

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 15 OCTOBER 1985

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 15 OCTOBER 1985

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

Assent to the following Bills reported by Mr Speaker—

Valuers Registration Act Amendment Bill;

Mining (Fossicking) Bill;

Coal and Oil Shale Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment Bill.

ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF REDLANDS**By-election Dates**

Mr SPEAKER: I inform the House that the dates in connection with the issue of the writ for the election of a member to serve in this House for the electoral district of Redlands will be as follows—

Issue of writ—11 October 1985;

Date of nomination—18 October 1985;

Polling day—2 November 1985;

Return of writ—3 December 1985.

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

Griffith University Course in Family Relationships

From Mrs Chapman (17 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will establish an inquiry into the Griffith University course in family relationships.

Third-party Insurance Premiums

From Mr D'Arcy (441 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will revoke recent increases in third-party insurance and ensure that future increases are determined after public hearing.

Electoral Districts Bill

From Mr White (1 018 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will reject or amend the Electoral Districts Bill so as not to increase the number of electorates from 82 to 89.

[A similar petition was received from Mr Lee (1 019 signatories).]

Petitions received.

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Queensland Police Department for the year ended 30 June 1985

Queensland Police Superannuation Board for the year ended 30 June 1985.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Orders in Council under—

Harbours Act 1955-1982

Industrial Development Act 1963-1981 and the Local Government Act 1936-1984

Industrial Development Act 1963-1981 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangement Act 1982-1984

Supreme Court Act of 1921

Reports—

Timber Research and Development Advisory Council, South and Central Queensland, for the year ended 30 June 1985

Timber Research and Development Advisory Council, North Queensland, for the year ended 30 June 1985

Pyramid Selling Schemes Elimination Committee for the year ended 30 June 1985

Supreme Court Library Committee together with Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 1985

Disaster Appeals Trust Fund Committee together with Statement of Receipts and Payments for the year ended 30 June 1985

Mortgage Secondary Market Board for the period 3 December 1984 to 30 June 1985.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Tamborine-Oxenford Road

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing) (11.7 a.m.), by leave: The honourable member for Ipswich (Mr Hamill) has made a number of very serious statements that allege that I have abused my ministerial office with regard to the relocation of the Tamborine-Oxenford Road. According to the honourable member, the alleged purpose was to obtain benefit for myself, my family and my family company, Maralinga Pty Ltd.

I reject emphatically those allegations. They are simply not true, and I flatly deny them. The land now being used for the extraction of gravel was formerly owned by me and, whilst I had ownership, on 29 March 1976 I entered into an agreement with Farley and Lewers (Qld) Pty Ltd, which allowed that company to have the exclusive right to win, extract, process and remove sand and gravel. Subsequent to that agreement, ownership of the land passed to my family company, Maralinga Pty Ltd, and one of the conditions of transfer was that this agreement, which has a life of 20 years, stay in place. That agreement provided a return by way of a royalty. That agreement was entered into long before any proposals to relocate the road, and would continue to exist whether or not the road was relocated and reconstructed.

Therefore, it is plainly obvious that neither myself or my family nor my family company owns or operates in this area any trucks that transport gravel to the crushing plant or beyond. Trucks employed in the area for this purpose are owned by CSR-Readymix—the successors to Farley and Lewers (Qld) Pty Ltd; Nucon; Nucrush, a Newman company; Coomera Quarries, which is not mine; and Sawtells. The only Maralinga trucks using the roads in this area are those used for the cartage of grain for cattle, silage to silage pits, and topsoil. The haul road, which is used for the carriage of topsoil by Maralinga trucks, is the old crossing, the use to which Maralinga, along with every other member of the motoring public, has always been entitled. It should be noted that there is no provision along the new road for physical access to any of Maralinga's land.

The honourable member for Ipswich alleged that, on 19 December 1983, the Main Roads Department gave its blessing to what he referred to as "the Hinze plan" for the relocated road. That is not true. The condition and location of this section of the road have been, for many years, a matter of concern for the Albert Shire Council. The section was dangerous and substandard. Even the honourable member himself referred to it as, "deteriorating".

I table a letter that I received from the chairman of Albert shire (Councillor Laver) and seek leave to have that letter incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

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

Mr Laver

ALBERT SHIRE COUNCIL

Ref. No. WML:VG

14 October, 1985

Hon. R. J. Hinze, M.L.A.,
Minister for Local Government,
Main Roads and Racing,
Department of Local Government,
P.O. Box 31,
North Quay, Qld., 4000

Dear Sir,

re: Oxenford-Tamborine Road

I wish to advise that since the early nineteen fifties the problems of the crossing over the Coomera River at Oxenford has been discussed by Council members and considered by the Albert Shire Works Department Engineers, in conjunction with Engineers from the Department of Main Roads.

The need for upgrading is well known. One life has already been lost, and in the last three years nine cars have ended in the river during storms or periods of wet weather. With the growth of the area this problem has been accentuated, and demands have been made in Council and there has been public pressure for upgrading the crossing. With the growth in the extractive industries in the area and the affect on the hydrology of the river, Council engaged Cameron and McNamara to report on the industry, any controls required and the relocation of the road network. Of the options recommended by Cameron and McNamara, the Shire Engineer and his staff recommended a relocation upstream. A modified version of this location was prepared by Burchill and Partners and approved by Council and included in the Development Agreement.

Council are pleased to see a longstanding demand achieved by the construction of the new road, and I have not viewed any complaints from residents of the area, in fact people to whom I have spoken are very happy about the new road.

Yours faithfully,

W. M. Laver,
Shire Chairman.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I inform the member for Lytton that this is his final warning.

Mr HINZE: That letter gives a broad overview of the history of this road. In 1979, the Albert Shire Council commissioned consulting engineers Cameron McNamara and Partners to advise on the hydrological effects of sand and gravel extraction proposals in the Coomera River. That report, inter alia, concluded—

"Replacement of the existing road crossing and weir is required as a result of the realignment of the Coomera River at this location."

That was dated June 1979.

On 31 August 1981, representatives of the Main Roads Department, the Albert Shire Council and Burchill and Partners, consulting engineers, met on site to discuss

road relocation options. As a result, a preliminary proposal was formulated and on 3 December 1982 the Albert Shire Council submitted that to the Main Roads Department district engineer. That letter attached a map showing the proposed relocation of the road at the Coomera River and asked whether the Main Roads Department was in general agreement with the design before further detailed works were continued. On 23 December 1982, the Main Roads Department replied to the Albert Shire Council indicating broad agreement with the submitted relocation proposal. That reply to the council required it to arrange for Cameron McNamara and Partners to undertake an analysis of the hydraulic performance of the vertical alignment of the proposed road in view of that firm's 1979 report. Subsequently, the council advised the Main Roads Department that Cameron McNamara and Partners had undertaken that analysis and the ultimate design was then based upon that firm's recommendations.

The honourable member for Ipswich (Mr Hamill) cited an alleged approval by the Main Roads Department on 19 December 1983 for what he called "the Hinze plan". That is not true. In fact, the plan was one submitted by the Albert Shire Council a year before. That 19 December 1983 approval from the Main Roads Department was for a proposal to build a crossing at a higher level of flood immunity and an acceptance by the Main Roads Department of additional costs involved in this upgrading. The approval for the relocated route was made a year prior to that, after a submission from the Albert Shire Council.

The honourable member for Ipswich alleged also that tax-payers' funds were used improperly to construct this new crossing. That is not true. Because of the requirements of the Albert Shire Council's rezoning approval, Maralinga accepted responsibility for building a new crossing to the same flood immunity as the old crossing. That the relocated crossing was of a far higher standard resulted from an agreement between the Albert Shire Council and the Main Roads Department and, as a result, a formula was adopted which resulted in Maralinga's paying approximately 30 per cent of the final cost—a cost equal to its original obligation.

The honourable member for Ipswich claimed that the relocated road cost \$2m. That also is not true. The brochure produced for the official opening, on 20 September last, mentioned the figure of \$865,000. I am advised by the Main Roads Department that the final cost will be approximately \$885,000. Because final accounts are to be settled, no precise figure is yet available.

Maralinga's contribution was the use of its plant and equipment, and supply of materials. The value of that contribution was assessed by the Albert shire engineer—not by Maralinga or by the Main Roads Department. Maralinga did not receive any payment for plant hire for the project.

The honourable member for Ipswich claimed that my family company stood to gain from compensation. That is not true. No compensation has been paid to Maralinga and there is no agreement for compensation. Maralinga dedicated to the Crown, by plan of subdivision for road purposes, a total area of approximately 1.6 ha. In February 1984, Burchill and Partners, acting for Maralinga, wrote to the Land Administration Commission suggesting that there be an exchange of land on an equal-area basis, and that a balance in favour of Maralinga of 0.94 ha be purchased by Maralinga. The Land Administration Commission replied on 5 June 1984 that the application would be considered only when the new road was constructed and open to the public. On this matter, there has been no further contact between Burchill and Partners, who are acting for Maralinga, and the Land Administration Commission.

The Main Roads Department has closed the old road to through traffic, but ownership still rests with the Crown through the Land Administration Commission. Resolution of the closure is yet to be made.

The honourable member for Ipswich claimed that the new road would take traffic away from gravel operations. He seemed to regard that as grounds for some sort of criticism. Perhaps the honourable member would be happier if traffic were routed closer

to gravel operations or kept on its existing highly flood-prone site, with a minimum width of only one and a half vehicles, and on a tortuous and dangerous alignment.

None of the wild allegations raised by the honourable member for Ipswich have the slightest relationship to the truth. Unfortunately, I have to say that the honourable member for Ipswich treats the truth carelessly.

Mr Hamill: Not as carelessly as you do.

Mr HINZE: The honourable member for Ipswich, who is young and is supposed to be a legal man, treats the truth carelessly. His wild allegations are figments of his imagination. They are flights of fancy.

I repeat that I categorically deny that the road was re-routed for the benefit of myself, my family or my family company. I categorically deny that I have been guilty of abusing my ministerial office for private gain. The facts presented by my statement destroy any vague suggestion that the allegations have any foundation.

Queensland Housing Commission Waiting-lists

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Minister for Works and Housing) (11.19 a.m.), by leave: I refer to an article in *The Sunday Mail* of 13 October, which reported a claim by the member for Rockhampton North (Mr Yewdale) that the State Government is not doing sufficient, through subsidies, to help people to achieve home-ownership. It is the latest in a series of hysterical statements made by the ALP about the Queensland Housing Commission, which show how desperate the Labor Party is to dredge up criticism of the State Government. The latest claim not only underlines that desperation but also is a clear instance of duplicity by Labor.

Earlier, the honourable member for Woodridge (Mr D'Arcy) made wild claims that families were being split up by high rental costs. An analysis of the rents received by the Housing Commission shows that 76 per cent of all commission households pay rent of less than \$50 a week.

Last week, the member for Rockhampton North claimed that the waiting-list for Housing Commission rental accommodation is increasing. He cited the waiting-list at Mount Isa as an example. In the last year, the waiting-list at Mount Isa has been reduced by more than 30 per cent. A remarkable reduction has occurred in the rental waiting-list throughout Queensland as a whole. In the 16 months to the end of June this year, it has been reduced by almost 18 per cent, and is still falling.

Opposition members' statements show the desperation of the Opposition, which is trying to score points, despite the facts. Statements made by the honourable member for Rockhampton North only highlight the Opposition's duplicity. He claimed that the Queensland Government has no interest-subsidised home-purchase assistance scheme to help lower-income home-buyers. His claims have been made at the very time when the Federal Labor Government is trying to make Queensland home-buyers who receive subsidy under the Housing Commission's interest subsidy income-gearred home loans repay that interest subsidy.

On the one hand, the Queensland Branch of the Australian Labor Party is saying that there is no subsidy; on the other, the Federal Labor Government is saying that low-income and moderate-income borrowers should have to repay that subsidy. Under the Housing Commission's income-gearred loan scheme, borrowers pay a set proportion of their income—25 per cent—as payment on the loan. Until that payment covers the interest rate applying at that time, a subsidy is available for the borrower.

The scheme is so effective and so popular with borrowers that the Government will, this financial year, expand assistance under this scheme by 22 per cent to a total of \$130m, which is more than double the \$57m that the Commonwealth Government has allocated to Queensland for home-ownership assistance under the first-home-owner scheme.

The Queensland Branch of the Australian Labor Party has a mock concern for those people seeking homes. It has made no criticism of the Federal Government's mismanagement of the economy, which has led to higher interest rates for home-buyers. My Government has strongly resisted the move by the Federal Government to add to the home-buyer's financial burden by having him repay the interest subsidy on home loans. If there is a genuine concern by the honourable member for Rockhampton North or among his fellow Opposition members, let them join with me now in rebuffing this move by Canberra. I would add, also, that the photograph of the honourable member in the paper was a lot more impressive than his statement; it, at least, had some resemblance to the truth.

Federal Government Taxation Reforms

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs) (11.22 a.m.), by leave: I wish to point out the hypocrisy of the proposals by the Federal Government to introduce a new tax on so-called perks and capital gains, which have resulted in job losses.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr LESTER: Opposition members are obviously not interested in the jobs that will be lost.

On the one hand, the Federal Government is spending hundreds of thousands of dollars by setting up and advertising new employment-generating schemes under the guise of the Commonwealth youth package. Photographs of the Prime Minister (Mr Hawke) have appeared in newspapers that carry articles on what a great fellow he is. Whereas the schemes are desirable in the interests of assisting young people, the Hawke Government's action has the potential to undermine the whole system. The Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer do not seem to understand that the new taxes on perks could result in the loss of approximately 10 000 jobs in the catering and hospitality industry.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: How many free lunches did Brian Maher buy you?

Mr LESTER: Members of the Opposition do not seem to be worried about the jobs that will be lost.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Wolston.

Mr LESTER: More than a thousand restaurant-workers have been sacked in the past four weeks in Queensland, but that does not seem to worry the Opposition. According to the Restaurant-Caterers Association of Queensland, that figure will rise to 3 000 by the end of the year unless there is a change in policy by the Federal Government. As a result of such taxes, new restaurants that were about to be opened will not be opened. The loss of employment that I have already mentioned does not include the expected down-turn that will be created in industries associated with restaurants, such as the building, manufacturing and primary industries.

These taxes will cut into the heart of small business, which is the real employment-generator, and which employs most of Australia's young people. In Australia, small business employs 760 000 people and provides employment for 60 per cent of the private-sector work-force.

Ultimately, these taxes will hit our apprentices, trainees and others who are trying to learn skills for the future. Surely the Hawke Government can learn from the mistakes made by the New Zealand Prime Minister (Mr Lange), who has admitted that the taxes on perks that operated in New Zealand are not collecting the revenue he thought they would. Moreover, with the introduction of a capital gains tax, the result will be that the home-building industry will suffer, rents will go up, and jobs will be lost.

It is ironic that these taxes are being introduced into the Australian system whereas other countries have phased them out. The United States of America has cut back these taxes to 17½ per cent, and it is intended that they will be phased out completely; yet Australia is going against the world trend by bringing these taxes in.

All I can do is call on all honourable members to strongly oppose these harmful taxes in the interests of young people and the future. If I had only one message for the electors of Redlands, it would be that they should reject the Australian Labor Party and its policies of high taxes, in the interests of the future of Queensland and in the interests of employment opportunities for young people and the people of the older generation.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

Questions submitted on notice were answered as follows—

1. Industrial Disputes at Brisbane Abattoir

Sir WILLIAM KNOX asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs—

(1) For each of the years 1975 to 1985, how many days were lost through industrial disputes at the Brisbane abattoir?

(2) What were the major issues which caused those disputes over that period?

Answer—

(1) From 1 July 1975 to 11 October 1985, there were approximately 71 full days when at least one section of the Metropolitan Regional Abattoir was closed due to industrial action. During that period, just under 255 000 man-hours were lost owing to the full-day closures and part-day stoppages.

I table a schedule setting out the year-by-year breakdown of this information.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the document on the table.

Those figures disclose that the performance of the Queensland work-force is not very good. I hope that it will pick up.

Mr Vaughan: Stop whinging.

Mr LESTER: Once again, the ALP just does not seem to be worried about strikes and job losses. ALP members do not care about the new taxes and the harm they have done to the generation of employment in this State. If the unions got behind the Government in its attempts to create employment, I am sure that Queensland would be a much better place. It is about time that Opposition members woke up to the problems of this State and told union leaders to pull their heads in. I am sure that if Mr Warburton did that, his stocks would be very much higher than they are.

Answer (continued)—

(2) An examination of industrial disputes at the Brisbane abattoir shows that approximately 23 per cent of the days lost were owing to matters unrelated to working conditions—for example, over Federal Government policy. The fact that union members go on strike shows just how bad the policies of the Federal Government are.

In addition to those days lost, approximately one-third of full-day stoppages arose from issues involving national or State-wide industrial campaigns. So union members have been roped into strikes over issues that do not really concern them. Is it any wonder that a number of abattoir-owners are saying that it might be a good idea if a contract system was introduced? Employees want such a system so that they will not be involved in needless stoppages and will thus be able to earn more money for themselves.

The issues causing the disputes covered a wide range of matters, many peculiar to the industry, and it would be extremely difficult to categorise them. A number of trade unions were involved and all would have to carry a share of the blame. It is obvious

that, right across the board, both State and Federal unions have to accept some of the blame.

It is a shame to see production affected in this way by matters not related to actual conditions of work. The message is that unionists have to pull their socks up; the Government wants a better deal in the interests of all Queenslanders.

2. Inspection of Organs Overseas

Mr BURNS asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

With reference to newspaper reports stating: "The Queensland Government has despatched two senior Works Department officials on a six-week first-class ticketed, world search for an organ . . . it is believed that neither bureaucrat plays a musical instrument"—

- (1) Is this report true?
- (2) If so, how many participated in this tour?
- (3) Who were they?
- (4) What was the total cost of the tour?
- (5) Who authorised the trip?
- (6) Did they travel first-class?
- (7) Which countries did they visit?
- (8) Were inquiries made in Australia and, if so, how and by whom?
- (9) What types of organs were inspected?
- (10) Who advised or will advise the non-musical public servants of the qualities of the organs inspected on the world trip?
- (11) Is it not normal practice to call tenders or invite submissions from internationally and nationally-known organ-manufacturers or agents?

Answer—

(1 to 11) No. The report is incorrect. However, as part of the development of the Queensland Cultural Centre's Performing Arts Complex, the State Government signed a contract agreement in April 1984 with Johannes Klais Orgelbau of Bonn, West Germany, for the design, fabrication and installation of an organ for the concert hall.

This contract was the result of the world-wide research and investigations undertaken by the Queensland Cultural Centre Trust honorary organ consultant, Mr Robert Boughen, who has world-wide recognition for his skill as an organist and knowledge of organs. His investigations included Australian firms, but they lacked the expertise and experience to successfully construct an organ of the complexity and size of the proposed organ.

Within the contract agreement, provision was made for the inspection of the work during construction to ensure that the design, cost and quality were to the Government's satisfaction, and to finalise delivery and installation arrangements.

I would mention that the Performing Arts Complex has already achieved a record of high success and the concert hall is already heavily booked for performances by world standard artists. Part of the meeting in Bonn dealt with arrangements for the installation of the organ so that that work would minimise disruption to the ongoing use of the hall.

For the purpose of inspection and technical detailing, the consultant architect for the Queensland Cultural Centre, Mr Robin Gibson, and the organ consultant, Mr Robert Boughen, visited Bonn, West Germany, for a period of one week.

Whilst investigating project delivery systems on major Government buildings in Europe and other countries, the Works Department's project liaison manager for the Queensland Cultural Centre project, Mr Brian Beauchamp, met with these two

representatives to deal with the Government's contractual responsibilities related to the organ. All travel was approved by Cabinet and was not first-class.

It can be seen from this that the inspections were undertaken by experts in their respective fields. The discussions held with the manufacturers were highly successful and progress on the manufacture of the organ is proceeding most satisfactorily.

Mr Gibson's costs for the visit are part of his consultancy fees provided for in the budget for the centre. Mr Boughen is an honorary consultant to the Cultural Centre Trust and the trust is meeting his costs in this exercise. That portion of Mr Beauchamp's visit to Bonn was apportioned to the Cultural Centre budget.

This acquisition will become a vital element of the Performing Arts Complex's Concert Hall and I hope that the honourable member takes the opportunity of improving his culture by attending a performance when the organ is installed in late 1986.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Burchill and Partners

Mr WARBURTON: In directing a question to the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing, I point out that, in the last issue of *The Weekend Australian*, a Mr Geoffrey Burchill, managing director of Burchill and Partners and the man reported in that newspaper as having arranged the relocation of a main road at the request of Maralinga, the Minister's family company, is reported as having said—

“I suggested relocating the road because I could see that it was a way to make the whole extractive operation much more efficient.”

Would the Minister agree, firstly, that Mr Burchill's statement exposes the real reason behind the construction of the new road, and, secondly, is the Burchill company, which claims to have been a client of Maralinga since about 1976, the company that was employed to design the new causeway for the Main Roads Department, for which the Minister has responsibility?

Mr HINZE: I believe that I have made it abundantly clear, with reference to the properties, the roadworks and the council representations, that there is no benefit for me, my family or my family companies. If the honourable member does not believe that, I do not know how to get it through to him so that he can absorb it. I have made the position as plain as I possibly can. It is entirely up to the Leader of the Opposition to make up his mind what he intends to do about it. I am sorry that I cannot make it any clearer than that.

Alleged Australian Labor Party and Liberal Party Coalition

Mr NEAL: I refer the Premier and Treasurer to a report in the last issue of *The Bulletin*, which canvasses a strategy under which the Liberal Party in Queensland has held secret meetings with the ALP with a view to forming a coalition Government after the next election. I now ask the Premier and Treasurer: Is he surprised at prospects of an attempted marriage of convenience between the Liberals and the socialists in Queensland?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am aware of that article. It was drawn to my attention some time ago. I have noted the way in which the leader of the Liberal Party and the Liberals consistently adopt the same attitude and deliver the same statements as do members of the ALP. The Liberals have voted with the ALP—the socialists—on 60 occasions. When the Liberals make a statement, I am blown if I can tell the difference between it and statements of the ALP. The Liberals continually attack me and the National Party. I do not remember when they last attacked members of the Labor Party. The Liberals claim to be part and parcel of the one-time Liberal Party that was associated with the National Party, but they are far apart when they concentrate their attack on me and the National Party and support the ALP whenever possible. After reading that statement, anybody could be forgiven for believing that it is true.

Australian Labor Party Funding for Redlands By-election

Mr NEAL: I ask the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs: Is he aware of reports to the effect that the Trades and Labor Council is donating funds to the ALP Redlands by-election campaign, and does he know whether the money involved is from the SEQEB strike fund?

Mr LESTER: It seems to be common knowledge that it most definitely is from that fund, because a terrible public wrangle is taking place within the union movement. I do not have to say a great deal about it in this Parliament. It is there for everybody to read. Mr Neville and other people in the union movement are at loggerheads about what is going on. Is it any wonder? I believe that \$10,000 has already been donated and that another \$10,000 is to come. Innocent people put money into this fund to try to help the SEQEB workers who walked out of their jobs, and now it is being used to fund an ALP election campaign.

Because the ALP has made it very clear that that money will be used for its by-election campaign in Redlands, that is money down the drain, I would have to ask: Where has the rest of the money gone? Is it any wonder that the members of the mining unions in my electorate have said that they will not cop this any longer? They are very upset. Their contributions will not be used, even in their own area; they are to be used hundreds of miles away to fund the by-election campaign. That is not the reason for which the contributions were made. In one union, at one mine, 87 per cent of the members did not want to contribute to the levy, yet they were forced to.

