promotional programme.

It is also part of a self-promotional plan by certain Liberal parliamentarians. Earlier I referred to the member for Sherwood and how he was outraged about the Justices Act and suddenly changed his attitude. I know that the same attitude was adopted by the member for Stafford. He suddenly did not know anything about it. He suddenly did not have any legal knowledge and therefore could not be blamed. He, too, left the Minister hanging alone.

I turn now to another Liberal member, the member for Wavell. I noticed in the week-end Press that he has suddenly come out on another issue. The joke about this one is that the Government parties already have been notified that legislation will be coming forward to amend the Real Property Act as it pertains to equitable mortgages. The honourable member suddenly announces that there is a problem. He has a copy—actually a draft—from the Minister explaining what the problem is and what he is going to do about it. So what does Brian Austin do? He comes out and tells the world that there is a real difficulty here. I am suggesting that it is all part of a protect-yourself plan. Austin is in it, Gygar is in it and Innes is in it up to his neck.

It is time that members of the public learned that they cannot depend on the Liberals to curb the erosion of civil liberties in this State. They can't depend on the Liberals to stand up to the National Party. Time after time, the Liberals have refused to act. We have heard so much about street march legislation. The Liberals say that they want it changed. There is a motion on the Business Paper at the moment and the matter could be brought before this Assembly and debated again. Will the Liberals support the Opposition? No, Mr. Speaker, not on your life!

Mr. Vaughan: Their leader is speaking to the Premier about it consistently, though.

Mr. WRIGHT: Oh, yes. What do they call him? "Squeak", I think, is the latest nickname that he has been given, because that seems to be the attitude that he takes.

The Liberals certainly are not doing very much in a positive way. They have refused time and time again, either on the street march issue or on electoral redistribution, to support the Opposition and bring about democracy in this State. They have a weak coalition because of themselves. They are a leaderless party because of themselves. They often wonder why they are the junior party in the coalition. They ought to have a good look at themselves.

The real proof of their attitude, and the real reason why the public ought to condemn the Liberal Party, is the attitude of Liberals today. They put forward a motion of condemnation that I personally will support in principle. But the Opposition moved an amendment to that, and did they bother to consider it or to look at the terms of it? No.

Mr. Akers: No. It was garbage.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am pleased that the honourable member for Pine Rivers said, "It was garbage." Let us see what it said, Mr. Speaker. The Opposition was asking for a full explanation from the Minister for Works and Housing of all the events last week associated with the political destruction of the Bellevue up to the start of actual destruction just after midnight on Friday. Obviously the honourable member for Pine

Rivers does not want such information. He is not interested in it. He says that that sort of information is garbage.

We went on to ask the name of the Government officer or Cabinet Minister who authorised the demolition exercise. The honourable member for Pine Rivers says that is garbage, that he does not want to know.

The Opposition asked that the Minister for Works and Housing table all reports and other documents that prompted recent decisions by Cabinet. Is that garbage? Surely we as a Parliament have a right to know what is happening. Surely we, as members, have a right to see those documents. But the Liberals who say that they support the motion of condemnation against the Government do not want the information. They are not really interested. They just want to score politically. They want to be able to say, "We have been rebels. We have opposed the Government. We have crossed the floor." That is what this motion is all about.

The Opposition also asked for a full report, with plans, from the Minister for Works and Housing of the alternative proposals, including location and design. The member for Pine Rivers says that is garbage, and every Liberal who voted against the Opposition's amendment is agreeing with him. They do not want to know these things.

I wonder why they do not want to know. Is there something in the evidence that would be presented or the information that would be supplied that would convict them? If the Minister for Works and Housing actually had to bring down documentation and details of all the relevant matters that took place up to the final decision, would it suddenly tie in the Liberals? Would we find, Mr. Speaker, that Liberal Cabinet Ministers were up to their neck in the decision, that the joint parties knew everything about it? Is that why members of the Liberal Party did not support the Opposition's amendment? I believe that that is the real reason. They knew that if that was forced upon the Government and if Claude Wharton, as Minister for Works, had to bring this information forward, they would be in trouble and would be indicting themselves.

Members of the Opposition want to know, and we believe that members of the public have a right to know, who authorised this demolition. We want to know the full details of all the events that surround it. We want more information about the tenders. We would like to know something about the Cabinet decision, to back up the complaint of the honourable member for Salisbury that it was only the Premier who made the decision. Was it, or were Liberals involved? We have a right to know what alternative plans were being put forward, and we also have a right to an explanation from the Treasurer. Liberals on the opposite side of the Chamber do not want that information.

Members of the Liberal Party did not oppose the amendment simply because it was put forward by the Opposition. They opposed it because they knew that if it was carried they would be put on a spot and the information that would be put before Parliament would condemn them and show their guilt by association.

I am disgusted by what has happened over the last few days; but I am even more disgusted by the attitude adopted by the Liberal Party. I am disgusted by the way in which Liberal members have refused to act, to use the power, to use the opportunity, to stop the erosion of the democratic process in this State, and I think it is about time that they had a darned good look at themselves.

Mr. WHITE (Southport) (3.30 p.m.): I rise to support the motion, but at the outset I want to make it clear that I favoured the demolition of the Bellevue and still do. What I do not support is the manner in which the demolition was carried out.

It is a very sorry thing for this State that this motion had to be moved today. The activities engaged in on Friday and Saturday nights impel me to speak to it. Like thousands of Queenslanders, I do not understand the need for the indecent haste. It is all very well to make a decision. A lot of people would say that once a decision is made the job should be carried out. As a man with some service background, I can well understand that point of view.

One of the worst examples of that type of decision was one arrived at in relation to Fraser Island. In the face of public opinion, the Federal Government made a decision to stop sand-mining on Fraser Island, and within six weeks it was stopped. The quickness of that decision is haunting the Federal Government to this day. I am sorry to say that the way in which the decision to demolish the Bellevue was implemented speedily will be a thorn in the side of the Government of this State.

Why was it that all the valuable woodwork, some of the air-conditioning units and some of the panelling were destroyed in such frantic haste? Was it a case of, "Tear the building down so that our decision will be forgotten quickly"? Unfortunately, the demolition of the Bellevue will live with us for a long, long time.

Has the Government got to the stage where it feels that it must act in the middle of the night? It is pointless for it to claim that the decision was that of the contractors. They would not have got any support for such a decision if someone in the Government had not been privy to it. What is more, I would expect that, if the Government had any sense, it would have stopped the demolition on that night. Perhaps it could have proceeded a week later, but at least the fixtures and fittings should have been taken out beforehand so that it did not look as if the Government had to act in the middle of the night like a thief.

As former speakers have said, the people of Queensland feel grave concern as a result of this action. Last week I was in the Central West and I know very well what people all over Queensland are thinking about this decision. The Government should take note of their feelings.

Mr. Sullivan: When did you get back from the Central West?

Mr. WHITE: I got back on Saturday, and I walked down the street as the demolition was taking place. I might add that the first I heard about it was when I rang the booking office in Rockhampton on Saturday morning to ask for a seat on another flight. My ticket revealed that I was a politician, and the booking clerk in the office said to me, "For God's sake, do you know what they've done?" He was the first person to tell me. His attitude is reflected throughout the State. I can assure the House that I did not feel too proud when I went to him for my ticket.

Let us get some common sense and moderation into the Government, of which I am part. It gives me no pleasure to stand up and speak against my Government. However, I will not be party to this type of operation. Over the past 18 months while I have been in Parliament, occurrences such as this have happened all too frequently. The Government will not stay in office by working at night in clandestine fashion. I for one do not support this type of activity. A decision is one thing; the manner in which it is carried out is another.

Mr. D'ARCY (Woodridge) (3.34 p.m.): The matter of the demolition of the Bellevue has been canvassed fairly well today. Members, however, have not looked at the real issues. Government members, including the previous speaker, claim that the Bellevue should have been demolished. That has never been my personal opinion, nor do I believe that the demolition was looked at by the Government in an economic context. That is probably the most pertinent comment I can make on this issue today.

It is very unfortunate that one of the most historic buildings in this city—and God knows we have few enough of them—has been destroyed by the Government. What has happened has been described in this Parliament as an act of vandalism, and it has been described in much stronger terms elsewhere.

It is well to remember that the estimates of cost of the conservation organisations and others who wanted to maintain the Bellevue building were about \$1,000,000. That was to restore the building to the condition that it was in around the 1880s. In the 1880s, it was a replica of earlier architecture. It gave the city some status and standing.

I am worried in that we were not even prepared to consider what was happening in other Australian States, which have such

buildings. The seat of Government is important in each capital city of Australia. Each State, including Queensland has its unique history. However, the Country and Liberal parties want to make this end of George Street a concrete jungle. They insist on destroying our heritage by forcing into the outer suburbs those who want to live in the city.

It is interesting to note that it was the Minister for Works and Housing who was responsible for the demolition of this building. The Housing Commissioner (Mr. Norm Hitchins), who is one of the most outstanding of our public servants, has fostered a firm policy to revitalise housing developments in the central city. Instead of the Botanic Gardens and this end of George Street being deserted like a morgue—that is probably why the morgue is situated in this area—with a restored Bellevue Hotel as the centre and with decent barbecue facilities in the Botanic Gardens, the area would come to life at week-ends. We could have followed the example set in South Australia with the Edmund Rise House and Eyres House. These buildings of historic value not only have paid for themselves but are bringing the Government an economic return. Restaurants there are leased out and at the week-ends they are full.

Queensland has a frightful record. Have you, Mr. Speaker, seen the disgraceful conditions in the office of the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages? If the Bellevue building, which was right next to our Botanic Gardens and the seat of Government, had been restored on an economic basis, we could have had a place for a registry office with proper facilities, including reception rooms and restaurants leased out to cater for the needs of the public.

Mr. Akers: With at least a 10 per cent return on investment.

Mr. D'ARCY: I agree.

The economic issues were not looked at fully by the Government in its clandestine haste to get rid of what is considered to be an eyesore. My point is that it had decided years ago to destroy this building. The Country-Liberal Party's lack of a conservation policy sticks out a mile. We all know what that is. I have described it in this Parliament before. If it stands still, knock it down; if it moves, shoot it. That is the theme song of the National and Liberal Parties. That is their philosophy on conservation. The Bellevue stood still, so it was knocked down. Fortunately it did not move or a shot might have been taken at it on Sunday.

The other points have been well canvassed. I am shocked at the Premier's excesses in this case and the fact that he has divided and continues to divide the people in this State. He rules his Government and his Cabinet in this way. The member for Salisbury was not wrong when she said that fear

permeates this State. It permeates our Public Service. It even permeates this Chamber. This is all happening because of the Premier's excesses. As a Queenslander, I am frightened. I am disappointed that the Premier can use fear in one way or another, even against members of this Parliament. As I said, we see this fear throughout the Public Service, particularly if people are subject to transfer. Like other members who come from the teaching profession, I know that that profession is tremendously concerned. Those in it are frightened to voice or state an opinion for fear of political retribution.

The points concerning the contractors have been well canvassed. I am disappointed. I was here when the final section of the Bellevue was demolished at 12.15 a.m. on Sunday. There was a crowd of about 100 people there. It was the largest section of the building to come down in one piece. People could have been injured. The Government claims that all safety precautions were observed. As a citizen who was there at the time, I do not believe that that is the case. I have seen other buildings demolished. The Government claims that the i's were dotted and the t's were crossed, but I do not believe they were.

Obviously the Brisbane City Council has a real axe to grind. It says, as was proved by photographers, that its installations were damaged by the contractor.

Mr. Akers: It was deliberately pulled on top of them. I watched it happen.

Mr. D'ARCY: That is even worse. The point I am making is that irrespective of whether or not the Government claims that all the conditions were met, I do not believe they were. The average Queenslander who saw the demolition does not believe that all safety precautions were observed.

My final comment is that, by design or otherwise, the Liberal Party has shown its attitude. Its leader seemed to make a series of statements that were not in line with one another. It was very important that his statements were taken up by the Press. The Press realised that he was trying to sit on both sides of the political fence. It was very noticeable that he was in Perth on the day of the demolition.

Mr. HARTWIG (Callide) (3.44 p.m.): I rise to make a few comments on this motion. Few of the members who have spoken spent as long at the Bellevue as I did. Having lived there for eight years, I am probably more qualified to speak about the building and the state that it was in—

Mr. Frawley: You were appointed one of the fire wardens.

Mr. HARTWIG: Yes.

I know more about the Bellevue than many of those who are saying that it should have been preserved. We hear a lot about democracy and responsible Government, but

there is no way in the world that I as a member of a responsible Government could agree to this Government's spending X thousands of dollars on a building when we consider the needs of our own electorates. I challenge members to stand up and say that they have everything they want for their electorates, that they do not want more class-rooms and libraries and better roads.

Mrs. Kyburz: They want new toilets for the Cabinet room. What about that sort of frivolity?

Mr. HARTWIG: The honourable member has had her say.

I have studied the buildings in this part of the world, and it is interesting to note that no mention has been made of the building that we now occupy. This Government created work for hundreds of men and spent millions of dollars erecting this beautiful building. Where is the comment about the employment that was created in this State? Has any credit been given to the Premier or this Government for erecting this building? On the contrary, the media has constantly ridiculed this building—

Mr. Houston: So they should.

Mr. HARTWIG: That is a great statement from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Houston: It is a poorly laid-out building.

Mr. HARTWIG: That is the worst statement the honourable member has ever made in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Callide will resume his seat. The honourable member for Bulimba will refrain from persistent interjections. I will not tolerate any more interjections from either side of the House. I warn all members under Standing Order 123A.

Mr. HARTWIG: The situation is that there are beautiful buildings at this end of George Street, such as The Mansions and the Queensland Club. Those members who attended last Wednesday's joint party meeting saw a plan presented to beautify that area.

Mr. Wright: Are you saying the Liberals actually knew what was going on?

Mr. HARTWIG: Absolutely. The Government is almost committed to spending an estimated \$30,000,000 to beautify this part of George Street. Just wait and see what this Government is going to do. I will guarantee that some members will eat their words within a short time. I reiterate that the Bellevue had not one bit of character about it. The only thing of character was the lacework, and that was removed years ago. The exterior was beautiful, but nobody can tell me that it compared with The Mansions, the Queensland Club or even the

old Treasury Building. It had no character at all. It could not hold a candle to the buildings I have mentioned. It was nothing.

Mr. Davis: That's only your opinion.

Mr. HARTWIG: I would not be far out. The honourable member never slept there and experienced the sparrow lice, the cockroaches and the water that poured in when it rained. I used to estimate the amount of rain overnight by calculating three plastic buckets to the inch.

Mrs. Kyburz: Why don't you debate the principle?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Salisbury will cease interjecting.

Mr. HARTWIG: One of the most unfortunate things that ever happened to this part of the city was that Alice Street was made an access street to the freeway. This immediately prevented families from parking cars in Alice Street on a peaceful Sunday afternoon and enjoying the Botanic Gardens. They cannot park in Alice Street, and it is almost impossible to park in George Street. If this Government made the rear of the allotment where the Bellevue stood a car-parking facility for the benefit of the people of Brisbane, they could then walk through a tunnel to the gardens. This is being denied them—

Mr. Davis: Ha, ha!

Mr. HARTWIG: And it is in the honourable member's electorate. He did not even know it was in his electorate. This is the sort of thing the Government is planning to beautify this part of the city.

I said to a reporter, "If this Parliament House had been built in Sydney or Melbourne, you would have acclaimed it." What do we see in the media? We see constant ridicule of this beautiful building. It is an asset not only to parliamentarians but to the people of Brisbane. This Government intends to deal similarly with the site of the Bellevue. Everyone of us who lived in the old Bellevue despised it. One used to come out of it feeling as though one had come out of a soup kitchen. What did we do about paying rent in the old Bellevue? Goodness me, we approached the Premier about it. He said, "Because of the conditions there, country members can stay there rent free." That was a pretty fair gesture. Did we hear any acknowledgement from those country members?

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. HARTWIG: No, but this is what the Premier did. Many people do not realise what we put up with in the old Bellevue for eight years.

Mr. Davis: Oh, well, you took it.

Mr. HARTWIG: The honourable member comes in here crying out for this and that in his electorate, yet he was prepared to

see \$1,000,000 going down the drain on that old building. I say that when the State Government completes the buildings covered by this plan, this area will be something of which every resident of Brisbane, and every person in Queensland, will be proud. That is what this Government has in mind, and I hope that a start will soon be made on the construction. Such a building would incorporate some of the iron lacework from the old Bellevue.

Mr. FOURAS (South Brisbane) (3.52 p.m.): I rise to support the motion. What amazes me is that it indirectly attacks the integrity of the Premier. Yet, until the member for Callide rose to speak, not one member of the Premier's party had got up to defend him in any way at all. I wonder why. I presume it is because his actions are indefensible.

The member for Callide spoke a lot of rubbish—typical words of a Philistine, a person who really does not understand what preservation or heritage is all about.

Mr. HARTWIG: Mr. Speaker, I take exception to those remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member taking a point of order?

Mr. HARTWIG: Yes. It is that I have the greatest respect for all things that we should preserve. I object to the words that the honourable member used, and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr. FOURAS: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw those comments. The member for Callide, when he talks about the state of the Bellevue, ought to be reminded that in The Rocks area in Sydney an old wool warehouse has been preserved. Of course, the Boot Factory at Petrie Terrace was once a boot factory. Now it is a marvellous restaurant. It is economically viable and does a lot to retain some of our heritage.

In this debate, I have heard a lot from the Liberals who are supporting the motion that they have put forward. From listening to the debate, one would think that all the back-bench Liberals are going to support the motion. I predict that no more than eight Liberals will support it.

In debating this motion, I should like to point out that the conservation record of this Government is appalling. At the protest meeting that was held at the Queensland Institute of Technology the other day, it was pointed out that Newstead House is funded only to the extent of meeting the expenses incurred in employing one caretaker. The money to meet the other expenses has to be raised through fund-raising.

I will support the motion, but it only expresses concern at what has happened. I believe that the Liberal members who have spoken in this debate—the members for Stafford, Salisbury and Pine Rivers—should have supported the amendment that the

Opposition put forward, because I think it is important that the Parliament should be told, for instance, the name of the Government officer or Cabinet Minister who authorised the demolition exercise. I also think that this Parliament should have a full report from the Works Minister on the alternative proposals, including the location and design of the new buildings and the fact that incorporated in them will be the iron lacework taken from the old Bellevue.

No doubt it is very good that a lot of Liberals are able to get up in this debate and salve their consciences, but I remember that when a former Federal Attorney-General, then Senator Murphy, led a raid on ASIO in the middle of the night, our Premier—the same Premier who sits over there now—blasted Senator Murphy and said that it was the thin end of the wedge; that it was the first step to totalitarianism.

I suggest to the Liberals that if they want to be part of a tolerant Government, not a totalitarian Government, if they want to give service to this State and not be subservient to the Minister, they have to stand up and be counted. It is no good every now and again, when an issue is exploded in their faces, going out to their electorates, washing their hands like Pontius Pilate, and saying, "We don't agree with that." Since I have been a member of this Assembly—and that is only about 15 months—there have been many instances of that.

Take, for example, the SEMP decision. The Liberals went out into the electorate amongst the people and said, "We don't support this." In the joint-party rooms and in the Parliament, they have been weak and subservient and they have supported whatever the Premier has dished up. There have been many issues—the street-march issue; the report of the inquiry into law reform; the Tarong issue. In today's "Telegraph" one sees further examples of instances in which Cabinet has never even looked at reports relative to the Port of Brisbane Authority. The only way in which we, as members of this Assembly, see these things is through reports being leaked to the media. We do not have a right to scrutinise or consider the actions of the Government.

Recently—and belatedly—the Liberals have looked at the question of a public accounts committee for this Parliament because they are concerned about the smell associated with Government contracts and the fact that they are not seen to be governing this State very well. Members of the Opposition have been asking for a long time for the establishment of such a committee.

I reiterate that I think that what happened last Friday night and last Saturday morning was abysmal. It was very difficult to believe. I had a feeling that Liberal members who turned up there had an inkling that something was going to happen. Why else were they there? I should like them to explain who told them that the demolition was about to take place. I believe that the

information was leaked to them in some way, and I believe that that is why they were there.

I do not wish to be part of a Parliament that sits here and listens to a lot of platitudes. Members of this Assembly have a right to scrutinise and to look at the way in which the decision was taken. That is why I am concerned that the Liberals did not support the more worthwhile amendment put forward by the Opposition. However, I am happy to show my disgust at the Gestapo tactics used last Saturday morning, and at the wanton destruction of property, the way in which the contract was let, the lack of security, and the failure to take the proper measures that the Government ought to have taken.

I do not think that any more will come out of this debate than an expression of what the community already feels, and I doubt that the motion will be carried. It is obvious from what other members on this side of the Chamber have said that the Opposition will support it, but I doubt whether any more than eight or nine Liberals will cross the floor on this issue. They find it very easy to have just a few of them go out into the electorate and say, "We can't stand being run by this one-man band. We will not put up with this Gestapo-style Government that we have in Queensland." If a few of them do that, the Liberals have salved their conscience and shown that they can do the right thing.

Again I say that members of the Liberal Party on the benches opposite are nothing more than the Brisbane branch of the National Party. If they support a fair redistribution of electoral boundaries, we will give them an opportunity later in this Parliament to show where they stand. Only if they decide to support equality of votes and give everyone a chance to have a fair say will they be able to claim that they belong to a Government of tolerance, not a totalitarian Government, and that they give service and are not subservient.

I am happy to support the motion; but, in conclusion, I should like to say that, unlike some honourable members, I fully supported the retention of the Bellevue. I should have liked to think that we had a Government in this State made up of people who could see what a beautiful old building it was and how desirable it would have been for us to retain that part of our heritage.

Mr. LANE (Merthyr) (3.59 p.m.): When the honourable member for Stafford rose in this Chamber this morning to move his motion relative to the demolition of the Bellevue building last Friday night, I was rather shocked and disappointed to see that there seemed to be a presumption, at least in the minds of some members of this Assembly—certainly in the minds of all honourable members opposite and, unfortunately, in the minds of some members on this side of the House—that no-one on this side of the House should ever disagree with the

Government, even in the way in which we are disagreeing now. I was extremely disappointed to hear one member on this side of the House refer by way of interjection to the member for Stafford as a dingo. He was forced to withdraw the comment when a point of order was taken.

Mr. HARTWIG: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. LANE: I won't name that member—unless he wishes to name himself, of course.

Mr. HARTWIG: My point of order is that the word referred to was used against the honourable member for Pine Rivers, not the member for Stafford. I ask the honourable member for Merthyr to withdraw his remark and apologise.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members must realise that it is the right of a member or a Minister to ask another member to withdraw a comment. That is all that is necessary. A member cannot be made to apologise.

Mr. HARTWIG: I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. LANE: I certainly withdraw the comment. I think the honourable member for Callide has made his position perfectly clear. It is the honourable member for Pine Rivers who he thinks is a dingo for expressing his opinion freely here today, not the member for Stafford. But he apologised profusely this morning.

The presumption that seems to be in the minds of some members is that no member on the Government side should disagree with the Government at any time, not even on an issue such as this. This does not involve the appropriation of money; it is not a budgetary matter; it is not a motion of no confidence in the Government; it is not a motion of confidence in the Government; consequently it is not one of those motions that bring down Governments. This is merely a motion of censure over a particular incident that occurred recently at night. The motion was moved responsibly and ably by the member for Stafford, and I defend his right to do that.

It may be news to some members, including some on the Government side, that in Federal Parliament on two of the three days each week that it sits debates take place in which members are allowed to move motions so that the Parliament may express its opinion on any issue at any time. These discussions take place every week that Parliament sits. Unfortunately, however, such debates take place very rarely in this Parliament. Members here are given little opportunity to express their opinions.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: Are you saying we should be a little more democratic in Queensland? Is that what you are saying? Are you saying you would like to see that in this Parliament?

Mr. LANE: I am saying that it ought to become the practice to conduct such debates in this Parliament so that members may express their opinions on matters of conscience and on matters pertaining to the administration of the Government. I believe that the only call that the Government can make on its back-benchers is for their support on votes of confidence at all times on the floor of Parliament or on money Bills. As the authority that handles the administration and the finances of this State in a businesslike manner, the Government has our support. What members are seeking to do here is deplore the action that was taken the other night, as indeed I do. I deplore such action because it paid no regard whatever to the feelings and sensitivities of the residents of the Brisbane area.

Unlike the member for Southport, I have not had an opportunity to go bush to learn how the country people feel on this issue. He has told me that quite a lot of them are alarmed. I am concerned about what the people in Brisbane think about it—the people with genuine conservation beliefs; the people with a genuine sense of history and a love for the great historic buildings around the city; and, indeed, the ordinary citizens in my electorate and others who, with a feeling of sentimentality for the Bellevue, were offended by the action that was taken last Friday night. It is my concern for all those people that impels me to speak to this motion today.

In view of the fact that the matter was discussed at the Government parties' meeting last week, I was very disappointed to see what happened. I am loath to outline in any detail what goes on at joint party meetings, but I want to make it clear that I do not believe in caucus government. I do not believe that the Government should submit all of its proposals to a weekly mass meeting of Government members for their approval or opposition. That is certainly not the way a Government should operate under the Westminster system. Government, or Cabinet, should stand on its merits and it should be judged in the Parliament on what it does. It should not be put to the test in the caucus-style Star Chamber that is held here every Wednesday afternoon. That is the type of arrangement for which the Australian Labor Party has been notorious ever since it came into existence.

I would remind members that Gough Whitlam fell from office as the result of going to his caucus for advice rather than relying on his public servants through the proper administrative and technical channels that are set up by the Westminster system. He went to his caucus instead of listening to members on the floor of Parliament and going out into the community and listening to interested groups and individuals who have expertise in a particular field. That is the way a Government should govern—with Cabinet accountable to Parliament and Parliament accountable to the people. It

should not be a matter of the Government's being accountable to caucus, with caucus accountable to the party and the party accountable to its membership in the community. That is how the Labor Party fell and, if we are not careful, that is how we will fall today.

Mr. Warburton interjected.

Mr. LANE: I did not catch the interjection made by the honourable member for Sandgate but I am pleased that he spoke. His predecessor, Mr. Dean, who was in Parliament a couple of years ago, made pleas in the Press for six months about Liquor Act amendments. He had a good, conscientious objection to the amendments. He was a man of temperance. However, when his party decided that it would vote in favour of lowering the age of drinking to 18, what did he do? He lined up with caucus because caucus stood over him. I do not want that to happen on this side of the House, but that is what happened to Harry Dean. He did what he was told although it was against his conscience.

Some members today feel that this is a conscience issue. While it may not be so tremendous, nevertheless it is a conscience issue to some sentimental people on this side of the House. That is how we will vote on the motion shortly; that is just how Mr. Dean would have voted on the Liquor Bill had he not been bound by the Labor Party rules.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: And the present vice-mayor of Brisbane, too.

Mr. LANE: That is so. Mr. Roy Harvey was in exactly the same position, but he could not disagree with caucus although liquor was a conscience issue with him. He said privately for months, and in the Press, that he objected to liberalising the liquor laws, but he fell into line and did what he was told. He voted with the Opposition because he was told to do so by caucus and people at the Trades Hall. That is not what the Liberal members or any National Party members who may join with the honourable member for Stafford will be doing today. They will be voting in accordance with their consciences. It is a condition of our membership in the Liberal Party that we vote according to our consciences.

I have something more to say in general terms about caucus government. I do not intend to discuss in detail the proposal that went through the other day, but let the point be made publicly that until about three or four years ago any member of the Government parties—I invite some of the National Party members of good will to listen to this point—no matter how junior he was, could attend a joint party meeting on Wednesday on matters of real concern and put forward his point of view. If he found something objectionable in a Bill or other Government proposal and he put up a good, reasonable and sensible case, he was

listened to. Many honourable members know that this is so. Ministers would then go away and talk to him privately to try to sort the matter out. A reasonable conclusion would be arrived at having regard to the feelings of people in the metropolitan electorate and taking into account our base of political power. Unfortunately, I must report to Parliament that that is not happening these days. Our views are not taken into account as they were three or four years ago. That is why friction has become apparent in the Press in recent months. I do not think it will disappear until some people try to understand others' points of view.