Those are the sorts of things that the ALP supports, yet it carries on about some of the things that it alleges the Government does from time to time. The ALP should get its own house in order first. It verges on fraud because innocent people gave this money—many of them against their will—to help in the provision of food and other necessities for those workers who walked out of their jobs. Now that money has gone to fund the ALP Redlands by-election campaign. I am not the only one who knows that; union members have told me and I have read about it in the press. I simply say it is time that this practice was cut out. It is time the ALP took its hands off that money. It is time that it got its house in order. One thing that these actions of the ALP will do is ensure a win for the National Party in Redlands.

Gateway Bridge Approach Roads

Mr BURNS: In asking a question of the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing, I refer to the opening of the Gateway Bridge scheduled for January of next year and the decision not to build flyovers over Nudgee Road, Wynnum Road and Mount Gravatt-Capalaba Road. Both Wynnum Road and Mount Gravatt-Capalaba Road service the Redlands area. The Main Roads Department estimates that 12 000 cars a day will cross the Gateway Bridge and that 26 000 cars a day use Wynnum Road and 38 000 cars a day use Old Cleveland Road. That means that the cars will have to drive off the freeway, stop at traffic-lights, cross the main roads, go back onto the on-ramps and back onto the freeway. I now ask: When will the Minister build a decent freeway so that the people who pay the money to use the bridge will at least be able to move through the area without having to encounter traffic-lights?

Mr HINZE: The honourable member said, "When are you going to build a decent freeway?" The cost of the freeway is \$100m and the cost of the bridge is \$140m. That is a total of \$240m.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr HINZE: I am not arguing with the honourable member.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Lytton has asked a question. I ask him to listen to the answer.

Mr HINZE: I have noticed, in the press, the honourable member's concern about his electorate. I am prepared to have the Commissioner for Main Roads come to the House and discuss the honourable member's particular problem with him.

Mr Burns: I want a flyover.

Mr HINZE: I would like a Mercedes Benz, but I have to drive a dirty old Caprice.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr HINZE: I will conclude by asking the honourable member not to get rude, because I certainly take on board the arguments that he is using in his electorate about the traffic that will use the Gateway Bridge. I am prepared to give consideration to the problems mentioned by him in this morning's press.

Hospital, Redlands Electorate

Mr ALISON: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to claims by the ALP that a hospital for the Redlands region had been promised before. Is that claim correct? If so, will the Premier table a copy of the policy speech or Budget papers in which the commitment appears?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Contrary to what the honourable Leader of the Opposition says, never at any time was a hospital promised. On many occasions, the former member for Redlands (the late Mr Goleby) suggested that it would be good to have a hospital in the area. Sites were inspected and recommendations were made. At no time were funds made available or was any commitment made. I repeat that funds were never committed. The Leader of the Opposition should not tell another one in here. I will not mention what it is.

Mr Warburton: You pork-barrelled the electorate then, as you are doing now.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: It is not a matter of——

Honourable Members interjected.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: If the ALP was shouldering its responsibilities in relation to a hospital, it would be getting onto its colleagues in Canberra. The ALP's colleagues in Canberra have opted out, as the Queensland ALP has opted out.

Previously, the Federal Government funded all construction as well as 50 per cent of day-to-day running costs. Now it is doing neither. The Queensland Government has to carry the whole commitment in relation to the construction of a new hospital. The Leader of the Opposition ought to be downright ashamed of himself and his party, which has opted out——

Mr Warburton: I rise to a point of order. The Premier and Treasurer is misleading the House. He knows that the Fraser Government cut out any capital expenditure directed towards hospitals. The Premier also knows quite well that every bit of capital expenditure that goes into hospitals is the responsibility of State Governments. I repeat that the Premier and Treasurer is misleading the House.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Leader of the Opposition repeated what I just said; he will not pay anything. He has opted out of it, and he has just admitted that.

Mr Warburton: It is your responsibility.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: It is not Queensland's responsibility. What about all the other States?

Mr Fouras interjected.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Mr Speaker, there are many ways of killing a cat.

Although Queenslanders pay the same 1 per cent Medicare levy as other Australians, the Federal Government gives South Australia three times as much money per person

per day as it gives to Queensland. All Labor States receive, for hospitals, twice as much money as Queensland receives. That is wrong, and it is skulduggery of the highest order. It is supported by Opposition members. They have the audacity to go to the Redlands electorate and say that the Queensland Government should build a hospital there. They know jolly well that, by skulduggery, the Federal Government has opted out of its responsibilities. We do not need a hospital issue down at Redlands. It is not necessary.

The construction of a hospital in the Redlands electorate is not the issue. I say to the people in the Redlands electorate that this is the first time that the Queensland Government has been able to get an indication of whether or not the Redlands electorate and other people support the Government's action in relation to the unions and turning on the lights or whether or not they support the Leader of the Opposition, who did everything in his power to make sure that they did not have power. Leaving aside the hospital issue, it will be very interesting to see whether the people in Redlands support the Leader of the Opposition and his candidate for what they have done in relation to the power issue alone. The Queensland Government has picked up the cudgels and played its part well across the board.

Funding for Non-Government Schools

Mr ALISON: I direct the attention of the Minister for Education to the front-page article in today's *Courier-Mail*, in which the Anglican Church is reported to have protested to the Commonwealth Government over its guide-lines for funding new non-Government schools. Could the Minister inform the House of the position of the Queensland Government in relation to the funding of non-Government schools?

Mr POWELL: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am aware of the article that appeared in this morning's *Courier-Mail*, in which it is reported that the Anglican Church has complained to the Federal Government about its structuring of funding for non-Government schools. The Anglican Church and anybody else operating a non-Government school that is not part of the system are concerned. The Federal Government, with its Schools Commission guide-lines, has decided that if a school is operated within a system, such as those conducted by churches and non-Government organisations, it is likely to receive better funding than the independently run schools.

It is interesting to note that the Federal Government, in its granting of moneys on a per capita basis to non-Government schools, regards some of them as being worth three times as much as others. I have in front of me the exact figures. The assistance provided by the Commonwealth to non-Government primary schools ranges from \$280 to \$789 a child and to non-Government secondary schools from \$444 to \$1,245 a student. That means that, under Commonwealth policy, some Australian children are worth almost three times as much as other Australian children. It is scandalous. The non-Government school sector should be allocated funds on the same basis as that used in Queensland. An across-the-board amount of money is allocated by the Queensland Government to the non-Government school sector.

The Commonwealth Government, through the Australian Schools Commission, is pandering to people in some areas and not to others. Almost 18 months ago, after the Australian Schools Commission signalled its intentions, I forecast what has happened today, that is, that groups of people within the community would see the Australian Schools Commission as playing one group or one denomination off against the other. That is exactly what it is doing. It is aiming at the systemic areas and saying that they are good but that the others are not so good.

Everybody in this country pays taxes. Unfortunately, because of the socialist Government in Canberra, taxes are paid on a sliding scale, so that the harder one works, the more one pays. Everybody must pay taxes. However, some people whose children attend non-Government schools are being asked to pay three times as many tax dollars as other people for education.

Export of Australian Education Services to Asia

Mr HENDERSON: In directing a question to the Minister for Education, I refer to the feature article in *The Courier-Mail* in regard to the export of Australian education services to Asia. Can the Minister inform the House of any initiatives under way in Queensland to export this State's university and college courses to the Asian market?

Mr POWELL: I thank the honourable member for Mount Gravatt for his question. The export of education to other countries is comparatively new. In fact, at the Australian Education Council meeting held in Broome during the last week-end, that matter was discussed quite widely.

In most parts of Australia, and, in fact, in the English-speaking world, education has always been regarded as a money-taking operation. Queensland is in the unique position of being able to make money out of education. I congratulate the Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education, through its director, Mr Lindsay Barker, for the work that it has carried out in that regard.

For the benefit of interested honourable members, I point out that the DDIAE is operating degree courses externally in Hong Kong. Fees are being received from the students who are undertaking those degrees. The courses are very much sought after, and quite a considerable amount of money will be made out of the provision of the courses.

Queensland colleges and universities are quite experienced, of course, in distance education. The opportunity presents itself of attracting the Asian market and a good deal of money to Queensland. As a result, a link is then forged between the host university or the host educational institution and the country in which the external education is being undertaken.

As recently as 20 September this year, I think it was, I forwarded a letter to the Director of Education in Hong Kong requesting his approval for the DDIAE to operate a study centre in Hong Kong. Queensland is doing more than merely selling courses from Australia. The DDIAE is considering the establishment of a centre in Hong Kong. Discussions are being undertaken with the Malaysian Government. It is my hope that the initiative will be extended to Indonesia as well. A tremendous need and a great demand exist in Asian countries, where the people have an absolute thirst for tertiary education but are unable to secure places in their own educational institutions. Queensland has the expertise and the quality of education. In my opinion, we should be selling the initiative and, as a result, attracting overseas funds to our State.

Tamborine-Oxenford Road

Mr GOSS: In directing a question to the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing, I refer to his denial this morning that the relocation of the Tamborine-Oxenford Road was a Hinze plan, and to the statement by his family's engineer, Mr Burchill, in *The Australian* of 12 October, which reads, "I suggested relocating the road because I could see that it was a way to make the whole extractive operation much more efficient."

I now ask: Does he deny that the proposal by his engineer was based on instructions from him and his family? As the relocation will make the gravel operation more efficient, will not an increase in the volume extracted mean that the existing benefit flowing to his company through royalties will be increased as a result of that increased efficiency and extraction?

Mr HINZE: I am becoming amazed at the limited ability of so-called legal men to absorb common sense. Perhaps the longer they stay in Parliament, the better they will become. In the meantime, I suppose that the Government will have to put up with the legal brains trust that has been formed on the Opposition side and try to answer, in a sensible way, the stupid questions asked by its members.

In a ministerial statement this morning, I related the circumstances as they have unfolded themselves. I have answered the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Goss: Well, answer me.

Mr HINZE: I answer the member for Salisbury in the same way as I answered the Leader of the Opposition. It should be clearly understood that members of the Opposition are provoking an argument on a matter that I have tried desperately to answer.

Tamborine-Oxenford Road

Mr GOSS: My second question—I must be a supreme optimist to persist in asking questions, but here I go—refers to his ministerial statement this morning——

A Government Member: Who's it to?

Mr GOSS: The same Minister, I said—the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing. Why does not the honourable member listen?

I refer to his ministerial statement this morning in which he said that his family company's contribution to the cost of the relocation of the Tamborine-Oxenford road was in the form of the use of plant and materials, and I ask another question in two parts: What was the value of the contribution sought from Maralinga Pty Ltd, which was given in kind?

Government Members interjected.

Mr GOSS: Can't you restrain them, Mr Speaker?

The first part of my question was——

Government Members interjected.

Mr GOSS: Have you got any control over them, Mr Speaker?

The second part of my question——

Mr Lane interjected.

Mr GOSS: In other cases——

Mr Lane interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Salisbury is upset with the remarks of the Minister for Transport. The Minister will refrain from making any further remarks while the honourable member is asking his question.

Mr GOSS: I thank you for your assistance, Mr Speaker.

My question is: What was the value of the contribution sought from Maralinga Pty Ltd that was made in kind? When other owners or developers are required to make a contribution to the cost of public works, will they be given the same option to substitute the use of plant and materials in kind for the cash contribution sought by the Government?

Mr HINZE: In reply to the honourable member for Salisbury, again I must remark on the deficiencies in ordinary common sense that have been indicated in this Chamber by him. When I first saw that young man in the House, I thought, "Well, perhaps he could become the Leader of the Opposition, eventually." Perhaps he is trying to put the skids under the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr GOSS: I rise to a point of order. I have asked quite seriously my second question. The answer being given by the Minister is quite irrelevant. It is a personal reference to me, and I call on you, Mr Speaker, to rule that the Minister answer the question in relevant terms, in accordance with Standing Orders.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! A point of order has been taken, and I ask the Minister for his reply.

Mr HINZE: Well, Mr Speaker, the honourable member said that he asked quite seriously that question. I have to claim that my reply was of a serious nature. I gained the impression when the honourable member entered the Chamber——

Mr Goss: Will other owners and developers get the same deal as Hinze?

Mr HINZE: Is this the way the honourable member jumps up in the courts? He cannot turn this place into a court. Mr Speaker, this junior office boy is turning the highest court in Australia——

Mr Goss interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Goss interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I issue my final warning.

Mr Vaughan: What about that lout over there?

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Mr Speaker, the honourable member for Nudgee has referred to the honourable gentleman as a lout. I assert that that is unparliamentary language.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! To tell the honest truth, I do not know who it was to whom reference was made. However, if it is felt by an honourable member that he has been referred to in unparliamentary language, that honourable member has a right to get to his feet and ask for the reference to be withdrawn. I inform the honourable member for Nudgee that if he makes a comment such as that again, I will warn him under Standing Order No. 123A.

Employment of Unregistered Teacher at Benowa High School

Mr BORBIDGE: I ask the Minister for Education: Is he aware of a threat by 34 teachers at the Benowa High School to strike if an unregistered teacher is not dismissed? If the Minister is aware of such a threat, will he advise the House of the circumstances surrounding the employment of the teacher concerned, and whether there is any foundation for claims made by the Queensland Teachers Union that an influx of untrained teachers could result?

Mr POWELL: I am aware of the claim and, as far as I am aware, it is fictitious.

I understand that an industrial officer from the Queensland Teachers Union is most upset. He does not understand the way in which the person was employed. Clause 4A of by-law No. 1 of the rules governing the Board of Teacher Education states that, if an employing authority cannot obtain a particular person to teach specific subjects, the board can seek authorisation for a qualified person to be employed.

The person who has been appointed holds the degrees of bachelor of science and master of town-planning, and is skilled in teaching mathematics and physics to students in Years 11 and 12. No other person is available to teach those subjects at that standard except one registered teacher who is prepared to teach only on a day-by-day basis. That is not good enough when the teaching involves students up to Year 10. The person who has been employed is teaching students in Years 8, 9 and 10 in the subjects of mathematics and science.

At 12 noon,

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 307, the House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY**Resumption of Committee—Estimates—Seventh and Eighth
Allotted Days****Estimates-in-Chief, 1985-86****Lands, Forestry and Police****Department of Lands**

Hon. W. H. GLASSON (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police) (12.1 p.m.): I move—

“That \$20,798,090 be granted for ‘Department of Lands’.”

It gives me great pleasure to rise today to speak to the Estimates for the Land Administration Commission, including the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board, the Brisbane Forest Park Administration Authority and the Rabbit Control Authority.

Land, together with capital, enterprise and labour, forms a corner-stone of any society. With the settlement of this State having reached its current state, administration of land becomes all the more important, as pressures intensify for the land available. Careful and considered judgment is necessary to decide competing claims, so that a balance is maintained among the groups that make up the community.

The development of this great State has accelerated in the last few years, and at this very moment, social, industrial and technological changes are occurring which will add to the demands on the Government, and increase pressures for continuing improvement in its administration.

The Land Act has a very long history, nonetheless it is being continually updated to meet changing community needs and demands. The Government's policies of offering more secure tenures to primary producers is but one example of that. More recent changes have addressed problems relative to the unlawful occupation of Crown lands, roads and reserves, and with coexisting tenures under the Land Act and Mining Act.

During 1984-85, the Land Administration Commission implemented a major reorganisation. That reorganisation, the result of a joint review between departmental officers and officers of the Department of the Public Service Board, was the first major review of the department in its 115-year history. The reorganisation, which effectively grouped functional units into new operating divisions, gives the department a sound base from which to develop into the future and provide improved community services.

The Land Administration Commission continues its involvement in several rural financing schemes set up to assist the primary producers of this State. Those schemes include—

The Young Farmer Establishment Scheme, which was established by this Government in 1978 to provide finance to young people to enable them to acquire their first viable rural property. Since its inception, a total of 68 applications for finance have been approved. In this financial year, an amount of \$3,200,000 is being made available to further the scheme.

The Dairy Industry Adjustment Scheme, which continues its role of aiding the rationalisation of the dairy industry through the Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Fund, which advances finance to farm and factory.

As inflation continues to put pressure on farm costs, farm build-up is another commission activity which is encouraged.

Land development for residential, industrial and other purposes has been an area of community need for many years, and the commission's co-ordination and planning of the development of Crown land continues in response to this need.

Expenditure in 1985-86 on estate development is estimated at \$8,200,000, which will result in approximately 600 allotments being available for sale, many in remote areas of the State. Activities on 84 ongoing projects range from the south-west and western areas to the major coastal centres. In the last financial year, 539 allotments were offered for sale in all areas of the State.

The department's operations in weed control research have received a significant boost in the last year, with the opening of the Alan P. Dodd Tropical Weeds Research Centre at Charters Towers. Together with the existing Alan Fletcher Research Station at Sherwood, the department's activities in this field will continue to benefit the people of this State.

Funding of weed research is carried out partly through the Department of Lands, which provides facilities and staff, and partly through funds directed through the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board, which provides money for research into specific noxious weeds. Of particular note this year is the commencement of a field program in Madagascar. After about 22 years of effort, permission has been obtained for a scientist to enter Madagascar to carry out field research into rubber vine, financed by funds from the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board.

Whereas the opening of the Charters Towers centre and the Madagascar projects are the highlights of the year, basic research into chemical and biological control continues. Some success has been achieved, but much yet needs to be done.

Work will be needed in the future on some plants not declared noxious, such as lantana, and some native species causing problems in certain areas.

The Brisbane Forest Park Administration Authority is an arm of the State Government formed to plan, develop and manage the recreational use of public and other lands to the north west of Brisbane.

The significance of the park to regional recreation and tourism was recognised by the Government through increased funds for maintenance, development and management of the park.

The input of additional resources has meant a greater awareness by the community of the park and what it offers. This, in turn, has meant greater use of the area, which means that the park is approaching the vision foreseen by the initial legislation, that is, one of the State's most significant recreation and tourism resources involving multiple land use.

In order to confidently plan for future developments, the authority continued its research and planning functions. A major planning project for the authority was the environmental impact study and recreation management plan for the road project linking Brisbane Forest Park with Wivenhoe Dam. Additionally, the authority produced a number of development plans for new recreation areas in the park.

The authority's increased budgetary allocation enabled the communication program to expand, providing a wider range of recreation and education activities for the public. The authority continues to receive extremely favourable response from the public, other park-managing agencies (throughout Australia and overseas) and Government departments, to its approach and management of recreation and education programs.

The Go Bush program of organised recreation activities is now well known throughout the community and continues to receive excellent support and patronage. The concept of Go Bush has been expanded to provide a service for organisations such as schools, community groups and special-needs groups.

Again, in 1984-1985, Community Employment Program (CEP) grants enabled the authority to extend its development works beyond those normally possible. Developments for the year include the redevelopment of Boombana National Park, construction of a new recreation area in Samford State Forest, an extension to the headquarters building, and the construction of walking tracks.

Members will recall that legislation passed through all stages in State Parliament on Thursday, 29 August 1985, to create a single Act consolidating all pest legislation. The Act will allow the present board—to be known simply as the Rural Lands Protection Board—to operate in a much more economical way than does the present set-up, and will allow better control of noxious weeds and animals. Regulations associated with that new Act are now being prepared, and proclamation of the Act should take place on 1 July 1986.

The need for stock routes in the rural scene cannot yet be denied, as many factors influence whether or not stock will move along the routes or be transported by motor vehicle. Maintenance of many of the water facilities has been, or in the future will be, handed over to land-holders, but many of the facilities on the stock routes of primary importance will be retained and maintained by local authorities and the board into the foreseeable future.

Reconstruction and re-alignment of the barrier fence has been proceeding for the past three years with a large input from consolidated revenue to this reconstruction work, and it is expected that the reconstruction work will be completed early in 1986.

Animal pest management in Queensland has, over the past three years, undergone significant advances in terms of both research and development and applied control programs.

Those pests of major concern have been the dingo and wild dog, the feral pig, and native rodents in the Central Highlands. All of these pests have been the subject of intensive investigations, which have resulted in the implementation of effective control programs.

The continuing development of the Robert Wicks Research Station at Inglewood will allow the further implementation of effective animal pest research programs, which will, in turn, support management and control operations throughout Queensland.

With the appointment of scientific/technical officers within the past three years in the persons of an agronomist and three project officers, staff training for field officers has been implemented, with week-long live-in workshops being held in April 1983 and again in October 1985—in fact, it is proceeding now. It is intended that these workshops will become biennial functions designed to keep staff abreast of changes in technology in relation to all aspects of declared plant and vermin control.

Similarly, training of local authority inspectorial staff has commenced. Fifty-seven shires, covering the whole of southern Queensland as far north as Bundaberg, have been involved in this training to date, and again it is intended that workshops be held throughout the State on a regular basis.

Specific programs in relation to control and/or containment of weeds such as giant sensitive plant, parthenium weed and groundsel bush have continued with encouraging success, particularly in relation to biological control. Chemical and mechanical control trials on mesquite have been conducted over the past three years, and a control program with land-holder involvement has been developed for implementation over the next three years and beyond.

The Rabbit Control Authority continued its campaign to maintain effective control over rabbit numbers. Clearing and cropping have effectively cleared rabbits from large areas of former grazing land, but pockets of rabbit population still cause serious damage to winter crops, orchards and cash crops. In 1984-85, the authority's staff carried out a major myxomatosis inoculation campaign, inoculating 2 485 rabbits in 12 shires from Stanthorpe, north to Taroom and west to Quilpie. In addition, a concerted 1080 carrot baiting campaign was carried out in the shires of Stanthorpe, Inglewood and Waggamba, which remain the most heavily rabbit infested areas. In 1985-86 the authority proposes to spend \$768,050, compared to \$798,270 in 1984-85.

Police Complaints Tribunal

In 1984-85 the tribunal received 242 new complaints, compared to 195 in 1983-84. In 1984-85 the tribunal began three major investigations, involving the use of its powers under the Commissions of Inquiry Act. One has been completed, and the other two will be finalised in 1985-86.

During 1984-85, the tribunal's clerical staff was increased from two to four. The appointment of an additional tribunal member has recently been approved by Parliament. To assist the tribunal, a vehicle has been provided to permit site inspections and visits to nearby country centres. It is also proposed that the tribunal will move into larger offices during this financial year.

Forestry

At this time, when the world is becoming acutely aware of the need to safeguard our environment and to preserve our finite natural resources, the role of the Department of Forestry is assuming even greater importance. The department operates within the framework of four Acts. In implementing these Acts and departmental management policies it employs 1 767 salaried and wages employees throughout the State, many in country areas.

An amount of \$20,275,000 has been provided from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to cover salaries and contingencies of the department, as outlined on page 53 of the printed *Estimates of Receipts and Expenditures*. An allocation of \$21,500,000 has been provided from the State Loan Fund for the Capital Works Program. Of that, \$21,152,000 has been allocated to the Forestry Development Fund and \$348,000 to the construction of recreation facilities on State forests. These Vote allocations are listed on page 140 of the printed Estimates.

The Forestry Development Fund provides for the management and development of State forests. The departmental projects associated with the Capital Works Program are detailed on pages 62 to 67 of Budget paper *The State Capital Works Programs 1985-86*. An amount of \$28.8m has been provided this financial year as outlined on page 116 of the printed Estimates. The sources of funding are as follows—

State Loan Fund	\$21.1m
Special Projects Fund	\$ 5.4m
Miscellaneous	\$ 0.3m
Balance from 1984-85	<u>\$ 2.0m</u>
Total	<u>\$28.8m</u>

Expenditure from the Forestry and Lumbering Fund, which deals with forest products revenue, is expected to be \$27.2m in 1985-86, as listed on page 116 of the printed Estimates.

Sound forest management contributes significantly to the quality of life in this great State of ours, while also producing an essential commodity on a continuing basis. Since 1957, this Government has increased the area of State forest in Queensland by 1 891 290 ha, through the reservation of Crown lands considered best suited to timber production, including suitable areas of previously alienated land. Total area presently reserved as State forest is 3 918 012 ha.

Native forests have supported a valuable timber industry over many years and, under the sound management practised by my department, will continue to do so whilst also fulfilling an environmental and nature-conservation role. While conservation today has become a popular and emotive issue, it should be well remembered that the first conservationists in this State were its professional foresters. The high media profile afforded the conservationist movement often ignores the very responsible management practices employed by these dedicated officers. In this respect, I remind honourable members of the need for any country or State to achieve a balance in respect to the management of its natural resources. Queensland has about 55 per cent of Australia's rain forest.

I draw to the attention of honourable members some key factors in respect to the management of the State's total rain forest resource, and it is a pity that a few more honourable members are not present to listen to these figures—

90 per cent is in Crown ownership;

nearly 25 per cent is in national park, and more will be added in due course;
and

25 per cent only is managed for uses that also involve timber production.

The bulk (about 67 per cent) of Queensland's rain forest is in virgin condition in Crown ownership.

At present, three members of the Opposition are in the Chamber.

Mr Burns: Four.

Mr GLASSON: There are four. One is hidden in the bleachers.

The Government has good reason to be proud of the balanced approach that it has taken to the management of its natural resources. Obviously, both the preservation and conservation status of Queensland's rain forest are high.

Turning to the forest estate at large—my department is now even more aware than ever before of the need to conserve forests under its control. Environmental considerations have prompted the department to apply strict management principles to protect the biological diversity and environmental integrity of its forest estate.

As I have already mentioned, one of the many advantages of timber is that, with care, it is a renewable natural resource, and the forests are responsive to cultural treatments. Funds expended on this type of work are thus capable of yielding a sound return to the community in terms of enhanced timber production and the maintenance of forest values generally.

The department's responsibility to provide the raw material for industry can be met in two ways: Firstly, by sound management of the native forests and, secondly, by establishing plantations to meet any shortfall between expected demand and the supply available from both Crown and private native timber resources.

To supplement sustainable yield from Queensland's native forests in the long term, a resource of about 200 000 ha of softwood plantations will be required. To date, almost 149 000 ha has been established. The softwood planting program is the major and most visible activity of the Department of Forestry, and it is proposed to plant a further 4 642 ha this year compared with last year's planting of 4 411 ha. To ensure that Queensland's needs are adequately provided for in the future, it is imperative that my department's planned planting program reaches fruition. In this regard, the attention of honourable members is drawn to the Government's provision of a special project fund allocation of \$5,400,000 to supplement the loan funds available this year to continue the plantation program.

The department has an ongoing commitment to the provision and maintenance of recreation facilities on State forests. Apart from meeting a community need, this program also plays a significant role in providing an opportunity to improve public awareness of the active management of State forests. In the provision of these facilities, it is essential that development be planned and adequate funding ensured for future maintenance.

I turn now to the timber-marketing activities of the department. The timber industry is extremely important to the State. Forestry and forest-based industries combined make a substantial contribution to the economy by generating sales estimated at \$900m in 1984-85, and by providing direct employment to more than 16 000 Queenslanders.

This year, provision is made to continue the West Indian drywood termite control and eradication program, which was commenced in 1966. This exotic and destructive

insect continues to pose a serious threat to timber structures. Ongoing projects of particular note also include—

- Conondale Range fauna study;
- study into rural tree decline; and
- involvement as managing agent in Dongmen forestry aid project in southern China.

The department proposes to continue its involvement with the Community Employment Program, and efforts will concentrate mainly on construction and maintenance of recreation facilities and other activities to the benefit of the community as a whole. Further information regarding the activities and functions of the department are outlined on pages 80 to 84 of the document entitled *Departmental Services and Programs: A Budget Perspective*.

Police Department

The Estimates of the Police Department were last debated in this Chamber in 1981, when, in the face of a world-wide trend of increasing crime rates, the department had achieved a then record clear-up rate for general crime of 52.1 per cent for 1980-81. Since that time, increasing work-loads have placed a heavy burden on the police force in servicing the needs of this State. However, I am pleased to report that for 1984-85 the department achieved a commendable crime clear-up rate of 51.05 per cent.

The cost to the community of providing an effective police service in this State is becoming increasingly expensive, as the operations of the force by nature are labour intensive. As a responsible Government, within the confines of overall budgetary requirements for all departments—and bearing in mind the ultimate tax impost on the community—the Government is doing its best to ensure the ability of the police force to cope with its increasing work-load.

The total Police Department Vote for 1985-86 is \$229,751,100, up \$19,302,900 on 1984-85. This allocation includes \$3,441,400—up \$538,700—for the operations of the State Emergency Service. The police component—the major Budget allocation—at \$226,309,700, is up 9.04 per cent on 1984-85 and an increase of 60 per cent on the amount that the Government provided when the Police Department Estimates were last debated in 1981.

In last month's Budget, to ease manpower problems, approval was given to increase the strength of police officers by 104 in 1985-86. These additions will assist in the deployment of manpower resources to satisfy demands in priority growth areas throughout the State. Taking into consideration natural wastage and an increase in establishment of 50 officers granted in February this year (who at the close of 1984-85 were still undergoing their training), 339 probationaries and cadets will be sworn in during 1985-86.

Additional police officers are constantly needed to man new stations, supplement existing stations that are extending services to 24 hours, and provide the necessary manpower required for new concepts in policing. During 1985-86, a new station is scheduled to open at Slacks Creek, and stations at Goodna, Emerald, Noosa and all Gold Coast stations, with the exception of Burleigh Heads, will become 24-hour stations. Provision has also been made for the purchase of an additional 27 motor vehicles, so necessary to meet the increasing demands for police services which are expected by the public.

An amount of \$157,615,250, that is, approximately 70 per cent of the total departmental allocation, has been allocated for the payment of personal salaries, wages and allowances. Last year, the amount expended for this purpose was \$150,118,045. The amount provided to meet the total contingencies cost of the department represents an increase of 13.9 per cent. Included in this amount is—

- (i) a special allocation of \$3.9m to enable the department to proceed with planned extensions of the police computer system; and

- (ii) \$55,192,100 to meet the cost of goods and services. This is an increase of 9.1 per cent on the 1984-85 allocation.

Increased special allocations have been made in 1985-86 for the purpose of drug investigations. Drugs and drug-related crimes have an enormous social cost, and it is felt that the preventive component of drug investigations will help avert these significant costs to society.

During 1985-86, a new unit will be established at the Gold Coast in conjunction with Jupiters Casino to ensure that a readily available investigatory agency can cover any illegal practices that might be detected at the casino.

Since the Vote of the department was last debated, an amount of \$10.53m has been spent on equipment for the department, apart from computer installation. A further \$3.83m has been provided for general equipment for 1985-86.

During 1984-85, the department commenced its initial stage of a three-phase radio communications network. In 1985-86, the improvements in communication equipment will continue, with the allocation of an additional \$1,082,000.

The overall crime picture in Queensland continues to cause concern, despite the excellent clear-up rate. The total number of offences recorded in 1984-85 was 219 524, which includes all criminal offences or offences against good order. Since the Vote of the department was last debated, general crime has increased by 40.6 per cent and selected crime by 47.5 per cent. Despite additional demands placed continually upon police services, the majority of police officers have worked tirelessly in an effort to cope with the continuously increasing work-load, and each year since 1977-78 the Queensland Police Force has recorded a crime clear-up rate of 50 per cent or over, with a new all-time record set in 1981-82 of 53.07 per cent, placing the force in the forefront of all police forces in the world in the successful resolution of general crime. This clearly reflects the dedication and morale of today's police officer and the excellent teamwork that has been developed.

The department's administration has embarked on a continuing program of review and modification of the police operational structure, systems and procedures to ensure that the maximum benefit is obtained from existing resources.

A significant advance in the department's crime-fighting capabilities was the acquisition in 1984 of the department's own computer. Extensive use has been made of the police computer since its installation and, at the commencement of this financial year, 211 terminals had been installed at locations throughout the State. As I have already signified, further funds are being provided this year for new enhancements to the system, including the provision of a further 88 terminals providing for easy access and rapid retrieval of data by operational police. Details of 600 000 offenders have now been entered into the computer, enabling direct inquiry by police officers.

Of particular concern is the continued increase in crimes of violence against people and property. In 1984-85, there were 195 offences in the homicide category—murder, attempted murder and manslaughter—an increase of 14 per cent on 1983-84. Serious assaults increased by 10 per cent, motor vehicle thefts by 9 per cent, vandalism by 12 per cent and arson by 11 per cent. Breaking and entering offences continue to be a problem. In 1984-85, offences increased by 6 per cent; 31 905 dwellings, shops and other premises were entered throughout the State, approximately half being private homes. Growth in these crimes is a malady of modern society and is no doubt a by-product of unemployment, drug abuse, the break-down in the family unit and general public apathy.

The flourishing trade in illicit drugs remains a serious problem. Major offenders have access to large financial backing and extensive and sophisticated equipment to maintain their criminal activities. Over the last five years, detected drug offences have increased by almost 150 per cent.

It is becoming increasingly evident that a strong nexus exists between drug abuse and crime, especially in the case of individuals who have a dependence on heroin. Quite

often, drug-users initially commit petty crimes but resort to more serious offences as their dependence increases. A large number turn to dealing in illicit drugs to support their habits.

Honourable members will appreciate that the problem cannot be solved entirely by the Government and that it is a problem which must be tackled at all levels of society. Because widespread cultivation and distribution are prevalent, concentrated policing is essential to eliminate the sources of supply. Therefore, a high priority has been given to the deployment of resources in this area.

It is disturbing that youth continues to contribute significantly to the crime rate. In the area of cleared-up offences, juveniles were found to be responsible for 55 per cent of breaking and entering offences, 43 per cent of all stealing offences, 31 per cent of receiving offences, 29 per cent of malicious damage, and 43 per cent of offences involving the stealing and unlawful use of motor vehicles.

To combat these problems, the scope and strength of the Juvenile Aid Bureau have been expanded over recent years and emphasis has been placed on prevention. The bureau has followed a policy of cautioning young offenders rather than using the court system. The decision to prosecute is taken only as a last resort, when all other efforts have failed.

There is no easy solution to the problem of juvenile crime and it certainly should not be left entirely to police officers to find the answers. Parents are urged to re-evaluate the relationship that they have with their children and take a greater interest in what their children are doing and with whom they are doing it.

Unfortunately, the satisfying reductions in the road toll in the past two years are not being maintained. Alcohol consumption continues to contribute to the carnage on Queensland roads. The high level of blood alcohol content in accident victims suggests that the lessons about impairment of driving skills caused by consumption of alcohol are not being learnt by some sections of the driving community.

Throughout the State, traffic and general police have been encouraged to use discretion in the enforcement of traffic rules and regulations. However, it is expected that stricter control will be exercised over the life-endangering offences. In the metropolitan area, zone and squad policing have been introduced. Selective and saturation enforcement procedures will be applied wherever appropriate. It is apparent that although everything possible is being done in enforcement and in education of the public, the real responsibility for the increasing road toll rests squarely on the shoulders of the road-using public.

Coping with crime requires an overall strategy based upon community involvement. In recent years, a more concentrated effort has been made by the Police Department to encourage a higher profile of personal involvement by police officers in community activities, and to foster a policy of developing a wider public understanding of the police role. These initiatives, combined with crime prevention measures, have enabled a high level of police service to be maintained in this State.

I am sure that honourable members will agree that the citizens of Queensland have every reason to have the utmost confidence in the police force and in the service it provides to the community.

Budget provisions this year have been designed to provide maximum assistance to the department in the continuance of this effective service.

State Emergency Service

As the Minister responsible for the State Emergency Service, it is indeed a rewarding experience to be associated with citizens of the calibre of those in the Queensland State Emergency Service. An amount of \$3,441,400 has been provided to maintain the service for 1985-86.

In 12 years, the service has grown from 2 800 volunteer members to 26 500. It is the largest and most effective State Emergency Service in Australia. The State Emergency Service police counter-disaster concept could well be a model for other States.

All honourable members will note from the annual report of the Director, State Emergency Service, that the service was involved in 557 counter-disaster operations for the year ended 30 June 1985. I am sure all members will agree that the charter of the service—to be responsible for the training, education, organisation and co-ordination of communities in coping with disasters—is being fully maintained by the service, and that its volunteer corps is indeed a be-aware component of each community.

All communities have clearly demonstrated their support of the State Government's providing the legislation and framework for counter-disaster management, operations and education.

The provision of five additional technical communications officers at Cairns, Townsville, Rockhampton and Brisbane in 1984 has been vindicated by an accelerated enhancement of the development of communications and preventive maintenance systems which have proved effective and economic.

In this financial year, computer facilities will be established in six of the 11 country regional offices to allow the extension of the benefits of computer management into regional areas.

This action conforms to the five-year development plan. Late in 1984, the service was provided with an additional helicopter, and helicopters are now stationed at Cairns and Brisbane. Many lives have been saved by the use of these helicopters with the support of trained ground parties.

At all times there is a requirement for the service to have the capacity to conduct continuous and protracted helicopter counter-disaster operations, and to this end funds in the 1985 Budget provided for the employment of an additional pilot and crewman. The additional pilot will also undertake relief pilot duties at Brisbane and Cairns.

The level of viability in each group will always be related to the phased development program, and it is very apparent that the understanding approach and support practised by the director, his staff at State headquarters and in the regions and each local authority's contribution means that the service will continue to be a vital part of Queensland life.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I desire to inform honourable members that, on the Vote proposed, I will allow a full discussion on all the Minister's departmental Estimates (Consolidated Revenue, Trust and Special Funds, and Loan Fund Account).

For the information of honourable members, I point out that the administrative acts of the department are open to debate, but the necessity for legislation and matters involving legislation cannot be discussed in Committee of Supply.

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (12.38 p.m.): In his speech, the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police (Mr Glasson) referred to the fact that very few Opposition members were in the Chamber to listen to him. I point out that only seven members of his own party bothered to remain in the Chamber to listen to what he had to say.

Today I want to raise a couple of matters relating to the Police Department, and in particular the fact that some police officers seem to think that, because they are police officers, they are above the law and are able to go about this State harassing some people and protecting certain individuals. By quoting court transcripts and other documents, I will prove the truth of what I am saying.

The first matter I wish to raise relates to Milan Crnjanin, who was charged—

“That on the 19th day of November, 1984, at Brisbane in the State of Queensland constituted by the Central Division of the Brisbane District appointed under the Decentralisation of the Magistrates Courts Act 1965 to 1974 one Milan Crnjanin did, contrary to Regulation 38(a) of The Telecommunications Regulations send over a Telecommunication Service . . . an offensive communication.”

I will prove that that offensive communication related to the fact that Milan Crnjanin telephoned a person and told him that he owed Crnjanin money and that if that money was not repaid he would take legal action, something that is done every

single day here in Queensland by large corporations. However, Milan Crnjanin was arrested by police, charged and then taken to court. The magistrate heard the evidence of the arresting officer and then threw the case out of court, because he found that there was no case to answer.

An examination of the evidence shows that the money owed was not as a result of work done. The person owed Crnjanin \$4,000 for an SP bet, yet the Police Department took no action whatever in relation to the SP-betting offence.

I will now refer to some documents. The first is a statement by Milan Crnjanin that sets out exactly what had happened. In part, it reads—

“I have known Michael and Florence Calligeros of Sunnybank for many years. I would say about at least 20 years.

. . .

Michael Calligeros is the member of a very wealthy family which owns a number of properties around Brisbane one of which is about to be sold a seven figure amount. He is however principally occupied as the operator of the cafeteria at Princess Alexandra Hospital. However at these premises he runs an extensive S.P. bookmaking operation and has done so for many years. He is in fact the agent for a few major S.P. bookmakers operating at the coast and over the border. I think sometimes he holds the bets himself, other times he passes them on to the major operators. I am aware of a number of people who bet S.P. with him. I have bet with him in this way over about the last seven years. I have had no difficulty with him over that time. For the most part I was losing money and when I did lose I promptly paid up my losing debt sometimes by cash sometimes by cheque. It was always the usual practice that the money not be placed up front. If I won he paid me always in cash except on the last occasion which I recount later, in this statement.

. . .

In October, 1984 the jockey Mal Schumacher rang me from Sydney and told me to put \$500.00 each way for him on the horse he was riding the following weekend. I did nothing about it but he rang me again in the early hours of the Saturday morning of that weekend and urged me again to put \$500.00 each way on the horse he was riding which was a horse called ‘Goleen’. So since I had very little time I went across to Calligeros’s cafeteria and placed \$700.00 each way on the horse running in Melbourne that afternoon. \$500.00 of this bet was for Schumacher \$200.00 was for myself. The horse was unplaced and I note from my cheque book that I wrote out a cheque for \$1,700.00 for cash which represents my payment of the lost bet of \$700.00 each way (\$1,400.00) and an extra \$300.00 just for pocket money. I recall I gave him this cheque on a Friday morning because Calligeros asked me to pay it because the bookmaker was calling to collect the losing bets later that Friday.

. . .

The week after I noticed that ‘Goleen’ was to run again in Melbourne, again being ridden by Schumacher. This time Schumacher did not ring me and, in fact for this reason, I suspected that the horse might do well, so late on the morning that it was to run in Melbourne I placed a bet with Calligeros of \$500.00 each way. I placed this bet with Calligeros by phone. At the time I phoned him he warned me that he may not be able to place the bet and asked me to ring later on to confirm whether he had managed to place the bet. In due course on my way to the Brisbane races I phoned him from a public telephone box and he told me that he had placed the bet but if I wished I could cancel. I told him I did not want to cancel. Later that afternoon ‘Goleen’ won after having started at 15 to 1. Since it was a credit bet that meant that I won 15 times the winning stake.

. . .

So the total winnings would have been about \$9,375.00. On the following Friday I saw Calligeros at his shop. At this time he gave me two cheques made out to cash or bearer one in the sum of \$5,375.00 and the other in the sum of \$4,000.00.

. . .

I attempted to have Calligeros's brother cash the cheques for me on the following Monday but he declined. So I visited the bank at Surfers Paradise where the cheques were drawn and presented them for payment. I recall that the cheques were consecutively numbered. The cheque for \$5,375.00 was paid but the cheque for \$4,000.00 was handed back to me marked with the notation that payment had been stopped.

. . .

The next day I telephoned Rodda (who was the book-maker) who angrily told me not to ring him again and to take the matter up with Calligeros. I made another phone call to Calligeros and related the conversation I had with Rodda and expressed some anxiety about whether the cheque was going to be met.

. . .

Calligeros after telling me never to ring him again hung up on me. A few minutes after this telephone conversation Rodda telephoned me from the coast and repeated that I was never to ring him again.

. . .

I rang Florence Calligeros on about the 19th November. I was at great pains not to mention to her that my difficulties with her husband arose from any betting transaction and merely told her that he owed me some money which I had loaned him. I told her that he had given me a cheque which had been stopped and that I would be having to issue a summons if they ignored my demands for payment. I told her that I would greatly prefer not to have to do this since the summons would appear in the White Mercantile Gazette and similar publications and in general I asked her to intervene on my behalf to procure payment.

. . .

Later in that day in the afternoon I received another telephone call from Detective George Pugh who related to me that he had a complaint that I had phoned Mrs Calligeros and that she was crying and upset as a result. I protested that the telephone call was not in any way offensive and in fact was a friendly call and that I really did not believe that she would be upset. As for the rest of the conversation I was completely honest and open with Pugh about the nature of my transactions with Calligeros and asked him in fact whether he was investigating S.P. bookmaking. I told him that the cheque I still had in my possession quoted him the number and the name of the drawer and the bank. It was a friendly sort of a call and concluded with him saying 'well you come in and we will sort these things out'. I then consulted my Solicitor."

Arrangements were made between Crnjanin's solicitor and Detective Pugh for Crnjanin to see Detective Pugh. He went in there. I wish now to quote from some of the transcript from the Magistrates Court, which relates what happened during the interview. I will begin Pugh's evidence with a statement that he put to Crnjanin—

"‘I have received a complaint from Michael Kalligeros that you abused his wife by threatening her this morning.’ The defendant said, ‘I didn’t threaten her. I just told her to tell her husband to pay me the money he owed me by 11 a.m. or I would take out a summons. I did not threaten her.’”

In evidence, Pugh stated also that when Crnjanin came to be interviewed on 27 November 1984, he said to him—

"‘I have some questions to ask you in relation to this matter but before I ask you any questions I warn you now that you don’t have to answer any questions or make any statements unless you wish. Do you fully understand that warning?’ He replied, ‘I don’t answer any questions.’ I said, ‘As a result of my investigations into this matter I will be arresting you now and charging you with an offence under the Telecommunication Act, do you understand that?’”

Pugh also testified—

“I subsequently arrested the defendant and charged him with the charge now before the Court.”

Pugh was then cross-examined by the barrister representing Crnjanin, a man by the name of Lippett. The transcript reads—

“LIPPETT: ALL RIGHT, YOU DO KNOW MR KALLIGEROS THOUGH, YOU WILL CONCEDE THAT SURELY WON'T YOU?

Pugh: Yes, I know Mr Kalligeros.

YES, AND DID HE TELL YOU WHAT THIS MATTER WAS ALL ABOUT? THE DEBT OWED BY HIM TO THE DEFENDANT OF FOUR THOUSAND DOLLARS?

He told me that . . . the defendant said he owed . . . he claimed that he owed him money but he told me that he didn't owe any money, it was a third party owed him the money.

YES WELL LET'S BE . . .

From S.P. betting.”

So Pugh admitted in the court that he knew that the \$4,000 was owed for SP betting. I see that the Commissioner of Police is present. When the Minister responds this evening, I would like him to tell me whether Detective Pugh made any complaint whatever about Kalligeros or Rodda being involved in SP betting. Surely that would be easy to ascertain. In those court proceedings, Pugh admitted that he knew about SP book-making. If Pugh made no report, the commissioner should be asking why.

The transcript continues—

“LIPPETT: THAT'S RIGHT YES, KALLIGEROS SAID HE WAS JUST THE AGENT FOR THE SP BOOKMAKER, IS THAT RIGHT?

Pugh: No, no, he didn't say that.

HE DIDN'T SAY THAT EH?

What he said was this. He said the defendant was trying to get him by ringing his wife and causing trouble at the home to get him to influence his SP friend, SP associate, to pay the defendant four thousand dollars—”

once again he admits that SP betting was involved—

“OH I SEE. BUT HE DIDN'T TELL YOU HE WAS THE BOOKMAKER'S AGENT EH.

Well he never told me that, no.

HE DIDN'T. I SEE, DID YOU ASK HIM WHY THE DEFENDANT MIGHT BE RINGING HIM INSTEAD OF THE BOOKMAKER HIMSELF?

No.

YOU DIDN'T?

No.

IT DIDN'T OCCUR TO YOU IT MIGHT BE OF SOME INTEREST AS TO HOW ALL THIS CAME ABOUT?

Well no, look it is of no interest to me.

I SEE. ALL RIGHT, SO YOU FIRST HEARD FROM MR KALLIGEROS IS THAT RIGHT, YOUR FRIEND?

That's right.

AND WHEN WAS THAT?

On the morning of the nineteenth of November, '84.

YES, AND DID YOU WRITE DOWN HIS COMPLAINT?

Yes.

DID HE TELL YOU THE WORDS THAT WERE SUPPOSED TO HAVE BEEN SPOKEN ON THE TELEPHONE?

Yes, the . . . some of the words, yes.

AND YOU HAVE THEM RECORDED DO YOU?

Yes.

CAN YOU TELL US WHAT MR KALLIGEROS ALLEGED THAT SOMEBODY HAD SAID TO HIS WIFE ON THE PHONE?

I have got written here on page 52, 'complaint . . . dated nineteenth of November 1984, complaint from Michael Kalligeros of an offensive telephone call received by his wife Florence at their home at seven thirty a.m. on nineteenth of November 1984, 17 Francey Street, Sunnybank—'

he gave the telephone number—

"offensive that 'He lent me the money, if not paid him by eleven a.m. he was going to make the summons and my name be in the paper.'"