I did not want the whole of the Bellevue preserved in its entirety. I did not believe that some of the rotting building at the rear should have been restored to the condition that it was in at the turn of the last century. I did not believe in that at all. I supported the compromise put forward by the Deputy Premier and Treasurer at the party meeting last Wednesday. It was drafted into the form of a motion by the Minister for Aboriginal and Island Affairs and supported by the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads. It was a compromise which included rebuilding of the facade of the Bellevue to incorporate much of the original material in that building. That is what was passed at our party meeting last Wednesday and that was our understanding of what would happen. That is why we are now shocked.

Indeed, I was shocked at 5.30 a.m. on Saturday when someone rang me and told me that half of the Bellevue had been reduced to rubble. I was shocked a quarter of an hour later when someone else rang, and so on for the remainder of the week-end. I respond to my electorate. That is not a dishonest response or emotion; it is the best and most honest emotion that can be expected from a politician. Honourable members can take my word for it. Members should respond to their electorates. That is what they are paid to do and that is what we are doing today.

Mr. Akers: That is real representation.

Mr. LANE: That is real representation.

Our party is not subject to the cast-iron discipline of some other parties in this place. We have no intention of subscribing to that. Liberal Party Cabinet Ministers are in a different position. They are bound to the rule covering Cabinet solidarity. It requires them to support all matters upon which the Government has agreed. Short of resigning from Cabinet, they are required to give support. Liberal Ministers maintain that position quite properly and quite responsibly. We expect them to do so. However, there is no collective responsibility imposed on Liberal back-benchers in this place by the caucus, the party organisation or Cabinet Ministers. I suggest to all honourable members that they should not expect that system to prevail because it will not.

In an endeavour to contribute last Wednesday to the suggestion put forward by the Deputy Premier that the facade be maintained, I made the suggestion publicly—and I make it again as an attempt to salvage something even at this late stage—that the State Government launch a national competition for a design that would incorporate the facade of the Bellevue in a new building to be situated at the corner of Alice and George Streets on the old Bellevue site.

Mr. Fouras: Phoney history.

Mr. LANE: It is the honourable member's right to say that. But it is not helpful to say it now.

What concerns Queenslanders most is preservation of the George Street precinct as a whole as distinct from preservation of the entire building. The proposal put forward by the Deputy Premier last Wednesday, on which I suggested that a national competition be launched to find an acceptable design, would answer many of the objections from the community. The purists in terms of maintaining our history would not be pleased with that suggestion.

Mr. Akers: Hear, hear!

Mr. LANE: My friend the honourable member for Pine Rivers says, "Hear, hear!" Of course he would not. He said that last Wednesday. He is entitled to his opinion. That is what was not taken into account. My feelings, and those of members such as the honourable member for Pine Rivers and the many people in my electorate who have been in touch with me, have been offended by the way in which the Government's decision was made or not made. Therefore I will be supporting the motion, and I commend the honourable member for Stafford for moving it.

Mr. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (4.14 p.m.): I rise to support the motion moved by the Liberal Party and in doing so even surprise myself. Liberal members, one after the other, have said how outraged they were at this action taken by the Government and the Premier in pulling down this building in the hours of darkness when, last Wednesday afternoon, all but five, I am told, supported the demolition of the building. They were not outraged enough to come into the Chamber on Thursday and move a motion supporting the retention of the building. Certainly they were not outraged enough then.

Mrs. Kyburz interjected.

Mr. MACKENROTH: It makes no difference whether it was pulled down by the contractor in the early hours of Saturday morning or whether the Premier let the contract under the normal circumstances. The building has been pulled down and it should not have been pulled down. Parliament should have supported—

Mrs. Kyburz: Can't you see the difference?

Mr. MACKENROTH: I can see the difference. The honourable member did not make a stand for complete restoration.

Mrs. Kyburz interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Salisbury will cease her persistent interjections and the honourable member for Chatsworth will continue with his speech.

Mr. MACKENROTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think they should have made this stand last week and supported the complete restoration of the Bellevue. The honourable member for Sherwood said earlier that the Opposition has never taken a stand on this matter. The honourable member for Brisbane Central said that he was present at the 1974 meeting in support of retention of the Bellevue building. When the Government ripped the balustrade off the Bellevue in 1974, I joined the National Trust, and I have remained a member ever since because of my desire to see the Bellevue restored. I do not think the Government should have taken the action of pulling the building down in the dead of night. This is the eve of Anzac Day. Tomorrow we remember our forefathers who went away to fight for democracy so that we could have a free country. We certainly do not have that now, particularly after the actions of the Premier's demolition men last Friday night.

It is good to see a few Liberals taking a stand. I would like to see the Deputy Premier taking a stand. I am told that the only stand he ever takes is when the Premier enters the room. It is about time he stood up to the Premier. People ring me up and say, "Why don't you take a stand on this issue in the Parliament?" This is the first time that we as members of Parliament have had the opportunity to debate this matter. My God, it is a bit late to be debating the restoration of the Bellevue building when one can walk outside and see the site. It looks like something in Berlin or London during World War II, certainly not something one would expect to see in Brisbane today. I tell my constituents that here in Queensland not just the back-bench members of the Labor Party but the back-bench members of the Liberal and National Parties are not getting a fair say in the Government of this State. We do not get any say in what goes on in Queensland. It is very frustrating to be a back-bench member in this Queensland Parliament.

A Government Member: In Opposition.

Mr. MACKENROTH: No. I think it would be very frustrating to be a back-bench member of the Government parties and have to take what they take every day from the Premier and the Cabinet. Yet we find this one instance when they are prepared to stand up and be counted. I understand that there has been a head count of

who is going to cross the floor and the Government will be ensuring that enough members are caught in the toilets or in the lifts so that the motion is not passed. Sufficient members will go home to ensure that the motion is not passed, exactly as happened when the Tarong decision was debated in the House last year. On that occasion eight members of the Liberal Party went home early with headaches. The honourable member for Mt. Gravatt, who is about to interject, went home early that night. I well remember that.

We have been criticised for not making any statements on this issue. While I do not wish to completely castigate the Press, I think someone should say something. When one picks up the "Telegraph", and looks at the report of the debate here today, we see that the members for Pine Rivers and Salisbury are mentioned as having participated, and right at the very end a little piece is tacked on saying that Mr. Ed Casey moved an amendment. The Press have not given Opposition members a fair go on this issue. On Thursday I released a statement containing my views, but it did not get a run. Fine, I am a back-bencher; but the Leader of the Opposition held a Press conference on Thursday and he did not get much of a run on that at all. The Leader of the Opposition addressed the public meeting on Saturday, and I saw one paragraph in the Press stating that he was at that meeting.

Mr. Austin: It's about all he's worth.

Mr. MACKENROTH: Oh, go on! Then we get the honourable member for Pine Rivers saying, "Fancy the Leader of the Opposition rolling up and making a political statement at a meeting like that." I was at that meeting, and I really thought I was at a Liberal Party meeting. The chairman stood up and said, "We've got this and that member of the Liberal Party here. We have apologies from Dr. Edwards." When he said he had apologies from Dr. Edwards, the whole crowd laughed. There was also an apology from Jim Killen. The honourable member for Brisbane Central assures me that it is exactly the same apology that was received from him at the 1974 meeting.

These were Liberals speaking at a non-political meeting! We heard from the honourable member for Pine Rivers. We also heard from a member of the Young Liberals, John Delahunty. But he was not just John Delahunty; he was John Delahunty from the Liberal Environmental Committee. They were not making speeches at a non-political meeting; they were out trying to do a little bit of political grandstanding in order to square off with the residents of Brisbane for having pulled down the Bellevue Hotel building and for not having supported its complete restoration, something which I feel they should have done at the joint party meeting last Wednesday.

Mr. Davis interjected.

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

Mr. MACKENROTH: There is one thing that I would like to bring to the attention of the House before I resume my seat. Perhaps the Premier or the Minister for Works and Housing will be able to answer it. I have it on good advice that the Prisons Department and the Parole Board have been ordered to leave The Mansions building by Thursday. I ask the Premier whether at The Mansions this week-end we are going to have a repeat of what happened last Friday. I hope not. I hope that Government members, at their party meeting this week, will support a proposal that will ensure the complete restoration of The Mansions. Do not let the same thing happen there.

A Government Member: You're just grandstanding!

Mr. MACKENROTH: The member for Callide told us that the proposals for the Bellevue site are a great idea. He said that a car-park will be provided there and that people will be able to walk through a tunnel to the Botanic Gardens. The Premier said that it would be a great idea to have sunken gardens there. The Deputy Premier said, "We have a great idea. We are going to build a replica of the Bellevue"—create a little bit of phony history there. I really would like to know what is proposed for the site. The Premier has one proposal and the Deputy Premier has another. The member for Callide is going to put a car-park there. I thought that someone was really going to let the cat out of the bag when he nearly said that a high-rise building was going to be built there. I would like to know what is to be there. I supported the proposal to completely restore the Bellevue. But now that it has gone, let the Government come out and tell us what is to go there.

A Government Member: It took you long enough to make up your mind.

Mr. MACKENROTH: I have given my view previously. I should like to see the proposals for the whole George Street area. The only building that I would like to see ripped down at this end of town is the old "Courier-Mail" garage.

Mr. FRAWLEY (Caboolture) (4.22 p.m.): I have sat here all day and listened to the weeping and wailing of members of the A.L.P. They are a bunch of hypocrites, because they had plenty of time to stand up and speak about the Bellevue.

Mr. MACKENROTH: I rise to a point of order. This matter has never been before the Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I must correct that last statement. The Matters of Public Interest debate allows any member to state what is in his mind. As a matter of fact, I have been around the ridges as long as members on my left have been in Opposition, and there has been ample opportunity for them to

raise this matter. I do not think that anybody, including myself, was of the opinion that it was going to be pulled down, but that is not the question.

Mr. FRAWLEY: He is only a grandstander. He handed back his silver tea service because he tried to hock it and could not get enough for it.

I am opposing the motion moved by the member for Stafford. I am glad that the Bellevue was demolished. It was a pile of junk and it stood up only because the white ants were linking hands to hold it together. It would have cost at least \$3,000,000 to restore it. It was a good idea to get it demolished quickly, because it stopped all the ratbags and radicals from standing down there demonstrating for weeks. Some of the women should have been home looking after their husbands and children instead of hanging around the gates of Parliament House and demonstrating.

The secretary of the Builders Workers' Union, who is chairman of the Communist Party, and admits it, wanted to put a green ban on the Bellevue, the same as Jack Munday did in Sydney a few years ago. I am glad that the Bellevue was pulled down. It got rid of all the idiots who hang around the streets demonstrating.

The member for Woodridge accused us of destroying our heritage. What about the Trades Hall? The A.L.P. applied to have the Trades Hall pulled down and to have something else built there.

Mr. R. J. GIBBS: I rise to a point of order. As a member of the A.L.P., I take exception to that remark by the honourable member for Caboolture. At no time has the Australian Labor Party made an application to have the Trades Hall pulled down. I find the remark offensive and ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for Caboolture.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Why should the Government give permission to pull it down? Why shouldn't Queensland's Kremlin be preserved in memory of some of the plots that have been hatched in the dark rooms up there by the member for Archerfield and other Labor members of this House? Members opposite speak with tongue in cheek when they say that we have destroyed our heritage.

The member for Brisbane Central got up and made his usual incoherent speech, no doubt written for him by somebody from the Trades Hall. Then the member for Rockhampton attempted to blame the Liberal Party for the alleged shortcomings of the Government parties. It should be remembered that the joint parties were elected in 1957 after years of Labor mismanagement. I know that, because I worked in Parliament House as a electrician when the Labor Party was in power in Queensland. I have told honourable members before of all the rorts and rackets that occurred under Labor. Labor

members sold the furniture to the Bellevue. No wonder honourable members opposite wanted the Bellevue preserved. They wanted to get back some of the furniture that members of the A.L.P. sold to pay their betting debts.

In 1974 a National-Liberal Government with 69 members was elected in this State. Doesn't that show a vote of confidence by the people of Queensland? It was the highest majority ever in Queensland political history. Again in 1977, with 59 members, we still had the second-greatest victory in Queensland politics. Doesn't that show that the people of this State are satisfied with the leadership of the Premier and the type of government that they are getting? Of course it does. They want a strong man. They do not want a "yes" man, an insipid, weak leader; they want someone who is not frightened.

I have disagreed with the Premier on many occasions, and I will probably do so again. However, I am supporting him in the action that was taken on this occasion. I say that the action of the joint Government parties in voting to demolish the Bellevue building should be acclaimed by everybody with a grain of sense. The Labor Party, with a miserable 23 members in this Chamber, certainly has not got the confidence of the people of Queensland. The Government has more than twice as many members as the Opposition.

The Labor Party is a party of "yes" men. They even give 3½ per cent of their salary to retain their endorsements, and I certainly do not have to give that to keep my endorsement.

What happened when the Hotel Daniell was demolished? Did any honourable members opposite or anyone else protest? What about the Gresham Hotel, which was the centre for racing people who came to Queensland?

Mr. Akers: They were all privately owned.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Of course they were privately owned.

Mr. Akers: This was Government property.

Mr. FRAWLEY: As soon as the Government buys something, somebody wants to preserve it. Until the Bellevue became the property of the Government, nobody wanted to keep it except Joe Bonenti, who held the licence at the time. Later I will tell honourable members how the Labor Party prevented him from improving the Bellevue Hotel.

What about Lennons Hotel, where General MacArthur stayed? Did anyone complain when that was pulled down? Or the Exchange Hotel, which was called the Whitehorse Inn, on the corner of Elizabeth and Albert Streets, when it was demolished to make way for the Forum picture theatre? Nobody complained about that. It was built before the Bellevue Hotel, and it was a centre of interest. Why didn't honourable members opposite complain about those buildings?

Let me get back to the Bellevue Hotel. When Joe Bonenti had the licence of the Bellevue Hotel, he applied to renovate the hotel and Vince Gair, as Premier of the Labor Government of the day, stopped him and told him that he would take the licence from him. The Bellevue began to fall into disrepair under a Labor Government.

Mr. Davis interjected.

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

Mr. FRAWLEY: An honourable member said—I do not know who it was—that the only people demonstrating at the Bellevue on Friday night were good, sincere people. I tell the House now that one person who was arrested there for jumping in front of a low loader has been arrested three times before. He is a teacher from the Caboolture State High School, and it is the third time that he has been arrested. He has been arrested twice in connection with street march demonstrations, and he was arrested again on Friday night. Would honourable members opposite call him a genuine demonstrator?

What about that clown known as "Waynee Poo" from one of the radio stations? The best thing that could have happened would have been for a bulldozer to run over him. He is just an idiot. That is one radio station that I would never listen to, with a clown like him on the air. He is not a true conservationist.

Mr. Akers: What about the 100 Young Liberals who were there?

Mr. FRAWLEY: What about Dean George? On "Nationwide" last night, Dean George proved to everybody what his sense of values really is. He said he was shocked and horrified that the Bellevue had been demolished. What about his action in regard to St. Martin's Hospital? What did he do about that? It was the only Anglican hospital in Brisbane, a War Memorial, and in the foyer there is a plaque, which I have read, saying "in perpetuity", which I thought meant for ever. What did Dean George do about that? That hospital was built in 1922, and it was basically a 17th century-style building. Why is there not any move from Dean George to preserve that hospital? Why is he concerned with the Bellevue building?

Even the National Trust gave St. Martin's Hospital an "A" classification. That means that the trust considers it to be a building of great historical value, the preservation of which is regarded as essential to the heritage of this State. What about that?

For some time, Dean George has set himself up as a political expert, and it puzzles me how someone in his position can find time to involve himself so much in politics. One would think that a man of God would have his time taken up spreading the word of Christ and looking after his parishioners

instead of involving himself in political activity. Surely there is something more important in the cause of Christianity for Dean George to take care of than involving himself in politics. Any man or woman is entitled to his or her opinion; but the church has a certain role to play in the community, and its servants should remember their role as ministers of the faith and not become political activists.

As I said earlier, there were many demonstrators at the Bellevue on Friday night. All I say in conclusion is that I support the Government. I went on record as having voted that not only the Bellevue but also The Mansions be demolished, because I considered that the whole area should be converted into gardens. I am not frightened to say that.

Mr. Wright: Are you saying that is going to happen, too?

Mr. FRAWLEY: I will answer the honourable member's question. I don't know. However, if the matter does come up, I will vote for its demolition.

In my electorate of Caboolture I have received only one telephone call, from a person on Bribe Island, objecting to the demolition of the Bellevue.

An Opposition Member: I have had a dozen from your electorate and they have all spoken that way.

Mr. FRAWLEY: All I can suggest is that at the next election the honourable member come up to my electorate and try to put me out. If anyone thinks he can come up and beat me on that issue, he can have a go.

In conclusion—once again I reiterate that I am pleased the Bellevue was demolished.

Mr. R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (4.31 p.m.): With some misgivings, I rise to support the motion moved by the Liberal Party. What we have seen here today is a complete charade by members of the Liberal Party. Having heard the intelligent and highly volatile address to the House by the member for Caboolture, I would not blame anyone in the House for sharing my opinion. The previous speaker referred to the fact that this Government was returned with handsome majorities in 1974 and 1977. I have news for him. This is now 1979—almost two years later. When the Government calls an election next year, it should beware, because it will pay a drastic price for the action that it took at the week-end and for other actions that preceded it.

One thing that is getting through loud and clear to the people of Queensland is that this Government is a Government of tired old men, a Government that is corrupt and rotten to the core. That is the only way it can be described. It is a Government that is administered and run by a Cabinet that comprises persons whose shonky business dealings and interpretation of the word "government" are being questioned deeply by the Queensland electorate.

Mr. WHARTON: I rise to a point of order. I object to the member's reference to shonky dealings of members of the Cabinet.

Mr. Wright: They are not shonky; they are shoddy.

Mr. WHARTON: The honourable member for Rockhampton should withdraw his statement, too. I ask for a withdrawal.

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

Mr. R. J. GIBBS: Is he asking that I withdraw the word "shonky"?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. R. J. GIBBS: I withdraw it, and replace it with "illicit".

Mr. WHARTON: I rise to a point of order. I ask for a withdrawal of that word, too.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Minister objects to that word, too, and on behalf of Cabinet asks for its withdrawal.

Mr. R. J. GIBBS: I will withdraw it. Later I shall write to the Minister and explain what it means. I shall spell it out for him like "T-h-e c-a-t s-a-t o-n t-h-e m-a-t".

When I entered Parliament, I believed that there was still some small shade of democracy left in the conduct of the procedures of this Parliament. However, to the shame of everybody in this House, that has not been so over the past 18 months.

Mr. Elliott: Is it correct that in the "Increase your word power" column in "Reader's Digest" you scored two out of 20?

Mr. R. J. GIBBS: No, that is not correct. In fact, if my brain power was put up against the honourable member's, I would appear to be a genius.

It is no mere coincidence that for almost this entire debate both the Premier and the Deputy Premier have been absent from the Chamber. They have been afraid to enter the House and state their points on the floor of the House. I was reliably informed in the parliamentary lobby that the Premier is absent because he has been out lighting candles on a giant swastika to celebrate the Fuehrer's birthday.

Mr. Houston: Wouldn't you think that one member of the Cabinet would have defended their actions?

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

Mr. R. J. GIBBS: I would, but not one Cabinet member has been on his feet today to put up an argument on behalf of the Government.

I draw the attention of the public of Queensland to the fact that the attendance in this House on this very important issue shows how it is regarded by Liberal and

National Party members. They have been conspicuous by their absence. The Premier, the Deputy Premier and other front-bench and back-bench members of Parliament are absent. It is well known that the roster system is operating today. Half of the Government members are probably running around their electorates in Queensland instead of being here to represent the people of their electorates and debate this motion.

The whole charade by the members for Pine Rivers, Wavell and Sherwood stems from the fact that these gentlemen make up the new brigade of the Liberal Party in Parliament. They are extremely concerned. Their concern about the Liberal Party's reputation is obvious. They realise full well that the only possible way in which the Liberal Party has a chance of being the senior party is by their standing up and dissociating themselves from the National Party. But likewise they realise that they have not the numbers to do it. They cannot organise them and they are afraid to do so.

A few years ago the ginger group existed in the Liberal Party. Half of that group was bought off with Cabinet appointments. The members associated with the ginger group who talked about the democratic running of Parliament, democracy in Queensland and freedom for the people who put them in their positions, sold out their very soul and their principles. When they accepted Cabinet rank they sold themselves out and now refuse to stand up and be counted on this issue.

Mr. Casey: Do you think the Premier has ginger-coated their ginger?

Mr. R. J. GIBBS: That is an apt comment.

In the past few months we saw a change in the leadership of the Liberal Party. We saw the axing of the member for Nundah as leader and his replacement by the member for Ipswich—the knight in shining armour, or rather the doctor in the white coat. He was to cure the ills of the Liberal Party. He was the Messiah who was to lead the Liberals out of the wilderness and show them the way after a long time as junior partner in the coalition. Instead, we have seen the further frustration of the Liberal Party. We have witnessed a situation identical to the one that confronted the member for Nundah.

The Deputy Premier and Treasurer is afraid to make concrete decisions on behalf of the Liberal Party. He will not stand up and be counted and constantly makes the excuse that he is a member of the coalition and has to respect the coalition. Only a few weeks ago, when certain coal-mines in my electorate were to be closed down because of insufficient Government contracts to guaranteed overseas exports, the Deputy Premier and Treasurer gave the most mealy-mouthed, weak excuse I have ever heard. He said, "I cannot be held responsible. I am the Deputy Premier, but all that I can say is

that I am extremely disappointed that this is taking place." That is the total or complete picture of the Deputy Premier's performance since he became Leader of the Liberal Party.

The so-called Liberals who talk about the glories of the free-enterprise system and tell us that they will be the senior partner in the coalition amaze me in that they have the hide to even suggest such a thing when they have not the belly to ensure the election of a leader who will take a firm stand on behalf of their party.

It would be extremely interesting to know what happened at the Liberal Party meeting this morning. What I believe took place is that a few of them went in with fire in their bellies and strong words in their mouths but that they were doused pretty quickly. The Nationals threw cold water over them and that is where the matter stayed. They did not get up off the floor. The motion is mealy-mouthed, is extremely weak and is very well-watered down.

I say without hesitation that the best news the Labor Party has heard today is that the coalition is to survive. That is the best news that we could possibly have because the longer the coalition survives, the better will be the prospects of the A.L.P.'s becoming the Government at the next State election. As I have said before, the people have seen through the shallowness of this very weak and corrupt Government.

Last night I watched "Nationwide". I saw the Deputy Premier protesting strongly about the Liberal Party's role in the coalition. It is about time that Liberal members woke up to what the word "coalition" means. It means that they enter an agreement with other people who have more numbers in this Parliament than they have. If they are so naive—

Mr. White: Who would we turn to—

Mr. R. J. GIBBS: The honourable member is naive. I regret his naivety. If he is naive enough to believe that at a joint party meeting those people will concede to the Liberals, he is smoking opium. They will not concede the numbers. The only way that the Liberals will get the slightest semblance of democracy operating in this House is to start supporting some of the motions moved in this Chamber by the Australian Labor Party.

What a tongue-in-the-cheek job it was when the honourable member for Merthyr —

Mr. Innes: We are doing pretty well now and you're supporting us.

Mr. R. J. GIBBS: The honourable member is not doing very well. As a matter of fact, I thought your contribution today was extremely poor.

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

Mr. R. J. GIBBS: We saw a complete somersault by the member for Merthyr, who spoke about introducing into this Parliament new democratic measures so that matters such as the Bellevue could be discussed at length. We have put up similar proposals before. We have made approaches to people in this Parliament about improvements in procedures at question-time and about improvements in the Standing Orders. We have not made one ounce of progress on those matters. Why? Because the Liberals have never had the guts to come over here and support us on those issues. They stand condemned. They stand condemned by the very fact that they refuse to take sides on issues of importance.

What a disgusting thing happened this morning. The honourable members for Stafford and Pine Rivers made excuses for Liberal members of Cabinet. I think that the honourable member for Pine Rivers is a very shallow person to put such an argument. What would be his position if tomorrow he was elevated to Cabinet? What he is saying—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will come back to the motion before the House.

Mr. R. J. GIBBS: I am speaking to it, Mr. Speaker.

What would be his action then on a matter like the Bellevue? If he had been a Cabinet Minister at the time of the Bellevue decision, would he have taken the same stand in the House today and would the honourable member for Stafford have moved his motion, or would they be sitting back and looking after their own Cabinet seats and keeping them warm? I have every confidence in saying that the latter would be the line of action that they would have adopted.

There has been much talk today about the democratic processes in this State. Some members have said that they want to see change and expressed the hope that there would be change in the future. That is something that we share. We all hope to see a more democratic process in this State. But where was this so-called great Liberal Party when we were debating issues such as the street march legislation, the Tarong Power House and the Premier's folly in flying off to New South Wales to campaign in that State election, and who paid for it? There was nary a word from the Liberal Party on those matters. What did they do about the public accounts committee that was called for last week by the Deputy Premier, something which the A.L.P. in this State has called for before? It has never been supported by Liberal Party members.

If Government members want to talk about heritage, where were they when the Government sold out some of the greatest heritage that Queenslanders fought for? My good friend the honourable member for

Chatsworth mentioned that tomorrow is Anzac Day. But Liberal Party members never considered that last year when they sold out our heritage up on the Central Coast and gave it to Mr. Iwasaki. Where were they then? They refused to support us. They ran away from the issue and gave away the land. Where did they stand on the issue of the secret files on the night that people were down here peering over the balcony at the honourable member for Salisbury and the Premier flashed the Special Branch files in front of people so that they would shut up?

Liberal Party members have to answer for actions of that type and they are not going to convince me and the Australian Labor Party and certainly not the Queensland electorate that they are genuine people. I say that because they are not playing their proper role. They are seen outside this House as members of a party prone to telling falsehoods and afraid to take a stand.

To sum up, I want to ask a couple of questions. If in the future we are going to talk about democracy and conservation, where are the members of the Liberal Party going to stand on issues such as the bridge to Stradbroke Island and mining on Moreton Island when they come before this House? Finally, I repeat one of the great statements made by our fine, statesmanlike Premier during the last election campaign, "If you want to fly like a crow, you will get shot as one."

Mr. BOURKE (Lockyer) (4.46 p.m.): I rise to make a few brief points. Firstly, I wish to refer to the manner in which the decision to demolish the Bellevue was taken. It was reached at a joint Government party meeting. Many wild statements have been made about the democracy or non-democracy of that decision. I believe that technically it was an Executive decision, which it was well within the capacity of Cabinet to make on its own, but I give credit to the Premier for referring it to a meeting of the joint parties. He gave us an undertaking to do that, and he carried it out in full. Technically I should have imagined that Cabinet would have made the decision, but Cabinet did defer to the joint parties and relied on their advice. In my opinion it was the right decision. It was not made in a hurry. If there is any issue that has been fully debated, it is the future of the Bellevue.

It was not a new question. It has been around this town for four or five years, and perhaps up to 10 years. We have all been approached by our constituents and we know their feelings on it. We have considered those feelings. Many of us had personal experience of the Bellevue. I attended the technical college down here for three years, and every time I came down here I walked past the Bellevue. I am aware of the part it played in the history of the parliamentary precinct. I stayed there for two years, so

I can claim that I know the building quite well. I can not say that I did not wish it to be knocked down. I looked at its claim to be preserved quite seriously and I decided that the case for preservation was not valid and that there was no point in paying the money required to preserve it.