That is considered by a police officer to be an offensive call.

The action then taken by Pugh was to bring Mr Crnjanin into police headquarters. He did not proceed by way of summons. He arrested him and threw him into the lock-up. I ask the Minister to answer that.

The transcript continues—

"BENCH: YES. YOU FURTHER RECORDED.

I have got here, I have got threat written here. I have got here, 'I lent your husband the money, if he not pay me by eleven a.m. today I am going to take out a summons and his name will be in all the papers.'"

Pugh admitted in court that that is what he considered to be a threat. It must be remembered that this telephone conversation allegedly took place on 19 November 1984. The matter went to court in February this year. In cross-examination, Pugh was asked, "When did you speak to Mrs Kalligeros to determine what she said was spoken about on the telephone?" Pugh said, "I took a detailed statement from her last week." That occurred on about 29 January. Two months after the complaint was received from Kalligeros and before he had even gone out and spoken to the woman who had made the complaint, Pugh arrested Crnjanin for making the threatening telephone call. That is a disgrace about which the Minister should do something.

I have further documents that relate to the telephone call. Anyone who wishes to read them can certainly do so.

In summing up, the magistrate stated—

"I cannot accept that the words complained of here by any measure can be seen as offensive. The fact that the lady was upset at the end of the telephone call may be due to many things, one of which of course may well be that her belief was that her husband had ceased gambling. Perhaps her upset was due to the suspicion that perhaps he had not remained true to that standard. One would never know. But it is clear that on her own version she said nothing was said that she found the statement offensive, if the subjective test were material, but in my view it is not. As I see it, the words complained of are merely a notice of an intention to bring legal proceedings by way of summons. If that is offensive then I cannot comprehend the manner of the meaning of the word. I believe there is and never was a case to answer."

However, Crnjanin had to go to court. He had to pay the barristers' fees and the solicitors' fees to defend him in an action instituted by a police officer who, I believe, abused his position to protect his friend who was an SP book-maker and an agent for larger SP book-makers. However, even though Pugh knew that that person was acting as an SP book-maker, not one thing was done about it.

Mr Fouras: Did he get costs of court?

Mr MACKENROTH: He received \$400 for his trouble, and Pugh had to pay that. It is a disgrace.

The second matter to which I refer is the Police Complaints Tribunal. I refer particularly to a case in Gatton.

The Police Complaints Tribunal has rejected complaints that two brothers were harassed, threatened and assaulted by police in Gatton for seven months. It examined two court transcripts in which magistrates preferred evidence given by the youths and their witnesses in cases in which allegations of police brutality were involved. One magistrate had even gone on record as finding that a police officer assaulted one of the boys, Mark Ashley, then aged 16 years.

It was alleged to the tribunal that Mark and his older brother, Michael, aged 18 years, had been victimised by police at Gatton. Seven officers were named—one of them regarding five alleged assaults and another regarding three. After a nine-month investigation by a police inspector, the tribunal wrote to solicitors acting for the family to say that the matter was closed.

The solicitors were told by tribunal secretary, R. J. Holt—

“The tribunal is of the view that there is insufficient evidence to justify or to sustain any charge, either criminally or departmentally, against any person.”

Mark's doctor has stated—

“I was treating Mark for depression when he died. It was brought on by the treatment he had been receiving from the police and from the huge amount he owed in fines.”

Michael Ashley believes that the police harassment started because he was friendly with a policeman's wife. Michael states that he and his brother had been constantly pulled up, their cars subjected to compulsory and expensive machinery tests at Too-woomba and their licences lost several times because of minor defects.

In August 1983, Mark, then aged 16 years, was taken to Gatton Police Station for alleged dangerous driving. He was interrogated until 4.25 a.m. without a parent being present. This formed part of one of seven complaints to the tribunal.

Senior Constable Steven Hemsley admitted in the ensuing court case at Gatton that he knew that Mark was a juvenile, that he knew where his mother lived, and that Mark had been questioned for five hours without her presence until 4 a.m. Michael had been in another part of the station, without being arrested, and was released before his brother.

Mrs Ashley told the court that when she was called to the police station by Michael, on his release “Mark had blood all over the front of his shirt, his nose was all swollen and split, and his eyes were reddish and rather swollen looking.” A solicitor had also seen the state that Mark was in. He was then taken by his mother to hospital.

Michael and another youth, Malcolm Demrow, alleged that Mark had been badly beaten by Senior Constable Hemsley at the time his car had been stopped. Michael claims—

“Hemsley handcuffed Mark and started bashing his face into the bonnet of the police car. He was punching him in the stomach, and punching him in the face.”

Malcolm Demrow, of Lilydale Road, Ma Ma Creek, said that he saw Mark being bashed and that there had been "a fair bit of blood". Mark told the court—

"He started belting into me and kneeling me in the ribs and that...and then he handcuffed me and then he just held me by the hair and made me say, 'I'm a smart'—"

I cannot use the word because it is unparliamentary—

"and that he's a good bloke and kept bashing my head into the bonnet of the police car."

Mark told the court that he had also been beaten by Senior Constable Hemsley on previous occasions.

Magistrate R. J. Muir said—

"It is clear to me at the time there was bad feeling between the defendant child and Constable Hemsley in view of his confrontations.

When the defendant child commenced his conduct of dangerous driving he said in evidence 'I took off because I was frightened what Hemsley might or might not do.'

Well, in view of the evidence of his previous encounters with Constable Hemsley, I accept his evidence in this regard."

Of the alleged beating by Constable Hemsley, the magistrate said—

"I accept the evidence of the defendant and his witnesses in relation to what actually occurred where the defendant child was assaulted by Hemsley."

In a case in which three charges against Michael were thrown out by Magistrate O. J. Luscombe, Michael alleged that he had been beaten by Senior Constable Hemsley. Michael said that Constable Boyd Wilson had held him while Senior Constable Hemsley had bashed his face with his fist. Senior Constable Hemsley told the court that the only mark on Michael's face had been a very small, old scratch. Dr Paul Rosenberg said that Michael had come to him after the alleged assault with injuries consistent with a fall or a car accident.

Defence counsel A. C. Smith told the magistrate—

"It all adds up to one thing: harassment of the worst and most ruinous kind in terms of the image of the Police Force in this State.

It's a connected and concerted attack that has been made on my client and on others as well.

The charges were completely fabricated and arose out of this vindictive nature on the part of this police officer."

In his decision Mr Luscombe said—

"I accept the credibility of the defendant and the witnesses...the police officer acted erroneously in the execution of his duty...on the three charges I order Michael be discharged."

That is an instance in which two magistrates have found that people were bashed by police officers, yet the Police Complaints Tribunal can find nothing wrong.

I am aware that Constable Hemsley has now been shifted out of Gatton. However, I am informed that the things that Constable Hemsley taught the police officers at Gatton continue to be practised and that young people in Gatton are continually being taken to the police station and held without being arrested.

Time expired.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr SIMPSON (Cooroorra) (2.15 p.m.): It is with pleasure that I support the Minister's presentation of the Estimates for Lands, Forestry and Police. Despite the cut-back in funding to the State from Canberra, the Minister has done a tremendous job. The

performance of all departments must be viewed in that context. The budgeting performance of Queensland is a credit to prudent management.

Notwithstanding the cut-back in funds, Queensland has benefited from the provision of many new facilities, one of which is the new police station at Noosa Heads in my electorate. It now provides a 24-hour service, for which I thank the Minister and his department. Recently the Reverend Ted Noffs from Kings Cross visited Queensland. He is the person who said that all drugs coming in to Australia entered through Noosa Heads. However, his reference was to Noosa Heads being the place where members of drug rings enjoy their recreation rather than have their headquarters. Much of Australia's population holidays at Noosa.

I commend the police in that area for the job that they do. The allegations made do not stand up to scrutiny. The local superintendent of police asked the reverend gentleman to assist the police if he had useful information. He replied that his statement was based on street talk only; that he had no hard evidence. The police operate on the basis of the background and movement of visitors to the area, and I commend them on their work. The 24-hour service will be of great assistance in catering for the needs of a rapidly growing centre.

I commend also the work of the State Emergency Service, particularly following the Kin Kin disaster. A very severe storm, which was only a few hundred yards wide, demolished buildings and damaged homes and other property. It is a miracle that no-one was killed. I thank the police, the State Emergency Service, the South East Queensland Electricity Board, the Noosa Shire Council workmen and the volunteers, who effected a restoration of facilities in the area very quickly. The sudden devastation was a great shock to the people of Kin Kin.

I now confine my remarks to forestry, leaving other aspects of the Minister's responsibilities to other honourable members. There appears to be an ignorance in the community, which regards forestry-workers as merely tree-cutters. Forestry-workers operated long before the recent fad of picnicking in the bush or appreciating the beauty of rain forests and the dripping coolness of subtropical canopies that have "turned on" so many people in the world. Beautiful forestry areas have existed for many centuries. They are born, they grow, they mature, they live and they die. The process is continuous. People who call for the preservation of forests do not understand the true meaning of "preservation". They do not realise that tremendous skills, bearing in mind the soil, the climate and the flora in all its variations, have been acquired in the forestry facet of primary production. That understanding has been built up by officers of the Forestry Department, despite the fact that silviculture is not understood throughout the community. People are slowly being educated about it, and I commend the Minister for the ForEd program of education that has been introduced directly into schools. It is in schools that a greater knowledge and understanding of the work of the Forestry Department can be engendered. Young people are educated about the responsibility of Forestry Department officers in the maintenance of this important natural resource.

Although mention is often made of the emotive term "conservation", people do not understand that a greater degree of conservation is manifested by using a piece of timber to make furniture or to construct a building than by using masonry, steel or aluminium. It should be remembered that the production of aluminium involves using up a great deal of energy resources and that aluminium can be produced only by using energy reserves in fossil fuels, both liquid and solid, that have been stored over many thousands of years and can now be used as fuel.

People ought to understand that the term "conservation" means the best use of resources, for as long into the future as possible, for the good of mankind, and not for the good of animals or birds or anything else. The responsibility of managing that resource at a sustainable yield devolves upon officers of the Forestry Department, and responsibility for that is carried out year after year. Although some variation can be introduced into forestry species, depending on the degree of management required, I do not think that people understand fully that a great deal of care is taken to ensure that

appropriate forest specimens are selected. For instance, because they are good specimens, some trees are selected for seed-stock purposes, which is an example of good forestry husbandry.

Felling timber also requires special skill, so that erosion will not be caused when timber is taken from areas of steep slope and transported from the forest. Forestry officers have to ensure that forestry roads are used and that the roads are designed to cross creeks at proper places. I have given three examples to show the many aspects of forestry management that are involved in conservation techniques implemented by officers of the Forestry Department. However, one of the best ways of educating people in the understanding of a forest as a future public resource is by the provision of recreation facilities within forest areas. Time and time again, pressure is brought to bear upon the Minister and his department to turn productive forestry areas into national parks, which would bring to a close the productive life of the forest. I mention the Conondale National Park, which forms part of three Queensland electorates, that is, Somerset and Landsborough, but mostly Cooroola. It is a beautiful and productive area of Queensland, and all of the benefits that are to be found there can be utilised by the implementation of good husbandry and good conservation techniques. Application of those techniques has formed a basis for the production of timber, the preservation of particular species, maintenance of a catchment area for water supply, and enjoyment of recreational activities.

People talk about the Brisbane Forest Park area, which serves the recreational needs of the large population base of the metropolitan area. I understand that the combined activities of the park are working out particularly well. The point that should be made is that a forest recreational area provides a low-cost recreational facility. I am sure that, because of our previous discussions, Mr Booth will understand. Whereas the forest can be utilised as a timber resource, it is also an area that can be enjoyed by families from interstate and overseas who visit the forest and have a picnic.

At Gheerulla, a special area which is not near a town, has been set aside for the use of motor cycles. I commend the Minister for his foresight in this area, and his officers for the manner in which they have gone about implementing the idea. They know that there is room for improvement, and that they will learn as they go. People have to be educated to be more caring about even that use of the area.

There are other forestry uses about which people are not aware. Bush-walking is an obvious use; however, car rallies are also held on a regular basis in the area. That is an important aspect of the recreational use of the forest. Other uses of the forest include hiking and driving. A great many locals, interstate visitors and even people from overseas are discovering how enjoyable are the several forest drives in my electorate. There is every reason why those various uses of forestry areas should be retained to complement the relatively few areas that are set aside as national parks, and from which timber cannot be extracted. In Cooloola, the Conondales and on Fraser Island the recreational use of forestry areas complements the national parks.

People have to understand that they can take their families and their pets when they visit a forest park and enjoy their time out together. They cannot do the same thing in a national park; they have to leave their pets at home. People have to understand that some of the best picnic and camping sites are being made available in forest camping areas.

Another important aspect that is often overlooked is that the Forestry Department can enhance the beauty of a picnic area by planting trees. The National Parks and Wildlife Service cannot do that. Its officers are forbidden to plant trees, even native trees. Forestry Department officers are planting additional trees in camping areas to enhance their beauty. They have an understanding and a knowledge of the resource on which they are working without the restrictions imposed on national parks.

Future generations will realise the wisdom of this Government, this Minister and the department as far as selective logging in the Palmerston area is concerned. A lot has been said about Downey Creek and the specialised timber resource that is being harvested

there. No doubt members have seen the beautiful timber that has been used in this building. Nowadays timber of that quality in a solid form is extremely expensive, and most people can afford to use it only in a veneer form. Such timber enhances the beauty of people's living areas and the whole environment, both built and natural. Many rare species of timber are produced in Queensland's rain forest areas, and with good management a sustainable yield will continue to be available.

It is important to remember that the rain forests of north Queensland are special in that the trees in them grow more luxuriantly than they do in southern Queensland. I believe that the Palmerston forest area, which is well serviced by the Palmerston Highway, will become a world-renowned attraction. I believe that it will ultimately achieve national park status. Before it achieves that status, however, I hope that an international resort can be built in the area. If that is done, the department can so order the construction and design of walkways in the rain forest as to enable people to understand and appreciate the top canopy, the middle canopy and the floor of the forest. Officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service in Innisfail put forward a scheme relative to such walkways, and they seemed to be a good idea. However, when it was looked at closely, it was found to be not practical with walkways hanging from the trees.

As you know, Mr Booth, trees are blown over in storms. The Government could not adopt the proposals put forward. The structures must be so designed that they are safe for people while they are having wonderful experiences. When I was in Yosemite, I saw the natural beauties and the way in which they were managed. If our forests and other areas are managed properly, people will have marvellous educational and recreational experiences, which will influence them to return.

Much of the beautiful Palmerston rain forest area has not been trodden by man. Although someone suggested that the Aborigines were the last to walk through it, I doubt that they would have troubled to go through the dense country when there were easier ways of getting around it. I am sure that, in future, the Queensland Government will be renowned internationally for the way in which it is looking after that area.

The Government is gaining good experience in managing Fraser Island. The ongoing multiple use of the island has gained much publicity. The Forestry Department is to be commended on what has been done. Improvements will be further enhanced thanks to the access charge to be levied on island visitors. Roads will be improved and maintained to carry additional people.

The Government wants to encourage people to visit the State's wonderful natural attractions. Reputedly, surveys carried out concerning Cooloola indicated that people wanted the whole of the area to be incorporated as a national park because of the number of people visiting it. The fallacy in that statement is that 90 per cent of visitors are fishermen, not park-users. The Government must look beyond such arguments to determine where the truth lies and what is sensible management, having in mind the track record of those in charge of the area. It knows that it is on a winner in providing wonderful experiences for people and, at the same time, getting the maximum from the resource.

Similar results will be achieved in Conondale. Fauna studies have been carried out to determine the effects of harvesting of timber and multiple use. I am sure that they will reveal nothing more than forestry officers have known for a long time, but the effects will be set down.

People who are interested in the Conondale area should read a number of books. I have in my hand booklets entitled *Forestry Management in Queensland*, part 1 and part 2. Everyone interested in national sites and in recreation in forestry and national parks should study these booklets.

Another excellent publication, *Rainforests*, relates to the way in which rain forest is being managed in Queensland. The Government is doing a first-class job in that field. When rain forests are adjacent to water areas, they are left untouched. In south

Queensland, only timbers in the open sclerophyll area and the wet sclerophyll area—not the wet forest area—are harvested. The Government is, and always has been, very mindful of that. The departmental officers have picked out the beauty spots and preserved them. That is why people say that they should be national parks. That is not so. Forestry workers have been wonderful in their management.

The publications that I mentioned set out what has always been done by the forestry officers. The picture is presented in a very readable way. We should let children know what is going on. In terms of conservation, despite the emotive outbursts in the media, the true worth of forestry in Queensland is realised much better than in other places throughout the world. The whole world could not be a national park. If it were, it would be completely unproductive and no-one would be able to live in it.

Timber is an important resource. Consider the amount of paper that we in this Chamber use. It is part of the timber resource, and much of the furniture that we use and the buildings in which we live are made from timber. It is an enhancement of the natural ingredient.

Time expired.

Mr HAMILL (Ipswich) (2.35 p.m.): These Estimates contain the Votes for the Departments of Lands, Forestry and Police. Although not especially significant in terms of total Budget outlays, they are very important, for, in one way or another, those departments touch upon the day-to-day life of every Queenslander.

The combined total of \$271m of consolidated revenue represents only 5.4 per cent of total outlays from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. However, it can be seen from the departmental accounts that it is the Police Department that is the big-spending department, with an allocation in excess of \$226m. Although there is to be an increase in staff, the police force, even with the proposed additional personnel, will remain severely understaffed.

When looking at staffing, one sees that the Lands Department will experience a slight fall in staff numbers this year and its allocation of funds will decline in real terms. I hope that that will not devalue the importance of the department in the eyes of the rest of the bureaucracy, because the Lands Department discharges a variety of duties through bodies such as the Land Administration Commission and the Land Court, both of which are constituted under provisions of the Land Act.

Although legislation pertaining to the Lands Department cannot be debated this afternoon, the cost effectiveness of its machinery is certainly a legitimate matter for discussion. As well as establishing the machinery of land administration, the Act provides for a variety of tenures and outlines the respective powers and rights of the Crown and occupiers in the event of alterations to titles, for example, through resumptions. The Land Act itself devotes Part 12 to roads. Sections 362 to 369 of Division 1 deal with the dedication, opening and closure of roads, and sections 370 to 378 of Division 2 deal with the Minister's power to construct roads. It is with that portion of the administration of the Lands Department that I will deal this afternoon.

Last Wednesday, I told the Assembly of a matter that, in my opinion, amounted to a disgusting and shameful abuse of ministerial power and a clear case of conflict of interest in the administration of the public policy of this State. I referred, of course, to the scandal of the relocation of the Tamborine-Oxenford Road at the behest of the family company of the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze). I referred to the use of tax-payers' money by the Department of Main Roads to fund a project primarily designed to provide substantial financial benefits to enrich the Minister's family company, Maralinga Pty Ltd. I referred to the involvement, or the apparent lack of involvement, of the Lands Department in this sordid affair.

Over the last week, honourable members have been treated to some extraordinary revelations, which have given the Parliament and the public an insight into the maladministration of this Government and into the way in which the National Party condones

the use of ministerial office for personal gain. The cover-up—the whitewash—began last Thursday with the Premier's claim that the rerouting of the road was justified, and that he had checked out my allegations late on Wednesday and concluded that they could not be justified. The Premier led the Chamber to believe that he had got to the bottom of the issue in but a few hours. Therefore, it was strange when, on Thursday morning, the Minister for Main Roads had one of his convenient lapses of memory during question-time and told the Assembly, in answer to a question on notice in the name of my colleague the member for Rockhampton (Mr Braddy)—

“The information he seeks will take considerable research and I will advise him of the details by letter in due course.”

That contrasts with the statement by the Minister for Lands (Mr Glasson), who was able to answer a similarly detailed question on 24 hours' notice.

In view of the comments by the Minister for Main Roads to the effect that he needed more time to research the answer, it was strange that his staff had not shown him the Main Roads Department booklet that was prepared for the official opening of the new section of the Tamborine-Oxenford Road on 20 September 1985. Certainly, a member of the Minister's staff had plenty of copies to pass round the press gallery, but it was a shame that he did not show one to the Minister in order to help him answer Mr Braddy's question.

The night before, the Minister's office put round the story that it was the Albert Shire Council and not the Minister's family company, Maralinga Pty Ltd, through its consulting engineers, Burchill and Partners, that sought the relocation of the road. Sadly for the Minister for Main Roads, that furphy has also been put to rest. The chairman of the Albert Shire Council, Councillor Bill Laver, stated that the council had not sought the rerouting of the road but that, on many occasions, it had asked for the old causeway crossing to be upgraded. Councillor Laver's comments have been corroborated by the Albert Shire Clerk, Mr Terry Moore, who confirmed that, for years, the Albert Shire Council had sought the upgrading of that crossing.

Talk about closing the stable door after the horse has bolted! This morning, a letter from Councillor Laver relating to this very important matter was tabled in this Assembly and incorporated in *Hansard*. It was received by the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing only yesterday. In that letter, Councillor Laver wrote about what he called public pressure for the upgrading of the crossing. He mentioned a study conducted for the Albert Shire Council by Cameron McNamara and Partners into extractive industry, controls over extractive industry and the possible relocation of the road network. The report of those consultants was the basis for the road relocation.

Councillor Laver's letter also added that Burchill and Partners prepared a modified version of the road relocation suggested by Cameron McNamara and Partners. This is the same plan that was described by Mr Geoffrey Burchill in *The Weekend Australian* of 12-13 October as “innovative planning”. Mr Burchill, the managing director of Burchill and Partners, added that the road relocation was his idea and that he had been acting for Maralinga Pty Ltd since about 1976. None of these matters came before the Parliament.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Booth): Order! I would like the member for Ipswich to explain the relevance of this material to the Estimates under debate.

Mr HAMILL: Indeed that becomes very clear in my next paragraph.

As I said, the Minister for Main Roads has not been forthcoming——

Mr FitzGerald: Are you reading from something?

Mr HAMILL: I have notes written in my own handwriting.

The Minister for Main Roads has shown contempt for the Parliament. Of course, the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police did not show the same sort of contempt that was shown by the Minister for Main Roads who, this morning, was continually reticent in answering questions on this subject.

What I wish to address is the input of the Lands Department in this affair. That is quite competent in terms of the administration of this department. Last Thursday, in answer to a question in the name of the member for Rockhampton (Mr Braddy), the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police made some truly remarkable revelations. The question referred to Road Case 44352, which concerns the Tamborine-Oxenford Road. The Minister's answer bears close examination. He was asked, "Has there been a gazetted closure of that segment of the old road between the Coomera River crossing downstream from the weir and the township of Upper Coomera?" The Minister gave a very clear, one-word answer—"No". I thank the Minister for that very clear answer.

Mr SIMPSON: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member is speaking from a prepared speech. As I understand it, in this Chamber that is not allowed. Mr Booth, I ask for your ruling.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! My ruling is that it happens so often in this Chamber that I do not think the honourable member could expect me to rule against the member on his feet.

Mr HAMILL: Mr Booth, I thank you. I am speaking from copious notes. The member for Cooroola would know that you cannot teach an old dog new tricks.

It is a pity that the Minister for Main Roads, unlike his colleague the Minister for Lands, is unable to give unequivocal answers. If the Minister for Lands is not already aware of it, let me inform him that the old road to which that question referred is now a cul-de-sac—it is impassable to traffic. However, it is used as a convenience by gravel trucks transporting the valuable gravel output of Maralinga Pty Ltd. As the Minister for Main Roads also told the Chamber this morning, the road is also used by Maralinga trucks to carry grain, silage and topsoil.

The Minister was asked—

"Has the owner of land adjoining that segment of the road referred to in (1) applied for the permanent closure of the road pursuant to provisions of the Land Act?"

The Minister for Lands replied—

"Not formally; however, consultants acting for the owners indicated to the Department of Lands, on 16 February 1984, an intention to seek permanent closure of such road area when construction of an alternative road has been completed through their client's property. The Lands Department informed the consultants on 5 June 1984 that the application for permanent road closure will be considered when the new road is constructed and is open for public use. No further approach has yet been received in this matter."

The letter to the Lands Department, over the signature of H. A. Parker, of Burchill and Partners Pty Ltd, Surfers Paradise, reads—

"On behalf of Maralinga Pty. Ltd., in relation to the quarry operation at Oxenford and the proposal, which has been agreed to by the Main Roads Department for the relocation of part of the Oxenford/Tamborine road."

Attached to that correspondence was a copy of a letter to the Main Roads Department, also over H. A. Parker's signature, in which it was revealed that the road was to be relocated across Maralinga's land (Lot 50—RP 142656) and that the section of road to be made redundant would be "used as a haul road for gravel trucks when quarrying commences on portion 50". It would also appear, from that answer by the Minister for Lands, that correspondence concerning the closure of that section of road ceased in June 1984.

When asked by the honourable member for Rockhampton whether the Crown had acquired any land for the purpose of relocating the road, the Minister for Lands told Parliament that no land had been acquired by his department. This morning, the Minister for Main Roads told Parliament that the land now occupied by the new road was Crown

land administered by the Land Administration Commission. All I want to know is who is telling the truth. Is it or is it not Crown land? Is it under the control of the Land Administration Commission?

Mr Simpson: That is what he said.

Mr HAMILL: Last week, the Minister for Lands said that no land had been acquired by his department. The two statements from the two Ministers do not jell.

In passing, the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police could also have added, with reference to part 8 of that question that he was asked concerning compensation, that in the letter of 16 February 1984 to the Land Administration Commission from H. A. Parker of Burchill and Partners Pty Ltd, Maralinga Pty Ltd sought a swap of the old road reserve for the new road reserve by way of compensation for the land given over the new road, the relocation of which it had successfully sought. The letter suggested that Maralinga should pay only for the difference in area between the two strips of land. As the Minister would well know, that type of formula is clearly at variance with standard procedures.

This morning, honourable members heard from the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) that the compensation issue with the Land Administration Commission was still open and awaiting a further approach to the commission by Maralinga.

The most extraordinary revelation of all was, however, left to the end. When the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police was asked whether the new road had been dedicated to public use and, if so, when, the Minister provided this truly fascinating response—

“I have no knowledge of whether the proposed new road has been dedicated to public use.”

However, Mr Hinze officially opened this proposed new road on 20 September. Perhaps the Minister whose responsibilities embrace the dedication of roads was not invited. Not only that; perhaps he was not even told.

What is the status of this new road that passes over Maralinga's land? After all, this road was built at a cost of \$865,000, as the Main Roads Department brochure now tells us. Or was it \$885,000, if the figure used this morning by the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing is correct? The fact is that the road was paid for with almost \$600,000 from public funds. This road was constructed at the behest of and for the benefit of the family company of the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing.

I ask the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police: Is this road a public thoroughfare, or is it a private road built over private property? It is incredible that the Minister responsible could not tell us that when he was asked that question last week. It must surely be a phantom road. Even after its official opening, it still did not appear on the working plans in the Lands Department. How does the Minister explain that? Weeks after its official opening, no plan had been registered at the Titles Office depicting the new road and consequential subdivisions. Has the Main Roads Department and its Minister cut corners to build the new road for Maralinga's benefit, or is the staff of the Lands Department incompetent? Is that department headed by an equally incompetent Minister? It is either one or the other. Who is it to be, Mr Hinze or Mr Glasson? Who is responsible?

In my speech last Wednesday, I made a series of allegations. Nothing that has transpired since then has shaken my belief in the substance of those allegations.

Mr SIMPSON: I rise to a point of order. I note that the press are reading, page by page, the same speech as the honourable member is making. I wonder who wrote it for him.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr HAMILL: Indeed, it may well be said that the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing misled the House with his frequent denials by way of points of order—as spurious as the point of order that was just taken—during my speech last Wednesday. He further misled the House this morning when, in answer to a question from the Leader of the Opposition, he denied that out of this project a benefit accrued to Maralinga. He contradicted himself, because he had already told the House that Maralinga Pty Ltd received royalties from the gravel on its land. Mr Booth, as you would know, a royalty is a financial return. Contrary to the Minister's protestations, it is clearly a financial benefit.

Let me repeat the charge that I directed at the Minister for Main Roads: this amounts to a gross conflict of interest whereby, at the instigation of the family company of the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing, the Department of Main Roads has spent public money on a project primarily designed to provide substantial financial benefits to enrich the family company of the Minister for Main Roads, Local Government and Racing, Mr Russell James Hinze.

If this prosecution needs any other witness to convince the people of Queensland of the truth of this allegation, let us go no further than Mr Geoffrey Burchill of Burchill and Partners Pty Ltd. Mr Burchill should know the answers. His firm has acted for Maralinga Pty Ltd for almost a decade. It negotiated the original zoning approval for the Hinze family's gravel business. Mr Burchill designed the road, and Mr Burchill dreamed up the idea of relocating the Tamborine-Oxenford Road.

What did he have to say? He stated—

“I suggested relocating the road because I could see that it was a way to make the whole extractive operation much more efficient.”

Burchill was acting for his client, Maralinga. He must have been instructed so to do. The Minister knew of the council's interest in upgrading the road. He would have known about the submissions of Cameron McNamara and Partners and the discussions that ensued between the Albert Shire Council and the Main Roads Department. After all, it was the modified plan of Burchill and Partners, the consulting engineers of Maralinga Pty Ltd, which the Minister responsible for main roads ultimately approved.

It is quite clear that the Hinze gravel business was the primary interest. It would reap a magnificent return from a comparatively small contribution to the cost of the new road. The documentation is clear that the extension of the gravel extraction to portion 50 of the land owned by Maralinga would yield more royalties to Maralinga. A pecuniary benefit would accrue to Maralinga Pty Ltd.

As for the poor old public—for years the Main Roads Department had ignored the representations of the shire council to upgrade the crossing. Now, with the interest of Maralinga acting as a catalyst, as the Main Roads Department brochure described it the Minister for Main Roads—who, after all, gives such projects his stamp of approval—decided to commit public money to the project, which was, to use the words of Mr Burchill, a project “To make the whole extractive operation much more efficient”. Whose extractive operation? The extractive operation of the family company of the Minister for Main Roads, of course, from which it derives income through royalties.

One area remains to be explored. Did the Minister for Main Roads breach the Premier's code of conduct for cases in which a conflict of interest may arise? The code itself is far from satisfactory. However, it was outlined by the Premier in answer to a question as recently as 28 August, when this same Minister was embroiled in the Oxenford TAB licence controversy. The rule of the Premier is that—

Mr ROW: I rise to a point of order. I refer to Standing Order No. 120, which reads—

“A Member shall not digress from the subject-matter under discussion, or comment upon expressions used by another Member on a previous Debate of the

same Session; and all imputations of improper motives, and all personal reflections, shall be deemed highly disorderly."

My point of order is that the honourable member for Ipswich has contravened that Standing Order.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Booth): Order! The honourable member for Ipswich has digressed from the subject-matter. I drew the attention of the honourable member to that fact, and he returned to the matter under debate. The debate during the previous session has previously been mentioned, but I do not know whether or not it was in the same context.

As to the imputations of improper motives and all personal reflections—unfortunately, the Minister is not present to take exception. In the light of that, I will allow the honourable member for Ipswich to continue.

Mr SIMPSON: I rise to a point of order. I do not see the relevance of the TAB to the Estimates under debate.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The TAB?

Mr SIMPSON: That is what he just said.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: I did not hear that.

Mr HAMILL: The honourable member for Cooroola is not listening. I said that it is a rule of the Premier that, if a Minister has an interest in a matter, he must declare his interest and, therefore, not take part in the decision-making on the matter.

The Premier told the people of Queensland that the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing did not disclose his very substantial personal interest in the Tamborine-Oxenford road relocation when the matter came before Cabinet or Executive Council. In view of that, it is clear that the Minister for Main Roads has breached the Premier's code of conduct. The penalty is clear. The Premier is obliged to remove the Minister if the Minister does not tender his resignation.

This week, in the press, the Minister for Main Roads accused me of being Inspector Clouseau. This afternoon, I brought along my magnifying glass. When I focus it on the statement made by the Minister this morning, I find the statement to be so full of holes that it would not hold water. Goldfinger has been caught with his fingers in the till. It is up to the Premier to remove this festering sore of corruption from his Government.

Mr HENDERSON (Mount Gravatt) (2.54 p.m.): Although I have a great deal of pleasure in participating in this debate, I do not have a great deal of pleasure in following the honourable member for Ipswich.

Mr DAVIS: I rise to a point of order. I do not like to do this, but I notice that the honourable member for Mount Gravatt is reading from a prepared speech. I want to make it clear that if that is what Government members do, it is what Opposition members will do.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I call the honourable member for Mount Gravatt.

Mr HENDERSON: It never ceases to amaze me that the honourable member for Ipswich does not have the courage to make his allegations in George Street. It is indeed interesting to hear a Rhodes scholar talking about roads. The only thing wrong with this Rhodes scholar is that he specialises in gutters.

I was very interested in the speech made by the honourable member for Chatsworth (Mr Mackenroth). I wish to refer to both of the incidents about which he spoke. The first related to starting-price operations, his allegation being that the police have not acted properly. I would have thought that the appropriate forum in which to raise such an allegation is the Queensland Police Complaints Tribunal.

Mr Goss: What an absolute waste of time that would be.

Mr HENDERSON: Could the honourable member for Chatsworth explain to the Parliament why that matter has not been referred to the appropriate statutory authority?

Mr Goss: Because it takes two years to hear it and then it does not do anything about it.

Mr Borbidge: Mr Goss suggests that the tribunal is a waste of time.

Mr HENDERSON: It is a pity that the honourable member for Salisbury did not say to His Honour Judge Pratt, QC, out on the street that he was hopeless.

Perhaps the real reason is that no publicity would be obtained by referring the matter to the Police Complaints Tribunal. In short, the opportunity for publicity overrides all other considerations, including the civil and legal rights of others.

The second matter raised by the honourable member for Chatsworth is even sadder. It relates to alleged police misconduct at Gatton. I wish to relate to the committee the background of the matter.

A Mr Steve Bishop of *Sunday Sun* has been pursuing the issue, I gather, for some time. As a result of his investigations, he obtained quite an amount of information. However, once he had compiled his report, legal advisers for *Sunday Sun* counselled the newspaper not to run the story, as the paper would be exposing itself to legal action for defamation. I gather that the legal advisers felt that *Sunday Sun* could well be the object of a massive damages suit. Why was that advice given? The answer, simply, is that the evidence does not support the allegations.

Not to be outdone, Mr Bishop then desperately sought an MLA to raise the matter in the Parliament. By so doing, he deliberately sought to circumvent the legal rights of citizens. Parliamentary processes were thus prostituted by sensationalism and publicity. The honourable member for Salisbury (Mr Goss) was approached, but apparently refused to deal with the issue. Therefore, I gather, it was handed to the honourable member for Chatsworth, who appears to have had no hesitation in raising it.

I put it to the Committee that it represents a serious abuse of the processes of law. It is a deliberate attempt to negate the laws of defamation by using Parliament as a kangaroo court. *Sunday Sun* and Steve Bishop are to be condemned for such despicable action. If they were so convinced that they were right, perhaps they ought to have had the guts to run the story instead of running what is said in Parliament. Is it any wonder that the Parliament is referred to as "coward's castle"?

This afternoon, I shall be writing to Mr Speaker, suggesting that, as a matter of urgency, because of the disgusting misuse of parliamentary privilege by the honourable member for Chatsworth, his speech be referred to the Select Committee of Privileges.

I congratulate the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police (Hon. W. H. Glasson) on the ministerial leadership of his portfolio. He does not have an easy job. I am sure that the Parliament recognises that his portfolio can, at times, be both controversial and demanding. Despite that, the Minister has performed in a very creditable way. I am especially impressed with the courteous and efficient manner in which all matters that I have addressed to him have been dealt with. In addition, I must say that his performance in the Parliament has been very good indeed.

My contribution to this debate is confined to the police section of the Minister's portfolio. I shall devote much of the time available to me to examining the application of technology to modern policing, and to the Police Complaints Tribunal.

I am impressed by the way in which the Queensland Police Department is pursuing an active program designed to ensure that modern technology is employed as fully as possible in every facet of policing in this State. When one thinks of modern technology, one inevitably thinks of computers. Hence, I believe that it is appropriate to begin my exploration of technology by drawing the attention of the Committee to computerisation within the Queensland Police Department.

The police computer arrived in May 1984, and, since then, the Queensland Police Department has established itself as one of the most efficient and effective users of computing equipment in the world, particularly in the area of law enforcement. In just three months after the arrival of their computer the Police Department had developed operational systems that were available 24 hours a day, seven days a week to many police stations throughout the State. Currently, 72 police locations outside the police headquarters have around-the-clock access to the information on the police computer.

Because of the size of Queensland, the police computer network is probably the most extensive of any State police computer network throughout the world. It is expected that, by the end of this year, 300 terminals will be available in no fewer than 120 police locations in Queensland. What this means is that all those country stations can update and inquire about the information which, before computerisation was available only at head office.

A computer-to-computer link with the New South Wales police computer allows direct access by country police to national police information held in Sydney. The link will be expanded this year to include more information, as well as access to other police computers. These intercomputer connections represent significant advances in the ability of police forces to combat crime.

Locally, the police computer has been linked to the Main Roads Department computer. Information regarding new vehicle registrations is passed to the police computer and it is checked against the police "vehicles of interest" file. Through the use of these modern techniques, cars that are stolen are located and returned much quicker. In fact, in many cases cars have been located before they have been reported stolen.

The computer has assisted directly in bringing to justice car thieves, child-molesters, house-breakers and many other offenders, including one person who committed murder. It has given considerable assistance in locating people to give them urgent messages from concerned relatives.

During the year, with the assistance of the Commonwealth Employment Service, 64 previously unemployed persons converted the information held on cards in head office to the computer. This now means that, through that names index, people are being located more quickly.

The cost of the police computer has not been excessive as compared to similar establishments; in fact, its cost has been considerably less. In December 1983, Executive Council approved an expenditure of \$6.3m. The expenditure in this Budget is part of that expenditure.

Until now, the Police Department has been using an interim computer in preparation for the delivery of the latest technology computer this year. The major cost in this Budget will be the purchase of that computer.

Possibly the most exciting breakthrough in the use of computers in police work in the last 10 years is the use of computers to match fingerprints. The fingerprint is still one of the best methods of identifying criminals; but, until now, that identification has been hampered by the time taken to manually research the fingerprint library. A feasibility study is currently being conducted with a view to computerising fingerprint searches, and it is expected that equipment will be purchased next year that will be compatible with the fingerprint computer currently being installed in the New South Wales Police Department.

I now direct my attention to the role of the Police Complaints Tribunal. The tribunal was set up in May 1982 to provide citizens of this State with an independent body to investigate complaints alleging misconduct, improper conduct or neglect of duty by members of the Queensland Police Force. It was not intended that the tribunal infringe upon the rights of the Commissioner of Police to discipline his members, and the people of Queensland were given a choice of where to lodge complaints.

The members of the tribunal have worked diligently in this sensitive area and, as well as displaying impartiality, have exercised care and consideration for all parties involved—be they complainant, or police officer.

The tribunal is recognised, both here in Queensland and in other States, as being an outstanding success. The recognition that the tribunal is receiving with the public of Queensland is indicated by the fact that a greater number of aggrieved citizens are now choosing to use the tribunal than in its earlier days. The overall ratio of complaints received by the Police Department as against the tribunal, over the last three and a half years, is 2.5:1. However, there has been a marked change in that ratio during this year, to the extent that the ratio is now 1.6:1. These figures are not intended to convey that the overall number of complaints against police in this State is increasing, but does clearly show that the tribunal is receiving a greater share, thus indicating the tribunal's wider public acceptance.

Recently, the South Australian Government set up its own Police Complaints Authority. Although the Act setting up the authority is not entirely the same as the Queensland Act, it is clear that the Queensland Police Complaints Tribunal has been used as a model.

Earlier this year, a Police Complaints Authority was set up in England to investigate complaints relating to the 48 police forces in England and Wales. The new authority replaced the Police Complaints Board, which had been in operation for about seven years. The board was a reviewing body, and the authority has been provided with much wider powers, which include an investigative role. The members of Queensland's tribunal are aware that, prior to the setting up of this new authority, senior officials in London expressed considerable interest in the operations of the Queensland Tribunal.

A major feature of the Queensland Act is the tribunal's function to consider matters of public knowledge with a view to exercising its discretion whether or not to investigate such complaints. There is no doubt that the Queensland Police Complaints Tribunal is a leader in its field in that regard.

The members of the tribunal are not satisfied with merely maintaining the present level of success, but are constantly reviewing the tribunal's performance, seeking to ensure that procedures are of the highest possible standard.

I have been informed that the tribunal members took considerable interest in the recent debate on the Police Complaints Tribunal Act Amendment Bill recently passed by this Parliament. As members will recall, the amendments included the provision for the appointment of a deputy chairman and an additional tribunal member. I understand that the comments made during the debate will be considered by the tribunal with a view to improving any areas perceived as deficiencies.

The tribunal does recognise and is concerned that it is not in as good a position as it would like to be in respect of dealing with complaints outside the south-east Queensland area. This is one aspect which the tribunal proposes to pursue in the coming years. The tribunal is of the view that all citizens in Queensland are entitled to the same service as that provided to citizens in south-east Queensland. Needless to say, time and money are important factors in seeking to improve this aspect, but every endeavour will be made to rectify this problem as time progresses.

The honourable member for Mulgrave (Mr Menzel) will pursue further some of the issues relative to the scientific activities of the Queensland Police Force, and I shall leave them to him.

Finally, I wish the Minister and all members of the Queensland Police Force an excellent year in 1985-86. On behalf of the public of Queensland, I wish to thank all police men and women in Queensland for the job that they are doing. I do appreciate it, and I thank them all very sincerely indeed.

Mr KRUGER (Murrumba) (3.9 p.m.): First of all, I wish to deal with a number of the points made earlier today by the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police (Mr Glasson). He said—

“The Land Act has a very long history, nonetheless it is being continually updated to meet changing community needs and demands.”

Such sentiments are commonly expressed by the Minister. He also said—

“The Government’s policies of offering more secure tenures to primary producers is but one example of that. More recent changes have addressed problems relative to the unlawful occupation of Crown lands, roads and reserves, and with coexisting tenures under the Land Act and Mining Act.”

Let me deal first with the changes in land tenure. I have on several occasions debated that issue with this Minister and the former Minister. I wonder whether the recent changes to the structure of land tenure have been an improvement. I raise this question because the method of freeholding can result in all sorts of problems. In most cases the system is not abused, but it certainly can be abused, and I will later cite a case to illustrate the point I want to make, that is, that the present method of freeholding does make it quite simple to freehold what was leasehold land.

Under lease arrangements, the Government has some control over soil erosion but, under freehold tenure, the Government can do little. Under leasehold tenure, the Government can determine stocking arrangements and timber-felling and generally have overriding control. The Government can certainly exercise control over leasehold land, but its job is much more difficult with freehold land. A person who has a freehold property with stands of timber and soil erosion often has the idea that it is his property and he can do what he wishes with it. That is not always so, but that is how many property-owners feel. In my opinion, the former lease arrangements were of great advantage to the State because they gave the Government some control over the future.

Quite a deal has been done about the unlawful occupation of Crown lands and road reserves.

Mr Glasson: You are not in favour of freehold land?

Mr KRUGER: I am talking generally about the rural sector and grazing properties, where most of the freeholding has taken place. The lease arrangements gave the Government a great deal of control, but much freeholding has taken place. In some areas, graziers are quite happy to lease land but, in other areas, close to the coast, much freeholding has taken place, deals have been done, and problems have arisen.

The Minister referred to the Young Farmer Establishment Scheme. I am sure that all honourable members are very pleased with it. However, the Government has not gone as far as it should. I am a little concerned about the people who get on the land under this scheme. Under the Labor Party’s schemes, people got on the land. Because of the better conditions, many more people had an opportunity to get onto the land. From what I have heard about the Young Farmer Establishment Scheme, it seems that applicants have to be almost millionaires to participate.

Mr Davis: Literally only a handful have got on.

Mr KRUGER: A few National Party supporters, families of former graziers, and so on have got into the scheme. I should like to see it broadened, with the land being subdivided to allow many more people onto properties.

I am a little worried about people being able to get onto their first viable rural property. Very few properties are really viable. I should like to think that, in some way, the Government will improve the viability of properties before putting young people on the land. The Minister may say that that is the idea of selecting the people favoured by the Government, because they will make it work. However, the economy is such that it is not as easy to work a property today as it was 10 or 15 years ago. The Government must take into account the viability of properties when it is putting people onto the

land. If the Government is to be able to say, "Go onto the land. This is your first viable property," it must be able to give an assurance of good returns from it.

The Dairy Industry Adjustment Scheme continues to aid the rationalisation of the dairy industry. That sounds fairly good but, unfortunately, the dairy industry has got itself into many problems. Although the Minister is playing a reasonable role, the desired results are not being achieved, because of the problems associated with the industry.

Research into the control of rubber vine and other noxious weeds is to be commended. A bigger allocation should be made for their control. The problems need to be tackled, and the more that can be done the better it will be. On a number of occasions, the Minister and I have looked at some of the tests taking place. Certainly they are worthwhile projects. Chemical and biological controls are being tested. In the long term, biological control may be the answer to many of the problems. I hope that the Minister's officers can make a breakthrough in this area, because many benefits will accrue to people on the land from such control. Chemicals are expensive and, unfortunately, dangers are associated with their use in the control of noxious weeds.

I turn now to discuss the Police Department's Estimates. The Minister stated that the scope and strength of the Juvenile Aid Bureau has been expanded over recent years to combat the growing number of juvenile offenders. The emphasis is placed on prevention, and I commend the Minister and his department for that attitude. Unfortunately, the Government is not spending enough to achieve a real result and too few police officers are in the field. However, the intention is right, and I would like to think that the young people who are moving off the straight and narrow because of the opportunities that are put in front of them can be helped. Without doubt, many young people are under the influence of others who lead them astray, and if that practice can be stamped out before it gets out of hand, well and good. I know that, as a result of the work of a number of police officers in my electorate, young people have come back onto the straight and narrow. If enough officers are employed and can get on top of this problem, that will prove to be of great benefit to the State.

On a number of occasions, I have made comments—which have not been contradicted—about land scandals that have occurred in Queensland. Queensland is a growing State, and it is clear that a lack of control has resulted in a number of scandalous deals. The Russell Island affair is a good example, and, because of the Government's involvement, I even class the Iwasaki development as a scandal. I remember trying to locate documents, which were actually in Brisbane, concerning Hamilton Island. Mr Williams was developing land on that island long before the lease arrangements were finalised, which is contrary to the intent of the legislation.

At the time, the local council considered taking Mr Williams to court to make sure that he had a permit to construct certain buildings on the island. Even though it had been brought to the attention of the Minister for Lands, Mr Williams carried on with his development and even constructed an airstrip. If it had been anywhere else, and if Keith Williams had not been involved, at that stage the development would not have been allowed to occur.

Other examples include the Coomera development and the South Stradbroke Island development, which involved co-ownership. I could go on and on listing a number of land scandals in this State. Indeed, I can produce evidence that shows that, for the little people, things are handled differently from the way in which they are handled for the big people.