I voted to have it demolished, and I do not wish to avoid that responsibility. I think a member of Parliament has to be prepared to take the responsibility for some decisions. I certainly voted to have it demolished. I think the joint parties similarly considered the question long and hard. To my mind, it was one that received much more attention than quite serious legislation. I believe it was discussed at the last joint party meeting for about two hours, so if people are going to talk about rushed decisions, I think they are way off course. This was not a rushed decision; it was taken quite seriously.

What about the other buildings in this area? We have heard a lot of noise and fuss about knocking down the Bellevue but not much has been said about The Mansions, which are to be preserved. Harris Court across the road is also to be preserved. We have the old Government House down here. I wonder how many Opposition members have even gone down and looked at it recently. It is to be preserved. The old Parliament House Lodge is to be reconstructed in the future. It will be completely restored. In short, the Government's actions are to its credit. We also have the Old Government Printer's building and the old State Stores Board building. The Government is spending literally millions of dollars to preserve them, and rightly so. I think the public would wish it.

The honourable member for Woodridge spoke about the Bellevue as being one of the greatest historical buildings of this State. To my mind that statement stretches credibility to the limit. I do not see its claim to be one of the greatest historical buildings of this State. Where do the honourable member for Woodridge and the members of the Labor Party stand on the future of the People's Palace owned by the Salvation Army?

Mr. Houston: What have you done?

Mr. BOURKE: Is the honourable member prepared to put his hand in the pocket and pay anything to preserve it? Honourable members opposite talk about preserving buildings. How many of them are prepared to put their hands in their pockets in order to preserve them? We heard the honourable member for Wolston talking about the Anzac tradition. What about Anzac Square? There we have a war memorial dedicated to the memory of the people who were killed in World War I. The Labor administration in the Brisbane City Council is proposing that an insurance company should redevelop that area. On that one, I do not hear much talk

about the traditions of Anzac from honourable members opposite. Of course, it is because their own party is involved in this matter up to its armpits.

I move on to the actual manner in which the Bellevue was demolished. I personally regret the manner in which it was demolished. I think that this matter will haunt the Government. I think that the manner in which it was demolished at night will return to haunt the Government in the future. I support the motion in a strict interpretation of its meaning, but I speak with hindsight. I am not getting up here and proposing to judge the person who made the decision to demolish the Bellevue.

It may have seemed a good decision, looking at the matter from the front. There was this question of union bans, green bans and pickets. There was the suggestion, even from some people in here who should be upholding the law, that decisions of this kind can be taken by people outside; that union executives can make a decision on whether a building should be demolished or not. I support without reservation the principle of government—

Mr. Yewdale: The Premier wants to challenge the decisions of the Industrial Commission.

Mr. BOURKE: It is not a decision taken by unions, and the honourable member is just stretching the point. The builders' labourers profess to be the right people to make these decisions. The A.L.P. has a particular problem here, because these unions have power within the Labor Party. Not many Labor politicians are very anxious to question these unions. Honourable members opposite talk about democracy, but when these particular questions arise they lie low, because these union people, even if they are connected with other Communist officials, have power within the Labor Party. We do not see any great enthusiasm in the Labor Party when it comes to questioning these union people. We hear talk about democracy and how it has declined, but we do not hear talk about how the unions are setting themselves up as a parallel Government. That is just something that does not concern honourable members opposite at all.

Mr. Fouras: Green bans have saved a lot of our heritage. History will judge them well.

Mr. BOURKE: I put it to the honourable member that the correct body to make a decision regarding the Bellevue is the Government, and the Government has made its decision.

Today we have heard members of the Labor Party—Her Majesty's Opposition, to give them a rather grand title that they have never deserved—pleading with the Liberals to support them on other issues. After more than 20 years in Opposition, they are so reduced that their sole function is to plead with the Liberals to go across and support them.

The member for South Brisbane was acting like a bookie. He was giving odds on how many of us were going to cross the floor and vote with them on this motion. That seems to be the question occupying the minds of the honourable members opposite. The big question to them is how many Liberals will go across and vote with them. It is not a matter of putting forward principles or arguments against the Government's case. It is a matter of how many Liberals they can talk into going across to vote with them. I have been here for only 2½ years, and all I can say to members opposite is that they are a very paltry Opposition.

The member for Wolston talked about the changes that he has seen take place since he came into place after the 1977 election. I have seen a change since I came here in 1976. There were 11 Labor members in Opposition then, and I might point out that the present Leader of the Opposition was not amongst them. After the 1977 election, there were 23 members of the Opposition and, to my mind, the quality of the Opposition has dropped, noticeably so. I am judging that from where I sit over here. Of course, the member for Wolston cannot judge that.

Then we have the question about Liberals standing up for their consciences. Honourable members opposite plead with the Liberals and say to them, "Stay true to your traditions." We do have great traditions and I am quite proud of them. Let us look at the Labor record. Has the Leader of the Opposition ever stood up for the party? He was expelled for standing up, not on a matter of principle but for refusing to pay a few lousy dollars towards party funds. The party kicked him out. He crawled back and the A.L.P. took him back because circumstances had changed.

Mr. Underwood: You tried to join the Labor Party in Toowoomba and they would not have you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Ipswich West under Standing Order 123A. If he interjects again, I will put him out.

Mr. BOURKE: I shall take the interjection. When one looks at the quality of the present members of the Labor Party, I do not think that the Labor Party would refuse to have anybody.

I come to the problem of what is going to happen in the Government. I have to admit that there are problems and stresses within the coalition. I do not want my position and my actions here today to be misinterpreted. I speak more in sorrow than in anger over the present situation. I do not think that the manner in which the Bellevue was demolished is a serious issue in the coalition. But one has to face the fact that there are problems that must be solved. I think that they can be solved. There is so much goodwill in the coalition that those problems will not remain. They will be solved.

I assure the Leader of the Opposition that he need not look forward to any breakdown of the coalition. However, I am concerned that the position of Liberal members should not be misinterpreted. The public or the Press seem to adopt the attitude that every time there seems to be argument on the Liberal side, the position of the leader of the Liberal Party is under attack. I do not think anyone would deny that the position of leader of the Liberal Party is not an easy one. We have a tradition for speaking our mind. We are individualists. So it is never easy to be the leader of the Liberal Party.

The puerile attitude of members of the A.L.P. in howling "leadership problems" will not gain them anything. It is simply a faint hope that they have that their problems will be resolved, that somehow the coalition will fly to pieces and that they will accidentally inherit government. They have not earned it, but they have a vague hope that they will achieve the reins of government by accident.

I assure the Leader of the Opposition and other honourable members opposite that they need not bother worrying about what names will go on the plaque when the new building that the Government proposes is erected over there, because it will not concern them. They will come along and try to claim the credit, because the Government's proposal will reflect great credit on all members of this Government. When the public see the final design, they will realise what a far-reaching decision the Government has taken. It is easy to dress up the facts and complain that the destruction of a building is terrible. But when people see the proposal to replace that building, they will acclaim the Government for its far-sighted decision.

Although the last couple of years have perhaps not been the best years of the coalition, I am sure that the best years are ahead of it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Ipswich West) (4.56 p.m.): I support the motion moved by the honourable member for Stafford. I have been waiting with great interest to hear some of the 55 people—we have been told that 55, or thereabouts, voted at the joint parties meeting in favour of the demolition of the Bellevue—defend the actions of the Government. So far only two have done so, the honourable member for Caboolture and the honourable member for Callide, and no Minister has defended himself for the actions of Cabinet. We have hardly seen the Deputy Premier. He has rushed in and out a couple of times, ashen-faced. On the other hand, the Premier has spent the longest time in the Chamber that I can recall since I was first elected to this Assembly.

As to the Bellevue building—over a period members were told from time to time through the media and through various leaks and rumours here and there, both in the Press and on television, that the Bellevue was

ridden with some voracious South American breed of white-ant. Yet—wonder of wonders—when the building was being pulled down, in fact it seemed to defy the force of gravity. It would not fall, and the contractor had tremendous trouble in pulling and bulldozing it over. Apparently there was not one white-ant in it.

Mr. Austin: Rubbish!

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Were there white-ants in it?

Mr. Austin: Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: What type?

Mr. Austin: I don't know.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: How does the honourable member know that they were there? Is he saying that the report by officers of the Department of Primary Industries is incorrect?

Mr. Austin: Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Following the decision of the joint Government parties, the Cabinet and the Government to demolish the Bellevue, people who are very interested in old buildings and their demolition—the fad for or interest in old things is increasing—would have paid, and willingly, to have the Bellevue demolished brick by brick, board by board, rafter by rafter. It would not have created any traffic hazard; it would not have led to the destruction of any Brisbane City Council facilities; it would not have created any problems for the 200-odd policemen and policewomen who were ordered out in the middle of the night to hold back all the radical Liberal and Labor Party people who were there demonstrating against the National-Liberal Government. No anxious moment would have arisen if a sensible approach had been adopted to the demolition of the Bellevue building.

We are not debating now whether or not the building should have been demolished. The motion shows that we are debating the way in which the demolition was carried out. Personally, I believe that the facade of the Bellevue should have been maintained and the interior redecorated or revamped. That is done in many places throughout the world. Both overseas and in many places in Australia, thousands of people flock to see buildings such as the Bellevue and even older buildings that have been restored with the facade retained. I cannot see what is wrong in doing that.

Mention is made of costs. The Deputy Premier and Treasurer did not know the cost of the demolition, nor does he know the cost of replacement of the Bellevue by something else. No Minister or Government backbencher can tell us what will replace the Bellevue, or even whether it will be a car park, a park or something else.

Mention is made of conservation. Today the self-proclaimed bleeding hearts in the Liberal Party stood up, as they have done

on one or two other occasions since I entered Parliament, and spoke in favour of the motion. On previous occasions, of course, they chickened out and backed away from their so-called principles. I am reminded of the old adage, "Empty vessels make the most sound." We have heard a lot of sound from them, and this morning we saw how empty they were when they refused to vote in favour of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. That amendment called for the facts, and surely that is what Parliament wants. We want the full facts surrounding the demolition. Yet this morning the members of the National Party and Liberal Party tied themselves together again and prevented Parliament from finding out the facts.

Who let the contracts? Who gave the orders? How much money was involved? When was the contract given? Was demolition agreed to two weeks ago or last week? The questions go on and on. Unfortunately, the whole matter is based on rumour and surmise. Even the Press does not know the full story. Instead of finding out the full facts, this Parliament rejected the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. The Liberal members have been shown to be frauds and phonies. If they were fair dinkum, they would have demanded the true facts. Obviously they do not know them. On many occasions they have said, and been reported in the Press as having said, that they have not had the facts, that they were tricked and roped in. The Deputy Premier had to go to Western Australia to make a statement because he was not game to make it in this Parliament.

It was not until he was forced by Haydn Sergeant and the media into making a statement that he came out and said anything at all. He did as he did on the Milan Brych controversy. When mention is made of the number of wins that the Deputy Premier has had over the Premier, the first one trotted out is the Milan Brych issue, and the second is the State bank. Reference is made to "many other occasions". There are no "many other occasions"; there are only the two. The Deputy Premier came out against Milan Brych only because he had behind him the full force of the medical profession, which would have cut his throat if he had not done so. And, of course, he is a doctor.

On the State bank issue, he had the full force of the capitalist, free-enterprise system against him. The National Party claims to be a free-enterprise party. It wanted a State bank. But, Mr. Speaker, I know that the House is not debating a State bank.

Some members of the Liberal Party, not the party itself, claim that they are interested in conservation. If they are, where were they when the long-haired, pot-smoking hippies at Cedar Bay had their meagre shelters burnt to the ground, their papaw trees slashed by machetes and their hoses slashed to pieces? That vandalism was just as bad as that which occurred at the Bellevue the other night. Where were the Liberal members then?

Not a sound from them! The establishment of the Liberal Party were with the workers from the Lytton electorate and the Chatsworth electorate, the ordinary man in the street, when the demolition took place. There was a great hue and cry. But where were they during the Cedar Bay issue? Where were they when, in the Tarong powerhouse controversy, the people of Queensland had \$290,000,000 stolen from them just so that the Premier could have a monument to him erected at Tarong? It will be a white elephant.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will come back to the motion, which concerns the Bellevue.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I am talking about conservation and the methods adopted by the Government in relation to the Bellevue. Where were the members of the Liberal Party when the controversy occurred over the new port of Brisbane? Where were they when decisions were made on Fraser Island, on Moreton Island and on the alienation of national parks in Queensland? The National Parks and Wildlife Service, with the meagre budget allocated to it by the Government, is trying its hardest to protect the environment. The member for Wolston mentioned the Iwasaki project. Where do the Liberal members stand on that issue? Now we have the Bellevue.

The Liberals are finally waking up to their impending absolute demise. Despite their better performance in the public opinion polls, they are still being ruled by the National Party. An examination of an extract of election figures since the split in Queensland, and even before it, shows that in every election they gained more votes, except on the last two occasions, than did the National Party, but gained fewer seats. Even so, they have sat back and taken it every time.

On numerous occasions the Opposition has offered support to get a redistribution so that the Liberal and Labor Parties could gain seats proportionate to the number of people who voted for them, and so that the National Party would get true representation in this House according to the votes it received. Where were the Liberals when that happened? They did not take up the challenge, and they will be in the same position this evening when the vote is taken. The Liberals will not take a stand. A few of them will cross the floor because they represent seats that the Labor Party will win at the next election. They know that they have to get publicity to try to retain their seats.

Mr. Casey: We might get Sherwood, too.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: If we have a redistribution, we might win the seat of Sherwood as well.

Mr. Bishop: Are you going to have a gerrymander?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: No. We will have one man, one vote.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address himself to the motion before the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I was replying to an interjection, Mr. Speaker.

The Liberals have taken this stand today because they have to make the front page in "The Courier-Mail" and the "Telegraph". They have to get in the news and the only way they can do that is by bucking the Government. They made a decision at the joint party meeting but they are not prepared to cop it in the true spirit of democratic traditions. When they join an organisation they accept its rules, which are that they get together on an issue, debate it and vote on it, and then abide by the decision. But now they are not prepared to abide by the decision. That is why we have them knocking a decision made by the joint parties. I do not agree with the decision, but they should abide by the rules of the organisation which they joined. They are scabbing on their organisation, as was pointed out by members of the National Party today.

Once again we have seen the half-hearted, empty-barrel efforts of the Liberal Party. We have witnessed the weak and puny effort of the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, who will not be here after the next State election. As was said earlier, he has absolutely rejected the people of the Ipswich/West Moreton area on coal-mining and unemployment issues. He has allowed the State Government to renege on promises to spend money on the electrification of railways and the education of schoolchildren in the Ipswich area.

I could go on and on. Where were the Liberals on the street march issue when students, older people and pensioners were getting their heads kicked in and when the Police Force was reduced to its lowest level in history? They have spoken up on the Bellevue issue because they are in dire electoral trouble, and because the Leader of the Opposition and other Opposition front-benchers are pushing back the tide. A National Party survey showed that the Labor Party will win marginal country seats at the next election because the Leader of the Opposition and other Opposition front-benchers are doing so well. That is the reason for the hue and cry.

Liberal and National Party members are running scared about losing their seats. We do not see Liberal Cabinet Ministers or other Liberal members representing safe seats jumping up on the Bellevue issue. They are safe and smelling the ministerial leather. Certain back-benchers, such as the honourable member for Lockyer, are waiting to move into Cabinet positions, just as did the honourable member for Kurilpa. He was one of the ginger group until he was moved

into Cabinet. After that, we heard no more from him. The motion moved this morning is nothing but a charade. It is a farce.

Mr. Akers: Why are you voting for it?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: We are voting for it because it condemns the unannounced, precipitate way in which the midnight under-hand deals were perpetrated. They are symptomatic of the Government's operations. We are not voting against the demolition of the Bellevue building. Everyone has an opinion on whether the Bellevue building should have been pushed down, but what we are concerned about is the way in which it was done, the lead-up to it, and the lack of information provided. It is the culmination of a series of issues. Every week we see a new issue, such as the powerhouse, street marches, the Brisbane wharves, the Mt. Gravatt Hospital, Minerals House, the Great Barrier Reef, Fraser Island and Moreton Island. There has been one example after another of corrupt, rotten-to-the-core government in Queensland. The honourable members for Pine Rivers and Salisbury are only looking to retain their seats in Parliament so that they can get their golden handshakes after three Parliaments. Their protestations are a charade and a farce.

Mr. MOORE (Windsor) (5.10 p.m.): I rise to support the motion moved by the honourable member for Stafford. It is rather late in the day and previous speakers have covered almost every aspect of the motion. However, I would be failing the people who rang me if I did not lodge my protest. They said to me, "You are my member. I expect you to stand up in Parliament on my behalf and say a few words." I understand that many petitions have been circulated and signed by something like 7,500 ordinary, decent people who live in and around Brisbane, who have expressed themselves strongly on this issue. Of course, the petition arrived here too late. They wanted to retain the building.

I have no haggle about the decision. I voted for the retention of the building; but, if a person is given the right to speak—and we were all given the right to speak on that occasion—at a joint party meeting, a trade union meeting or any other meeting and he does not have sufficient persuasive power to influence his own colleagues to change their minds, he has to abide by the decision. I did not hold with what the conservationists said about the building or with the society that said it could not be retained.

If anybody looked over the building completely, I did. I was a member of the Parliamentary Buildings Committee and as soon as the building was taken over—before the library books were put in—I went over it from the top ceiling to the bottom floor. It is true that there was some white-ant infestation on the lower-level floor, which was about 6 in. above the ground. Had I

owned the building as a private citizen I would not have felt it beyond me to keep it in operation.

The history of this matter goes back a long way—to when the Gair Government decided to have a precinct. That Government said that it would take over the Bellevue. The actual purchase was made by our Government. We paid the bill of about \$600,000. There is no doubt about that. The reason the building was falling into decay was that the Brisbane City Council at that time would not allow the licensee to restore the building. This was because the newels, or posts, supporting the verandas on the first and second floors went to ground level. I do not say that the present Brisbane City Council made that decision. It could have been the Chandler administration or the Groom administration. The council at that time said that it was a hazard. No thought was given to conservation and keeping this old building the way it looked. The council did not use an ounce of nous and consider erecting a steel defence rail to save the building in its pristine glory.

The licensee was in a cleft stick. Because the Brisbane City Council would not allow him to do anything about it, he could not restore the building with its facade and lace-work while conducting a first-class hotel inside. He said that his only other option was to build a hotel behind it. The Gair Government said that it would not allow that to happen and that the Government would purchase the building. That Government lost office to us. I think it was when Mr. Bjelke-Petersen was the Minister for Works that we bought the building for \$600,000.

I was hopeful until the other day that the building would be retained. The verandas should not have been taken off. All that was required was a reasonable amount of money spent on it. The old paint would have to be cleaned off, the windows puttied and then the whole outside of the building repainted to prevent further deterioration. The gutters would have to be levelled and prepared so that they did not spill water onto the side of the building and cause rot in the timber, which was not very great, anyway.

Mr. Akers interjected.

Mr. MOORE: It was nothing like \$2,000,000. If I had owned the building I would have been thinking in terms of \$15,000, or something like that, plus continuing maintenance. One cannot keep these old buildings in good condition without continuing maintenance, and we could have done that. But there has to be a will to do it, and we did not have that. We purchased that building because it was going on the market. If the Government had not purchased it at the time, it would have been purchased by private enterprise and a high-rise building erected on the site. So people should not talk to me about what would have happened if private enterprise had got its hands on the building.

But time goes by. The longer the building remained, the more I hoped we would retain it. From Queen Street to Parliament House the Government had the concept of a building, then a park, a building, then a park, a building and then another park. In that concept, the site of the Bellevue was to be a park. It does not follow that I had to go along with that concept. I disregard the experts. I built my own house. If somebody mentions a job, I fancy that I can do that job. Given a job, I can do it. One can make a mistake. One often thinks one is far better than one really is.

Mr. Lane: You're a tradesman.

Mr. MOORE: I am a tradesman, but some people might dispute that. I have been told that I am a Jack of all trades and master of none. Carpentry is not my trade, but with a little bit of nous anyone who sets his mind towards doing something can do it.

So we got to the stage where we had a joint party meeting for the purpose of discussing whether or not the building should be demolished. I have to say that about half a dozen Liberals and one National Party member supported its retention. In all sorts of speeches the rest said, "The sooner it goes, the better. Put a bulldozer through the lot and clear it." I am not haggling with that decision. However, we then decided that a building should be erected in its place which John Citizen who had been away for some time and who did not know the building had even been knocked down would be able to drive past and say, "That is the old place where we had our honeymoon", not knowing the difference. We would have kept the facade and yet there would have been a good functional building behind. That is the concept that I would have liked to see put into effect, and that was virtually decided upon.

Mr. Casey: You believe in fairy tales, too.

Mr. MOORE: Alice in Wonderland is a nice story, too, but that was decided upon.

Then the problems arose. Hamilton decided that there would be a green ban. We did not show our real strength and say, "Listen, Mr. Hamilton, you are not running the Government. We have decided to knock the building down." This is what should have happened: we should have removed the roof and roof timbers, and if there were any West Indian termites we should have disposed of that timber correctly by fumigation or incineration. In the normal course of demolition we would then have taken the windows out, knocked the walls down and taken up the heavy 10 x 3 floor timbers. The good timber could have been sold, together with all the prime-cost articles such as sinks, basins, baths, light fittings and other various bits and pieces.

It should not be forgotten that it was a nice old building with many cedar doors, architraves and skirting boards, which many people would have liked to purchase. People

said to me that, if we were going to knock the building down—and they hoped we would not—they would like to purchase some part of it. Mr. Bonenti said, “If you are going to knock it down, would you preserve the front door so I can purchase it?” I said, “I will do what I can, but I hope they don’t knock it down.” Another person said to me, “There are some beautiful stained-glass lead-light windows along the Alice Street wall that I would like to purchase.”

Perhaps, in order to retain the memory, some of the material could have been used in another building. When one looks at the amount of material involved and the contract price of about \$40,000 to knock the building down, I hazard a blind guess that the material in that building could have been sold for about \$30,000. What happened was that Hamilton said there would be a green ban, and the Premier—this is only conjecture—would have said to the Minister for Works, “Righto, Mr. Wharton, tell one of your officers to get some quotes over the phone and knock the building down quick and smart, because we are not going to have the unions standing over us.” The correct thing to have said was, “No trade union is going to tell us what to do. We are going to knock this building down because we have decided to. We will knock it down piecemeal, in a systematic way, and the unions can go and jump in the lake. Because we are the Government and we have made the decision, rightly or wrongly, we will abide by it.” Had the Government done that, there would not have been this furore.

The Premier, being the leader of the Government, accepts responsibility for the actions the Government takes. He gets credit for the good things and brickbats for the bad things. We are not members of the Cabinet, so we do not know what really happens in Cabinet. We might suspect that certain things happen; but, for all I know, the Premier might be as meek as a mouse in Cabinet, although I doubt it.

The situation is that we made a decision to knock down the Bellevue. We are all responsible. I am responsible. I am part of it. I go along with the decision that was made. One fights the fight to the last. But when one is down, when one is on the canvas and is counted out, that is it. That is the way it was with this decision. All the people who rang me about this matter said, “We can’t allow this type of thing to continue, where one man”—they believe it to be one man—“is deciding what is or what is not the action of the Government. We want you to stand up there and support this point of view.” I am doing that.

Mr. WARBURTON (Sandgate) (5.24 p.m.): It is my intention to outline a couple of alarming features concerning the actual demolition of the Bellevue Hotel. However, before I do, I would be remiss if I did not refer to the contributions of a couple of Government members. Firstly, I refer to the member for Sherwood, who implied that

the Labor Party, in supporting this motion, was not doing so for proper reasons. His main implication was that we were not promoting issues for debate in this House. I refer the honourable member to the Business Paper of this Parliament. He will see there five very important motions that the Opposition would be only too pleased to debate if he and some of his Liberal colleagues would support the Labor Party in bringing these matters on for debate. They include the Tarong issue and unemployment. There could not be anything more important in this State than unemployment. I will not go through all the matters. I leave it to the honourable member for Sherwood to peruse them. The honourable member for Sherwood, unfortunately, referred to a couple of former members of this Parliament. One was my predecessor, Mr. Dean.

The honourable member for Merthyr mentioned the debate on the amendments to the Liquor Act, and the important point that I make is that Opposition members at least vote on issues and do not run away from them. I remind the House that on the very matter mentioned by the honourable member for Merthyr, his leader, the Deputy Premier and Treasurer of this Government, very viciously opposed the amendments. But what did he do? He did not remain in the Chamber and vote; he walked outside. That is something that I do not do; it is something that other members of the Opposition do not do. We stay here and vote. We put our vote where our mouth is, and our vote is registered. That is something that Liberal members should think about. It is something that the honourable member for Merthyr should think about when he begins criticising members on this side of the House. His own leader was badly at fault.

Criticism is being levelled at the National-Liberal Government in this debate not only because of the actual destruction of the Bellevue building, not only because of what has been described by a number of honourable members as the devious manner in which the destruction was carried out, but also because of the way in which some senior members of the Government have unsuccessfully ducked and dived on the issue. That is a very important point, and the number of different stories that have been put forward causes public concern. The fact remains that the Government knew—and this is very important—on Thursday last, 19 April, that the Bellevue was to be demolished the following evening.

I do not know whether all Government members or the public realised that. What happened was that on Thursday, 19 April, after receiving a request from the Government for electricity supply to be disconnected, the South East Queensland Electricity Board excavated a pit on the George Street footpath just east of the Bellevue building alignment. No disconnection of electricity supply was undertaken by the employees of

the South East Queensland Electricity Board, but on Saturday night the pit was filled in, or partly filled in, concealing the electrical joint from which the Bellevue obtained electricity supply. I repeat that that request went to the South East Queensland Electricity Board on the Thursday.

A visit to the site yesterday morning, Monday, 23 April, showed that the cable from the pit on the George Street footpath into what remained of the Bellevue was still alive. That means that electricity was still flowing through it. That concerns me greatly, and I am sure honourable members would be concerned about it in view of the way in which the demolition was carried out. Evidently no regard was had for the safety of the public or employees. The Minister for Works and Housing shakes his head. It is up to him to give an indication, if he can, that what I am saying is incorrect. I am saying to honourable members that the electricity was disconnected at 2 p.m. yesterday.

The implications are that the work was carried out in extremely hazardous conditions, and it is an indictment of this Government, which purports to be an advocate of industrial safety, that such a situation was allowed to come about—a complete indictment, if my comments are correct, and I have it on the best information that they are correct.

The destruction of the traffic lights at the Alice and George Streets intersection and other damage to the footpaths in Alice Street and George Street and the meters and the underground services, as yet undetermined, resulted from the demolition being done in undue haste. That is what the motion is all about—undue haste and the manner in which this work was carried out. In other words, it was a case of, "Destroy the Bellevue, no matter what damage is done to other property and", it appears, "no matter what risks the people are subjected to." That concerns me greatly.

Whenever the State Government intends to demolish a Government building, it does not make any application to the Brisbane City Council. Private companies, on the other hand, are required to make an application to the council. The Government does, however, usually notify the council, giving it an opportunity to advise the Government of works and equipment that require protection as well as any other advice that is necessary. That practice was not followed in relation to the Bellevue. No advice or notification was received by the Brisbane City Council. That odd state of affairs must give support to the claim that what occurred was underhand and devious and that the interests of the public and other authorities with property under their control were ignored.

At about 6.30 p.m. last Saturday the chairman of the Brisbane City Council Planning and Traffic Committee, Alderman Ardill, was informed that the Alice Street wall of the

Bellevue had fallen and had badly damaged the intersection traffic lights. The honourable member for Pine Rivers made the point earlier that he witnessed that wall being pulled down onto the traffic signals. The implication in his interjection was that it was a deliberate action without any thought of the consequences. The traffic signals are of the inner-city three-way-movement type.

Mr. Akers: The demolishers worked systematically along that building. You could see for half an hour that it was going to happen.

Mr. Warburton: I know that what the honourable member is saying is quite correct, and that is the point I am making. With undue haste to carry out their instructions, the demolishers had no regard whatever for other property and the public interest. That is the point I make in relation to the electricity cable. The Minister for Works and Housing, who shook his head, doubted my word. I assure him that the electricity cable into the ruins of the Bellevue was alive. Employees and members of the public could have been killed. If the Brisbane City Council had been given an opportunity to make some comment about what was required, the safety of the public would have been assured.

It will take time to repair the traffic signals that were destroyed. The cost of repairs is estimated roughly at \$10,000. That estimate does not include repairs to footpaths, underground cables and other services in the area. Until the rubble is removed, who knows what services have been damaged?

When the council employees were able to start repairs on the signalling equipment, that is, the traffic lights, they noticed that severe electrical arcing was occurring. This introduces the possible occurrence of a major problem. If because of the slipshod methods used in demolition, gas leaks had occurred, the severe arcing could have ignited the gas and there could have been a holocaust similar to the one that occurred some years ago near the intersection of Queen and George Streets.

Was any check made to determine whether any gas services were located near the project? Was any assurance given by anyone that gas would not leak as a result of the demolition work? As the demolishers worked while live electrical cables lay under the rubble and while arcing was occurring in the traffic signalling system, a serious accident could have resulted if gas was in fact leaking. Had there been a gas leak when members of the public were present and while the workmen were working, we could have had another holocaust.

Mr. Akers: When was that found?

Mr. Warburton: I could be corrected about when the arcing was found, but I am reasonably sure that it was Sunday morning.

Had the State Government done what it should have done, that is, advised the Brisbane City Council, the dumping of the spoil, which I understand is taking place on a Nudgee drainage problem area, would not have been allowed. The Brisbane Town Plan requires people wanting to carry on such activities to get council permission.

I could speak for some time on the text of the motion but I simply wanted to bring these points to the attention of the House. The responsibility for the dangers foisted on both the workers and the public by the Bellevue demolition will be placed on the contractors. I am sure that that is what the Government will do. I do not believe that the contractors are wholly to blame. The blame must surely lie with the Government, which has bent every rule and principle to desecrate a building that was still the subject of public debate. That issue was raised quite properly by many Opposition and some Government members.

The whole scene is pathetic. It is indicative of the dictatorial role adopted in Queensland by the National-Liberal coalition, which has been described properly as a marriage of convenience.

I said that I intended to rise simply to point out that because of the Government's undue haste to destroy the Bellevue building—and I will not take the matter any further than I have—the Government, not the contractors, put the safety of the public and the contractors (who probably knew no better) in grave doubt.

I have pointed out some of the problems, and I believe that what I have said clearly indicates that the Government was at fault. The Government should certainly be castigated on the way in which it proceeded. I conclude by saying that I fully support the motion under debate.

Mr. BISHOP (Surfers Paradise) (5.39 p.m.): I rise to support the motion moved by my colleague the honourable member for Stafford. I am grateful that the last Opposition speaker spoke to the motion, which is—

“That this House condemns the precipitate and unannounced way the demolition of the Bellevue Hotel was commenced on the night of Friday, 20 April 1979.”

Very many Opposition speakers have completely ignored the terms of the motion. Like many other speakers, I was sickened and shocked when I saw on television the way in which the demolition crews swooped in at the dead of night to destroy the Bellevue. On looking at those T.V. programmes, one would have to accept that something extraordinary was happening in the State of Queensland.

My attitude has been one of support for the demolition of the Bellevue. I support the concept of the 1974 plan for reconstruction of the Bellevue on the present site.

I hope that the Government moves quickly to introduce into the precinct plan that concept of a reconstructed Bellevue.

By its action last week-end, the Government has driven deep rifts into the coalition and the community. Perhaps the real difficulty arising is that the decision seems to have been taken without the knowledge and agreement of the coalition parties. Too often, as other speakers have said, this type of approach is occurring in this Parliament. It is upsetting not only Liberals but also members of the National Party. Perhaps this debate today will serve as an opportunity for the coalition to take stock.

Even today in the “Gold Coast Bulletin” a very prominent member of the National Party, Mr. Kilvington, saw fit to publicly offer his resignation. The article reads—

“In his letter of resignation, Mr. Kilvington likened the Bjelke-Petersen government to the teetering Idi Amin regime.

“There is also a certain significance in the fact that the Bellevue was destroyed on the anniversary of Hitler's birthday,” Mr. Kilvington said yesterday.

‘I am appalled at the wanton destruction of that historic Brisbane landmark.

‘I was sufficiently incensed to make my resignation public.

‘I think the backlash to this will sweep the Bjelke-Petersen Government out of office.’

“Mr. Kilvington, who has been a member of the National Party for nearly two years, was at one time the press secretary to Mr. Ivan Gibbs (NP, Albert).

‘I don't give my allegiances lightly,’ he said.

“In his letter he said: ‘The claim by the Premier that those thousands of people who opposed the destruction of the Bellevue must now be feeling “pretty sheepish” typifies the appalling arrogance of both the man and Party.

‘As was the case with Idi Amin, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen appears to be surrounding himself with sycophants of both Coalition groups who are prepared to defy public opinion and public interest so long as they themselves are cosseted at our expense.’”

That is what one member of the National Party thinks not only about the National Party but also about the coalition on this matter.

It has been said by some members of the Opposition that the Deputy Premier is not giving his party support in this matter. For my part—and I believe that every member of the Liberal Party will support me when I say this—the Deputy Treasurer has the whole-hearted, 100 per cent support of the Parliamentary Liberal Party, which is more than could be said by the members of the Opposition about the leader of the Labor Party.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: One of his colleagues won't even dine with him.

Mr. BISHOP: That is right. I noticed today that he was eating his fish and chips in isolation.

So let us not have any doubts about the support for the Deputy Premier. In fact, the honourable member for Wolston, who devoted almost his entire speech to an attack on the Liberal Party, gave a very clear indication of how terrified the Labor Party is of the increasing support the Liberal Party is receiving in the community. In the next few days, the Gallup polls will show how support for the Liberal Party is growing in the community. I rather imagine the polls will show that support for the Liberal Party is greater than it has ever been before, and this is under the leadership of the Deputy Premier.

If members of the Labor Party feel that they are going to be able to gain cheap points as a result of the courageous actions today of the honourable members for Stafford and Salisbury and others, they will be sadly mistaken. I say this because the speeches that those members of the Liberal Party have made today show the balance that is needed in this Coalition.

In the interests of other members who wish to speak, I will close now by saying that I support the motion moved by the honourable member for Stafford.

Mr. KRUGER (Murrumba) (5.46 p.m.): Because the debate has been going on for some considerable time, I shall say only a few words. I believe that the Liberal Party in Queensland will stand or fall on its support of the Premier. A large percentage of Liberal Party back-benchers have come out strongly against the Premier. On the other hand a number of Liberal Cabinet Ministers believe they should stay silent on this issue. Over the years, the Premier has proved that with only a very small percentage of the vote he is still able to do things he wants to do. There again, I believe that the Liberal Party will stand or fall on its stance on matters of this type. If the Liberal Party intends to continually oppose the Premier, then the inevitable is around the corner. The coalition will split and give the people of Queensland a chance to look at real politicians who can put Queensland in a much more presentable state than it is today.

I believe that the Premier should have been at the Bellevue last Friday night to be part of its destruction, because over the last few months he seems to have been trying to destroy the State of Queensland.

An Opposition Member: For years.

Mr. KRUGER: That is correct, but I have a sneaking suspicion that he has gone downhill in the last few months since he lost a very good member of his staff who used to keep him under control.

To get back to the destruction of the Bellevue—there have been interminable discussions about whether or not it should have been restored, and I thought we should have looked into ways of trying to save it. The real problem is the way the Premier went about getting rid of the Bellevue at such an odd hour of the night and at such risk to so many people. The Premier stands condemned for his actions, as do those who support him. Some Government members have been silent on this issue, and we are not quite sure how they intend to vote. A percentage of Government members have been silent while others have made a lot of noise. Each group has its motives, but when the vote is taken we will know just what it is all about.

I believe that if the Premier is allowed to continue to run wild then the entire State, not just the Bellevue, will become a heap of rubble. On this occasion the Premier's action was not warranted, and I cannot see why so many Ministers just sat back and allowed him to do what he did.

This morning one of my constituents, a German chap, rang me and said—

"Mr. Kruger, this situation reminds me of when the Gestapo tore down the cathedrals back when Hitler was starting to run wild. To me, having lived in Germany at that time, these actions of the Premier at present are very similar. I hope that you people in the Parliament today can do something to stop the Premier from adopting this type of attitude towards the Government and the people of Queensland."

The member for Sandgate spoke at some length about the power supply to the Bellevue. I also have it on good authority—and from a source different from that quoted by the honourable member—that the power to the Bellevue was not completely cut off until yesterday. It seems a disgrace that any organisation, particularly the Government of Queensland, could allow a demolition of that sort to take place while there was a danger from the power not being disconnected. I believe that the glass was not removed from the windows and doors, which I believe was unusual in that type of demolition.

Safety helmets were not worn on the job. When I came in on Saturday afternoon to see what was taking place, I saw, I think, a digger reaching out at the building and pulling it down piece by piece. Actually it reminded me of this Government, with the Premier doing just the same thing. No consideration was given to whether the rubble might fall onto the street and damage the parking meters and/or the traffic lights.

When I drove into the city on Saturday to see just what was going on, I was appalled to find that the streets had been blocked off. When I saw the blockade at the bottom of the street, I imagined that a few thousand street marchers were present, or something like that. The Premier complains about street marchers because the streets are

blocked and the traffic is disrupted. I found that he had his Police Force out on the streets on Saturday afternoon, blocking off the traffic so that he could go about demolishing that building, which he particularly wanted to destroy. That was something that he, on his own, decided ought to be done, and he went ahead and did it, irrespective of the inconvenience caused to the people of Queensland and to those people who might like to drive through the city on a Saturday afternoon.

Mention was made this afternoon by the source that usually mentions this sort of thing of our giving $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of our salary to our party. I would just say in passing that I would not give $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of my salary to the National Party. That just would not be on. In our case, we see it as doing something for the people of Queensland. That is why it is done.

Much hot air has been spoken here this afternoon by Government members. The test will come tonight when the vote is taken, and it will show just how sincere those people are. It will show whether, in fact, they are grandstanding, whether they are playing for the Press, whether they are concerned about the Bellevue and the safety of the people of Queensland, or whether they are just trying to get their names into the Press once again.

When I was watching television last night, I felt rather sorry for the Minister for Works and Housing. He was asked some questions but he was unable to answer them or he could not get rolling with a couple of them. I believe it was very unfortunate that a Minister of the Crown had been told so little that he could not answer simple questions on television. I do not think it was his fault. Because he had not been given the facts, he just did not know. There he was, trying to ponder over his answers to the questions. That is the type of thing that is going on. That is the way in which the Premier is operating. He did not even consider his own Minister in that case.

A Government Member: It does not say much for your questions here in the House, does it?

Mr. KRUGER: I have asked some pretty good questions in the House and received some pretty good answers. I have found that the people in my electorate are very pleased with the questions that I ask on their behalf, and I am going from strength to strength in supplying those answers to them.

This morning or early this afternoon reference was made to the police action in the streets on Friday night and Saturday and to the way in which they performed in the streets and handled certain people. I believe that the police operated in this way, again at the direction of the Premier. They would have acted in that way because they would have been told, "You are there to do a job. The Bellevue is coming down tonight and tomorrow, and we are not to be inter-

rupted in any way whatsoever. You will make sure that it is wrecked, and wrecked before anyone has a chance to do anything about it. With it goes all the fittings, light fittings, cedar doors." That is why the police took this action in the streets. They did not take it because they wanted to do so. I know for a fact—and I have spoken to a few policemen about it—that they do not like that sort of thing, but they are told that they have to do it. Naturally, they are not told by the Premier directly, but the departmental heads give them the information. That is the way in which they are trained.

The joint party situation within this Government must be suspect. We have heard so many different ideas today. We heard some speakers say that they voted for the proposal to demolish the Bellevue, whether it was right or wrong, and that the majority view should prevail. Others have said over the radio and in the Press that they did not know what was going on; whether, in fact, the building was to come down, whether it was to come down at that particular hour, or what the situation was. It makes me believe that too many decisions are made by too few people in the Cabinet. Even though members of the Opposition blame the Cabinet for decisions and say that it is government by Cabinet, not by Parliament, I am wondering whether it even goes as far as the Cabinet.

When we see destruction such as this, it seems to me that we must look again at the way in which government is carried out. Whether we are members of the Labor Party, the Liberal Party, or the National Party, and particularly if we are back-bench members, we must ensure that the Premier is prevented from taking action of this type. Not only does it belittle the Government of Queensland; it also casts a slur on all of us who are supposed to be working with the Premier. The Opposition certainly expects that decisions will be made in such a way that the people of Queensland will benefit.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT (Greenslopes) (5.56 p.m.): Before last Wednesday there would have been a large number of divergent points of view regarding the former Bellevue Hotel. First of all, there were those who belonged to the Save the Bellevue Committee, and it is worth recording that even their sentiments were not unanimous. There were those who wanted to save the Bellevue in its entirety, and there were those who would have been satisfied to preserve the facade only.

A different point of view was that the building was not worth preserving and should be demolished—indeed, there were those who said it was a load of rubbish—and there were a great many people who were not terribly concerned one way or the other. They probably took the point of view that the area could be redeveloped and substantially enhanced.

Although those differing points of view prevailed before Friday night of last week, the overwhelming single point of view that we face this week is one of concern and alarm that a decision should be implemented so quickly and in so arbitrary a fashion. The defence for that action is that we are a Government that makes decisions and carries them out—a very fine sentiment, a very noble sentiment—and I am one who has always contributed to the point of view that Governments should be firm and resolute and, indeed, should stick to their judgments. If the Government's track record were impeccable in that regard, what it has done would be very defensible. But the fact is that its track record is not impeccable—in fact, it is far from being impeccable—and on a great number of occasions the joint parties have decided to consider, reconsider and reconsider again.

Undoubtedly, the best example one could cite of that is the continuing argument about the redevelopment of Anzac Square. Some time ago the Government said, "Yes, we approve. It will go forward." But in the light of opposition expressed in the joint party meeting—opposition with which I do not agree, let it be said—that decision was changed and cancelled and reversed and delayed, and so, many moons later, we still vacillate on a decision on the redevelopment of Anzac Square. Because contrary points of view were introduced, people looked at the plan on paper and said, "We want some time to think about it. We are opposed to the overall concept.", and the Government said, "We will hold back."

That is in clear contradistinction to what has happened in the last few days. Plans were printed in "The Courier-Mail". One plan was printed that I hoped desperately would not be printed, because it showed in the background a high-level saw-tooth building that was positively hideous, and every last person in the joint party meeting said that it was positively hideous. They said, "That is totally out of character with the precinct, totally out of character with what we want to see round there. Get it out.", and it was agreed that that sort of building would not go in that precinct. Nevertheless, that plan appeared in the newspaper.

One would have expected that, those plans having been printed, public dialogue would then take place, that people would be convinced, or possibly remain unconvinced, that the redevelopment was desirable. I am pleased—in fact, I am more than pleased; I am thrilled—to learn that, of the four historic buildings in the area, three will be preserved and enhanced. I hope they will be kept in perpetuity.

Mr. Houston: For how long? Can we trust the Government?

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: That scheme is included in the present plan.

Mr. Houston: That could change next week, as you said.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: I can only say that I am pleased that those buildings are to be preserved. I am particularly pleased that The Mansions is to be preserved, because, unlike the Bellevue—which, although it had great character, was not unique—The Mansions certainly is unique.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The House will resume at 7.15. As the House will be sitting on a double day, I advise honourable members that the first division after the resumption will be of seven minutes' duration.

[Sitting suspended from 6.1 to 7.15 p.m.]

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: Before the dinner recess I was trying to consider the Government's rationale in saying that, the decision having been made, it had to be put into effect as quickly as possible. I pointed out that if there was consistency in that attitude the action taken last Friday night would have been defensible. However, I demonstrated that on a great number of occasions the Government has made decisions and, in the light of second thought or further advice, has decided to either delay the implementation of those decisions or totally change them. By way of example I cited the redevelopment of Anzac Square, which has been an on-again, off-again project for quite a number of years.

If one wanted to delve further into history, one could talk about the Bligh plan, which proposed the redevelopment of all the upper-city area in the Roma Street district. That was a most ambitious plan involving the expenditure of millions and millions of dollars. On the day after the publication of the plans in the newspapers we did not see the wreckers moving in or devastation taking place forthwith. Indeed, the plan was never implemented, and Roma Street is as it always was.

The indignation that is expressed in the electorate in relation to the Bellevue stems from the fact that the plans were not given public scrutiny and were not promulgated in such a fashion as to enable people to make observations upon them or determine whether they could be changed. They were not given an opportunity to determine whether there could be contrary points of view concerning the preservation either in part or in toto of the Bellevue.

As I have said already, before the decision was arrived at last week, there was no unanimity among the community at all. There was in fact a substantial volume of opinion in favour of the destruction of the Bellevue. The indignation in the electorate is not at the decision but at its implementation. In my electorate I have had a greater response on this issue than on any other in recent experience. I owe it to the people whom I represent to express their indignation and their sense of outrage at the fact that

this decision was implemented so quickly without giving them any further opportunity to express a point of view or indeed to consider the precinct plan that had been outlined to them. In expressing their point of view, I associate myself with the points of view that have been expressed so forcefully.

Today some discussion took place about the redevelopment of the whole precinct. I have already expressed my pleasure at the fact that three historic buildings will be preserved. I want to refer to one matter that has not been mentioned, a matter that involved you, Mr. Speaker, on a previous occasion. In referring to it, I want to speak about you in complimentary terms.

Some months ago you made some reference to an extension of the Botanic Gardens to the fence of the old Parliament House. You were done a singular disservice by those who commented upon it in that the suggestion was floated that the area would then be for the exclusive use of parliamentarians. That was nonsense of the first order.

Mr. Moore: Hear, hear!

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: I am pleased that my friend from Windsor interjects, because whenever attempts were made to intrude upon the integrity of the Botanic Gardens, no-one was more vocal or vehement in opposition than my friend from Windsor. On a few occasions he had led the fight in the joint party room to ensure that the integrity of the Botanic Gardens would not be disturbed. Your viewpoint, Mr. Speaker, which I totally support, is that the Botanic Gardens should be extended to the very fence of Parliament House, so that Parliament House would complement the gardens and the gardens would complement Parliament House. The traffic that presently goes to the Q.I.T. would be diverted around the back of Parliament House.

Mr. Moore: Leaving a walkway.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: Indeed, so that pedestrian traffic is given proper access.

I hope that, whatever takes place in this redevelopment, your idea, Mr. Speaker, which we all support, will be sustained. I emphasise again that, whenever suggestions that the integrity of the gardens should be disturbed have been put forward, it has been members of the Government who have supported the retention of the gardens in their present form.

I associate myself with this motion because I agree with it in personal terms. I agree with it also because I am sure it is the point of view that the people whom I represent would want me to express in this House tonight.

Dr. LOCKWOOD (Toowoomba North) (7.21 p.m.): In rising to address myself to the motion, I must say firstly that I have supported the demolition of the Bellevue. I believe that every member who has lived in the Bellevue would similarly support its

demolition. Brisbane Liberals, for their part, formed most of their opinions from the outside of the Bellevue from looking at the facade and at pictures of the Bellevue in other days. Brisbane voters, for the most part, have formed their opinions on pleasant memories of the Bellevue, the sweet nostalgia of a happy occasion such as an anniversary, wedding reception or other function held there. Many people who were accustomed to drinking there in the days when it was a hotel have pleasant memories of it.

But nostalgia is no substitute for cold, hard facts, and those facts are that the Bellevue was rotten inside. From the outside, it may have looked to be a substantial brick building, but those of us who trod its corridors inside knew that the floors and carpets were worn through.

An Opposition Member: What a poor argument!

Dr. LOCKWOOD: The honourable member did not live there. He would not know. His comments are based on outside impressions. They are not informed and, I venture to suggest, neither are his electors.

On the night of 13 September, the Bellevue shook from top to bottom. I was in there and felt it shake. At that time very strong westerly winds were blowing. I think the Weather Bureau recorded gusts of upwards of 60 km an hour. At the intersections of George and Alice, and George and Elizabeth Streets, the gusts were sometimes in excess of 80 to 90 km an hour. They were strong enough to make it difficult for people to cross the intersections. The building shook because it was not a solid brick and concrete building. It had a brick facade and inside it was timber. Over the years the timbers had rotted; let nobody deny that.

Some of the timbers extruded through the brick walls that were nowhere near thick enough to support the whole building. I think a brick wall a minimum of 20 in. thick would be necessary to support a building of that height. At best, I think it was a double brick wall.

Mr. Moore: It was four bricks in places.

Dr. LOCKWOOD: I accept the honourable member's comment. The building shook because the timbers taking the weight of the roof could not fully withstand the gusts. Some Brisbane members will not believe that.

Mr. Burns: Have you a licence under the Builders' Registration Act?

Dr. LOCKWOOD: I do not need one. I can tell whether something is trembling or not.

Mr. Burns: What about that sore foot that you had for a month and could not cure?

Dr. LOCKWOOD: The honourable member would know nothing about sore feet. If he cares to come over, I will give him a lesson about them.

That building was the subject of a great many complaints, and certainly none the least of them related to the plumbing. Frequently the plumbing was blocked. The hot water failed. If a complaint was made about the hot water it would be fixed, and then there would be no cold water.

An Opposition Member: What is all this about?

Dr. LOCKWOOD: The honourable member does not know. He did not live there and does not know what it was like. He is harking back to pleasant memories when he sneaked in there as a teenager to have a drink. Bathroom floors in the building were leaking. I would like it recorded in "Hansard" that on the occasion of the Queen's visit my wife had a second-hand shower. Some honourable members may have heard of second-hand baths. But as she stood in the shower, shower water was coming through the floor above.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: Who was that?

Dr. LOCKWOOD: That was my wife. She eventually had a shower under a golf umbrella that I had in my car, and she got dressed under a raincoat. That was how she got ready to attend a royal ball.

There was dry rot in the timbers and there were definitely borers in them. I showed the borers to men from the media.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Dr. LOCKWOOD: The honourable member would not have appreciated it. It is something that he would not put up with in his own home.

Those honourable members who have had anything to do with the council know that it would not pass it, or even a building like it, for human habitation. That was the slum that we lived in. There were definitely borers in that building. I have seen them. I have shown them to journalists and they did not dispute what they saw. I showed them borers at work. In fact, the timbers were rotten. The building became unsafe for human habitation when the verandas were removed because they did not comply with our concepts, the council's concepts or traffic concepts of safety. If a vehicle had hit the supports, the verandas would have come down, because they were supported by those timber posts on the edge of the footpath.

Without verandas, the building was an absolute firetrap. The Government was put to great expense in installing smoke detectors, heat detectors and emergency lighting systems. But, for all of those precautions, had the building caught fire when it was occupied, people would have been fried in it left, right and centre. The

Labor Party would have lost a few, too. The Brisbane Liberals would have lost virtually none, but a couple of country Liberals would have gone.

The Government would not tolerate such a firetrap if it was run by a person who plied as a boarding-house or hotel keeper. The Government would condemn it and force its closure unless alternative fire escapes were provided.

We did not force this on ourselves, and I believe that we should have. The Bellevue should have been demolished the day the verandas were taken down. There was a lack of serviceable fire escapes and I, for one, had a rope so that if it did catch alight I could get out. I had an axe to get through other members' doors in case they would not open.

Mr. Jones interjected.

Dr. LOCKWOOD: I told the honourable member how much I care about it.

The honourable member for Pine Rivers has what I would call a euthanasia complex about old buildings. He hates to see them go. He believes, as an architect, that they have some merit even in their latter stages. I am sure that a great many members tonight believe that the Bellevue was not built as a single complex. It was not built as something intended to last. It was put up and expanded to meet a need at the time it was built. It was not architect-designed from beginning to end. It was not built in accordance with those building practices that would have ensured that it could be serviced and maintained for hundreds of years.

Mr. Akers interjected.

Dr. LOCKWOOD: Every building should be designed by an architect; I agree with the honourable member. The Premier has had the habit of calling the honourable member for Pine Rivers "George". I think that the honourable member will go down in history as "George of George Street". The Premier might have had some foresight when he started calling him "George".

The honourable members for Stafford and Salisbury have claimed several breaches of the safety construction legislation when the demolition was in progress. Those of us who saw anything of the T.V. coverage would agree that there were near disasters during the demolition.

The motion before the House fails in one very important regard. I think it was the honourable member for Stafford who said that he fully expected the National Party to vote as a block and the A.L.P. to vote as a block. He expected the Liberal Ministers to vote with the Government. That meant that the weight would be firmly put on the Liberal back-benchers to support the motion. As a political ploy, I cannot support the motion. It treats back-bench Liberal members like sardines or asparagus—something that can be stuffed onto hot toast and brought into this Chamber.

Hon. R. E. CAMM (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines, Energy and Police) (7.30 p.m.): In all the years I have been in Parliament I have never experienced a day like today. During the whole day, and we are really in the second day now, the business of this Parliament has been devoted to a debate which has not in any way been constructive or directed towards the development or progress of this State. All that members have been doing is denigrating one another and the actions of the Premier and Cabinet. Not one constructive or suggestive thought has come from any member. Here we have a Business Paper containing 22 items of legislation, and I dare say that many of those who have spoken today will be complaining next week that this session of Parliament is extending into the school holidays and that they have to get home.

A.L.P. members rose and accused the Premier of dictatorial tactics. They also accused the Premier and the Deputy Premier of not being present in the Chamber during the debate. They then endeavoured to castigate Cabinet because some Cabinet members were not present in the Chamber. Little did they realise that the Premier and Deputy Premier have responsibilities to deputations that have been arranged and that Cabinet Ministers have their own departmental responsibilities. Yet I dare say some members of the Opposition would be complaining if Minister after Minister had entered this debate. They would have said we were taking up the time of the House and denying them the opportunity of rising in the debate. They would have said we were interrupting the debate that they thought they were justified in having.

I want to impress upon the House the fact that the Government bought the Bellevue as part of the parliamentary precinct for the benefit of the people of Queensland. As Works Minister, the Premier bought the Bellevue and other buildings so that the whole precinct could be developed, and over the years we in Cabinet have been presented with many sketch plans and suggestions by interested people about what should be done with these buildings. They were presented for our consideration and we had the responsibility of making a decision about what should happen to the older buildings in this precinct that had been purchased by this Government.

I know that many people were interested in maintaining the Bellevue as it was many years ago, but it has been indicated by members that the Bellevue was in such a state of disrepair that it would have been uneconomic to repair it. Because the posts would have had to intrude onto the footpath, which is not allowed under the building by-laws of the city council, in effect, it could not have been restored to the state it was in 20 years ago. The beauty of the Bellevue disappeared when, for safety reasons, the lace railings and the verandas

were removed. They were removed on the advice of officers of the Works Department because they had become unsafe for people to walk on.

We in Cabinet had many discussions and meetings with private members about what would happen to the Bellevue. Some people tended to become very emotional about this issue. I respect the viewpoint of those people who felt that the Bellevue should have been restored, but we in Government have to be practical. We had to assess the value of the restoration as against the cost involved, and whether something better or more attractive could be placed in that area. At a recent meeting we were presented with a plan by the Works Department. Before this, the Premier had met many people who were interested in preserving all the old buildings in this precinct. They had agreed that several of these buildings should be preserved, but when they were taken through the Bellevue and they saw the deterioration that had occurred, many organisations and individuals were convinced that it would be better if the Bellevue was removed and the other buildings restored. A plan was then submitted showing the entire concept for the precinct.

At a joint party meeting, the decision was made to demolish the Bellevue. There were many speakers—

Mr. Wright: Did the Liberals support you?

Mr. CAMM: Wait till I finish. I paid the honourable member the respect of listening to him, much as I disagree with his remarks.