I recall the time when the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr Casey) called for an inquiry into an incident involving Crown land in which the developer Miran-Khan, 18 months after he paid \$40,000 for it, offered beachfront land near Mackay for \$1.9m. Miran-Khan acquired the grazing homestead lease land from the State and converted it to freehold. He defended the development on the grounds that he had spent \$1m to

freehold the land and to put in roads, water, electricity and drainage. At the time, the local council expressed the following concern about the development—

“The Sarina Shire Council is concerned that an area of vacant Crown land near Armstrongs Beach is to become freehold for tourist development purposes.

The land, at Freshwater Point, between Sarina Inlet and Llewellyn Bay, is already partly occupied by a tourist accommodation development established by Mr J. R. Miran-Khan.

Mr Miran-Khan has applied to the Minister for Lands and Forestry for the land to be made freehold.

The Sarina Shire Council has told the Minister it believes the land will be lost to public use if it is declared freehold.”

That occurred in 1982, and, having read the article, I wrote to the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police, from whom I received a reasonable but quite confusing reply. Although it is some years ago, it is worth mentioning because it highlights the difficulties with the new system of freeholding land.

The Minister’s reply reads—

“I have your letter of 10th June, 1982 in relation to the future dealing with Crown land in the vicinity of Armstrong Beach.

The only land in the locality which will become available to the Crown for dealing with, is an area of land on the sea frontage running westerly from Freshwater Point and which is presently held under Occupation License by Mr Rahim Miran-Khan. A plan of the area is attached.

The particular parcel of land was formerly part of a pastoral holding obtained from Mr Miran-Khan by way of surrender in return for the grant to him of a grazing selection tenure over the balance of the holding (portion 116) which has now been converted to freehold tenure.”

He has converted that land to freehold tenure. In the request for that conversion, he has surrendered some of the property.

The letter continues—

“An Occupation License carries with it no freeholding entitlement and may be cancelled at any time in respect of the whole or part thereof on three (3) months’ notice given by the Minister to the licensee.”

Recently, I saw a letter which stated—

“Could the ALP have an inquiry into the freeholding of land by one Miran-Khan (who can hardly speak English) of one of the best parcels of coastal land in Central Queensland.

I believe Khan freeholded the first parcel for approximately \$2 an acre & resold for \$10,000 an acre.

The second parcel of beach front land of 3 to 4 hundred acres has now been freeholded for the price of a 24 perch allotment.”

I cannot say whether that allegation is 100 per cent correct, but I ask the Minister to clarify, either in his response or at some other time, whether the owner of that parcel of land that was surrendered received special treatment, either recently or some years back. I have received no more information on that matter, which has been brought to my attention. It could be that the Minister has a reasonable explanation. If the Minister can clarify the matter, that would clear it up once and for all. I do not intend to try to smear the Minister or the department. I make the request and I seek an answer as soon as possible. The explanation might be quite acceptable.

In turning to the Police section of the Minister’s portfolio, I shall be a little parochial. As the Minister and his staff would be aware, the Redcliffe Police Station is the centre for operations in my electorate, which has a limited night patrol. That patrol has to

cover Caboolture, Bribie Island, Petrie and various other areas. That is a very wide area to cover. The night patrol consists of one car with a couple of officers. A few years ago, I had to wait almost 1½ hours for a police car to come to attend to a problem that I had at home. I do not condemn the police officer. He had been on duty at a road accident, which meant that nobody was on night patrol duty. I know that since then things have been improved, but there is much room left for improvement. Because of that matter, I wrote to the Minister on 1 February 1983, and I received a reply from him dated 10 March 1983. The Minister said—

“I refer to your letter of 1 February 1983 in relation to accommodation at and the allocation of an additional motor vehicle for Petrie Police Station.

I have had these matters investigated and wish to inform you that provision will be included on the 1983/84 Estimates of the Police Department for the allocation of an additional motor vehicle for Petrie Police Station.

An application was received in March 1982 for alterations to be carried out to provide additional office accommodation at Petrie. Due to the limited funds available this work could not be undertaken by the Department of Works, but will be kept under constant review.”

Much still needs to be done about that police station. The station has not been altered since that time. I understand that work is under consideration and may be undertaken in the not-too-distant future. I urge the Minister to give that matter serious consideration.

The officers at that station work in the most cramped conditions of all the police stations in the south-east corner of the State. I certainly believe that the morale and efforts of those officers would be enhanced by the provision of better office facilities. The Magistrates Court could quite easily use the space of the existing building. I certainly hope that the Minister has already considered that matter.

In relation to the provision of more police cars—on 22 March 1984, the Minister wrote to me in the following terms—

“I refer to your letter of 11 January 1984, in relation to the need for an additional car at Petrie Police Station.

I have examined this matter and ascertained that the purchase of an additional vehicle for allocation to the above Station was listed for consideration on the 1983-84 Estimates of the Police Department.

You will appreciate that there are many police stations seeking additional transport and when determining the allocation of additional vehicles purchased the needs of the various stations have to be assessed on a priority basis.”

The problem in my electorate is the very large area that has to be covered by police patrols. Although by now another car may have been provided, with the traffic problems and the distances that have to be covered between Strathpine, Petrie, Lawnton, Dayboro, Caboolture, Bribie Island and the Redcliffe centre, that additional car may not be enough.

An extra car should be operating now. As well as there being long distances between certain suburbs, there are many growth areas. To deter juvenile offenders, it would make good sense to provide another vehicle. The Minister should ask his department to examine the growth in the areas that I have mentioned. I understand that some of the Minister's staff have talked to various organisations in the area, including the local councils, to determine the expected growth patterns. One cannot take the money whenever it is needed and do everything at once. However, as the funding has been delayed for a couple of years, as is indicated in the correspondence to which I have referred, I ask the Minister to give consideration to providing additional patrol vehicles in my electorate, particularly at night-time.

I ask the Minister also to give consideration to providing a new police station at Petrie. There is no point in asking for the upgrading of the present police station; it is far past that point. A new police station is needed. When problems arise, it will be essential for the police officers to have a good office from which they can act quickly.

I ask the Minister to give consideration, as soon as possible, to the honest demands that I have made. The things that I have requested are needed urgently in the district.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (3.26 p.m.): I will attempt to relate what I want to say to the Police Department report, which I am still reading because it was tabled only this morning. If I need to grope for some statistics, I hope that the Committee will bear with me.

My interpretation of the report on the operational units of the Queensland Police Force bears out some statements on which I have commented briefly in the past and which are of major concern. I am concerned about the increased level of offences and the growth of particular offences in this State.

In earlier times, because the increase in the level of offences in Queensland was lower than the increases in the other States, Queensland was set apart from the other States. The motor vehicle insurance industry has indicated that, in the last couple of years, Queensland had the highest growth rate in the number of motor vehicle thefts. Queensland's previous good record no longer stands. It has the highest level in Australia for some offences.

The Queensland Police Department has struggled valiantly to stop the rise in the number of offences. With its record one cannot blame it for the high level of offences. From the report, it can be seen that the police department has struggled manfully with the problems confronting it, which is undoubtedly related to a variety of sociological events. On previous occasions, I have said in this Chamber that one cannot ignore the fact that Queensland had the highest rate of unemployment in the country over significant periods in the last couple of years. One cannot ignore the fact that Queensland had the only fall in average weekly earnings. One cannot ignore the fact that Queensland has the highest divorce rate in Australia or that it has the highest growth rate for certain offences. There is a relationship between economic break-down, economic problems and broken marriages, and the occurrence of offences, particularly those involving children, which are emphasised in the very comprehensive report tabled today by the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police.

What I am saying and what the Liberal Party has said is that we must, as a Parliament, be responsive to changes. If an upsurge in crime occurs, an upswing in the resources made available to fight crime must also occur. The people who are at the forefront of the fight against crime are the members of the police force.

Sir William Knox: A very good force it is, too.

Mr INNES: It is a good force. However, as happens to every force that is overtaxed, it can no longer do its job as well. It can no longer exercise in full force the preventive role of policing, which should be the primary role. Indeed, overtaking imposes burdens on the officers that from time to time can lead to problems. An overworked and harassed police officer occasionally can demonstrate the same human frailties as everybody else does.

The statistics reveal an astonishing increase during the last two to three years in major crimes. I will examine a few of them. Last year a slow-down occurred, for which everybody is grateful. However, reported general crime throughout this State increased by 2.8 per cent last year, on top of a 12 per cent increase for the year before. That is in excess of 14.8 per cent on the figures of two years ago. The population change has been only approximately 3 per cent, but general crime has increased by 14.8 per cent or slightly more, because last year's percentage was on last year's figure and the year before was on the previous figure. It is in excess of 14.8 per cent more than the figure of two years ago.

The crime clear-up rate—and for this the police force should be commended—has stayed at about the same rate, which is something more than half. Of course, with the number of offences increasing, in numerical terms a large number of offences are going undetected. It would be wonderful if no convictions were recorded, if no crime occurred.

The ideal would be fewer commissions of offences rather than fewer convictions being recorded.

That is why the role of preventive policing is constantly referred to, as opposed to policing which simply catches or detains people who have committed offences. A crime-free Queensland, or as crime-free as possible, is what is needed so that people can go about the streets in safety, leave their homes in safety and allow their children to go off to school without the fear that they might fall into the hands of criminals.

The increase in juvenile involvement in the commission of offences was a matter of special comment in the annual report of the Police Commissioner. An increase of 17.7 per cent—or from 13 214 to 15 553—occurred in the number of recorded offences involving a juvenile. The involvement of juveniles in the commission of offences is a matter of significant comment throughout the report. The figure of 17.7 per cent in one year is an extremely disturbing figure. Special mention is made of young offenders and truancy in the reports of regional areas.

The report outlines that the statistics reveal an alarming increase in the crime rate in Queensland during the last two years. In selected crime—that is, offences of particular seriousness—an overall increase of 3 per cent was recorded last year. General crime also underwent an increase of 3 per cent. The two together add up to an increase twice that in population.

In regard to offences against the person, an increase occurred of 4 per cent, compared with an increase of 16 per cent for the previous year. Again, despite a population growth of only 3 per cent—it must be borne in mind that the base changes each year—the increase in two years is in excess of 20 per cent. They are alarming figures.

Of all breaking and entering offences cleared up by the police, 55 per cent involved juveniles—people under the age of 17 years. That is an astonishing figure, particularly as the report says that most police officers relate breaking and entering offences by children to drugs. A relationship is perceived between school truancy, the commission of offences by juveniles and their seeking to meet a level of drug involvement. That is a very serious matter for any law-abiding, responsible Queenslander.

In my view, the commissioner directly highlights one of the problems related to the serious level of increase in offences—manpower. The introduction to the annual report of the Queensland Police Department contains the statement—

“Lack of manpower in many areas has certainly hampered our desires to improve on the high standards established in recent years.”

Despite that, the department has still been able to achieve a very significant and creditable clear-up rate. The Commissioner estimates—

“... that, at the present time, the Department is some 463 officers short of the manpower needed to cope with the work currently available.”

I have said before in the Chamber—and the Liberal Party stands strongly on this—that any modern Government has several fundamental responsibilities. One is the maintenance of an adequate police force to ensure the safety of its citizens—an adequate police and court system to bring any offenders—

Mr Mackenroth: You are a former policeman, aren't you?

Mr INNES: I was in the Northern Territory police for three years.

Mr Mackenroth: Why don't you resign from Parliament and join the police force?

Mr INNES: That comment is about as irrelevant as the member's speech. It certainly underlines the fact that I know something about the problems of the operational policeman. I have a great deal of sympathy for his problems and for the problem confronted by the commissioner in meeting the statistics spelt out in his report. That type of irresponsible remark made by the member for Chatsworth leads to a climate in the community in which irresponsible behaviour is explained and justified by somebody

in his mental slot so that, in the end, nobody realises what is right and what is wrong. If somebody commits a crime, it is not really his fault; it is the fault of society; it is the fault of everybody other than the person who commits the crime or the parents of the child who did not go to school and committed the crime. There must be more individual responsibility. An effective police force is required to deal with those people who do not exercise effective responsibility.

The State Budget allocated \$100m to the building of dams in Queensland; \$100m was given to three or four other capital works projects. The State has no more valuable asset than its citizenry. It is a matter of Government priorities. Money is given for the building of dams when the agricultural industries for which many of those dams will be of the most benefit are not in particularly good shape—in fact, additional production is about the last thing the vegetable-farmers, cane-farmers and other crop-growers in Queensland need at the moment. Obviously, some of the dams are necessary for water for townships; but one would have thought that, as a priority, part of that \$100m, rather than being used to boost irrigation for a market in which there is already a surplus of production and a reduction in prices, could have been directed to the hard-worked police force. I use that as an example only.

There are many other aspects of police work, and I am sure that, if an average Queenslander were asked, "Which matter do you consider takes top priority?", he would reply, "Safety—for myself, my family, in my home and on the streets." Safety is one of the greatest needs in the community. It should be remembered that the Queensland Government accuses other Governments of not listening to minorities, and it should avoid taking that course also.

The statistics show evidence of a problem that the Commissioner of Police has identified and, as might be expected to be the case, the Queensland Police Union has also highlighted the need for more police officers. The union asked for 500 to 600 more police officers, but only 100 are provided for in the last Budget. That represents only a quarter of the number estimated to be necessary to meet the compelling need for more law enforcement in Queensland. That proportionate or fractional increase in no way matches the increase in the commission of crimes.

I raise a particular plea about a particular area of Queensland. I have undertaken an exercise of relating police officers situated in various areas to populations served, and I have used the figures set out in the Queensland Police Department Annual Report 1985. Shortly, I will compare those figures with other statistics that I have obtained. I take, firstly, the bald figures published for the South-Eastern Police Region, which covers Coolangatta, Burleigh Heads, Broadbeach, Surfers Paradise, Southport, Nerang, Coomera, Beenleigh, Woodridge, Beaudesert, Canungra and Rathdowney. That area, with a population of 341 000 people, is served by 395 police officers—a ratio of 1:863.2 people, according to my quick calculations. I understand that the police would feel more than comfortable, in terms of being able to provide patrols and other preventive measures in addition to catching offenders. With a ratio of 1:500, that would be a desirable and very efficient level of police force strength.

The superintendent in charge of that region has referred to the ever-increasing workload on police officers in that region. The report gives a recitation of particularly dreadful crimes of a violent or outrageous nature, such as assaults on women, committed in that district in the year reviewed. One such crime was committed upon the sister of a constituent of mine. The woman was stabbed repeatedly and left to die—fortunately she survived—by an assailant who did not know her, and that crime occurred on the streets of Surfers Paradise at 3 o'clock in the morning.

In the North Brisbane Police Region, the ratio is 1:902. I draw particular attention to the South Brisbane Region, where the ratio is 1:1 082—the worst for active police enforcement on a population basis throughout the State. Before I deal specifically with that area, however, I mention the Far Northern Region where the ratio is 1:493, the Northern Region where the ratio is 1:439, the Central Region where the ratio is 1:613, and the North Coast Region where the ratio is 1:757.

Because I have worked as a police officer in a remote area, I know that it is necessary to have a network of police to catch a prisoner or a criminal on the move. By providing a network of police operations, the Police Department recognises that certain local functions must also be discharged, that is, checking vehicle registrations and all of the other things that country police officers do. Although it is understandable that areas in which the population is scattered would have fewer police officers, it must be remembered that a police force is primarily set up to stop offences from occurring and to apprehend offenders, and more importance must be placed on the relationship between the presence of police and the areas in which offences occur.

I return to the point I was about to make about the South Brisbane Police Region. My constituents are numbered among the people who live in the South Brisbane Police Region, and the primary police stations are located at Wynnum, South Brisbane, Oxley and Ipswich. That area has the worst police coverage in this State and, between the hours of midnight and 8 a.m.—or between the hours of midnight and 6 a.m.—no more than a handful of patrol cars would be found in that district. Tragically, all criminals do not go to bed at 10 o'clock at night, and the commissioner for the area said that 1985 was a particularly busy year for the staff because general crime in the region rose from 38 000 to 40 141 offences. That is a 5.5 per cent increase in crime. The region is still the most heavily populated area in the State. Frankly, the area gets a raw deal—an appalling deal. It has an inappropriate and inadequate police coverage. It is not satisfactory, and that is reflected by the level of crime, which is twice as high as should be expected.

The trouble is in the figures I have put forward. They are not related directly to policemen on the ground. I accept that there have to be administrative police officers, but the figures on the ground show that in the north Brisbane area there is one policeman to 1 056 citizens, and in the south Brisbane area one policeman to 1 342 citizens. One can see the underlying problem from the statistics, the claim by the commissioner for more police and the complaints of overwork by the regional commissioners. Something has to be done about it, because there is no greater priority for this Government or any State Government than the protection of its people and their property. That requires the maintenance of sufficient police to prevent the commission of offences, to identify offenders before they commit offences, and to capture those who do offend. The problem will not rectify itself, and Queensland will not lose its garland as one of the leading crime growth States until the police force is adequately staffed.

Time expired.

Mr ROW (Hinchinbrook) (3.47 p.m.): Unaccustomed as I am to occupying this seat, I have chosen it today in deference to you, Mr Fouras, so that I can at least face you and not be talking from partly behind your back as I would have been if I had spoken from the seat I usually occupy.

Mr Veivers: Is he going to treat you the same way as you treat us?

Mr ROW: The honourable member should not forget that sooner or later I will be back in the chair.

My role in this debate today is to make some reference to the plantation program undertaken by the Forestry Department and also to the recreational potential of State forests.

I congratulate the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police (Mr Glasson) on the presentation of his Estimates. As honourable members will be aware, the inadequacy of the State's natural forests to meet future demands for timber has been well recognised, and accordingly a vigorous program of softwood plantation establishment has been pursued by the Minister's Forestry Department. That program has great relevance to me personally, because my electorate is one of the greatest developmental centres of that activity at present. I do not want to appear parochial, but it is important that I mention that fact. Of course, that program is being carried out State-wide. The early plantations were established in the south-east part of Queensland. Because of the high productivity

of softwoods, the plantations have been based mainly on the native hoop pine and the introduced Caribbean and slash pines. Although successful in plantations, hoop pine does not regenerate well in its natural environment. It is only through the establishment of plantations, mainly in south-east Queensland, that this unique native species will continue to be commercially available in quantity in the future.

Because of the shortfall in availability of land suitable for the establishment of hoop pine plantations, it has been necessary to complement these plantings with introduced species, mainly Caribbean and slash pines, which grow well in poorer soils. The areas able to be planted with those species range from treeless swamps, through wallum with its stunted banksias and tea-tree, to some better-drained sites which carry in the main only species of low commercial value. These plantings have taken place mainly on the coastal lowlands between Caboolture and the Rockhampton region, and also in Cardwell in north Queensland, which, as I have already mentioned, is an important part of my electorate.

In fact, the department's major plantation program in north Queensland is based on the very centre of my electorate—at Ingham and Cardwell in the coastal lowlands. The program began at Cardwell in 1967 with a small, yearly planting of 50 ha using Caribbean pine.

In 1979, I sought a report on the project, particularly with reference to the north, and the need for softwood plantations. I quote now from the 1979 report, which reads—

“Apart from the rain forests, few other significant natural forest types occur in North Queensland.

The virgin rain forests yielded not only substantial volumes per hectare but also large logs and primary species such as Queensland maple, Northern silky oak, etc.

The selective harvesting of available virgin rain forests is nearing completion. The yields from the second cut of the rain forest will be substantially different in volume, size of logs and species composition.”

Some species, of course, have poorer regenerative capacity than others.

The report continues—

“The annual cut of rainforest species in N.Q. both from Crown and private lands has declined from a peak of 247 580 m³ in 1956 to 153 510 m³ in 1978. This has been due to depletion of private resources as well as a reduction in the available prescribed yield from State Forests.”

It has always been a source of wonder to me that more people on the land have not gone in for private plantations. Perhaps the slow return from such plantations deters people from undertaking that activity, I remember, during my childhood in north Queensland, that people came from New Zealand to sell shares in New Zealand forest plantation projects. Apparently Queensland did not follow suit and institute similar projects. If it had done so, it might have private forests to draw on at this time.

Later, the report relative to the whole State reads—

“The Department aims to establish over 200 000 hectares of softwood plantations consisting of about 50 000 hectares of Hoop pine, and the remainder being exotic pine species such as Slash pine and Caribbean pine.

To date a total of about 125 000 hectares of softwood plantations has been established with about 40 000 hectares being Hoop pine.

The present annual planting rate is about 7 000 hectares, the majority of which has been concentrated in the Tuan—Toolara area near Maryborough to produce the raw material for a large industrial timber complex as quickly as possible.”

With reference to the Ingham area, the report reads—

“The Department aims to establish some 30 000 hectares of softwood plantations in the Ingham—Cardwell area.

To date a total of about 2 300 hectares of softwood plantations has been established on S.F. 461 near Cardwell, using principally Caribbean pine.

The current annual planting will be about 500 hectares. The rate will gradually increase as other projects in southern Queensland near completion. Once a planting programme is commenced it is necessary for future economic management of the plantations for timber production for planting to be maintained at a steady planting rate over the rotation.

Efforts have been continuing since about 1972 to secure additional State and Federal Government funds to enable the overall Ingham planting programme to be increased to at least 800 hectares per year."

I come now to a factor that arose in the development of softwood plantations in competition with other industries. In 1979, in the northern sugar belt, intense competition arose between the potential private land-developer and the Crown in its forestry program. I have always felt that this matter requires considerable attention.

One thing that disturbs me is the alienation of potential future agricultural land by the Crown. I have referred specifically to the sugar industry, but many other industries may also require good agricultural land. Competition between private developers and the Crown for such land must be balanced and considered carefully. In that respect, I am grateful for the work that has been done.

By way of an example, I mention that the Cardwell shire, which is in my electorate, is restricted to less than 50 per cent of its total area by the alienation of land in State forests, national parks, habitat reserves and fish habitat areas. In today's economic climate, it is very difficult for a shire to make ends meet on less than half its potential area, and I have always advocated that the viability of land held by the Crown must be considered.

In the past, the lack of management of Crown lands has presented many problems, but I do not single out the Forestry Department particularly. In national parks, which are administered by another Minister and which allow restricted public access, vermin have become a serious problem. In days gone by, when there was little or no restriction or policing of Crown lands, vermin numbers were controlled by hunting or organised destruction. These days, with restriction of entry into State lands, vermin have taken over and, for example, wild pigs, which are almost out of control, are destroying many crops in the northern wet belt. The extent to which private citizens can control vermin is limited, because they must have a permit. In addition, a number of requirements inhibit people from taking action. I mention this because it is important that there is surveillance over such lands so that the balance between nature and the needs of commercial industry is maintained and is not jeopardised by an uncontrollable factor.

At my request, a land utilisation committee was set up in my electorate. That committee is supported strongly by the Minister for Lands and his officers and also by the Department of Primary Industries. A large contingent of senior public servants and representatives of the sugar industry and of other industries form the committee. It devised a program of land utilisation, which is fairly satisfactory. A number of minor discrepancies, if I might use that term, still exist between the boundaries of areas proposed for future sugar development or other prime agricultural development and the sections of land required by the Forestry Department for plantation purposes. Those discrepancies are now minor. I congratulate the public servants in the various departments and the Ministers concerned for bringing about that amelioration in the competition for land.

I look forward to great future development. Ingham is now the major nursery centre in north Queensland for the production of pine seedlings. I am very proud that the area has that development and that the industry will participate in the very necessary diversification of the monocultures in some parts of north Queensland and will make a contribution towards maintaining the work-force in the area. Those who work for the Forestry Department—in the administration and in the forests—are all very good citizens who participate well in the public affairs of the towns and villages in which they reside.

I convey to the Minister that, in my electorate, Forestry Department employees generally are held in high regard. They certainly pull their weight in the community, which is to be commended.