There have been many speakers from both parties, the Liberal Party and the National Party. People in the National Party who were concerned about the Bellevue would have liked it to be retained. Many speakers from the Liberal Party also wanted to see the Bellevue preserved. But the majority decision of that joint party meeting was that the Bellevue should be dismantled, and that is democracy.

Despite what we hear from any speaker here, democracy means people abiding by the majority decision of the people who have the responsibility for making the decision. It is up to each and every one of us to abide by the decision of the majority. When a decision has been made by the majority, after everybody has had an opportunity to speak and voice his disapproval or approval of a certain project, it is up to every member to abide by that majority decision. That is democracy. If, after a majority decision has been made, the people who disagree with that decision can go outside and criticise that decision and try to get a bit of publicity out of it, that is not democracy, that is not a democratic action, and we cannot remain in Government if this sort of thing is going to prevail.

I will give the credit to several of the speakers in this debate, who did say that they agreed with the democratic decision and would abide by it. But then they deplored the action that took place following the making of that decision. I want to make it clear to the members of this House that, in my opinion, the Premier has been absolutely honest and fair in his presentation of the joint party decision, which then became the Government decision.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs: You are like a blind horse. You are wearing blinkers.

Mr. CAMM: I am not hobbled like the honourable member is, with the A.L.P. hierarchy on his back all the time. I might have blinkers, but they direct my views the right way.

The decision was that the Bellevue would be demolished. Someone criticised the Premier, saying that the only statement he made to the Press was that the Bellevue would be demolished. That is right, because that was the only final operative determination that was made about the Bellevue and the precinct adjoining it. The other decision was that we would await further presentation of plans to see what we would do with the rest of the land and the buildings on it. The only determinative decision that was made was that the Bellevue would be dismantled.

Of course the Premier does make decisions himself, but this was a decision of the joint party meeting. Of course, as leader of our Government he has to take the blame. I am sure that many Government members, particularly many of the newer Government members, would not be here if the Premier had not been capable of making decisions and statements following those decisions, and of looking after the welfare of this State and the Commonwealth. At a time when even people in Canberra were wavering, he was the one man who stood firm on his decisions, he never wavered. As a result, we kicked out the Whitlam Government, and we came back with the biggest majority that a Government in this State has ever had. Let us give him credit for something he has done, and for the many good things he has done since he became Premier of this State. He has never made a mistake in the statements he has made following decisions of joint party meetings. I deplore all the false accusations and innuendoes that have been levelled at him today.

I repeat that this was a majority decision of a joint party meeting conducted in a democratic way. Following that, a sufficient number of signatures of Ministers was obtained on the Cabinet minute that authorised the expenditure involved in the destruction of the Bellevue.

Mr. Burns: Did they all sign it?

Mr. CAMM: The member for Lytton asks whether all Ministers signed it. He should know that a Cabinet minute being presented

to the Governor in Council does not require the signatures of all the Cabinet Ministers to make it a legal document and one on which the Government and the Governor operate.

Let me put these facts very clearly before the House. On the Wednesday afternoon, following the meeting of the joint Government parties relating to the redevelopment plan of the Government precinct, wherein it was decided to accept that it was not feasible for the existing Bellevue building to be retained—

Mr. Burns: Who said that?

Mr. CAMM: I am just telling the honourable member.

Mr. Burns: Did all the Ministers sign?

Mr. CAMM: The honourable member for Lytton must be deaf. I said that there is no need for all Ministers to sign it.

Mr. Burns: Interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have warned the honourable member for Lytton before. I now warn him under Standing Order 123A.

Mr. CAMM: There were sufficient signatures on that document to make it effective.

Following that decision, six firms were contacted early on Thursday morning. Quotation on the department's official quotation form were subsequently received from three of those firms. As the quotations were competitive and as the lowest quotation was considered reasonable, a recommendation was prepared and submitted to Cabinet for consideration. Executive Council approval of the necessary expenditure and acceptance of the quotation was received on the afternoon of Thursday, 19 April.

On Friday, 20 April, the contractor was contacted, informed that he was successful in his quotation for the demolition work, and asked what would be the most suitable time for him to commence demolition, having due regard to the location of this building. The contractor stated that he considered that this work should be carried out during the week-end, as it would result in the least dislocation of traffic and as he could obtain the necessary equipment that week-end. He indicated that he would commence work as soon as the necessary police permission could be obtained.

This was basically the contractor's decision, because he assessed that the job would take two days' continuous work; furthermore, he was able to have the necessary equipment available, as I said, during the week-end. He thought—and he thought properly—that to do the work during the week-end would cause the least dislocation to the traffic in the area.

As to the services—I wish to make it clear that the Department of Works arranged for all services to the building to be disconnected prior to commencement of the demolition. The earliest time that the police were prepared to close off those sections of

Alice and George Streets was midnight on Friday, 20 April 1979. They indicated that they were prepared to close off those streets after that time. The contractor estimated that the street closure should apply until 6 a.m. on Monday, 23 April. The approval for the street closures obviated the need to incur expenditure for the construction of hoardings and other safety measures.

It was ascertained that the necessary approval for the demolition by mechanical means was issued to the contractor by the Department of Construction and Safety; furthermore, the construction and safety officer was present during all times that demolition work was in progress; also, a Forestry Department officer made periodic inspections to ensure that there was no infestation of timber.

An Opposition Member: That's a joke!

Mr. CAMM: I am putting this on record in "Hansard". Opposition members can guffaw and giggle as much as they like, and they can then correct it if they can.

The Works Department undertook to disconnect all services—water, gas, fire alarms—and arrange for electricity to be disconnected prior to commencement of the demolition. At no time was there any danger to any of the demolition staff or the general public.

Mr. Warburton: Do you deny that the electricity was not disconnected?

Mr. CAMM: I was shown a document that stated that it was disconnected on the relevant date.

Mr. Warburton: Then you are wrong.

Mr. CAMM: I think the honourable member is wrong. Electricity was left connected to a control box, but from the control box to the Bellevue it was disconnected. I am informed that the contractor, Sim Enterprises Pty. Ltd., held the necessary insurance policy to cover any claim for damage to any person or property and I am assured that this will cover any damage that may have been done to the Brisbane City Council's property.

I want to quote now from an article in today's "Telegraph" concerning the demolition of the Bellevue. We have all been told how solid the building was supposed to be. I distinctly remember one member saying that the faces of the Bellevue along George Street and Alice Street comprised big sandstone blocks. In fact, they consisted of a brick wall with a rubble filling behind it.

As is stated in the article, the demolishers were hired on subcontract to the major contractor, Sim Enterprises. They are reported as saying—

"We tendered for the job ourselves, but ours was \$2,000 above Sim's \$40,000 tender."

74755—140

They were unsuccessful in obtaining the contract themselves. They went on to say—

"We had been told the building had to be down within two days, and we had it on the ground in 23 hours."

They said that there was nothing sinister about their starting work on the demolition after midnight. Some people become emotional when they see a machine going out at midnight and tearing down walls and roofs. How do they expect a building to be taken down? Do they expect someone to get up on it with a hammer and chisel? This building had to be demolished and the demolishers used the most efficient and economical way of doing it.

The contractors said—

"We often knock down buildings at night. Normally we start at seven or eight o'clock but because of night shopping we had to start later."

That was at 12 o'clock. To quote word for word what he said—

"It was a bloody wreck. It was a safety hazard. I wouldn't have walked in there. One section on the right-hand side of the building was solid, but the rest was crumbling away."

They went on to say—

"Normally when we knock a brick building down the bricks come down in large slabs. But these bricks just broke apart when we hit them with the excavator and they fell down loose."

Today's "Telegraph" contains a letter setting out the opinion of the writer and what happened prior to the demolition. It sets out the history of the matter and, in view of what has been said and what I witnessed on television last night, when the Government was criticised by a certain reverend gentleman, I think I should quote the concluding part of that letter. That portion of the letter reads—

"The only Church of England hospital in Brisbane, St. Martin's War Memorial Hospital, adjacent to St. John's Cathedral, is of historic importance.

"Many people contributed so much to this beautiful building with their prayers, money and efforts through nursing and caring for the sick and dying, especially during the traumatic years of World War II.

"Dedicated to the Anzacs, it stands as a monument to the men who sacrificed their lives for our country."

To use my own words—it is to be hoped that the same reverend gentleman and people who have been so outspoken on this issue will become as actively involved in the preservation and restoration of the much-needed hospital as they have been about the ex-public house, the Bellevue.

Mr. Burns: Is that signed by Cecilia McNally, of the National Party Branch at Spring Hill?

Mr. CAMM: I haven't looked at the signature.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. CAMM: I can see the Leader of the Opposition guffawing. He would like to see this old hospital torn down. He is not interested in preserving that historic building. Because he thinks he can gain some publicity by hopping on the bandwagon, he takes an interest in this old termite-ridden, borer-ridden building, which, as the contractor indicated, had been unsafe for years. He would like to see the Government spend \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000 on the restoration of that building when, in effect, it was no good.

As I said a while ago, many people become quite emotional about these issues. I respect their feelings and I am not criticising them at all. In fact, today one honourable member spoke about traffic indicators being "injured". Maybe he will correct that and say that they were "damaged". Anyone who talks about traffic indicators being "injured" is becoming a little emotional.

Reference was also made to our restoration of buildings in other parts of the State and our contributing money to the restoration of the court-house at Charters Towers. It was in fact the old Stock Exchange that has been restored.

The National Party has been criticised by members of the Opposition for its participation in the demolition of the Bellevue. As I indicated earlier, some National Party members—members of Parliament as well as ordinary members of our party—were concerned about the preservation of the Bellevue. They approached us and asked us what we intended to do to preserve the Bellevue. They had their say just as the members of the Parliamentary Liberal Party and their supporters had their say in our joint party meeting.

As I indicated earlier, the majority democratic decision was that the Bellevue should be destroyed. Rather than get up here today, one after the other, and criticise the men who did the work, and how they went about it, they should be congratulating the men who did the job. They did a very good job in a very short time at a reasonable price for the Government. Let them criticise the Government for the decision to demolish the Bellevue, but they should not criticise the men and the contractor who had the responsibility for the job.

Much has been said about indecent haste. Where was the indecent haste? Apparently members of the Labor Party do not want to see men work fast or hard to get a job done quickly. They like to see it drag on week after week. Why have they levelled criticism about indecent haste? The workers hopped into the job with machinery and vigour and finished it in 23 hours.

Some honourable members have criticised what was left there. Some said that beautiful doors and panelling were left in the building.

The honourable member for Rockhampton said that he knew it was going to happen two weeks before because everything worth while was removed. Opposition members cannot have it both ways. Either the material was removed or it was not. The honourable member for Rockhampton said that everything possible was removed. We know that some timbers were left. It was suspected (and it has been proved) that borers were in some of the timber; borers that would become a danger to many structures in Brisbane if they had got loose. We are now fumigating the old Parliament House to destroy the termites and borers that have taken over. Were we supposed to allow that termite-infested timber to be used throughout residential parts of Brisbane, and allow people to re-erect doors or strips of timber from the Bellevue? Surely members agree that it was wise to have that timber destroyed?

Mr. Burns: Wally Rae took one of the beds to England. Do you think it was wise to send the termites to England?

Mr. CAMM: Wally Rae took a bed from Parliament House. I well remember that the honourable member for Rockhampton said that Mr. Rae had taken a red cedar bed to London. He castigated the party until one member of the Labor movement said, "Don't be so ridiculous! He took a pine bed that had been stained." The Opposition fell on its face at that time. It should not raise the matter again.

Some honourable members got well away from the motion and said that members had not had an opportunity to discuss the Bellevue issue. What a lot of rot that is! Honourable members have had at least 10 years. It is over 10 years since the Government purchased this building. The Premier was then Minister for Public Works and, as honourable members know, he has now served a record term of over 10 years as Premier of the State. And thank goodness for Queensland that he has been here! It was over 10 years ago that the Government purchased the Bellevue building. Honourable members have had over 10 years to debate what should have happened to the building.

Honourable members have had 10 minutes each Wednesday, if they wished, to discuss it. They have had an opportunity during the Address-in-Reply debate every year to talk about anything, which they do. They have had an opportunity in the Budget debate to talk about anything, which they do. No-one stops them. If they were so interested in preserving the Bellevue, why did not they get up then to talk about what should be done? Why did not they speak when the Government was being presented with sketches and plans of what individuals and groups thought should be done in this precinct?

It has been claimed that we should bring democracy back into government. I indicated earlier that democracy is a matter of abiding by the majority decision of those who are responsible for making the decision. People

who do not agree with those decisions after being party to the decisions—after voicing their opinions and being defeated—and then go outside this Chamber or outside the meeting and claim that democracy is not working are the very people who are prostituting democracy by doing so. For goodness' sake let us get back to government under a democratic system, where the majority does rule.

Let me point out that the majority does rule on this side of the House. Accusations have been made against the Premier about his being a dictator. I have served with him for a long time and many of the decisions that are made in the joint party meeting are not made on party lines. The decisions made in Cabinet are not made on party lines. I have never known the Premier to make a statement that has not been discussed with his Ministers and has not had the approval of a majority of the Ministers in Cabinet.

Many other issues have been brought in. The honourable member for Mackay even got onto our heritage and the Great Barrier Reef. He also mentioned mining of the coloured sands. Nobody in this Government has ever wanted to mine the coloured sands, but he tosses it in. He tosses in innuendoes and false accusations that have been made not only today but right throughout the term of the honourable member for Mackay, who is the Leader of the Opposition. He lives on this. It would appear that A.L.P. policy has degenerated to what was brought back by the honourable member for Lytton after his visit to America to study political tactics. The main political tactic being adopted in America at that time was character assassination. He brought that back here and it has been tried ever since. The A.L.P. has been trying to espouse a policy of character assassination. They started with the Premier and then moved to the Minister for Local Government. They are now trying to get onto the Deputy Premier and his activities.

Mr. R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have already warned the honourable member for Wolston under Standing Order 123A. I now ask him to leave the Chamber.

Whereupon the honourable member for Wolston withdrew from the Chamber.

Mr. CAMM: I say to the members on this side of the House that when they make their decision tonight as to which way they vote on this motion they should remember that we are a coalition party, a team with the responsibility of governing this State. We are a democratic coalition Government, in which majority decisions stand. We deplore the fact that those who have been parties to those decisions but have been defeated have taken those issues outside of this Chamber. I warn Government members

to beware of being coerced and pressured by members of the Opposition. They have been trying to do this for years. They have tried it on all new members who have come into this House.

Mr. BISHOP: I rise to a point of order. I ask the Minister to withdraw that particular comment. I take objection to the imputation that I have been coerced by the Opposition. I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. CAMM: If the honourable member is offended and the cap fits, I will apologise.

Mr. BISHOP: I rise to a point of order. I ask the Minister to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. CAMM: Yes. I withdraw them. When I say that somebody has been coerced, I do not mean that he has succumbed to the coercion or that he will fall for it. I hope that the honourable member does not succumb. I hope that he votes as his conscience dictates so that we will know where he stands in our democratic form of government. I hope that he exercises his democratic right. I hope that we all do.

I advise honourable members to be careful that they are not influenced by what they have heard from the other side of the House. This is not a dictatorial Government. It is a coalition of two good and strong political parties. Let us keep it that way so that together we can go forward and develop this State for the benefit and prosperity of those who are here, their children and their children's children who will follow them.

Mr. BURNS (Lytton) (8 p.m.): After listening to the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police, I am wondering who moved the motion we are debating. As I understand it, it was a member of the coalition, a member of the Liberal Party, who said that he was disgusted and dismayed at what happened over the week-end when the Bellevue was knocked down in the middle of the night. All the talk tonight about democratic government, the rights of the people, the rights of the individual, and how back-bench members of the Liberal and National Parties have their say is, in colloquial terms, a lot of bull.

The Minister does not expect those people to have a say. The Premier has never allowed those on the back benches to have a say on Tarong, Iwasaki, the port authority or any of the other issues that affect the people of this State. The Premier has made that clear. When John Murray resigned in the old House he said to the people of this State, "I am getting out of this Parliament because whenever we raise a question Mr. Bjelke-Petersen comes into the joint party room and says to us, 'If you don't do what I want, I will take you to the people and I will argue with you there.'" No one denies the Premier stands over the Government back-bench members.

Tonight we will see how many of them face the test. We will see whether they are prepared to show they have a little backbone and stand up for what they have been saying and for the statements of their colleagues over the week-end, or whether they will accept the standover, dictatorial tactics of the Premier, just as they have for the last four or five years. It is pretty clear to everybody outside this House that the Liberals toe the Joh line—make no bones about that.

Over the week-end I watched the Dean of Brisbane, who is a well-known Liberal supporter. He made it very clear that he was very concerned about the trend in government here. In 1974, with my colleague from Brisbane Central, I went along to the gardens to defend the Bellevue. When none of the Liberal and National Party people turned up to defend the Bellevue, the dean's great defence was to read out a telegram from Jim Killen expressing his apologies at being unable to attend. I understand from my colleagues who went there on Sunday that he did the same thing the other day. He mentioned most of the Liberals and ignored the Labor people. He is one of the Government's supporters, one of the upper-crust, establishment class in this State which the Government supports and which Government members represent. Yet he is uncertain about the future of this State because of the dictatorial tactics of the Premier.

I stood over the road the other night from about one o'clock till half past 3. Afterwards I sat in a room with some of the members who have spoken today and talked to them about what happened. I was just as worried as they were. But what people have to understand is this: what happened the other night is symptomatic of what is happening in this State.

Like that move in the dark at one o'clock in the morning, they move in like that giant machine moved on the Bellevue and trundle aside the views of the little ordinary, decent people who believe that parliamentary democracy means that they have, through their members of Parliament, a say in the government of this State. The people believe that the ordinary member of Parliament, whom they elect, has the right to a say, and that his rights and their rights as individuals should not be trammelled by the standover dictatorial tactics of one man alone who makes members opposite toe the line time after time both inside and outside this Parliament. This is the man who says to some members opposite, "Toe the line and behave or I'll have your hide", and they do.

Today is the day when many members opposite will face the test as men or women of principle. Today is the day on which they will be given the opportunity to say, "I have some principles. I believe in democratic government. I believe that honest people can have their say whether or not their

political party says it is right, and whether or not Bjelke-Petersen says it is right." They will be able to have their say tonight, and we will count the numbers of Liberals who cross the floor and vote with the Labor Party. We will be able to see the lack of backbone in those who fail to cross over.

Let us talk about the Bellevue and what happened the other night. I was not sure about the value of the Bellevue. I wondered whether or not the stories about the termites and borers were true and whether or not it should be pulled down. I stood over there in William Street and saw a large crane and a bulldozer connected to the building by a chain. But they were unable to pull it down. I do not care what the Minister for Labour Relations says, I saw the laws of this land defied with the destruction of that building. I read the law very carefully, and it provides that a building is to be demolished from the top. When they were unable to pull it down—

Government Members interjected.

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

Mr. BURNS: Mr. Speaker, I really do not need your protection, but thank you very much. They are not making any sort of impression at all.

The facts are that they were unable to pull the building down with their crane and bulldozer. Then they stood out against the law. The fellow operating the crane was not wearing a hard hat. Large numbers of people were fenced away behind barbed wire. These were innocent people who vote for the Liberal Party and the National Party. Most were not Labor supporters. Many Liberal and National Party supporters were prevented by a 6-ft barbed wire fence from interfering or having a say.

The Government moved in, in the middle of the night, in the dark, after hours. It got the contractors in, by phone, probably against its own rules. But Government members are not worried about rules, because their policy is clear, "If Joh says it will come down, it will come down irrespective of what people feel and irrespective of what the Liberal/National Party organisation feels." Mrs. McComb can rant and rave, but the plain fact is that after she had finished complaining on behalf of the Liberals, the building was down in a heap of rubble the next morning.

The Deputy Premier complained in Perth that he was not consulted, that he was not aware of what was happening. But the next morning the building was down, because Joh said it had to come down. The plain facts of the matter are that irrespective of what Government members say, and irrespective of who votes for them, those who vote for the Liberal Party in elections in this State have no say, because the Liberals are dominated by the National Party in the joint

party room. This is the first time that one of their own members has moved a motion—

Mr. Hartwig. This is the greatest State in Australia.

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

Mr. BURNS: This is the first time—

Mr. Hartwig interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I will not tolerate any of that behaviour from the honourable member for Callide. I have warned him under Standing Order 123A. If he interjects again, he will leave the Chamber.

Mr. BURNS: This is the first time that a member of the Liberal Party has moved that the Orders of the Day stand aside while he moves a motion on behalf of those Liberal voters in the community who are concerned about the dictatorial attitude of the Premier. It makes no difference that he referred only to the Bellevue. The plain facts are that people are becoming concerned that this Parliament is being brushed aside day in and day out. It does not matter whether the issue is the right to march, the Tarong Power House and the additional \$270,000,000 investment that affects the people of Queensland, the Iwasaki project that we debated all through one night, or the matter of the Port of Brisbane Authority. On the front page of today's Press there is reference to the people being robbed again by that decision. Day in and day out, one man is dominating politics in this State. If the Liberal members of this Parliament are not prepared to stand up and be counted on an issue, in the final analysis they will be hung on the same issue.

So today's exercise is a cosmetic one for the Liberals. They are saying, "If we don't stand up to Joh, if we don't get ourselves a little headline in 'The Courier-Mail' tomorrow, we will be in trouble." So they moved this motion. Opposition members are prepared to vote with you, because we have to help you to find a bit of backbone. We have to hope that one day in this Parliament—

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

Mr. BURNS: All right. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I hope that one day the Liberal members in this Parliament will get a little bit of spunk and a little bit of backbone and will be prepared to stand up and vote for the policies that they take to the people at every election.

Mr. Wright: Like redistributions?

Mr. BURNS: Like redistribution as the honourable member for Rockhampton says. But they will not do that. The midnight destruction of the Bellevue is a clear example

in the people's minds of what the Liberal Party is all about. It is a stunter's party, a party that headline hunts, but a party that always gets knocked down in the middle of the night by Joh or in secrecy in the joint party room. It is a party that fails on every occasion to stand up for the things that its members believe in and it is defeated on every occasion. Every time the Liberal Party pretends to fight, it loses. It is a pretender's party; it is a party of failure; it is a party of no-hopers. The people who vote for it are going to be condemned to a period of no hope if they think that the Liberal Party is going to stand up and fight for them, or continue to fight for them.

Today's exercise is very clear. As I said, it is a cosmetic exercise. It is a paint-and-paper exercise to join up the cracks between the Liberals and those who control their party to cover up the weaknesses, the lack of backbone, the lack of spunk, the lack of courage.

Mr. Frawley interjected.

Mr. BURNS: I am not going to worry about inane interjections from you or any other member of the National Party, because the plain facts are—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Lytton will address the chair.

Mr. BURNS: The final point that I have to make is that the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police said to the Opposition, "You have 10 minutes on Matters of Public Interest every Wednesday. You have two speakers from the Opposition every Wednesday. You should have said something about it. You get one opportunity every year in the Budget debate. You get one opportunity every year in the Address-and-Reply debate." This Parliament is being throttled by the Premier and by the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police. They do not give the Opposition a go. They have never believed in Her Majesty's Opposition. They have never believed in the right of free speech in this State; they close it down. This Parliament is sitting a few more days only because earlier in the session my leader raised with the Government the question that it was going to sit for only three weeks. But for that, we would never have had this opportunity. The Government would have knocked the Bellevue down in the middle of the night and Parliament would not have been sitting but for Ed Casey's raising the matter.

On the Business Paper there are notices that I moved in April last year. In April last year I challenged the Parliament to debate the right to march. Why has not the Government debated it, 12 months later? I asked 12 months ago to debate Tarong. Why has not the Government debated Tarong, 12 months later? The Opposition asked to debate the question of the Government aircraft; it has asked to debate issue after issue. The Government has refused, and 12 months later the motions are still on the

Business Paper. We move motions seeking urgency debates and we are knocked back. The Government talks about democracy!

When I stood in the street last Friday night, I stood next to policemen who were hanging their heads in shame; I stood next to Government supporters who were hanging their heads in shame. As that building went down, and a cloud of dust went up, I said to myself, "This is a clear example to the people of Queensland. This is what the Liberal and National Parties stand for." That is exactly what honourable members opposite stand for. They support it; they believe in it.

Mr. SIMPSON (Coorooora) (8.14 p.m.): We have just listened to an oration from the honourable member for Lytton. The only problem, of course, is that it was not based on fact. It seems to me that, if honourable members opposite cannot win the game according to the rules, they have to try, by innuendo, to make out that there is something wrong with the rules.

The honourable member picked the wrong issue when he accused the Premier of telling back-benchers what to do. In this case, the Cabinet said, "We will take it to the joint party room and let members decide there." That is where it was decided. Furthermore, only three or four opposed the motion that the Bellevue be removed because it could not continue to stand there with its verandas, attractive as they were, over the footpath, and that in fact the Works Department should consider providing a functional building with the same type of aesthetic appeal as the Bellevue to complement buildings at the Parliament House intersection of George and Alice Streets.

The member for Lytton missed the whole point. How could he claim that Queensland has a dictator, that it is ruled by one person, when in fact the decisions are made by 59 people? This decision was arrived at, not on a vote of 30 to 29, but with only three or four voting against it. Some of those who voted against it did so because they believed that no portion of the Bellevue should be retained in the precinct area stretching from the old Executive Building down George Street. It will cost the State many millions of dollars to restore and preserve the many historic buildings in that precinct, which comprises the old colonial stores, the old Treasury, The Mansions, Harris Court, the old Administration Building, the old Executive Building and Parliament House.

I can understand the emotions of people who are not used to seeing buildings demolished. The only member who felt very strongly about preserving the Bellevue, the member for Pine Rivers, was disappointed because once it is down it's down and that's that. Some people who have not been involved in the decision-making process do not realise that once a decision is made

it cannot be changed three or four times. Decision-making is not some parlour game; it is a process involving all the factors for and against. Many factors were involved in this decision.

I happened to walk out of the joint party room when the new development building models were taken out of the room. The Premier was asked, "What is that in the corner where the Bellevue was?" He replied, "That is a sunken garden." As I understand it, he was not given an opportunity to say what was decided or whether the Works Department would come up with a proposition for the replacement of the Bellevue by something that would enhance the corner.

The people of this State have not been given the full facts by the media. But this is not something new. The people were led to believe, for example, that in this session Parliament would sit for only a few days. They were misled. Parliament is sitting for the normal period of the autumn session and it has a great deal of legislation to put through. I doubt whether we will be able to deal with all of it. Furthermore, it was reported that members of the Opposition are not given ample opportunity in question-time or in the Matters of Public Interest debate. Such a report just does not fit the facts. We have heard it claimed that members of the Opposition have no place in which to hold meetings and have no security. Those claims just do not fit the facts. The people of Queensland are being misled. They do not realise that someone between them and this Parliament is leading them to believe that the Government is led by a dictator. That is absolute rot. How can the wishes of one man in Cabinet prevail over those of the other 17?

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SIMPSON: Opposition members laugh. One man said to me, "Gordon, Joh directs you. There is no doubt about it; one look from him and you wither up." What rot! He went on, "You won't get endorsed at the next election." I said, "Joh doesn't have a say. It is the electorate council of my party that determines whether or not I get endorsed." The claims and allegations that we have heard just do not fit the facts.

The media reports that go forth of what takes place in this House and how the Parliament works, have misled many people in this State. A few people have climbed onto the bandwagon, thinking it might help their party. I suggest it is about time that they came down to earth and we got back to the business of governing the State.

Mr. GYGAR (Stafford) (8.21 p.m.), in reply: In my reply I think it is necessary to remind honourable members of the wording of the motion because fully 80 per cent

or more of what we heard today was totally irrelevant to the question now before the House. The motion is—

“That this House condemns the precipitate and unannounced way the demolition of the Bellevue Hotel was commenced on the night of Friday, 20 April 1979.”

Let us forget about the red herrings; let us consider the question itself.

A lot has been said in this debate. Perhaps the most disgusting feature of the whole thing is what has been said by the Opposition. Opposition members have put forward some propositions in this debate that are frankly quite preposterous. The first thing we heard was the johnny-come-lately attempt by the Leader of the Opposition to jump on the bandwagon. It was a futile attempt to disguise his lack of action and his lack of concern by a plethora of phoney, empty rhetoric—something that we have come to expect from him, and something that shows again that he is nothing more than a complete political opportunist. The last empty gesture, the last desperate attempt to leap on the bandwagon, was the phoney amendment that he put to the House. It was cleverly designed and couched in terms that were totally unacceptable to members of the Government parties. All the drivel, crocodile tears and wringing of hands by the honourable member for Rockhampton cannot disguise this last nail of cynicism in the coffin of the credibility of members of the Opposition. They just don't rate.

Members of the public and the media should read the last sentence of the phoney amendment that was put up in paragraph 4. It was a transparent political fraud that the Opposition attempted to foist on the House. The public and the media could thus see for themselves the poor quality, hopelessness and incompetence of these third-class political hacks.

The attitude of the Opposition in this debate is best exemplified by the fairy stories put forward by that buffoon, the honourable member for Archerfield, who treated this issue with disgusting and contemptuous levity that displays his own and his party's lack of ability and integrity. His speech was a classic example of the tired, sick and sorry performance of the political lightweights who currently infest the Opposition benches of this House.

Tonight we have heard a lot of drivel about crossing the floor. Most of it came from the great experts at crossing the floor, that is, members of the Australian Labor Party. Not one of these Opposition members has ever crossed the floor in this House during his political career to vote against the party Whip, but these are the men who talk tonight about honour, integrity and honesty in voting according to how we believe. When did they last do that? Never! That is wrong, Mr. Speaker. They did it once, in 1957, when a few members of the Labor Party, for once in their political history, developed the

intestinal fortitude to buck the party line. That was in the days of the Gair Government and it fell that day.

These phonies, these hypocrites, come here crying all over the floor of Parliament asking, “Why don't you cross the floor?” I ask them why they do not cross the floor; why don't they come clean just for once?

A lot of bad things have happened in this State in the past few days, but one of the most despicable has been the sight of these half-baked, political hacks coming into this Chamber trying to make out that there is the slightest shred of integrity or conscience among the lot of them. We could turn them upside down and shake them for a week without getting one drop of integrity out of the whole sore, sick, sorry collection. I have seldom seen a more disgusting spectacle than the actions of these creatures today on the floor of this Parliament.

There is only one issue in this motion that we are discussing today. It is none of those issues that these buffoons have been attempting to throw up to the media in some desperate attempt to salvage their credibility. The issue is the circumstances surrounding the demolition of the Bellevue, this midnight raid. It was an action tainted with stealth and deceit. There can be no justification for what occurred that night. It was an action totally without honour. That I find extremely offensive and I think that most of the people of Queensland share that view.

Many things have been said tonight and today regarding the role of the police. I for one, as one who witnessed that night, would like to praise them. I do not say that every policeman acted at every moment as he should. There were certain incidents involving certain policemen that were not right. Overall, it was a performance of constraint and reasonableness by the vast majority of the police present on that night that is worthy of praise and worthy of recognition. Too often everybody grabs the police and kicks the can. It is not justified in most cases in regard to what occurred that night.

The crowd that attended deserves similar praise. Those people, too, behaved with constraint. They, too, behaved with responsibility. There were again, on their side, a couple of minor incidents where people let their emotions get away from them. Overall, they deserve praise, and the police deserve praise for what they did.

When the motion is put, all Cabinet Ministers will naturally vote against it, as they are obliged to. They are obliged to support a Government of which they are members because they are bound by Cabinet solidarity. I understand that, I appreciate it and I expect nothing else from them. I would be somewhat disappointed to find a Minister crossing the floor of this House to join us if he had not at first taken the honourable step of advising his leader that he was resigning from the Cabinet.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. GYGAR: I should like "Hansard" to record the cackles coming from the other side. It occurs every time anybody mentions the word "honour". Frankly, it is a concept that they have absolutely no appreciation of, as those who have witnessed this debate can clearly see.

We have heard during the debate that the coalition is in danger.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. GYGAR: It is rare that the honourable member can leave me speechless but I am not above it on this occasion.

If the coalition is in danger—and I do not believe it is—it is only because decisions are being made without consultation and without consideration. I ask my coalition partners: when can we return to the once harmonious relationship that we enjoyed? Can there be a true partnership without consultation, consideration and mutual give and take? Surely it is in the interests not only of our respective parties but also of all of the people of Queensland that this situation be rectified. The solution of the present problem lies in the hands of the Parliamentary National Party.

We now come to voting. Let every member tonight vote according to his conscience. Let there be no thought of Liberal members voting with the Labor Party. If the A.L.P. members want to join me and my Liberal colleagues in this motion, let them. Unfortunately, if they do, it will not be because of any issue of conscience. It will be because they have been told how to vote, as usual, and we will see them trooping up and voting en bloc, also as usual.

The issues have been well and exhaustively covered; no-one can doubt that. Every member has had an opportunity to consider his position. Let us vote and see what those positions are.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I notice the honourable member for Wolston in the gallery. I have asked the honourable member to withdraw from the Chamber and he will now withdraw.

Whereupon the honourable member for Wolston withdrew from the Chamber.

Question—That the motion (Mr. Gygarr) be agreed to—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 30

Akers	Lane
Austin	Mackenroth
Bishop	Milliner
Bourke	Moore
Burns	Scassola
Casey	Scott-Young
Davis	Shaw
Fouras	Underwood
Gygarr	Vaughan
Hansen	Warburton
Hewitt, W. D.	White
Hooper, K. J.	Wright
Houston	
Innes	<i>Tellers:</i>
Jones	D'Arcy
Kyburz	Kruger

NOES, 41

Ahern	Lee
Armstrong	Lester
Bertoni	Lickiss
Bjelke-Petersen	Lockwood
Booth	Miller
Camm	Müller
Campbell	Neal
Doumany	Newbery
Edwards	Powell
Elliott	Row
Gibbs, I. J.	Simpson
Glasson	Sullivan
Goleby	Tenni
Greenwood	Tomkins
Gunn	Turner
Hartwig	Warner
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Wharton
Hinze	
Hodges	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hooper, M. D.	Frawley
Katter	McKechnie
Kippin	

PAIRS:

Blake	Knox
Prest	Bird
Wilson	Porter
Yewdale	Kaus

Resolved in the negative.

ROADS (CONTRIBUTION TO MAINTENANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. K. B. TOMKINS (Roma—Minister for Transport): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Roads (Contribution to Maintenance) Act 1957–1978 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY; MINISTER FOR EDUCATION

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (8.41 p.m.): I desire to inform the House that, in connection with the overseas visit of the Minister for Education, His Excellency the Governor has, by virtue of the provisions of the Officials in Parliament Act 1896–1975, and all other powers thereunto him enabling authorised and empowered:—

(1) The Honourable Russell James Hinze, M.L.A., Minister for Local Government and Main Roads, to perform and exercise all or any of the duties, powers and authorities imposed or conferred upon the Minister for Education by any Act, rule, practice or ordinance on and from 20 April 1979 and until and including 29 April 1979;

(2) The Honourable Thomas Guy Newbery, M.L.A., Minister for Culture, National Parks and Recreation, to perform and exercise all or any of the duties,

powers and authorities imposed or conferred upon the Minister for Education by any Act, rule, practice or ordinance on and from 30 April 1979 and until the return to Queensland of the Honourable Valmond James Bird, M.L.A.

I lay upon the table of the House a copy of the Queensland Government Gazette of 21 April 1979 notifying this arrangement.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the Government Gazette on the table.

PETITION

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS TRANSPORTED BY QUEENSLAND RAILWAYS AND ROAD TRANSPORT

Mr. BURNS (Lytton) presented a petition from 523 electors of Queensland praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take the necessary steps to amend the relevant legislation to ensure that animals transported by Queensland Railways and by road transport are not forced to suffer intolerable pain and suffering due to neglect, lack of water and lack of concern.

Petition read and received.

PROPOSED MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

DEMOLITION OF BELLEVUE BUILDING

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to announce that this morning I received the following letter from the Leader of the Opposition:—

“Leader of the Opposition,
“Parliament House,
“Brisbane, 4000.
“24 April, 1979.

“The Honourable J. E. H. Houghton
M.L.A.

“Speaker,
“Parliament House,
“Brisbane, Qld. 4000.

“Dear Mr. Speaker,

“I beg to inform you that in accordance with Standing Order 137 I intend this day, Tuesday 24 April 1979, to move that this House do now adjourn.

“I move this motion to give the Parliament of Queensland the immediate opportunity to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance and concern, namely the secretive, politically-motivated destruction just after midnight last Friday (20 April 1979) of the historic Bellevue Hotel, Corner Alice and George Streets, Brisbane.

“To outline the reason for moving this motion, I point out that—

The entire Parliamentary system of Queensland has come under a cloud of public disrespect and distrust as a result of this hasty act of moonlight political vandalism.

It is deplorable that this building, almost a century old, in the heart of the Parliamentary precinct could be ‘slaughtered’ on political orders less than sixty hours after a private decision of the Joint Government Parties without any report or debate in Parliament or any proper opportunity to assess public opinion.

This House finds it even more deplorable that police were instructed to supervise this sneaky, arrogant wreckage of Queensland heritage and that, in the disorganised destruction, safety laws were apparently breached and valuable traffic equipment damaged.

This Parliament reminds the Executive that it is answerable through it to the people of Queensland.

In this case, as in others recently, this accountability, so inherent in the Westminster system of Government, was either disregarded or abused and this Parliament is now—regrettably belatedly—forced to demand as a question of urgency—

- (1) A full explanation from the Works Minister of all events last week up to the actual start of destruction just after midnight on Friday associated with this political destruction of the Bellevue Hotel, including the name of the Government officer or Cabinet Minister who authorised the demolition exercise. As part of such report, this House demands also from the Minister complete details of the way and timing in which this contract was let; the number of companies invited by his Department to tender and how the Deen Brothers—a firm recently suspect at top Police level in regard to what was termed ‘slave camp’ industrial activities—came to be part of the demolition team.
- (2) That the Works Minister table all reports and other documents that prompted recent decisions by Cabinet and the Joint Government Parties on the fate of the Bellevue Hotel. In view of reports as late as last Friday of confusion between the Premier and his Deputy on the issue, such documents should include the exact wording and intent of the decision of the Joint Government Parties.
- (3) A full report with plans from the Works Minister of the alternative proposals, including location and design, for the announced new building to bear the dismantled iron lacings of the Bellevue.
- (4) A complete explanation from the Treasurer of the obvious lack of either communication or influence of the Liberal Party that exists within the coalition Government in

that this destruction could be ordered politically at Cabinet level allegedly without his knowledge.

"Mr. Speaker, I believe the undesirable unnecessary secrecy, haste and environmental political destruction involved in this unfortunate incident make it imperative that this Parliament, in protection of its own reputation and integrity, urgently debates this most distressing issue that—over the weekend—has shocked and disturbed the people of both our State of Queensland and Australia.

"Yours sincerely,

"Edmund Casey."

I think that the subject-matter of the letter from the Leader of the Opposition has been fully debated on the motion moved without notice by the honourable member for Stafford, so I am not prepared to accept this motion. Nobody could claim that Parliament did not have a fair, open and frank debate on the demolition of the Bellevue. Admittedly I allowed some latitude to get the matter cleared up. I believe everybody has had a fair go, and I have no intention of accepting the motion outlined in the letter.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

1. SUBCONTRACTING BY CIVIL & CIVIC SUBSIDIARIES

Mr. Casey, pursuant to notice, asked the Deputy Premier and Treasurer—

(1) With reference to his recent agreement with the Opposition's call for greater accountability by the Government in its financial operations and as this contrasts sharply with the answer he provided to me on 17 April, on behalf of the Premier, on subcontracts for the Mt. Gravatt Hospital, will he check and inform this Parliament which subsidiaries of Civil & Civic Pty. Ltd. have received subcontracts in relation to Mt. Gravatt and Ipswich Hospital works and a number of other projects in which the company was project manager?

(2) Will he detail the nature of such contracts, the subsidiaries involved and the amounts of each contract?

(3) In view of the answer of the Minister for Works and Housing to my question on 20 March that Civil & Civic Pty. Ltd. was precluded from tendering for subcontracts in projects where it was project manager, does he regard this back-door process of tendering as undesirable?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) The simple answer to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition's question is that there have been no contracts or subcontracts awarded to Civil & Civic or its subsidiaries for works on the Mt. Gravatt Hospital project. Civil &

Civic has no association whatsoever with the Ipswich Hospitals Board. As the honourable member has previously been advised, all work being carried out on the Mt. Gravatt Hospital is awarded by public tender.

2. GEORGE STREET PRECINCT DEVELOPMENT; BELLEVUE BUILDING

Mr. Casey, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

(1) With reference to Cabinet decision No. 19792 of 10 December 1973 regarding the preparation of a development plan for the George Street Precinct by his department's consultants, Lund Hutton Newell Paulsen Pty. Ltd., architects, Brisbane, in collaboration with Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, architects and planners, Chicago, U.S.A., what was the total cost to his department of the preparation of this report?

(2) Did this report clearly indicate that the Bellevue Hotel could be completely restored in its present site for \$4,300,000 based on a 30 June 1978 costing?

(3) What was the consultant's reaction to the suggestion by the National Trust of Queensland that the Bellevue Hotel, having been designed for a corner site, would appear ridiculous if removed from a corner?

(4) As the recently announced Government intention regarding the use of the Bellevue railings conforms to neither the master plan nor any other report submitted to his department, what is the basis of the current proposal?

(5) Did the study team receive a report from the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, Queensland Chapter, recommending the retention and restoration of the Bellevue Hotel on its present site?

(6) What other reports has his department commissioned or undertaken itself on any aspect of the precinct proposal since the date of the Cabinet decision mentioned above?

(7) Who compiled the reports and what was the cost of each?

(8) Will he table in this Parliament the development plan for the Government Precinct and all other subsequent reports, so that a proper and public analysis may be made of them?

Answers:—

(1) The cost of preparation of the development plan and report in August 1974 was \$48,500.

(2) The figure shown in the Works Department's report, submitted to Cabinet in 1974, was calculated when an inflation rate of about 20 per cent was current.

However, as the inflation rate has sharply declined since that date, any figure would be meaningless if taken out of context.

(3) The Government at that time deferred a decision on the Bellevue Hotel and therefore no further services of consultants were required in this regard.

(4) This matter is currently under investigation and will receive further consideration when specific planning options are available.

(5) A report was received from a small committee nominated by the Council of the Queensland Chapter of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects. I have been informed, however, that the views of this committee and the council regarding the Bellevue and The Mansions were divided at that time.

(6 & 7) Consultants were commissioned by my department comprising firms of architects, quantity surveyors and real estate agents for the various aspects of the study. Works Department's interim reports were submitted to the inter-departmental committee in June 1978, and the most recent report, incorporating all consultants' reports, was submitted in March 1979.

Consultants' fees were—architects, \$26,248; quantity surveyors, \$3,064; real estate agents, \$500.

(8) See answer to (4).

3. CONTROL OF TRAFFIC ON RAINBOW BEACH

Mr. Frawley, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police—

(1) Is he aware that at Rainbow Beach during the Easter week-end a child was knocked down on the beach by a beach buggy and that approximately 30 motor-cyclists rode up and down the beach terrorising people?

(2) Is he also aware that the Widgee Shire Council stated that the council will not control beach buggies and motor cycles on the beach, and that police have stated that they have no jurisdiction in this matter?

(3) In the interests of tourism, will he arrange for police to be present at Rainbow Beach during holiday week-ends and also request the Widgee Shire Council to carry out its responsibilities and control traffic on the beach?

Answers:—

(1) During the Easter week-end a nine-year-old female ran into the side of a Volkswagen dune buggy on the beach at Double Island Point about 14 km from Rainbow Beach. She suffered injuries to upper and lower lip and teeth, also shock. The incident occurred at approximately 4.30 p.m. on 13 April 1979 (Good Friday) and is the subject of police investigation. A number of motor-cyclists were

on the beach, but from information available it is not considered that they were terrorising people on the beach. At times that police visited the beach motor-cyclists left the area.

(2 & 3) The enforcement of the Motor Vehicles Control Act 1975 is primarily the responsibility of the local authority for the area concerned and I understand that the Widgee and Noosa Shire Councils and Maryborough Town Council are holding discussions in the near future for possible action to be taken under this Act. During holiday periods such as Easter, school holidays, etc., a member of the Police Force is stationed at Rainbow Beach. This practice will continue and where evidence of an offence is obtained appropriate action will ensue.

4. NEW STATION AND PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS, STRATHPINE-LAWNTON RAILWAY STATION

Mr. Akers, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Transport—

What is the present position regarding the planning and provision of (a) a new railway station between Strathpine and Lawnton, and (b) pedestrian access across the railway line in the vicinity of the Strathpine State School and Pine Rivers District High School?

Answer:—

(a) The study carried out on behalf of the Metropolitan Transit Authority to assess the need for a new station between Strathpine and Lawnton concludes that such a facility could become desirable within the next 10 years. The Metropolitan Transit Authority proposes to monitor the development of the Strathpine area so that new station requirements can be met when warranted, compatible with funding availability.

(b) A preliminary plan for a foot-bridge is being prepared to a design that will permit of its incorporation in any new station that might be provided.

5. OFFICE ACCOMMODATION, COOMERA POLICE STATION

Mr. I. J. Gibbs, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police—

Further to his recent visit to the Coomera and Nerang Police Stations to inspect accommodation and the advice by the Minister for Works and Housing that new office accommodation is to be supplied at the Nerang Police Station, has any decision been made to supply new office accommodation at Coomera?

Answer:—

As the honourable member has stated, I visited Coomera Station and am well aware of the cramped conditions in relation to office accommodation there. The matter

has been referred to the Department of Works for consideration. At this stage a decision has not been made, but the honourable member can be assured that, consistent with the availability of finance, improvements in the office accommodation will receive every consideration.

6. TRUST FUND MISAPPROPRIATIONS BY REAL ESTATE AGENTS

Mr. Wright, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) How many claims have been lodged under the Auctioneers and Agents Act 1971–1978 regarding real estate agents who have gone bankrupt?

(2) On how many occasions has it been necessary to advertise, seeking claims against the trust accounts of agents who have gone into liquidation?

(3) Was a charge against an estate agent of having stolen \$12,047 as a trustee dismissed recently in the District Court after the agent's counsel argued that the Criminal Code section did not include real estate agents?

(4) Had another real estate agent a week before been gaoled for three years on a similar charge?

(5) As these conflicting decisions forced Corporate Affairs investigators to delay several investigations involving alleged misappropriation of trust funds, will he supply the House with details of the two decisions and any other matters that would make members aware of the ramifications of the decisions?

Answers:—

(1) I am advised by the Registrar of Auctioneers and Agents that it is not possible from the records maintained by his office to determine the number of agents against whom claims have been lodged under the Auctioneers and Agents Act 1971–1978 who have subsequently gone into liquidation or bankruptcy as the case may be. For the information of the honourable member, the registrar has advised me that his records indicate that there have been 155 successful claims against the Fidelity Guarantee Fund relating to real estate agents.

(2) The registrar has advised me that, under the Auctioneers and Agents Act, there is no statutory obligation to advertise seeking claims against the trust accounts of a business conducted by a real estate agent. However, receivers of such trust accounts appointed by the Auctioneers and Agents Committee under the provisions of the Act have made advertisements on some occasions.

In relation to claims against the Auctioneers and Agents Fidelity Guarantee Fund, unless the Governor in Council has, by notification in the Government Gazette,

fixed the aggregate amounts which may be applied in the reimbursement of all persons who suffer loss through the fault of any particular real estate agent, there is no statutory obligation to advertise seeking claims against the fund.

(3 to 5) On 23 February 1979, Judge Gibney discharged Neville William Halley, against whom an indictment had been presented charging him with an offence under section 436 of the Criminal Code of fraudulently converting trust property. Halley was a real estate agent and it was alleged that he was a trustee within that section. The amount involved was \$12,047.16. It may be noted that the discharge of the accused does not constitute a final determination of the charge and does not in law amount to an acquittal. What the judge, in effect, has determined is that the charge did not disclose an offence.

In the case of Mervyn Leonard Caesar, Caesar pleaded guilty before Judge Kimmins on a similar charge. He was sentenced to three years' imprisonment. Caesar has now appealed against his conviction and sentence and the matter will be argued before the Court of Criminal Appeal at its next sittings which commence on Tuesday, 24 April 1979.

Whether the judgment of Judge Gibney represents a correct statement of the law will be determined by the Court of Criminal Appeal on the appeal by Caesar. Once the court has made its determination, the Crown will be in a position to decide what further action is necessary or desirable. It is inadvisable at this stage to make any more comment on the law and facts having regard to the impending appeal.

The honourable member's attention is drawn to the recent amendment to the Criminal Code by virtue of the Criminal Law Amendment Act 1979. A new offence has been created of the dishonest applying of moneys in a bank account, including where it is subject to a trust direction or condition. The import of this section still remains to be determined in the light of particular factual situations. Again, any further comment is undesirable.

I can assure the honourable member that the matter will receive the closest attention in the light of the decision of the Court of Criminal Appeal.

7. CONSUMER PROTECTION; MAXIMUM-PRICE SCHEME AND PROSECUTION FOR PROFITEERING

Mr. Wright, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Labour Relations—

(1) As the cost of living has a direct effect on wages through the National Wage cases, etc., and as Queensland, on many occasions, tops the list of cost of living

increases across the nation, does his Government carry out any checks on food and household equipment prices in major retail stores and food barns, where price differences of up to \$2 on the same article, for example, rubbish bins, can be found at different locations across the city?

(2) In view of the Federal Government's virtual freeze on pension increases and as a precedent is being set by the proposed concept of a minimum-price scheme for bread, will he now give consideration to introducing a maximum-price scheme for everyday consumer goods, if only for a test period of one year?

(3) Is it possible to prosecute those stores that are making excessive profits under the Profiteering Prevention Act 1948 to 1959 and, if not, will he explain what protection this Act gives to consumers?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) The honourable member is exaggerating when he says that on many occasions Queensland tops the list of quarterly cost of living increases. Reference to the last 14 quarterly C.P.I. increases shows that of the six capitals Brisbane was the highest only twice and once equal first with three other capitals. On two occasions it had the lowest increase and on another it was equal lowest.

A vast difference exists between a minimum-price scheme and a maximum level. A price freeze in Queensland is legally possible but hardly practicable given the Federal structure and interdependence on products from interstate. "Everyday consumer goods" would cover a wide ambit and the administrative controls involving an army of prices inspectors would be extremely expensive to the taxpayer.

This Government, as a matter of economic policy, does not subscribe to price control but rather to market forces being the determining factor. In this respect, naturally prices will vary from store to store.

Fair price competition with overall low shelf price and heavy specialising is the dominant factor in retailing at the moment, which invariably occurs with some loss of service to the customer. The wise and prudent shopper takes advantage of this competition in the market-place.

8. S.P. BOOKMAKING

Mr. Wright, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police—

(1) With reference to starting-price bookmaking in Queensland, how many (a) raids were conducted, (b) charges laid and (c) convictions obtained by the Licensing Branch during the months of February and March this year?

(2) What is the present strength of the Licensing Branch in terms of ranks, and how do the present personnel numbers compare with those in each of the last three years?

(3) Is he aware of a memorandum sent to the Gold Coast Criminal Investigation Branch by Superintendent Atkinson in relation to a man whom I referred to in this House as Mr. S. and his involvement in starting-price bookmaking and, if so, how does this memorandum conflict with a Press statement recently made by Superintendent Atkinson that there was no knowledge of the same Mr. S. being involved in starting-price bookmaking on the Gold Coast?

Answers:—

(1) (a) 7; (b) 7; (c) above charges all presently on remand.

(2) Established strength of the Licensing Branch is as follows:—

Ranks	Present	1978	1977	1976
Inspector ..	1	1	1	1
Senior Sergeant	1	1	1	1
Sergeant 1/C ..	1	1	1	1
Sergeant 2/C ..	5	3	3	3
Constables ..	15	17	15	15

(3) Yes. I am now aware that on 30 January 1979 Superintendent Atkinson issued a confidential memorandum to acting Superintendent Weiss, Gold Coast District, concerning a person named Stan S. and another person. I am in possession of a copy of that memorandum and I do not consider that it conflicts in any material way with the Press statement attributed to Superintendent Atkinson appearing in the "Gold Coast Bulletin" on 20 March 1979.

9. SALE OF UNDATED EGGS

Mr. Bertoni, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

(1) Do Queensland retailers of N.S.W.-produced eggs have to abide by the use-by-date system operating for Queensland-produced eggs?

(2) If so, will he investigate why the store named "Big Apple", Beaudesert Road, Brisbane, is selling undated eggs from Brazil's of Legume, New South Wales?

Answers:—

(1) The use-by-date system operating in southern Queensland was introduced by the Egg Marketing Board on a voluntary basis to assist the consumer. Thus it applies to eggs handled only by the board. Consequently, there is no obligation on packers of eggs outside the direct control of the Egg Marketing Board, for example those in New South Wales, to apply the use-by-date system for eggs sold in Queensland.

(2) As it is stated that the eggs in question originated in New South Wales, an investigation would be inappropriate.

10. MT. ISA HOSPITAL EXTENSION

Mr. Bertoni, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Health—

What is the latest position regarding the proposed extensions to the Mt. Isa Hospital, and when can we expect a start on these extensions?

Answer:—

As indicated in my letter of 15 March 1979 to the honourable member, certain aspects of planning of extensions to the Mt. Isa Hospital still remain unresolved and are currently being examined by the hospitals board and my department. It is intended that a further meeting of the project team will be held in the near future, when it is expected that the functional brief will be finalised. Approval would then be given for the preparation of sketch plans and an estimate of cost for the extensions. It is not possible at the present time to forecast when commencement of the extensions will take place, but I can assure the honourable member that the completion of the necessary documentation associated with the project will be closely monitored to avoid any unnecessary delay in commencement of work.

11. EFFECT ON FAMILIES AND TOURIST RESORTS OF SCHOOL HOLIDAY CHANGES

Mr. Elliott, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism—

In view of the various proposals that the Queensland Education Department has suggested for a changed school-holiday system in Queensland, will he ensure that his department takes the opportunity of acquainting the Minister for Education of the relevance of such suggestions as they relate to family holidays and tourist resorts?

Answer:—

Yes. Comments will also be passed to the Honourable F. A. Campbell, M.L.A., Minister for Labour Relations, and the Honourable N. E. Lee, M.L.A., Minister for Industry and Administrative Services.

12. SYNCHRONISATION OF TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mr. Elliott, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

(1) In view of the close correlation between traffic flow rate and fuel consumption, what is the level of synchronisation and computerisation presently existing in the traffic lights system of Brisbane and other provincial cities?

(2) Will this be an avenue for further fuel savings in the future?

Answers:—

(1) There are co-ordinated traffic signal systems existing within the cities of Brisbane, Gold Coast, Townsville, Rockhampton, Bundaberg and Maryborough. These systems range from simple fixed-time single plan to traffic-responsive, computer-monitored installations.

(2) Co-ordination of traffic signals has the potential for fuel savings because of the reduction in delay to individual trips which it can provide. Such potential savings would of course be greatest in Brisbane, where the Brisbane City Council and the Main Roads Department have installed extensive networks controlling a large volume of traffic.

13. FOOD MARKETING COSTS

Mr. Burns, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Labour Relations—

(1) In the light of a growing consumer backlash against soaring meat prices, has the Queensland Government, which claims to represent rural interests, investigated the cost of marketing food after it leaves the farm?

(2) As a U.S. report indicated that 74c in every consumer dollar is spent on marketing, has the Liberal-National Party in this State carried out detailed investigations into marketing, labour, packaging, transportation, taxes, levies, charges, depreciation, rents, advertising, interest, profit, etc., and what percentage each represents of the consumer dollar spent on farm products?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) This question should be directed to my colleague the Honourable V. B. Sullivan, M.L.A., Minister for Primary Industries.