In the time that I have left, I will address the recreational prospects and potential of forestry land. In many cases, forestry land is shared by people with grazing rights. To a limited extent, they are allowed, by permit, to run cattle and some domestic animals on forestry land. Of course, they are not allowed to remove any trees or alter the land in any way. Many years ago, that was the beginning of the use by other people of forestry areas.

I would like to see that extended to recreation. I am pleased to say that there will be even more use of State forests for recreational purposes. Much has been heard about the Brisbane Forest Park, which has been a great success. In the very near future, I will be making representations to the Minister for the establishment of a forest park in north Queensland. More specifically, I will suggest to him that it should be in the Tully River gorge.

Particularly in other parts of the world, the recreational use of State forests is long-established as one of the multiple uses of forestry areas. The potential of State forests to provide recreation has long been recognised. However, because for many years most recreational demands were centred on national parks, only low-key development of facilities occurred at popular spots in State forests in Queensland. I appreciate that, to some extent, the National Parks and Wildlife Service has taken over from the Forestry Department those areas that have been designated separately as national parks, and it is doing a very good job.

In the early 1970s, the increased awareness of environmental issues within the community was reflected in dramatic increases in visits to natural areas, particularly forest areas near large centres of population. At the same time, national parks were increasingly expected to play a full nature conservation role, which is often incompatible with heavy recreational use. I might mention that national parks are also incompatible with heavy industry, which is sometimes associated with forestry operations. State forests are seen by the community as a readily available recreation complement, or alternative, to the national parks system. They offer areas of outstanding scenery and are generally readily accessible owing to the existing network of management roads.

I wish to comment further on forestry roads. There is some slight conflict in shires as to the responsibility for roads that have a multiplicity of uses. Fortunately, in my electorate those conflicts have been resolved.

Almost annually, shires hesitate to commit themselves to the large amount of maintenance on roads that are used by tourists, recreation-seekers and forestry processors, especially heavy timber trucks. Usually, the shire council, the Forestry Department, or, if the areas are contiguous, the Tourist and Travel Corporation or the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service, must make an annual decision as to the contribution. I would like to see set down a more permanent basis for the positive definition of what level of contribution is made towards the maintenance of these very important roads. I know that in many instances the roads are established by the Forestry Department at great cost to it. Sooner or later, the general public want to use the roads. The question then arises as to who will accept responsibility for them. Safety is also an important consideration, and it certainly is not desirable to have a small motor vehicle under a large timber truck. So that a serious traffic problem is not encountered suddenly, all those aspects should be examined before forests are opened to recreational use. I recommend to the Minister that a great deal of consideration be given to that matter.

Many activities may be carried out in forest parks—off-road driving, car rallies and trail-bike riding. Those activities must be made as safe as possible. Trail-bike riders have been killed when they have come into conflict with other public activities. Because of their nuisance value, trail-bike riders are not popular with other people. I suggest that the Minister also examine that matter.

Time expired.

Mr VEIVERS (Ashgrove) (4.7 p.m.): I have been a member of this Assembly for almost two years. I have found it a very interesting experience to observe the modus operandi and attitudes of Government Ministers and the way in which they handle their portfolios. The Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police is one of the few Ministers who treat this Assembly with some respect. From my observations, there is always an endeavour by him to answer the questions asked by Opposition members. I respect him for that. I am sincere in my comments; I am not being patronising or softening-up the Minister for what I will say later. I have always given recognition where recognition is due.

The Minister's colleague the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze), who occupies the seat next to the place in which the Minister is now seated, does not respect the privileges of this Assembly. He refuses to answer questions. His attitude and his personal attacks on individuals in this Chamber leave a great deal to be desired and bring this institution into very low repute. Although the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police makes an effort and attempts, to the best of his ability, to provide the Opposition with information, the Opposition will take every opportunity to score off the Minister. That is the Opposition's responsibility.

Mrs Chapman interjected.

Mr VEIVERS: The honourable member for Pine Rivers is wearing ministerial robes, or possible ministerial robes. I have referred to the procedures and the institution of Parliament that need to be upheld very strongly.

Mr Cooper: Let's talk about the Estimates.

Mr VEIVERS: I will.

I refer specifically to the August edition of the *Queensland Police Union Journal* in which a number of very serious allegations were made.

Mr Davis: Very serious allegations.

Mr VEIVERS: The allegations are very serious.

I do not believe that the matters that I will raise this afternoon will come as any surprise to the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police or the Commissioner of Police because some very pertinent comments have been made regarding the Police Air Unit.

As a result of reading that journal, I believe that the responsible Minister and the Commissioner of Police may not be entirely responsible for what has occurred. However, let me say that the buck stops short at the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police because he is the responsible Minister. I look forward to his response to the allegations that have been made in the *Queensland Police Union Journal*. Perhaps such a response will be forthcoming later today. It might be asking a bit too much to expect the Minister to pull figures out of the air and come up with magical answers. However, I believe that the substance of the allegations requires a response from the Minister at some stage. I admit that I am using material from the union journal as the basis of my speech.

In 1975, a Police Air Wing was established. Two pilots with flying qualifications commenced operation with two ex-army spotter aircraft. Between 1975 and 1983, improved and more sophisticated aircraft were purchased by the department. During those eight years, eight police officers were transferred to the Police Air Wing. I understand that each member expended, from his own funds, between \$10,000 and \$20,000 to achieve a pilot's licence—a basic pilot's licence, I believe—and then to upgrade his licence to the requirements of the Department of Aviation and the Police Department.

During 1983, pilots reported to the Queensland Police Union that certain practices were occurring which the union believed did not conform with safety standards and could ultimately lead to fatalities. Every endeavour was made to bring to the attention of the Police Department the concerns of the pilots. The complaints appeared to fall on deaf ears. Ultimately, a decision was taken to approach the Department of Aviation in

Canberra. This was done on 10 November 1983, at which time the police union was advised that investigations would be commenced by air safety inspectors attached to the Brisbane regional office.

Mr Davis: That put the kibosh on it.

Mr VEIVERS: That is so.

Statements were obtained from the pilots and provided to the relevant aviation authority for further inquiry. It is strange to relate that documents which would have supported the pilots' claims could not be located in Police Department files. The Aviation Department eventually advised that its investigations were complete and that certain action had been taken. But the ultimate action was never disclosed to the police union or the former police pilots.

Mrs Chapman: Written by the police union.

Mr VEIVERS: I am using its material, and I make no apology for doing so. I commented on that earlier. In my opinion, these allegations need to be aired.

Is it coincidental that, on 11 November 1983, the day after formal complaints were made to the Aviation Department, the Government closed the Police Air Wing and transferred three aircraft to total control by the Government? The police pilots, who had given loyal and sterling service from 1975 to 1983, were summarily transferred to other duties. Admittedly, the pilots were given a choice as to where they wished to serve and what responsibilities they wanted to take on.

About 16 months later—about March 1985—it was announced that the Commissioner of Police would have total control over the Police Air Unit, which was about to be re-formed.

The union immediately sought from the Commissioner of Police and the Minister a guarantee that the former police pilots would be returned to flying duties with the re-formed Police Air Unit. Neither the commissioner nor the Minister would give such an undertaking. The Minister was advised that, if the Government would accept a proposal by the union for the operation and control of the Police Air Unit, the Police Department's budget for the air wing could be saved 50 per cent or more each year. That is particularly relevant to what I have to say today in the debate on the Estimates presented by the Minister.

The following are examples of savings that could be achieved. The former police pilots already held qualifications and had previously flown the aircraft reassigned to the department. If those pilots were transferred to the air wing, the Police Department's budget would be saved a minimum of \$100,000 a year, because outside or civilian pilots would not have to be employed at an annual cost, the union says, of \$25,000, \$30,000 or even more.

The union proposed that the larger and the smaller King Air aircraft, which it claimed were of the corporate or cocktail-bar-equipped type, could be likened——

Mr Cooper interjected.

Mr VEIVERS: I have not been in one. I wonder whether the member for Roma has.

It is said that using those aircraft could be likened to operating Rolls Royce motor vehicles for police patrol work instead of using Falcon sedans.

Government Members interjected.

Mr VEIVERS: Have my comments enlightened Government back-benchers?

It was suggested that those two costly aircraft could be sold and replaced with three piston-driven, twin-engined aircraft at little or no cost. That would enable the air wing to carry double the capacity in three different directions instead of two with the existing aircraft.

To support the proposal, I give honourable members the following comparisons—

	Existing Aircraft	Proposed Aircraft
Operating costs per hour	\$400 to \$500	\$160
Passenger load	5 to 9	6 to 7
Navigational charges	\$6,800	\$4,223
100-hourly maintenance	\$3,000 to \$6,000	\$1,500
Battery	\$3,500	\$260
Engine overhaul	\$100,000 to \$200,000	\$36,000
Replacement propellor	\$10,000	\$5,000
Replacement brakes	\$2,500	\$1,100

Mr Glasson: If you had asked for permission from the Chair to incorporate the article from *the Queensland Police Union Journal* in *Hansard*, you would have saved yourself and the Committee a great deal of time.

Mr VEIVERS: I made the point earlier that I was using material from the journal. It needs to be spoken about. It needs to be listened to by that highly intelligent—in italics and inverted commas—back bench on the Government side.

The figures I have given clearly demonstrate that three twin-engined, piston-driven aircraft could be purchased by trading in the corporate type of aircraft. In addition, the piston-driven, twin-engined aircraft could be operated at half the operating costs of the corporate type of aircraft.

Inquiries I have made indicate that between \$1m and \$2m could be saved if the recommendations of the Queensland Police Union had been accepted this financial year. How many additional policemen would such an amount provide for the police force? Is the Government more interested in its selfish political ends than in the need to provide its police force with sufficient manpower and the best resources to protect the State's citizens? There is a need to protect Queensland from being, as it is called by those from interstate, the con man's paradise of Australia. There can be no doubt that the Fraud Squad is grossly under-staffed. That is a commonly known fact of life.

What about the huffing and puffing by the Government in relation to its stand on drug-pushers? That issue is a perfect example of runs not being put on the board. The record speaks for itself. The Government's record is abysmal.

I realise that the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police has pressed for the provision of extra police officers in the 1985-86 Budget. I am sure that the Minister is on record, in reply to questions asked of him in this House, as having said that extra police officers have been requested, and I commend him for that. But it must be pointed out that the provision of 104 additional police officers is but a drop in the ocean.

The Government gives more priority to the purchase of an aircraft worth \$8m as a play-thing for the Premier and Treasurer and Ministers to be used on junkets round the State and the nation. How many extra policemen could have been employed if that \$8m aircraft had not been purchased? I ask the Minister: Was the purchase of that aeroplane absolutely necessary to conduct the affairs of this State? So much for the priorities set by this Government.

Honourable members are well aware of the constant claim made about the Government's being short of funds, which has resulted in the cancellation of overtime and insufficient police being available to work on week-ends. That is the answer to the question that I posed previously. Why does the Government thrust upon the Police Department the purchase of three aircraft which will cause the expenditure of the Police Department to double, whereas its Budget could be halved if that cost were not incurred? That is a critical question which the Minister must answer at some stage. Moreover, has the Government sufficient expertise and interest to conserve funds, or is economic mismanagement a part of the problem?

Many of the points that I wish to mention in the short time available have previously been raised in the *Queensland Police Union Journal* and have been taken up by the Queensland Police Union. Although requests for the reinstatement of pilots employed by the Government Air Wing were made, all approaches failed. Following that, advertisements appeared in newspapers calling for applications for five positions in the Police Air Unit. A committee of three, in which only one senior police officer was involved, made the selections from the applicants. It is amazing that the qualifications required were 3 000 flying hours and six re-endorsements of instrument ratings. The police pilots, or most of them, did not have 3 000 hours or the six re-endorsements necessary. Although the pilots were good enough and loyal enough to spend their own funds to obtain licences and upgrade their qualifications, they were thrown out of the ball game.

I have been apprised of a triennial conference at which representatives of the union asked for relevant correspondence to be forwarded to the Premier and Treasurer and requested an urgent meeting with the Premier and Treasurer and the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police with a view to having the former pilots returned to the Police Air Unit. A letter was forwarded on 21 March 1985, but no reply has been received. In a subsequent deputation that met the Minister, it was indicated by the Minister that the Premier and Treasurer would not receive a deputation and would not be involved. The matter was left under the sole control of the Commissioner of Police. An attempt made to have the matter discussed with the Commissioner of Police was rejected.

At a further meeting between the Queensland Police Union and the Minister, it was pointed out that, as the Premier and Treasurer was not involved and the matter was solely under the control of the Commissioner of Police, and as the commissioner had refused to receive a deputation, the Minister should direct the Commissioner of Police to reinstate the pilots to duties associated with the Police Air Unit. However, the Minister refused to issue such a direction.

As a last resort, the matter was taken up, by notification of an industrial dispute, before the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission on 4 April this year. The presiding industrial commissioner was requested to issue an order restraining the Commissioner of Police from employing non-police personnel in flying duties associated with the Police Air Unit or, alternatively, to refer the matter of the dispute to arbitration before the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. For legal reasons, it was not possible to make the order sought and, for similar reasons, no order was made for the matter to be referred to arbitration. Shortly thereafter, the Police Department entered into contractual arrangements with privately employed pilots.

It was noted that one serving police officer, a former Police Air Unit pilot, was selected for interview and ultimately accepted an appointment. The conditions of appointment are that the member, after approximately 20 years of loyal service to the Police Department, was required to resign from the police force, losing optional retirement at 55 years, and enter into a new superannuation scheme, even though Parliament recently passed legislation to enable portability of superannuation when members move from one section to another section of State Government employment.

It is also interesting to note that positive information is now available that "Executive Council (Government) on 21 March, 1985"—the very same day that the triennial conference letter was delivered to the Premier—"approved the establishment of contractual arrangements including conditions of employment for those persons appointed to the Police Air Unit."

Quite obviously, the Commissioner of Police and the Minister for Police had absolutely no say whatever in the restructuring and re-establishment of the Police Air Unit, whereas the union was previously informed that the Commissioner of Police would have total control of the new air unit. It would appear that the only control that the Commissioner of Police has in this instance is control of three unsuitable and very expensive aircraft, which one might reasonably expect will further "blow out" the police budget in the coming years.

Mrs Chapman: Have you ever been in them?

Mr VEIVERS: No, I have not.

During the time that the three aircraft were under the control of the Government—November 1983 to April 1985—the union had received advice that there were numerous requests for Government Air Wing aircraft to be placed at the disposal of police for important policing functions, and that the majority of such requests were refused.

As an example, when did police in the Warwick, Dalby, Roma, Charleville, Longreach and Toowoomba districts last utilise or even see a police aircraft? It would appear that two aircraft are servicing the Townsville to Thursday Island regions and parts of the Mount Isa region and one aircraft is servicing the coastal strip from Brisbane to Cairns. It is high time that the union's proposal for alternative aircraft was adopted, thus enabling an air service to be made available to police in the central and western areas of this State.

Time expired.

Mr COOPER (Roma) (4.27 p.m.): I want to make a few brief comments on the enlightening speech of the member for Ashgrove (Mr Veivers).

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr COOPER: It was inane, but it was also knocking, as one usually hears from Opposition members. One never hears anything constructive from them.

I refer specifically to the Super King Air aircraft. The honourable member tried to knock it by claiming how expensive it is. Strange as it may seem, identical aircraft happen to be used round Australia by other Governments and private agencies for search and rescue work. For example, the National Safety Council utilises them. It seems to think that they are all right. I do not believe that it would use them if it did not think that they were economical and efficient. This Government adopts the same view.

As far as the jet is concerned, although Opposition members always knock it, it has been used on many occasions for emergency medical evacuations, including operations relative to the transplant program. It is a rapid flight aircraft, and I do not think that anyone could deny its life-saving endeavours. I wonder why the member for Ashgrove continually knocks it and wants to deny its services to the people of Queensland. It is economical and efficient. As those of us who travel round the State know, Queensland is a vast State. I and other Government members are sick of the needless knocking by Opposition members. Perhaps they could try to be a little more constructive—

Mr Borbidge: A lot of Opposition members don't get far from Trades Hall.

Mr COOPER: I am fully aware of that. It is rare to see them outside the south-east corner.

I want to refer briefly to police numbers. Like all Government members, I support the provision of more police. All members would like more nurses, teachers and so on; however, there are budgetary restraints. The Government has to get as much value as it possibly can from each dollar, and that is exactly what it is trying to do. Government members will always keep pushing for more police; however, they will do it in a responsible fashion. Perhaps the member for Ashgrove could direct his efforts towards getting the Federal Government to repay some of the \$362m shortfall in this year's Budget allocation to this State.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to take part in this debate on the Lands, Forestry and Police Estimates. This portfolio opens up a wide range of topics for discussion. All of them are certainly interesting in varying degrees. However, my time limits me to the canvassing of three main topics: stock routes and rural lands, freeholding and other land tenures, and the Young Farmer Establishment Scheme.

As honourable members will recall, after nine years of discussion, Parliament recently put through the rural lands protection legislation. During that debate, members canvassed

the issues very comprehensively. In the debate, I referred to progress in the control of parthenium weed, amongst others, and the new method of dingo-baiting in the form of beef crackle. Recently, Cabinet approved the use of this method of dingo-baiting.

Mr Borbidge: Speaking of dingoes——

Mr COOPER: Yes, there are two-legged ones on the opposite side of the Chamber; but I am referring to the four-legged ones.

Cabinet has approved the use of this form of baiting and my shire of Bendemere is looking into the availability of this bait as soon as possible because many people are anxious to use it.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr COOPER: I will do so, but the honourable member will have to be patient.

It is significant that the stock routes report notes that feral pigs and dogs continued to be the major declared animal pests last year.

The board conducted an exotic-disease exercise during the year based on the control of feral pigs. Pigs carry foot-and-mouth disease. The entry of foot-and-mouth to this country would be disastrous to the livestock industry and the tax-payers. It would cost billions of dollars. During the year, operation By-field was carried out. It was undertaken to clear up bugs in the contingency plan should such an exotic disease break out. It was also designed to train staff.

Pig-control techniques are also an important factor, particularly in north Queensland and other northern parts of Australia, much of which is inaccessible. The area has a very large pig problem, which poses a tremendous potential danger. Sound methods of pig control and an understanding of their behaviour are essential. The movement patterns of pigs have proved to be very enlightening. The needed knowledge has been gained concerning pig-bait material preferences.

A Mr Peter Pavlov is carrying out a detailed study. He is nearing the completion of a four-year field study of the ecology of feral pigs in the far north. He is investigating the disease status, the diet, behaviour and movement patterns of pigs, which will prove invaluable in the implementation of effective control programs, particularly for the control of exotic diseases.

In the rural lands debate I spoke on the use of beef crackle, which is factory prepared. I will not elaborate other than to point out that it has come to my attention that a research program is being conducted into chemical attractants to be added to the baits to tempt the shy and cunning dog. Trials have been undertaken in the Inglewood area. They are proving successful. Trials are planned for other areas. These measures will be very valuable in assisting to control dogs. I know at first hand that it is very easy to get the inexperienced dogs and pups, but the cagey and cunning dogs, the ones that do most damage, are a major problem. I acknowledge the work of the board and its staff in this area, who are achieving very real, genuine results.

Parthenium weed is causing major problems in central Queensland. That matter was canvassed widely in the Bill we passed earlier. The staff at the Alan Fletcher Research Station is continuing work on biological control. It is the only economic method of control. Spraying is still used by shire councils, contractors and board staff on the roadside, where it is effective. It should be noted that vehicles carry the seed. The stem-galling moth (*epiblema strenuana*) is proving successful. I am very pleased with the results that are being achieved. It was released in 1982. The good news is that it has spread, on its own, from release sites. Although it does not actually kill the plant, it stunts its growth and minimises seed production. In addition, noogoora burr acts as a host and is affected itself. It is not nearly as prolific as it once was, and biological methods are being used to control it. Other species as well as the stem-galling moth are being tested, and a new strain of rust is being investigated both here and overseas.

However, because of quarantine restrictions, experimentation cannot be carried out on different species of fungus.

It is pleasing that parthenium weed is being brought under control, and I wish the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board and its staff well. The work that they have carried out during the year, particularly their efforts to frame the Rural Lands Protection Bill after nine years, is commendable.

I note from today's *Courier-Mail* that Cabinet has agreed to allow some Crown land to be leased in perpetuity. It will apply mainly to cattle properties in the remote north west and will afford greater security to lease-holders. I commend this move. The isolated regions involve high risks because a good deal of money is needed to develop properties in those regions. Whether the owners are companies or families, they must have secure tenure to develop their properties and to be able to borrow against that security to develop their properties.

The Queensland Government is still one of the biggest landlords in the world, so the Opposition need not worry that all the land has been given away. However, the Government must continue to secure long-term tenures in remote areas and extend freehold living standards in the closer settled regions. I have been told that 10 per cent of the land in Queensland is now freehold and that another 14 per cent is in the process of being freeholded. That figure should be increased, and the living area on cattle and sheep properties should be extended to compensate for the horrific cost/price pressures and the disastrous seasons that have plagued rural industries since the year dot and will continue to plague them.

The Government's aim should be to achieve a more genuine and unrestricted type of freehold. At present, freehold is restricted to cattle and sheep living area standards and, in the Roma region, a cattle living area carries between 1 300 and 1 900 head. This should be extended—perhaps it will be—to at least 2 800 to 3 000 head to give more scope to family enterprises to withstand the vagaries of bad seasons, market fluctuations and the cost/price squeeze. It is really a case of giving these property-owners more elbow-room.

For the benefit of the Committee, I will give what can be regarded as a fairly common example. A property-owner may allow himself a budget—if he can stick to it—of \$400 a week or \$20,000 a year for living expenses. That cannot be considered to be an extravagant sum because a labourer who works a 38-hour week averages a similar wage; and people on the land work 80 hours a week. When one considers that the princely return on capital investment is less than 2 per cent, it is not an excessive income. It must also be remembered that most property-owners have borrowed up to 25 per cent of the market value of their property. So, on a property that is valued at \$400,000, borrowings could easily be \$100,000. Interest payable on that amount is \$18,000, which leaves about \$2,000 for the necessities of life. Unfortunately, I could list a number of far worse examples. Obviously, there is greater scope for expansion so that people in rural industry can face their problems, and I urge the Government to err on the side of generosity and to permit a more genuine security of tenure for these regions.

It is to that end that I suggest that there be fairly extensive increases in the sheep and cattle area standards. They should not be increased only to a subsistence level; well in excess of that is required. The Government's moves in this direction have been most encouraging. What is permissible now is two living areas. The description of land by area—square kilometres, acres or hectares—has been done away with and the Government has adopted cattle or sheep area standards. The Government should be given further encouragement to increase those standards to a more generous level.

People in the Cunnamulla region running between 10 000 and 12 000 sheep claim that it is barely possible to make a living from that number of sheep. A glaring example of the proof of that statement is that many of the places out there are in a run-down condition. The improvements are not as the owners would like them to be. They are suggesting that perhaps the sheep area standard should be increased to 15 000 or 20 000,

which would enable them to maintain higher standards in improvements and to withstand the economic difficulties that they have experienced for some time.

There is no doubt that costs are a major problem for producers. An examination of any profit and loss balance sheet from a property in that region shows that 90 per cent of expenses are on fixed costs in the form of rent, rates, electricity, wages and so on—the list is endless. To carry those costs, to guard against the vagaries of seasons and markets and to make use of economies of scale, the family units need that higher sheep or cattle standard. Comparatively speaking, the additional stock do not cost much more to run, but they do allow the opportunity for the family unit to earn a little more on its investment. I will give the Committee the practical example of a property that runs 10 000 sheep and employs only one permanent man. Obviously casuals are used, but the property has engaged only one permanent employee. Properties running 20 000 sheep can do so with two permanent employees. Honourable members may think that that is the same, but it is not. Simply because of the economy of scale, better returns have been proven with the larger numbers of stock. The Government is moving in the right direction. It has been innovative and must continue to be innovative, imaginative and responsive to the requirements and conditions of rural enterprise.