Mr. Burns: I do so accordingly.

14. PRICE, QUALITY AND AVAILABILITY OF SPARE PARTS

Mr. Burns, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Labour Relations—

(1) Further to my previous questions regarding prices, quality and availability of spare parts for cars, trucks and farm machinery, did the New South Wales Prices Commissioner's report on an inquiry into vehicle replacement parts reveal mark-ups of 650 per cent on spare parts?

(2) Was the report critical of the way in which the industry was structured, stating that the nearly universal use of recommended list prices in the spare parts industry denied the buyer the benefits of competition?

(3) Did it also recommend control over imported parts because unscrupulous operators counterfeit parts and parts of poor quality were all affecting the industry?

(4) In the light of the report's evidence of rip-offs in the spare parts industry and the growing concern of farming groups, community bodies and car owners generally at the price and poor quality of many spare parts sold in Queensland, what action has the Government taken to investigate the spare parts prices and quality in this State?

(5) Will he detail to the House actions taken to protect motorists, transport operators and farmers from spare parts rip-offs?

Answer:—

(1 to 5) The question asked by the honourable member refers to a 250-page report and he lifts points out of context. The mark-ups referred to are from a manufacturer's price list with each seller in the chain of distribution having his mark-up incorporated. To make this point about the level of the mark-up ignores the realities of how the motor vehicle spare parts distribution industry works, that is to say, manufacturers, wholesaler, distributor, dealer and retailer.

Many complaints of overpricing arise when erroneous comparisons are made between genuine replacement parts, non-genuine replacement parts, imported parts, pirated parts and imports from developing countries. It is always possible for individuals to produce isolated cases but the broad view has to be taken.

The comment that use of recommended prices denies competition is irrational. The prices are recommended only and there is no reason why the retailers could not sell above or below that price.

The point, of course, is that the system ensures that there is a stability in the market that could be destroyed if drastic price cutting was to occur. Stability is more important in this particular industry because of the need for a business to have a guarantee of viability in the long term.

As the honourable member should know, in this industry there is a need to carry large and varied stocks to meet the demands of members of the public with a variety of vehicles and plant requiring thousands of parts which stockists are required to carry. This in turn requires high financial involvement.

In so far as control over imported parts is concerned, this is the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government.

In November and December 1976 an investigation was carried out for the Consumer Affairs Council, at my request, to "investigate the prices of automotive spare parts in Queensland, to see if there are

serious discrepancies between manufacturers' recommended prices and actual retail prices". Difficulty was encountered in establishing just what are the recommended prices, particularly as this is an area where there are continual changes. Resources were limited, but on the basis of discussions with interested groups and a small sample survey there was no evidence to suggest that generally there were any abnormally large-scale variations in prices being charged.

May I say the question is so general that it is not possible to give comment meaningfully. For example, where is the evidence that prices are generally too high? This cannot be seen in isolation from industry structure and costs.

15. MEDICAL SCREENING OF SCHOOLCHILDREN

Mr. Burns, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Health—

(1) As it has been reported that increased medical screening of primary-school children could save the community hundreds of thousands of dollars in medical costs, and with reference to the school health services, on how many occasions during his or her primary-school career can a student expect to be visited by a school health nurse?

(2) What tests are carried out by the nurse?

(3) What follow-up action is taken if defects are discovered?

(4) In young children, does one in 10 screened have physical or emotional deficiencies?

(5) Is there any plan to increase the number of times that a student is visited by a school nurse under the system?

(6) Does the Health Department lay down any conditions for school health rooms?

(7) Is any training given to teachers graduating from our colleges to assist them in ascertaining pupil difficulties?

Answers:—

(1) The aim of the Division of School Health Services is to see every child at least twice in its primary school life, that is to say, on entry and in year 7. Children are also seen if referred by teachers or parents.

(2) School health sisters check the children's eyes for defective vision squint and other conditions; hearing; general posture and gait; general nutrition, cleanliness, skin, abdomen, pu'ses etc.; height and weight (where scales are available); general development; speech.

Mr. Burns: Did they miss you when you were young?

Mr. CAMPBELL: Those services were not available under the Labor Government.

Mr. Burns: You were under the Moore Government, and you were a Tory from New South Wales.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The honourable member should know better than that. I was working during the period of the Moore Government.

Answers (contd.):—

(3) Unsuspected defects found are notified to the parents who are requested to consult their own medical practitioner. If, after a period of six weeks, no action has been taken by the parents and the condition is considered serious, the school sisters make home visits to discuss the condition with the parents.

(4) Yes.

(5) This matter is presently under review.

(6) Yes.

(7) A "Check List for Teachers" was prepared by the division to alert teachers of children requiring referral.

16. RAILWAY CATTLE WAGONS

Mr. Turner, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Transport—

In view of misconceptions in some areas of the livestock industry as to the availability of rail cattle wagons, will he indicate (a) what is the availability of rail wagons, (b) what is the system of lodgment of wagon bookings and (c) what are the refund conditions in the event of cancellations?

Answer:—

(a) The department's cattle wagon fleet has been progressively advanced to a total representing the equivalent of 1,959 "K" wagons, the equivalent of 389 "K" wagons having been added in the past two years.

Whilst the record demand for the supply of livestock wagons during the 1978 stock season was, generally speaking, comfortably met, problems have arisen during the last few weeks. Because of the significant increase in the orders placed during that period, it has been necessary, in some instances, to defer, for a few days, the meeting of orders.

(b) The system governing the booking of cattle wagons is open to all sections of the cattle industry and is based on the department's aim of ensuring that available wagons are fairly allocated and an efficient service provided to its customers. The Railway Department is, naturally, seeking to derive maximum revenue from available wagon resources, whilst it is the desire of members of the cattle industry that wagons be supplied to meet a programme laid down by them. Accordingly, it is to the mutual advantage of the department and the cattle industry that wagon-booking

requirements be planned as far in advance as possible, given the normal constraints such as wet weather, road transport availability, etc. There is no limit on the period of advance bookings of cattle wagons.

(c) The departmental booking system requires the lodgment, prior to the date of loading, of a deposit of \$20 for each "K" class and \$8 for each "IC" class wagon. In the event of cancellation of an order prior to the loading date, the deposit is forfeited to the department. If the booking is cancelled on the due loading date, an additional demurrage charge of \$11 per eight-wheel wagon or \$5.75 per four-wheel wagon is enforced. In special circumstances, such as inability to load owing to rain or industrial disputes at meatworks, consideration is given to a 90 per cent refund. In other extenuating circumstances, consideration is given to a refund of 50 per cent of forfeited deposit. Each case is treated on its merits.

17. RAILWAY RESIDENCES, AMBY AND MUNGALLALA

Mr. Turner, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Transport—

In view of the extreme delay in completing the construction of railway station-masters' residences at Amby and Mungallala, what action will he take to complete these houses as a matter of urgency?

Answer:—

The delay in the completion of the contract involving the construction of residences at Amby and Mungallala has been actively pursued by the department with the contractor by discussion and correspondence.

The avenues of redress open to the department under the conditions of contract are now being invoked with a view to having construction completed with a minimum of further delay.

I say to the honourable member that the position is similar in the Roma electorate.

18. HOUSING COMMISSION APPLICATIONS, WARREGO ELECTORATE

Mr. Turner, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

(1) How many applications are currently held for Housing Commission houses in Cunnamulla, Charleville, Mitchell, Augathella, Tambo and Blackall?

(2) Into what category does each application fall?

(3) What action is being taken to overcome the shortage of Housing Commission houses in these areas?

Answers:—

(1 & 2) Cunnamulla—1 with 100 points priority; 7 with 40 points priority; and 10 with nil priority.

Charleville—1 with 100 points priority; 5 with 40 points priority; and 5 with nil priority.

Mitchell—1 with 100 points priority.

Augathella—Nil.

Tambo—Nil.

Blackall—1 with nil priority

(3) I am closely watching the demand for accommodation in all areas of the State. Subject to finance being available in 1979-80, the honourable member's personal representations for the above towns will be given every consideration when programmes are being prepared.

19. WESTERN AIR SERVICES

Mr. Glasson, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Transport—

(1) As the representative of a western district, is he aware that western communities are not prepared to accept a downgrading of their air services from a regular public transport level to a commuter service at a second or third level?

(2) Is he also aware that regular public transport services to western districts must collapse unless one of the major operators is given exclusive rights to the passenger traffic to and from Mt. Isa, or one of these operators is heavily subsidised by the State or Federal Government?

(3) Are western people expected to believe that T.A.A. can carry the current losses on the western routes indefinitely and, if not, what steps are being taken by his department to maintain regular public transport services to western communities on a viable basis for the operator and the taxpayer?

(4) What long-term arrangement can these communities expect from the State Government?

Answers:—

(1) I am fully aware of and appreciate the views and concern expressed by western communities.

(2) This is an over-simplification of the problem involving the two-airline policy under which both airlines operate in Australia, and it cannot be looked at in isolation with regard to one particular area of Queensland.

(3 & 4) Continuing discussions are being held with T.A.A. and all steps possible are being taken to ensure the maintenance of regular air transport services to western communities into the foreseeable future.

20. OVERSEAS LOANS NEGOTIATED BY TREASURER

Mr. Houston, pursuant to notice, asked the Deputy Premier and Treasurer—

Concerning his recent overseas visit—

(1) What loans was he able to obtain and for whom was he acting?

(2) What were the terms, including the period, repayments and interest, of each loan?

(3) In what currency were the loans made?

Answers:—

(1) Two borrowings were signed. The first was a \$37,000,000 loan towards the cost of the fifth and sixth units at the Gladstone Power House on behalf of the State Electricity Commission of Queensland. The second was for \$8,000,000 on behalf of the Metropolitan Transit Authority towards the cost of the electric multiple-unit vehicles for use on the Brisbane electrification programme.

(2) Both borrowings have been hailed in the international financial press as being the finest terms yet offered to any sovereign borrower. The term is 15 years in the case of the S.E.C.Q. and nine years in the case of the M.T.A. The interest rate is in both cases a floating rate based on a margin over LIBOR.

(3) The loan is denominated in United States dollars with the option to switch to other available Euro-currencies at six monthly roll-over periods. At present both loans are being drawn down in Swiss francs at an interest rate of approximately 2½ per cent.

21. RESPONSIBILITY FOR PORT OF BRISBANE SERVICE ROADS

Mr. Houston, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

Are any roads serving the new port for Brisbane at Fisherman Islands declared or will any be declared, either in whole or in part, as the responsibility of the State Government?

Answer:—

It is the responsibility of the State Government to ensure that the best use is made of the road funds available to it. Accordingly, recommendations were made to the Commonwealth Government, and urban roads serving the new Port for Brisbane at Fisherman Islands were declared as national commerce roads under the State Grants (Roads) Act of 1977, for which the Commonwealth provided some \$2,800,000 annually in the Act for the three financial years ending 1979-80. The allocation for 1978-79 was escalated to

cover inflation costs. Construction of roads serving the new port has been largely financed from this source.

22. PRODUCTION AND VALUE OF LOBSTERS AND OYSTERS

Mr. Houston, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism—

For 1977-78, what was (a) the production and (b) the value of (i) rock lobsters, (ii) bay lobsters and (iii) oysters?

Answer:—

Statistics of the production referred to by the honourable member are not available, but it has been estimated that the production and value for 1977-78 would be in the vicinity of—

Rock lobsters—100,000 kg, value \$1,000,000,

Bay lobsters—125,000 kg, value \$240,000.

Oysters—Various packages (bottles, shell, etc.), value \$225,000.

23. COAL-MINING AREA ROAD LINKS

Mr. Lester, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

(1) What progress is being made in the gazettal of the road linking Blackwater with the Oaky Creek coal-mine?

(2) What is the current progress in the linking of South Blackwater, Blackwater, Oaky Creek, German Creek, Norwich Park, Dysart, Saraji, Peak Downs, Moranbah and Goonyella?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) I have already given the honourable member an undertaking to declare the road, together with other important roads affecting Peak Downs and the Emerald Shire, in due course. This road is one of a system in the region that is the subject of a report requested by Cabinet. This report, being prepared by the Main Roads Department, will review planning for the major road network in the area and will make recommendations on any changes to the road system considered desirable. Might I suggest to the honourable member that he be patient with us a little longer until this report has been finalised and submitted to Cabinet. I recognise, of course, the tremendous work that the honourable member for Peak Downs is doing in his part of Queensland, which is highly productive, particularly in the export of our coal surpluses.

24. PROTECTION OF NEWSAGENTS FROM CHAIN STORE COMPETITION

Mr. Lester, pursuant to notice, asked the Premier—

(1) What steps will his Government take to ensure that Queensland newsagents will not be adversely affected by moves in other areas of Australia to allow huge chain stores to sell papers, books, etc., which is the traditional right of the local news-agent?

(2) Can I assure newsagents in the electorate of Peak Downs of his support?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) The Queensland Government has noted with concern the draft determination handed down by the Trade Practices Commission in relation to the operation of newsagencies in New South Wales. The Queensland Government shares the legitimate concern of newsagents that this decision, if implemented in Queensland, will affect the livelihood of numerous small businessmen.

The draft determination is currently being considered by the Trade Practices Tribunal, which in effect provides a mechanism of appeal against the draft determination. All interested parties including the New South Wales Newsagents Association and the major publishers have been vigorously participating in that hearing.

At present, the draft determination and hearing by the Trade Practices Tribunal apply only in New South Wales. The ultimate result of that hearing is uncertain and it may be that any decision of the tribunal could itself be subject to further legal proceedings.

The Queensland Government will continue to maintain a close watch on these proceedings so as to ensure that newsagents in Queensland may continue to provide the present acceptable service to the community.

25. EQUINE METRITIS

Mr. Warner, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

(1) Is he aware that Victoria is conducting pathology research into a virulent equine venereal disease called equine metritis, which is reported to cut the fertility rate by one-third?

(2) Has this disease been reported in the horse-breeding industry in Victoria?

(3) Have any cases been reported in Queensland, and what steps are being taken to make sure that this serious disease does not spread?

Answers:—

(1) Yes, I am aware that research on the disease is being done in Victoria.

(2) The disease has been reported in the horse-breeding industry in Victoria.

(3) No. Animals coming to Queensland from interstate are accompanied by a health certificate to the effect that they are healthy. Contagious equine metritis is a notifiable disease in Queensland and Victoria.

In Victoria, voluntary movement controls are imposed and treatment is instituted immediately.

26. NURSING TRAINING ENTRY STANDARD

Mr. Warner, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Health—

(1) Is he aware that a student attaining the necessary standard at the end of Grade 10 is acceptable to the Nurses Registration Board of Queensland for admission to training as a student general nurse and yet applications to the few training schools for general nurses left in Brisbane, such as the Princess Alexandra Hospital, have not been approved and those applying have been informed that a Senior pass is necessary?

(2) Will he clarify this situation as parents are still receiving advice that the Junior standard is acceptable?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) The Nurses Registration Board has set a minimum educational standard for entry to nursing training as Grade 10. However, there are large numbers of applicants for training positions, so the metropolitan hospitals have no difficulty in recruiting students with Grade 12 standard.

Parents and guidance officers are advised that the hospital has the prerogative to set a standard higher than the minimum prescribed by the Nurses Registration Board.

27. PROTECTION FOR CAR BUYERS

Mr. Jones for Mr. Yewdale, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Labour Relations—

(1) With reference to the December-January edition of "The Road Ahead" and the article headed "Car Buyers need more Protection", which refers to the Consumer Affairs Council annual report and makes specific reference to greater protection for car buyers, as the article emanating from the chairman of the council indicates that the Minister for Labour Relations and the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General had been given reports urging greater protection for consumers dealing with motor dealers, have he and his colleague considered this matter and, if so, are any plans in hand to update the present legislation for the purpose of providing an obviously improved position for the consumer?

(2) If not, is he prepared to give any indication as to the Government's intention?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) As I previously advised the honourable member in this House on 25 October 1978, the Consumer Affairs Bureau is represented on an inter-departmental committee that was convened by the Department of Justice and is currently examining the question whether sufficient protection is being afforded consumers when dealing with motor dealers. For further advice in this regard, the honourable member should direct his question to my colleague the Honourable the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General.

28. DAMAGE LIMIT FOR REPORTING OF MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS

Mr. Jones for Mr. Yewdale, pursuant to notice, asked the Premier—

With reference to the damage limit on motor vehicles, whereby it is necessary for a police officer to assess damage at \$1000 at least before a non-injury accident is officially reported, as the damage figure in New South Wales is \$300 and in South Australia and Western Australia \$100, as non-injury accidents do not have to be reported in Victoria and Tasmania, as it is considered reasonable to assess damages at approximately \$300 whereas in the case of \$1000 such assessment poses a much more complex situation, and as the R.A.C.Q. considers this matter should be reviewed for a number of valid reasons, will he consult with his ministerial colleagues to have a review considered?

Answer:—

The increase in the sum from \$300 to \$1,000 as from 1 October 1978, as prescribed under section 31 of the Traffic Act, in respect of damage to property arising from a traffic incident was made after full and careful consideration of all the relevant facts and factors. It is not proposed that the present prescribed amount be reviewed as sought by the honourable member.

29. QUALIFICATIONS OF PORT INQUIRY COMMITTEE MEMBER

Mr. Jones for Mr. Yewdale, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism—

(1) With reference to the inquiry by a Cabinet-appointed committee headed by Sir Sidney Roberts into contract operations at the new Brisbane port, is the P. G. Addison of Woodfield Road, Kenmore, who served on this three-man committee, the Peter George Addison, described variously as investment broker and company director, who stood as a candidate

for the National Party in Petrie in the 1974 Federal election and for Lilley in the 1975 election?

(2) Since the personal history issued on Addition by the National Party shows that his background is confined to investment matters, with past experience in furniture manufacture and pig-raising as a tax avoidance sideline, what special qualifications has he over and above maritime experts and senior public servants in the questions of wharf operation?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) I would refer the honourable member to the questions asked by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition on 3 April 1979 and 17 April 1979, and to the answers which I gave to those questions on those occasions.

30. UPGRADING AND SIGNPOSTING OF ROCKHAMPTON-YEPPON ROAD

Mr. Hartwig, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

(1) As the international tourist resort at Yeppoon will officially be launched on 20 June, will he in liaison with the Livingstone Shire, expedite work on the Yeppoon to Rockhampton road by giving financial and machinery assistance?

(2) Will he erect a suitable sign at the junction of the Yeppoon Road with the Bruce Highway, indicating to tourists where this world-class resort is being built?

Answers:—

(1) The progress on current works on the Rockhampton-Yeppoon Road is presently limited only by the resources which the Livingstone Shire Council can make available. The Main Roads Department has already offered the use of additional resources. The present job is programmed to be completed during the 1979-80 financial year.

(2) There is no need for additional direction signs at the intersection of the Yeppoon Road and the Bruce Highway. The need for road signs is under continual review and it can be expected that additional signs will be provided if required as the resort develops.

31. YEPPON COURT HOUSE

Mr. Hartwig, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

As the Yeppoon Court House is one of the oldest in Australia and Yeppoon is now a most progressive area, will consideration be given to the erection of a new court-house to replace the old building?

Answer:—

The department is aware of the condition of the court-house at Yeppoon, which was renovated in 1975. Because it was anticipated that the work at Yeppoon would increase, a recommendation has been made to the Works Department for the construction of a new court-house to be included on the annual programme of loan works. This recommendation has been made for several years but, owing to other priorities, funds have not yet been made available. This year a further recommendation has been made for its inclusion in the 1979-80 programme of loan works. Its inclusion in the programme will depend on the priorities of other centres and the amount of money available for such projects.

32. MOVEMENT OF FERAL PIGS TO ABATTOIRS

Mr. Hartwig, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

As the Stock Act regulates or prohibits the movement of swine for the purpose of slaughter from piggeries licensed under this Act, and as it is common knowledge that feral pigs are being slaughtered at public abattoirs, how does he view the problem where 100 pigs escaped at the Toowoomba railway yards while being trucked from South-east Queensland?

Answer:—

Wild pigs are being slaughtered only at the Toowoomba Public Abattoir under the control of the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry for the export trade to West Germany. Carcasses rejected for export or condemned, are boiled down and do not reach the domestic trade. Whilst I am concerned at the escape of wild pigs into areas not infested with these pests, this is not a matter which comes under the jurisdiction of my department. The harvesting of wild pigs is effectively reducing populations on a number of properties and is therefore welcomed by graziers as a means of helping to control the pest.

Under the provisions of clause 7C, piggeries on licensed slaughtering premises are exempt as they come under the provisions of the Meat Industry Act 1965-1977. The only piggeries licensed under 7C, therefore, are those situated outside slaughterhouse premises which treat and feed offal and meat scraps derived from licensed slaughtering premises or butchers' shops. There are only six such piggeries in Queensland, the majority of which receive their supplies from local poultry slaughterhouses. Pigs from such licensed piggeries may only be moved direct to a licensed abattoir or slaughterhouse for immediate slaughter.

I remind the honourable member that, whether he is handling wild pigs or domestic pigs, the advice I gave him the

other day is worth remembering, namely, that he should grab them firmly by the tail and lift both back feet off the ground.

33. WATER RESOURCES OF QUEENSLAND

Mr. Simpson, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Water Resources—

(1) What water resources does Queensland have compared to other States?

(2) Where does this place Queensland industrially in the future development of Australia?

Answers:—

(1) The run off from all Queensland streams is estimated to be 137,000,000 megalitres annually or some 40 per cent of the Australian total. Of this total, about 60 per cent of the run off occurs along the north-east coast north of Townsville and in the Gulf area. In addition, the State is endowed with large underground water resources, including a substantial part of the Great Artesian Basin and extensive shallow underground aquifers.

(2) There is little doubt that Queensland, blessed as it is with such a large proportion of the nation's water resources, combined with rich mineral deposits including vast supplies of coal, must grow in importance as an industrial State. However, in some areas of the State it will be essential to carefully husband the available water resources if this development is to occur.

34. PENALTY RATES

Mr. Simpson, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Labour Relations—

In view of the number of restaurants in tourist areas that are closed on holidays and operating below capacity, what are the current penalty rates in Queensland for bar attendants, waitresses and cooks on public holidays, Saturdays and Sundays and after hours, that is, overtime, and hourly rates on public holidays, Saturdays and Sundays?

Answer:—

Bar attendants, waitresses and cooks employed in the restaurants are covered by the Cafe, Restaurant and Catering Award South-Eastern Division or the Cafe, Restaurant and Catering Award—State (Excluding South-East Queensland). Selected wage rates contained in the awards are—

	Per week	Per hour
	\$	\$
Bar attendant . .	143.40	3.59
Waiter/waitress . .	140.70	3.52
Single hand cook	145.40	3.64

These rates do not include the divisional and district parities applicable in the northern and western parts of the State.

The following is a summary of conditions applicable in the South-east Queensland award—

Weekly employees employed on a five-day basis for work performed during ordinary working hours on a Saturday or a Sunday receive time and a half the ordinary rate of pay.

Weekly employees employed on a five and a half day basis for work performed during ordinary working hours on a Saturday in the majority of establishments receive time and a half the ordinary rate of pay. All time worked on a Sunday is paid for at double time.

For work performed on statutory holidays during ordinary working hours employees receive double time and a half with a minimum of four hours.

For work performed on statutory holidays outside ordinary working hours employees receive double the applicable overtime rate which would be three times the ordinary rate for the first three hours and four times the ordinary rate for the remaining work performed.

The following is a summary of conditions applicable in the award operating outside South-east Queensland—

Weekly employees employed during ordinary working hours on a Saturday or a Sunday receive time and a half the ordinary rates.

For work performed on statutory holidays during ordinary working hours employees receive double time and a half with a minimum of four hours.

For work performed on statutory holidays outside ordinary working hours employees receive double the applicable overtime rate which would be three times the ordinary rate for the first three hours and four times the ordinary rate for the remaining work performed.

The honourable member will no doubt be able to calculate the possible earnings of employees working a variety of hours from the information provided. I stress that this information relates to weekly hire employees and does not refer to the earnings of casual employees.

35. HERBICIDE 2,4-D; GROUNDSEL WEED CONTROL

Mr. Simpson, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

(1) What is the susceptibility of fruit and vegetable crops to 2,4-D spray as compared to the cereal crops of wheat, oats and barley and pasture grasses and sugar-cane?

(2) What is the known control for groundsel weed?

(3) What are the requirements on primary producers and land owners in this State to control groundsel?

Answers:—

(1) Broad-leaved plants such as fruit and vegetable crops are susceptible to damage by the herbicide 2,4-D. Cereal crops, grasses and sugar-cane are much less susceptible. That is why 2,4-D is termed a selective weedicide for the control of many broad-leaved weeds growing amongst cereals, grasses or sugar-cane.

(2) The herbicide 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T will control groundsel. In pastoral situations, the planting and maintaining of vigorous pastures will help in long-term control.

(3) Groundsel is declared a noxious weed under the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Act. This Act is administered by my colleague the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Water Resources.

36. GREEN ISLAND EROSION

Mr. Jones, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism—

Further to his answer to my question of 22 March 1977 concerning the serious erosion on the south-western approaches at Green Island, has he received a submission from the Green Island Management Committee, and will he now accept the need for urgent action and the recommendations that urgent action be taken to halt the erosion?

Answer:—

No submission by the Green Island Management Committee has been received to date. Regarding any action required to halt the erosion, I would refer the honourable member to the question asked by the honourable member for Townsville West and the answer which I shall provide thereto.

37. IMPLEMENTATION OF BEACH PROTECTION ACT

Mr. Jones, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism—

(1) With reference to section 40 of the Beach Protection Act 1968-1974 relative to the authority's carrying out beach protection works on behalf of any local authority, under what circumstances could this clause be implemented and must the local authority invite the Beach Protection Authority to undertake such works?

(2) If not, will he outline the arrangements on how works may be carried out, with a general interpretation of responsibility and costs under the provisions of the Act?

Answers:—

(1) Section 40 of the Beach Protection Act would not be implemented by the Beach Protection Authority unless requested by the local authority.

(2) The carrying out of beach-protection works is the responsibility of the local authority. The local authority may carry out the works itself or request the Beach Protection Authority to carry out the works pursuant to section 40 of the Act.

Subject to a State subsidy of 20 per cent granted in respect of approved projects, the local authority is responsible in either case for the costs of the works.

38. FACILITIES FOR BOATING AND FISHERIES SERVICES, CAIRNS

Mr. Jones, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism—

(1) Relative to funds totalling \$130,000 provided from loan funds for the first stage of the construction of new laboratories, offices, boat sheds, ramp and jetty at Cairns, have approvals been received and, if so, when will tenders be advertised and the work commence?

(2) Will these facilities be conjointly utilised by the Queensland Boating and Fisheries Patrol and the Queensland Fisheries Service?

Answers:—

(1) Tenders have been called for the first stage of the project and approval given for the acceptance of the tender submitted by M. Spaulding of Cairns. Work will commence immediately.

(2) The facilities will be used conjointly by the Queensland Fisheries Service, the Boating Patrol, the pilot vessel and the shark-netting contractor.

39. LAND COURT REDUCTION OF LAND RESUMPTION COMPENSATION

Mr. M. D. Hooper, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Survey and Valuation—

(1) As he has been asked to investigate the predicament of Mr. A. Buck of Woodstock, who was paid approximately \$39,000 in part settlement for land compulsorily resumed by the Townsville City Council for the Ross River Dam development, and who was subsequently embarrassed by a Land Court decision assessing his loss at approximately \$6,000, does Mr. Buck have any right of appeal against the Land Court decision in view of the fact that the city council valuer changed his opinion prior to the court hearing?

(2) If not, is Mr. Buck entitled to retain the sum paid to him by the city council, even though it is in excess of the compensation figure assessed by the Land Court?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) This problem arises out of a dispute between the Townsville City Council and a resident whose land it had acquired. Apparently the Land Court,

after hearing evidence from both the private valuer engaged by the landowner and the private valuer engaged by the council, assessed proper compensation at \$6,000. If the council paid out \$39,000 in partial settlement, this would appear to be a matter between the council and the ratepayers whose money they are spending.

40. GREEN ISLAND EROSION

Mr. M. D. Hooper, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism—

(1) Has the Beach Protection Authority kept him fully informed of the serious beach erosion at Green Island?

(2) Is he aware that since the Harbours and Marine Department removed groynes 10 years ago, approximately 150 ft. of sandy beach has been washed away, to the extent that tidal waters now encroach within several metres of the dining-room of the Green Island Hotel owned by Hayles Ltd.?

(3) Why is the Beach Protection Authority holding back permission from Hayles Ltd. to replace sand groynes at Green Island when the company has stated its willingness to spend \$50,000 on groynes to protect the beach area?

(4) What urgent action will he take to help restore the beach area at Green Island, not only in the interests of Hayles Ltd., who pioneered tourism in North Queensland, but also in the interests of Cairns citizens, who appreciate the value of the tourist facilities on Green Island?

Answers:—

(1) Yes.

(2) The groynes deteriorated naturally to the extent that they were no longer serviceable and their remains were removed under a contract let by the Department of Harbours and Marine in 1972. I am aware of the extent of erosion at the island.

(3) The Beach Protection Authority has not withheld permission from Hayles Ltd. to construct groynes at the island.

(4) The carrying out of shore protection works on the island is not considered to be a State Government responsibility and Hayles Magnetic Island Pty. Ltd. has been advised to this effect.

41. ALARM SYSTEMS, SOUTH COAST FIRE BRIGADE DISTRICT

Mr. Bishop, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police—

(1) How many buildings in the South Coast Fire Brigade District have fire sprinkler systems and thermal or smoke alarms installed, and which buildings are provided with each?

(2) How many (a) individual home units and (b) residential dwellings have the same equipment?

Answers:—

(1) I table information with respect to the number of certain types of buildings which have sprinkler, smoke or thermal detection equipment and break glass connections to the fire brigade.

(2) (a) The number of high rise apartments (six floors and over) is included in the statement, but the fire brigade board has no knowledge of the total number of units included in the apartment blocks.

(b) The fire brigade board has no knowledge of the number of residential dwellings which have installed fire protection equipment.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the document on the table.

42. SIGNPOSTING OF SURFERS PARADISE EXIT ROAD, NERANG

Mr. Bishop, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

With reference to the exit to Southport and Surfers Paradise off the approach to the recently constructed bridge over the Nerang River at Nerang, will he investigate means of having the name "Surfers Paradise" placed on the exit directional signs, so that traffic will be able to proceed on the shorter Isle of Capri route rather than on the roundabout routes either via Southport or Broadbeach?

Answer:—

Southport and Broadbeach are principal focal points in the State-wide direction-signing system. In accordance with the logic of the system, principal focal points are used on direction signs unless there are compelling reasons to include other information.

While the distance from Nerang to the centre of Surfers Paradise is only slightly longer via Southport than via Ashmore Road and Salerno, nevertheless there should be some indication that the shorter route exists. The possibility of providing a suitable sign at the Ashmore Road intersection with the Nerang-Southport Road will be investigated as a means of fulfilling this need.

43. CANAL LAND FOR MERRIMAC HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. Bishop, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Education—

With reference to the requirement for additional waterfront land at the Merrimac

High School, what negotiations are taking place to acquire canal land for that school and what stage have negotiations reached?

Answer:—

It is proposed that waterfront land be acquired for the joint use of Merrimac, Miami and Benowa State High Schools. Discussions have taken place concerning the location of that land. Negotiations will proceed once the location has been agreed upon.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I rise to a point of order. Before asking question No. 44, Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that the form of my question 44 has been changed. Part 2 of my question reads—

“Will he supply the information to the House as soon as he receives it?”

My original question read—

“... or will we have to wait 17 months, the same as we did for the report from Touche Ross to be completed?”

Mr. SPEAKER: Question 44 has been changed?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: It has been changed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot give an opinion on it now, but if the honourable member leaves it on the Notices of Questions I will have a look at it.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: Even though I am rather upset about it, I ask question 44.

44. LOANS TO DIRECTORS, QUEENSLAND PERMANENT BUILDING SOCIETY

Mr. K. J. Hooper, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) With reference to his answer to part (2) of my question on 29 March wherein he stated that information concerning loans to directors of the collapsed Queensland Permanent Building Society was not available from the Registrar of Building Societies, will he take urgent steps to approach the auditors, Touche Ross and Co., to supply this information, which they no doubt uncovered during the course of their investigation?

(2) Will he supply the information to the House as soon as he receives it?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) The Registrar of Building Societies is taking action to seek the information sought by the honourable member for Archerfield from the administrator of the Queensland Permanent Building Society, who is the person appointed to conduct the affairs of that society.

I will table a copy of a letter dated 23 April 1979 received by the Deputy Registrar of Building Societies from the administrator of the Queensland Permanent Building Society relating to the availability of the information sought by the honourable member.

I will advise the honourable member when further information has been received from the administrator.

I seek leave to have the letter tabled incorporated in “Hansard”.

(Leave granted.)

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid on the table the following document:

“Mr. D. B. McKirdy,
“Deputy Registrar of Building Societies,
“Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs,
“231 Turbot Street,
“Brisbane, Q., 4000.

“Dear Sir,

“I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 20 April 1979 by which you informed me that the Honourable the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General wishes to satisfy an enquiry by Mr. Hooper and if at all possible, a reply should be in the hands of the Registrar by 2 p.m. today, and if the information is not available, I should give some indication as to when the information might be available.

“As you are aware, the administration of the Society is drawing to a close and until recently, I was employing only one person on a full time basis and one person on a casual basis. Unfortunately my full time employee died suddenly. As a result, I have decided to transfer the remaining current files of the Society to my office at Hungerfords in the T & G Building and to transfer the telephone on to Hungerfords’ switchboard, so that the affairs of the Society can be attended to promptly. I have given notice to you that the registered office of the Society will be situated in the T & G Building as from Friday 27 April 1979. The remaining files and records of the Society have been boxed for transportation from the company’s premises in George Street to the T & G Building. I understand that the carriers will be shifting the files from the George Street premises to the T & G Building tomorrow, 24 April, or on Thursday, 26 April, Wednesday being a public holiday.

“I have endeavoured to locate files which may readily give me the information or some of the information you require. However, until the boxes are delivered and the files once again sorted, the exact location of each file will not be known, and this has precluded me from locating the files quickly enough to allow the information to be prepared assuming the information is contained in those files.

"However, it has occurred to me that without a great deal of searching through all of the files of the Society relating to the period prior to the appointment of the Administrator, which files are now located in a warehouse in Fairfield and covers a floor area of more than 1,000 square metres, there may be no quick way to provide the information relating to loans made by this Society to the directors. When the minute book is delivered, it may very well detail the various loans made to the directors, however it may not detail loans made to persons who were employees at the time the loan was made but who became directors subsequent thereto. I understand that J. R. R. Frost would fall into that category. Many of the other names are not known to me and I assume that they may have been Directors of other Societies which were absorbed by this Society. In the short time available since I received your letter, I have been unable to contact previous employees of the Society who may know what type of special record the Society kept in this regard.

"To answer your specific questions:

(a) I am not in a position to furnish in full, all of the details requested. Some of the reasons for not being able to do so are indicated above.

(b) The earliest date I feel I would be in a position to furnish the Registrar with the details requested would be Friday 4 May, which date allows a few days only after the Society's files have been resorted after delivery to the T & G Building by the carriers. However, I must point out that unless the information is readily available in the minute book or a register, I believe it will take considerably longer to establish if the information is available in the Society's records now in storage.

(c) I do not think the cost of collating the information will be significant if the information is reasonably readily available in the Society's records. However it will be significant in both time delay and cost if a complete search is to be made of the thousands of files contained in the warehouse previously mentioned. Unfortunately, I have not yet been able to establish whether the computer records now under the control of the S.G.I.O. Building Society can be searched to obtain this information. However I doubt whether that kind of information was ever stored in the computer separately from other borrowers and if it was, whether it is now available for the periods of time indicated.

"Yours faithfully,

"R. H. Peldan,

"Administrator."

45. HARRY LONDY PTY. LTD.

Mr. K. J. Hooper, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the liquidation on 7 March of the firm Harry Londy Pty Ltd, which was placed in liquidation on the application of the Deputy Commissioner of Taxation for the sum owing of \$130,829?

(2) Is this the same Mr. Londy who was proposing a \$35,000,000 land development at Victoria Point, which was supported and lauded by the Premier in September 1976?

(3) Is this the type of entrepreneur supported by the Premier and his Government in land dealings in this State?

Answers:—

(1) I have been advised by the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs that the documents lodged at his office indicate that the company Harry Londy Pty. Ltd. was placed in liquidation on 7 March 1979 on the hearing of a petition for winding up presented on 12 February 1979 by the Deputy Commissioner for Taxation.

(2 & 3) Although the records of Harry Londy Pty. Ltd. reveal that a Mr. Harry Londy is a director thereof, I am unable to say whether or not it is the same person referred to by the honourable member.

46. PROPERTY VALUES, GOLD COAST AREA

Mr. K. J. Hooper, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Survey and Valuation—

What was the average rise and fall in (a) commercial and (b) residential property values in the heart of (i) Southport, (ii) Surfers Paradise and (iii) Coolangatta for each year since 1970, relative to 1970 as a base year?

Answer:—

The Department of the Valuer-General does not maintain indices such as these on an annual basis, and hence I am unable to help the honourable member. However, a great deal of statistical information is available in the annual reports, and I refer the honourable member to these.

47. PREVENTION OF ACCESS TO STORY BRIDGE SUPERSTRUCTURE

Mr. Ahern for Mr. Lane, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

In view of the several recent incidents of persons climbing onto the superstructure of the Story Bridge, presumably to attempt suicide, and the serious traffic disruption that has occurred in the Fortitude Valley/New Farm area on these

occasions, together with the wastage in manhours of both police and fire brigade personnel, will he investigate the possibility of having gates and manproof protections fitted to the bridge to inhibit entry to the superstructure?

Answer:—

I will take the matter up with the Brisbane City Council, which has control of the bridge, and advise the honourable member by letter of the outcome.

48. BRISBANE ABATTOIR, DEBT AND PRODUCTION

Mr. Ahern for **Mr. Lane**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

(1) At the end of the last financial year, what was the total debt owed by the Metropolitan Public Abattoir Board relative to the construction of the new Brisbane Abattoir?

(2) What is the burden of interest and redemption of this debt imposed on the operation of the Brisbane Abattoir?

(3) What was the total weight in kilograms of meat, including beef, veal, mutton, lamb and pork, slaughtered at the Brisbane Abattoir for sale on the domestic market during that same year?

Answers:—

(1) The balance sheet of the Metropolitan Public Abattoir Board as at 1 July 1978 shows total indebtedness of \$16,797,413.

(2) An accurate figure is not available at short notice but interest and redemption payments approximate \$1,700,000 per year.

(3) Cattle—22,350,393; Sheep and lambs—6,911,279; Calves—3,170,717; Pigs—2,602,751.

(Figures are expressed in kilograms estimated chilled dressed carcass weight).

49. ALARM SYSTEMS, METROPOLITAN FIRE BRIGADE DISTRICT

Mr. Ahern for **Mr. Lane**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police—

How many residential dwellings within the Metropolitan Fire Brigade District are fitted with (a) full sprinkler systems and (b) thermal or smoke alarms?

Answer:—

It is not known how many dwellings are so fitted. However, with regard to private dwelling units, which are Class 1 premises under the Building By-laws, there are no systems connected to the brigade from this type of premises.

Unofficially, the brigade is aware of one private house with full sprinkler protection and also that many hundreds of homes have thermal/smoke detection units installed, which are mostly self-contained and give varying degrees of protection. There are no records as to the number of such buildings.

With regard to residential buildings in the Class 2 category (that is, home units), nine high-rise apartment buildings have thermal/fire alarm systems connected to the brigade's fire alarm recording system.

50. MURDERS AND ARMED HOLD-UPS

Dr. Scott-Young, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police—

(1) How many murders have been committed in Queensland in the last five years?

(2) How many persons were murdered by means of (a) shot-guns, (b) rifles, (c) concealable weapons, (d) strangulation, (e) stabbing, (f) bashing and (g) other methods?

(3) How many armed hold-ups have occurred with the perpetrator using (a) a pistol, a revolver, a cut-down shot-gun or rifle, (b) a sub-machine-gun and (c) a rifle or shot-gun?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) Full statistics sought by the honourable member are not available without extensive research being undertaken and it is not proposed to direct police from other urgent duties for this purpose.

Statistics available in the categories required are as follows:—

		Murders	Robberies
1973-74	..	41	283
1974-75	..	32	337
1975-76	..	49	312
1976-77	..	47	268
1977-78	..	36	308

51. COSTS OF LEGAL ACTION AGAINST PREMIER; EFFECT OF JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENTS ON PROSECUTIONS OF INNOCENT PEOPLE

Dr. Scott-Young, pursuant to notice, asked the Premier—

(1) Did a university student named Plunkett take legal action against him recently and, if so, did he authorise the payment of all of Plunkett's legal expenses in this case?

(2) If he did not personally authorise this payment, who did and what was the cost to the taxpayer?

(3) Will the present amendments to the Justices Act prevent similar vicious and crackpot prosecutions from being launched at innocent people, and will it prevent

innocent people from being subjected to financial and mental trauma while defending their good names and positions?

Answers:—

(1 & 2) Mark Oliver Plunkett took out a complaint against me alleging conspiracy to defeat the execution of a Statute.

I can assure the honourable member that Plunkett's legal expenses were not paid by the Queensland Government. He did not pay them himself, and I can assure the honourable member that the matter is still being pursued.

(3) The present amendments to the Justices Act will result in the doing away with frivolous and vexatious complaints against any person; the amendments do not affect the actions taken by the regular law enforcement agencies but merely regulate private prosecutions of indictable offences. The aim is that, unless there is a proper basis, persons should not be subjected to the criminal processes of the criminal law and the attendant publicity in relation thereto.

Dr. Edwards: He is working for the Labor Party.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Yes, he is a member of the Labor Party.

52. POLICE STRENGTH AND DUTIES, MOURA

Mr. Jones for Mr. Vaughan, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police—

(1) How many police officers are stationed at Moura?

(2) Is it the responsibility of police officers stationed at Moura to patrol the Thiess Dampier Mitsui mining lease as part of their regular, normal police duties?

(3) Is he aware that police stationed at Moura are patrolling the lease at night and at week-ends?

(4) Are police carrying out such regular patrols of the lease in exchange for the subsidising of police housing in Moura by the company?

Answers:—

(1) Established strength is one sergeant 1/C and four constables.

(2) Among the basic functions and/or responsibilities of members of the Police Force are the protection of property and the prevention and detection of offences. In order to carry out these functions, members of the Police Force at Moura make patrols whenever practicable including night-time and week-ends of the Thiess Dampier Mitsui mining lease. Similar preventive patrols are carried out for example in schoolgrounds and grounds of business

premises, etc. As late as last week-end two offenders were detected stealing property on the mining lease.

(3) Yes.

(4) No.

53. POWER FOR OIL-SHALE PLANT, GLADSTONE AREA

Mr. Jones for Mr. Vaughan, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police—

(1) With reference to recent Press reports relating to the likely development of an oil-shale plant near Gladstone in the near future, have discussions taken place with the partners regarding the amount of electric power that might be required for the project and, if so, what is the estimate of MW of power that will be required by the project, and when will that power be required?

(2) Was no provision made by the State Electricity Commission of Queensland for very large industrial developments such as the Gladstone oil-shale project when estimating future requirements for electricity?

(3) If the project does proceed, will the State have the capacity to supply the power required, since Comalco Ltd. is now proceeding with its aluminium smelter at Gladstone?

Answers:—

(1) Discussions have taken place and approximately 520 MW has been indicated as the requirement at full development, but the date when the power will be required is indefinite at this stage.

(2) Although planned future requirement provided for some industrial development, no specific provision has been made in the plans for the Rundle shale-oil project.

(3) When a firm date is established for this project to proceed, it will be possible to comment on the capacity of the system to supply the power required. However, the State is prepared to take measures to adequately provide for this important Queensland development should the necessity arise.

54. SHALE-OIL PRODUCTION, RUNDLE AND JULIA CREEK DEPOSITS

Mr. Jones for Mr. Vaughan, pursuant to notice, asked the Deputy Premier and Treasurer—

With reference to the talks he had during his recent visit to the United States in relation to the development of the Rundle shale-oil deposits near Gladstone—

(1) With what companies did he have such talks?

(2) What large oil companies in the United States are interested in the venture?

(3) Have they perfected the technology necessary to commercially produce oil from the shale-oil deposits near Gladstone?

(4) How will the oil produced be refined, and is it intended that a new refinery will be built to refine the oil produced or is it intended to export the oil for special refining overseas?

(5) Have any discussions been held in relation to the development of the shale-oil deposits at Julia Creek, which are reported to be much larger than the Rundle deposits?

(6) Has an environmental impact study been prepared on the Rundle shale-oil project and, if so, will the Government make the contents of that statement public and, if not, what is the reason?

Answer:—

(1 to 6) I would prefer not to mention by name the companies with which I discussed the prospects of the Rundle oil-shale project whilst I was in New York. I can, however, outline broadly that they were a senior technical company which has been deeply involved in the Rundle and other shale-oil investigations, two world-wide oil companies and a very large and respected U.S. financial house.

The feasibility reports are apparently quite favourable, there are more to come and, of course, they then must be evaluated by the companies that will accept the financial responsibility for the operation. The talks centred around the financial aspects of the project and did not generally involve in great detail the technological considerations. It is understood that the companies presently engaged in the Rundle development are confident that the necessary technology will be available to allow the project to proceed.

As to the further processing of the oil, the specific marketing plans of the companies must remain confidential. In negotiations, the State will be looking for the maximum investment in Queensland consistent with commercial reality.

Discussions were confined to the Rundle project, where investigations are well advanced. Although large deposits of low-grade oil-shale have been found in the Julia Creek area, I am not aware of any proposed full-scale development at the moment. I am advised that authorities to prospect in the area are held by CSR Ltd. and the Oil Shale Corporation (Australia). It is understood that their investigations are continuing.

An environmental study report has been submitted by the companies. This is being studied. Any agreement with the State will provide for adequate protection of the environment. Details of environmental controls are still being worked out.

The usual procedure is that if persons are interested in obtaining a copy of an environmental report, they should contact the companies involved directly.

55. NEW SCHOOLS, PORT DOUGLAS

Mr. Tenni, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

(1) When will construction of the proposed new primary school at Port Douglas commence?

(2) When will construction of the proposed new high school on the northern beaches commence?

Answers:—

(1) The Education Department is presently giving consideration to the acquisition of a site for a future primary school at Port Douglas. Until the matter of the site has been finalised it will not be possible to include this proposal on the forward-planning programme.

(2) Investigations are in hand for the purchase of land for a future high school site in the Trinity Beach area, off Wewak Avenue and adjacent to the recently opened primary school. It is not possible, therefore, at this juncture to indicate when construction work will commence on this new high school building.

The honourable member is assured that, because of his many submissions regarding the need for these two new schools, the proposals will be kept under review.

56. REX RANGE ROAD AND DAINTREE ROAD

Mr. Tenni, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

(1) When will construction of the next section of the Rex Range Road commence?

(2) When will construction of the final section of the Daintree Road to the township commence?

Answers:—

(1) Construction of the section of the Rex Range Road from the top of the range to the power line is at present scheduled to commence in the 1979-80 financial year. However, design is currently proceeding with a view to its earlier release if additional road funds that I am currently seeking are forthcoming.

(2) Again, construction of the Barratt Creek to Daintree section of the Mossman-Daintree Road is programmed to commence in the 1979-80 financial year. Its exact date of release is dependent on the availability of funds.

57. PURCHASE OF MOWERS BY PARENTS
AND CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. Innes, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Education—

Why are the parents and citizens' associations of this State expected to find the money to buy the grass-mowing equipment needed to keep the inevitably large grounds of schools properly mown?

Answer:—

In common with all other departments, the Department of Education does not have access to unlimited funds. Parents and citizens' associations are justly recognized as being very commendable bodies and the work which they carry out is deeply appreciated.

58. IMPROVEMENT OF FISH BOARD
FACILITIES, GLADSTONE

Mr. Jones for **Mr. Prest**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism—

(1) As statements were made during the 1977 election campaign by the then Minister, other members and candidates of the National-Liberal Party that there were to be improvements to the Gladstone Fish Board wharf and handling facilities, when will a start be made to provide the improved facilities?

(2) What work will be carried out and what facilities will be provided that will improve the handling of fish, prawns, scallops and crabs caught in the area?

(3) If no work is planned for this Fish Board depot, will he give immediate consideration to such work and ensure that it be given a high priority?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) Improvements to facilities at the Gladstone market of the Queensland Fish Board were commenced in November 1977, when modifications were made to the existing wharf to ensure loadings up to 1 000 kg.

Work currently scheduled includes provision of a new concrete area between the market buildings and the wharf and new fish-filleting facilities. Approval from the relevant authority is expected this week to enable the new concrete area to proceed. The new fish-filleting facilities have been included in the Fish Board's works programme for 1979-80. This work could commence towards the end of this year, depending on finance.

59. UPGRADING OF BRUCE HIGHWAY

Mr. Jones for **Mr. Prest**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

As the main concern of delegates to the tourism workshop held in Mackay recently was the state of the Bruce Highway, when

will the Bruce Highway be an all-weather highway, thus eliminating delays to the travelling public and assisting tourism in Queensland?

Answer:—

As the honourable member must surely be aware, the Bruce Highway is a national highway, construction and maintenance funds for which are the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government, and it is the level of funding provided by the Commonwealth Government which fixes the rate at which improvements to the highway can be undertaken.

The funds provided for national highways under the present legislation are far from adequate and in this financial year alone are more than \$20,000,000 less than the level recommended by the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads.

The current legislation expires at the end of the 1979-80 financial year and as yet the Commonwealth Government has given no indication of its intentions beyond that date.

Needless to say, the Queensland Government will continue its representations to Canberra to convince the Commonwealth Government that the level of funding for national highways in Queensland must be substantially lifted if a satisfactory rate of construction on the Bruce Highway is to be achieved so that we can capitalise on the remarkable progress which has already been achieved.

60. NEW SCHOOLS, GLADSTONE
ELECTORATE

Mr. Jones for **Mr. Prest**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Education—

(1) As he stated in answer to a question on 22 September 1977 that pre-schools were to be built in Gladstone in 1978 and 1979 and as none of the pre-schools have been constructed, when will they be built?

(2) When will the new high school in Gladstone be constructed?

(3) When will the primary school be built at Kin Kora, as tenders for earth-works were let in February 1977?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) The new schools being planned for Gladstone have been given a priority rating that will result in their construction immediately funds become available through my colleague the Honourable the Minister for Works and Housing.

61. ELECTORAL ENROLMENTS

Mr. Bourke, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) Is he aware of the degree of confusion caused to voters at the recent local government elections as to whether or not their names were on the State electoral rolls?

(2) What percentage of section 29 votes claimed by electors under the impression that they were on the electoral rolls was subsequently disallowed?

(3) Is he aware that a common cause of confusion of the electors was that they were enrolled on the Commonwealth roll and not the State roll and that they were unaware that they were obliged to enrol on the State roll?

(4) Will he explore the possibility of abandoning the State roll in favour of Commonwealth roll facilities, as has been done in most States of Australia?

Answers:—

(1 & 2) The honourable member will recall that, in answer to questions by the honourable member for Port Curtis on 12 April 1979, I stated that when the Principal Electoral Officer has received details of all section votes recorded at the recent local government elections he will report to me and I will examine his report with a view to determining what action, if any, should be taken. At that point in time the House could be informed what percentage of Rule 29 votes claimed by electors were subsequently disallowed.

(3) An investigation of certain complaints received following the 1977 State election revealed that some people who previously resided in other States had apparently completed Commonwealth enrolment cards but had failed to complete State enrolment cards and therefore were ineligible to vote at the State election. In some cases, because of the difference in residential qualifications, these people might not have qualified for enrolment in Queensland.

(4) Approval has been given for the State Principal Electoral Officer to have discussions with the Australian Electoral Officer for Queensland regarding the possibility of the adoption of a joint Commonwealth/Queensland electoral roll. These discussions are continuing.

62. HIBERNIAN MEDICAL BENEFITS FUND

Mr. Bourke, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Health—

(1) What is the current situation in regard to the financial affairs of the Hibernian Medical Benefits Fund?

(2) When can former contributors expect definite information on the payment of their claims against that society?

(3) Does he have any information as to the degree of ability of the former Hibernian Medical Benefits Fund to meet its obligations?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) The matter raised by the honourable member comes within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth Department of Health, which is investigating this matter. I suggest that the honourable member direct his inquiries to that department.

63. ROAD TAX ON BUS TRAVEL

Mr. Bourke, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Transport—

(1) How much revenue will be raised by the Queensland Government in this financial year from road tax on bus travel?

(2) Are bus operators forced to provide information in detail on each ticket sold by them to assist the Government in calculating the tax due?

(3) Is he fully aware of the cost and inconvenience foisted onto private bus operators by this bureaucratic exercise?

(4) In view of the lifting of road tax for freight operators, will he also consider having this particular road tax eliminated?

Answers:—

(1) I assume the honourable member is not referring to roads (contribution to maintenance) charges, which have never been levied on buses. It is estimated, so far as licence and permit fees apply to the grant of an authority for the operation of a bus service, that for 1978-79 an amount of approximately \$734,000 will be collected. These fees have regard to administrative costs as well as to the benefits an operator obtains from holding a licence or permit under conditions of franchise.

(2) No bus operator is required to submit any more information than what he should have available to him for the proper conduct of his business. If the honourable member has any particular case in mind, I will have it examined.

(3) I refer the honourable member to the answer to (2).

(4) The lifting of road tax, and in this regard roads (contribution to maintenance) charges are included, has no relevance to the issue of licences or permits to operators of bus services where entry to this area of passenger transport is subject to strict quality and quantity requirements which have regard to the public interest. It must be pointed out that passenger service licences can have a considerable goodwill value on transfer and it can hardly be conceded that there are any grounds for removal of fees for licences which confer

a substantial benefit on their holders, apart from the cost to the Government in administering these services.

64. RECONSTRUCTION OF BRUCE HIGHWAY
SECTION, HINCHINBROOK SHIRE

Mr. Row, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

(1) What is the present state of progress of the Bruce Highway reconstruction project between the Gairloch washaway and Ripple Creek in the Hinchinbrook Shire?

(2) What construction methods are being used on the project and, if cement stabilisation is being used, how is it applied and is it considered to be successful?

Answers:—

(1) Laying of the top layer of crushed rock on this project has been disrupted on three occasions by heavy rainfall. The work was being carried out under traffic and there has been some concern as to whether this top layer of material had become contaminated. Some tests have indicated that there is little cause for concern and, should the results of a final series of tests confirm this, the final stages of construction will be undertaken without delay with a view to finalising the project next month.

(2) Widening and overlaying of the old pavement was carried out using a cement-stabilised gravel as the bottom layer, over which was laid a crushed-rock layer. The cement-stabilised gravel was applied by conventional means without any undue complication. However, the pugmill used to mix the cement in with the gravel broke down, which resulted in the mixing having to be done with a grader on mixing pads in the quarry. Obviously mixing with a pugmill is preferable, but in this case it was considered desirable to ensure completion of the bottom course before the wet season. No distress of the cement-stabilised gravel has since been noted. It is therefore considered reasonable to deduce that the methods adopted have been reasonably successful.

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

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Hon. T. G. NEWBERY (Mirani—Leader of the House): I move—

“That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Thursday next.”

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9.51 p.m.