The great nations of the world—certainly the most progressive of them—base their system of land-holding on freehold tenure. This State's philosophy must not be any different. I do not believe that it is. My belief is that the security, progress and capacity of a nation's people and the value of their currency are dependent on the right of freehold. Queensland has made good progress, but it must continue to progress further. I take this opportunity to acknowledge the ability and the work of the Chief Commissioner and Chairman of the Land Administration Commission (Mr Wally Baker), who knows land matters backwards and always adopts a very forward, progressive policy. I encourage him further.

In respect to the State's more remote pastoral leases, the extension from 30 years to 50 years will certainly be welcomed in rural circles. One day the Government may even see fit to extend that to 75 years. That will provide the greater security that I have already mentioned.

The Young Farmer Establishment Scheme was begun in 1982 with the objective of providing funds of last resort on a concessional basis to help deserving young farmers to acquire their first viable rural property. Assistance is not given to an applicant who is capable of raising his own money. It is certainly not an adjustment scheme; it is a genuine scheme to help put young people on the land. Experience is most definitely a requirement. They have to have a reasonable prospect of success. Because there is no use at all in putting young people on the land if they do not have equity and have no prospect of coming through at the other end, applicants need a 40 per cent equity. Many young people get bright-eyed about the bush and about rural land; they would love to own a piece of it. If the State was to finance all of these young people onto the land, many of them would not manage the difficulties, would end up going broke and would have to be bailed out.

Mr Davis: How many farmers have been put on since the scheme started?

Mr COOPER: The honourable member should wait.

Mr Davis: Not one from my electorate.

Mr COOPER: I would not expect that they would.

The scheme was originally funded with a Vote of \$16m over a seven-year period. In the first year, \$1.5m was available; in the second year, \$4.5m; and, following that, \$2m a year. The funds are now being recycled and, as a result, \$2.5m was available last year, of which \$1.5m was utilised. However, a further one and a quarter million dollars is still under investigation.

The interest charged on the loans is based on the Commonwealth bond tender rate of 13.6 per cent, with varying concessions available according to the year of operation.

For instance, in the first and second year, the interest rate is 60 per cent of the Commonwealth bond tender rate; in the third and fourth year, 70 per cent; in the seventh and eighth year, 90 per cent; and in the ninth year, until the completion of the loan, interest is charged at the full bond rate.

On average, the amount of loan available is \$150,000. That has been the case since the inception of the fund. Honourable members realise that that sum is no longer adequate. Because of the fall in the value of the dollar, perhaps that figure should be doubled. The scheme has been utilised for lucerne properties, cattle and sheep properties, small crops, cane-growing, dairy properties, grain-growing, piggeries, fruit-growing and poultry farms. The funds are utilised in a wide range of industries.

The scheme is working. As always, more funds are needed. It is essential that more young people be encouraged onto the land. They are obviously our future. The rural population is ageing; at present, the average age is 55 years or more. Rural life is a very hard and difficult existence. Business management is now an essential requirement. The margin for error has been greatly diminished. I urge the Government to continue its scheme and to expand it.

Time expired.

Mr GOSS (Salisbury) (4.47 p.m.): In rising to speak to the Estimates, I would like to concentrate on the Police Estimates. First, I record my disappointment in the tabling of the annual report of the Police Department. It was a very poor effort on the part of the Minister to have the report tabled today. Honourable members are expected to digest it in some detail and to make a response. It seems that the tabling of the report is timed to minimise the ability of honourable members to go through it and to make a response and a reference to the material contained in it.

Mr Glasson: Nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr GOSS: When the Minister responds, perhaps he might like to explain why the report, which is dated more than two weeks ago, was not tabled before today.

Mr Glasson: We are not endeavouring to hide anything. We are very proud of that report.

Mr GOSS: Why was it not tabled last week so that honourable members could read it before the presentation of the Estimates? Why was it not tabled last week so that honourable members could read it before they made their speeches?

Mr Glasson: I will explain that later. It is not an endeavour to hide anything.

Mr GOSS: Does the Minister have to obtain the answer from the box?

As the Minister is unable to answer that question, I shall speak more generally about the issue of police protection in this State.

Mr Stoneman interjected.

Mr GOSS: I would have thought that the honourable member would have been satisfied with unloading his house at market rates, and that that would have kept him satisfied for the whole of this sitting.

Mr Stoneman: How petty you are.

Mr GOSS: I would rather be petty than be what the honourable member has been in relation to that particular transaction.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr GOSS: If Government members want to interject, they will have to cop it. If they want me to return to the Police Estimates, I advise them to keep their mouths shut.

Today, many members referred to police protection; no doubt, many more will do so later. The report refers to the average police to population ratio being in the vicinity of 1:536, which is about the worst in Australia. It is even worse than the raw figures actually indicate, because the Queensland Police Force has a much greater area to cover than most other Australian police forces. On the basis of the figures as they appear in the report, that decentralisation makes the job of the Queensland Police Department even harder than it would otherwise be.

In this Chamber and at a number of public meetings last year, I referred to the fact that, although the Minister took a submission from the commissioner to Cabinet seeking an additional 400 or 500 police officers, he received only an additional 100. This year the commissioner again got an additional 100. It is simply not good enough. The commissioner and the department are not getting the numbers necessary to provide a reasonable level of police protection in this State, which is the level that they would like to provide.

It is not only the commissioner and the department who are missing out on the numbers needed. First and foremost, it is the community that is missing out. The honourable member for Sherwood (Mr Innes) referred earlier to police to population ratios in various districts—1:536 throughout the State. However, in many areas, particularly the Gold Coast, Hervey Bay, north Queensland and my electorate of Salisbury, the ratio is much worse than that, and, as a consequence, people are suffering.

Mr Mackenroth: Redlands.

Mr GOSS: As the honourable member for Chatsworth says, the electorate of Redlands is another area in which the police to population ratio is too low.

The people are entitled to that service ahead of most other services. If people cannot be protected in their own homes, if their personal well-being cannot be protected, it is a very sad state of affairs. The Government should give greater priority to funding that section of the Minister's portfolio.

On the matter of police staffing, I will comment on what I perceive to be some degree of administrative mismanagement. By that I mean that a very large number of police officers seem to be carrying out purely and simply clerical duties. The Government would be well served, as would the community, if it allocated greater clerical or civilian staff to the police force so that the commissioner could release many trained police officers from pen-pushing and get them out onto the streets.

Police officers have said to me that these days too many police officers want to get into an office and sit behind a desk. If police officers do not want to be on the street or in a patrol car, they should not be in the police force. Police officers are needed who are prepared to go out and do police work, not clerical work.

If one stands outside police headquarters at 4 or 5 o'clock, or whenever the shift finishes, one sees the public service rush of blue uniforms come out. Those officers have finished working at their desks for the day and they are off. In my opinion, that is a waste of trained police officers. It is expensive to train them. Police officers should be out in the field.

Furthermore, if one visits any police station or CI Branch in this State, one quite often sees a trained and very experienced police officer very slowly typing out a detailed report or statement. Police officers, particularly detectives, should be given greater access to stenographic services and other measures that would cheaply and more efficiently make them available to do serious police work. Police sergeants, who are on about \$1,000 a fortnight or something like that, must be the best-paid clerks in this State. They can be seen at police headquarters doing purely and simply clerical work, when they could and should be doing police work.

A frequent complaint by constituents and members of the public is not only that police officers are not out doing police work but also that a large number of police officers always seem to be available to man radar traps. About a month ago, I attended

a public meeting in my electorate at which residents complained about the fact that they could not get a police officer to come out and see them when that very night, approximately one kilometre up the road, 10 police officers were standing on the corner, waiting to apprehend motorists who sped through a radar trap. Nobody was actually being apprehended at the time. The police officers were simply standing around, talking to one another.

I realise that the traffic problems must be dealt with; I realise that something must be done about the rate at which people are being killed and injured on the roads. However, it seems to me that a better balance could be struck. I refer in particular to that radar trap operation on a Monday night in the outer southern suburbs of Brisbane. Similar operations are carried out from time to time. They are not particularly effective, even in doing the job that they are supposed to be doing.

Mr Davis: It is like a real social gathering.

Mr GOSS: The police officers certainly seemed to be having a pleasant chat.

Another matter that I will comment on in regard to the operation and the funding of the Police Department is that even with the present numbers, unsatisfactory as they are, unreasonable restrictions are still placed on overtime. Because of the restrictions that the Government has placed on the commissioner in relation to the amount of overtime that can be incurred, police officers cannot finish a job or go to a job.

I cite an example of which I became aware in my own practice shortly before I entered Parliament. Police were interviewing three people suspected of breaking and entering. At 10 o'clock on a Sunday night, the police sergeant came to the officer and said, "Your shift is finished. That's it." They indicated that they had only a short way to go to finish the interviews. The senior sergeant would not authorise the overtime, and the suspects were allowed to leave.

The investigation was resumed when the officers next came on duty a couple of days later. Overall, that involved a waste of public money and police time, but saved the senior sergeant from having to justify overtime. One of the three suspects returned to his home in Sydney; hence the department had to incur the expense of flying a detective down to charge him, extradite him and bring him back. Consequently, that mismanagement caused by the absurd overtime restriction resulted in a much greater cost to the public purse.

I move on now to the subject of the clear-up rate, which has already been commented on today by other honourable members. The annual report refers to a clear-up rate of 51 per cent. At first glance—on a superficial view—that appears to be a reasonable result. I point out that loaded into the clear-up rate of so-called crime are 2 536 instances of disqualified drivers, 23 184 drink-driving offences and 14 119 drug offences. In other words, almost one-quarter of the 180 000-odd offences for the year are those in respect of which there will always be a 100 per cent clear-up rate. That must call into question, to a certain extent, the validity of the so-called statistics in the report. We know that statistics never provide the whole picture—and I do not restrict my comments to the police report—but when, included in the clear-up figure, are 25 000 traffic offences, for which there will always be a 100 per cent clear-up rate, the result is a higher clear-up figure.

Let me deal with the offences that really strike at the average member of the public—the average family. In my area, the clear-up rate for offences of breaking and entering private homes is approximately 12 per cent, or one in eight. A burglar in my electorate would really have to be incompetent and clumsy to be caught. The annual report shows that the average burglary clear-up rate is approximately 16 per cent, which is not good enough. This year, the clear-up rate for the unlawful use of motor vehicles—another offence that, understandably, greatly offends people and upsets them—once again had a clear-up rate of only about 25 per cent, the same as last year.

I have already made reference to my electorate. I shall now speak about it in more detail. At the eastern end of my electorate—the suburbs of Runcorn, Runcorn Heights,

Sunnybank, Sunnybank Hills, Fruitgrove, Kuraby and Eight Mile Plains, which abut the electorates of Mount Gravatt and Mansfield—widespread concern and complaint are expressed about the inadequacy of police protection, there being no police station in the area. Part is serviced by the police station at Upper Mount Gravatt and part by that at Acacia Ridge. Each requires half a dozen more officers to cover the territory for which each is responsible. That is no reflection on the officers in those stations. They are doing the best they can, but they are not being provided with the necessary staff.

As a result of that widespread concern, a number of citizens, principally from the Runcorn area, have formed the Runcorn Action Group, which, in the next month or so, will be in touch with the Minister. They are very responsible people, who are attempting to do things through the correct channels. They are attempting to have a better understanding of the police protection provided, and are seeking answers about why it cannot be improved. Obviously, they seek a new police station. I would like to hear whether or not that is viable. The Minister probably cannot answer that today; so I ask him to have his planning branch consider it. The overall object of the group is to obtain a reasonable level of police protection. A study, I am sure, would indicate the need for more protection.

I record the appreciation of the citizens, as it was recorded at the meeting last night, for the number of police officers who were prepared to attend, some of them in their own time. That they were prepared to attend when they were not on duty and not being paid indicates the genuine concern that many police officers have about such problems. Those who attended included Sergeant Bartels from Woolloongabba, Detective John Patterson from Upper Mount Gravatt, Sergeant Farquharson from Acacia Ridge and Detective Kearney from the Juvenile Aid Bureau.

All of the police officers made contributions to the meeting, and I can assure the Minister that their attendance was very much appreciated by the people. The people of my electorate would like a blitz or some kind of crime prevention program to be implemented in the short term, but would also like a long-term, more permanent and substantial crime prevention measure to be taken, such as the establishment of a police station. I realise that my electorate is not alone when it comes to the problems associated with crime, but my electorate needs attention. As I have said, submissions and correspondence will be forwarded to the Minister.

The Minister would be aware that in recent months, at least two constituents of mine have telephoned the local police station with a complaint but were unable to obtain a response. In certain cases, identification of the offender has been available, but the complainants received no response. Months have elapsed, and I am still trying to find out what happened and why no response was received. Although I realise that police manpower is stretched in that area, that kind of delay does not engender in me or the people concerned very much confidence in the operations of the Police Department.

I turn now to make brief reference to a comment made by the honourable member for Mount Gravatt (Mr Henderson) in respect of the Ashley case in Gatton. He claimed that I had refused to take the matter up. The fact is simply that, after it was brought to my attention, my colleague the honourable member for Chatsworth (Mr Mackenroth) became the Opposition spokesman on police matters, and I passed the matter into his hands. I know that the honourable member has raised the matter in the House, as it is his duty to do.

Mr FitzGerald: He did not even know where it was. He asked whether it was Goodna, and looked round to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who said, "Gatton."

Mr GOSS: The honourable member for Lockyer is the fox terrier of the Parliament—a lot of noise, but very little impact!

For the record, I make it clear that I did not refuse to handle the matter. I passed the matter into the hands of my colleague. However, as the spurious remarks made by the honourable member for Mount Gravatt relate to a supposed conspiracy between a journalist from the *Sunday Sun* and members of the Opposition, I say that I have never

spoken to Mr Bishop about that particular case, and I reject out of hand the comments made by the honourable member.

The remark made by the honourable member for Mount Gravatt brings me to consider the Police Complaints Tribunal. The honourable member for Mount Gravatt made the laughable comment that members of the Opposition sought to obtain publicity rather than bring complaints about police to the responsible body, namely, the Police Complaints Tribunal. It must be remembered that those words come from a member of Parliament who sought to have himself photographed while he poked his tongue out at a frog, so that the photograph could appear on the front page of a newspaper that circulates in his area, and complained about the editorial policy of the local newspaper when it was applied to matters of serious community concern.

Mr Mackenroth: It was a toad.

Mr GOSS: I am not sure what it was, but perhaps Mr Henderson can tell us because he has a greater interest in the subject.

The widespread view of people with whom I come into contact is that, for one reason or another—and varying reasons have been suggested—the Police Complaints Tribunal is ineffectual in dealing with matters of complaint against police officers. The result seems to be that, in the most serious cases, the reports are presented after very, very lengthy delays, that is, after the members of the public and the media have lost interest. The question is: How convenient and deliberate is that result, as far as the powers that be are concerned?

My reference to the Police Complaints Tribunal reminds me of a particularly serious case concerning a person charged with murder on 22 June 1984, Mr Barry Mannix. It is now almost a year and a-half since that occurred. What has the Government done about the matter? What has the Police Minister or the Police Complaints Tribunal done about the matter? Zilch!

It must be remembered that, if it had not been for a guilty conscience of one of the four people who were eventually convicted of the charge, the son of the deceased would have been convicted by virtue of a false confession, a concocted confession, that was elicited in relation to the murder of his father. A more gross abuse of police power could not be imagined than for the son of a deceased person to be verballed on a murder charge that involved cutting the throat of the deceased. The concoction of the confession was so clumsy that it was not even matched up with the scientific evidence obtained by the police.

The police officers involved deserve all that is coming to them, but the question is—and rumours are flying thick and fast throughout the police force—whether they will get what is coming to them. Apparently, last year certain police started to make moves to see whether some kind of bridge or link could be made between Barry Mannix and the four people who were eventually convicted of the crime, so that the police officers could be taken off the hook. The first reaction of a small section of police officers was, “How do we get our mates out of this?” That is a disgraceful attitude and, believe me, members of the Opposition will be looking closely at the final result of the deliberations of the Police Complaints Tribunal—that is, if it ever brings down a report, and if at some time during the decade it ever gets round to reporting on the Mannix case. The Police Complaints Tribunal will not be permitted to adopt delay tactics, if that course is sought to be adopted, as has been suggested to me by some police officers.

The snail's pace of that investigation is not good enough. The overwhelming majority of decent police officers and most members of the community would, I believe, abhor what was done to Barry Mannix. I urge the Minister and the commissioner to take firm, prompt and decisive action in relation to the police officers involved in that case, because not only will that do justice to Barry Mannix, but it will result, I believe, in the public having much higher esteem for police in general. It is only by weeding out the bad apples that the deserved reputation of the great majority of hard-working, decent and honest police will be saved.

As I say, the Mannix case will not go away easily. It is a sad indictment of affairs in Queensland when, a year and a-half after the murder, Barry Mannix is in New Zealand hiding from a number of Queensland police for his own protection. That is absolutely disgraceful.

Mr Glasson interjected.

Mr GOSS: That is why he is there and that is why he has been there from the beginning. I know that certain police are trying to put it round that he is in New Zealand hiding from the real villains, but that is not the reason. He is in New Zealand on good advice to keep away from certain police officers. If that is not so, he would be back here, because the real villains are now in goal. As I say, the police officers concerned are in the minority but, if they are not weeded out, the whole police force and the whole community of Queensland will suffer from what occurred in that case.

Again I implore the Minister and the commissioner to get moving. Over a year ago, *The Sunday Mail* exposed what happened. There was announcement of a police investigation, yet still the excuses continue. First it was the trial, now it is the Police Complaints Tribunal. The trial has been over for a while, but the tribunal still moves with the speed of a thousand snails, even though this is probably the most serious and gross abuse of police power that has occurred in this State for a long time. Immediate action should be taken. A royal commission is the only way to sort this case out, because the Police Complaints Tribunal will, at some far distant time in the future, come up with an indecisive report, or at least I suspect that that is what will happen. And what will it do then? All it does is make recommendations to the commissioner or Mr Sturgess.

Time expired.

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Condamine) (5.7 p.m.): I rise today to support the Minister in this debate on the Estimates for Lands, Forestry and Police.

It is my intention to address myself to matters relating to the Forestry Department. Firstly, however, I want to acknowledge the fine service given by the staff of that department. Quite recently, Mr Jim Smart retired from the position of Conservator of Forests. Mr Smart's contributions to the department have been outstanding. I join with all those people who wish him and Mrs Smart a long and happy retirement. Queensland's new Conservator of Forests is Mr John Kelly. I congratulate Mr Kelly on his appointment and look forward to working harmoniously with him and his officers.

It is interesting to note that the head of the Forestry Department is called a conservator. Honourable members will quickly realise that the word "conservator" comes from the word "conserve". So, too, does the word "conservationist". There is a tendency for a minority of people to look upon the Forestry Department as being a rapist of Queensland forests. That, of course, is utter nonsense. Queensland's foresters are, in fact people highly skilled in the art of caring for and conserving Queensland's forests, yet harvesting these forests for the good of the State. I would have no hesitation in claiming that Queensland's forestry employees are better qualified in the art of conservation than many of those who are critical of the department.

Nevertheless, I hope that the department continues to listen to the voices of responsible conservation bodies and carefully assesses the points that they raise.

Sustained yield production of forest products within a balanced conservation program is the main objective of the Department of Forestry. A two-part document *Forest Management in Queensland* was released in 1984. It covers in detail the general forest policies and management strategies for the 4.4 million ha Crown forest estate. At the time, the Minister described the document as the most comprehensive management guide for forests ever produced in Queensland, reflecting the wealth of knowledge gained during the department's 85-year history.

The document sets out, for the first time, a basis for the comprehensive ongoing multiple-use management of the State's forest resources. The Minister said, when

announcing its publication, that the document brings together soundly based and clearly defined policies for the conservation of the forest environment and the protection of its water catchments and landscapes. While providing for carefully regulated timber production, the strategies outlined in the document assure positive attention to the continued protection of the wildlife habitats and ecological systems of the forests.

The principle of multiple use also caters for a variety of community needs, including recreation and education pursuits. The Minister has made it perfectly clear that this latest management document signals no major shifts in policy direction. Nevertheless, it sets out for the first time the balanced approach applied by the department to management of its forests.

Among other things, the document outlines the policy followed when dealing with such things as proposals for mining in sensitive forest areas, proposals for quarry operations and the use of State forest land for public utilities. Through the policies and strategies listed in the document, timber-harvesting based on sustained yield production will maintain the genetic diversity of our forests.

Environmental considerations continue to be recognised as important aspects of forest management and will be maintained through the application of a number of guidelines.

These are—

- carefully controlled logging under tree-marking rules and strict operating controls;
- preservation of intact representative areas of significant forest types and ecological communities;

- a vigorous selection and tree-breeding program to protect and improve native and exotic species; and

- detailed investigation into the silviculture, fire ecology, hydrology, zoology and pathology of the forests.

Special management areas will continue to be set aside for stream protection, scientific areas, beauty spots, State forest parks, forest drives and other forest values.

Practical application of the management strategies was discussed thoroughly by departmental officers at a special management plan development conference at Gympie last October. As a result of that conference, four types of plans will be developed progressively. They are—

- State plan (parts one and two referred to above);

- thematic plans covering major forest types and activities such as recreation;

- State forest group plans; and

- action plans.

The State forest group plans will be made available for public comment at the draft stage. In order not to delay their preparation, the first generation plans will be, in essence, status quo statements of current and planned management procedures.

Where appropriate, the forests will be zoned for priority management, which will ensure that all forest values are given adequate consideration during the planning process.

It is envisaged that the first State forest group plans will become available for public scrutiny towards the end of this year, or early 1986. I believe this to be a major initiative by the department and the Government. It will be most interesting to monitor the reaction and response to this form of public involvement.

The Department of Forestry has developed a special management plan for its forests in the Conondale Ranges. That plan was published in 1982 and is currently being implemented.

Management of the Conondale forests is based on multiple-use principles, which ensures that all forests values, including wood production, landscape, water quality and recreation, are managed in a responsible, balanced and planned manner.

Forest management in the Conondales embraces the three primary objectives of the World and National Conservation Strategies, and pursues the sustained utilisation of a valuable and necessary timber resource.

Selective logging in the Conondales is controlled by strict environmental guide-lines which are stringently administered by officers of the department.

Unfortunately, many misconceptions are being promoted by some conservationists about the department's role in the Conondales. Environmentalists are actively campaigning for the extension of national park tenure in the area supposedly to attract more tourists.

There are two national parks in the Conondale Range region. National Park 477, with an area of 386 ha, was first gazetted in 1931, and extended in 1979 by the inclusion of former State forest. National Park 1100, with an area of 1 740 ha, was gazetted in 1977, and was based on a joint report made by Queensland Government and CSIRO officers.

The bulk of the area recommended as the most significant by these officers was included in the national park. The report did not refer to the Booloumba Creek catchment as being significant for preservation.

The total area of the Conondales preserved in national parks and feature protection areas amounts to more than 3 000 ha, covering much of the region's most valuable virgin forests. Another 4 000 ha of rainforests are being held in a virgin condition in the area's State forests.

I might add here that, contrary to suggestions by a number of conservationists, none of the Conondale rain forests is being logged except for narrow strips less than 40 metres wide.

The Minister has quite rightly challenged conservationists' claims that more than 300 000 tourists could visit an extended national park in the Conondales.

As the Minister pointed out, 300 000 visitors would trample the place to death; it would be an ecological disaster. The Forestry Department adopts the attitude that, to conserve the forest environment, future planning must spread rather than concentrate the tourist load.

This year, more than 30 000 tourists to the Conondales will use facilities and roads provided by the Forestry Department. This vindicates the department's multiple-use management of the region. It shows that tourism and scientifically sound logging can coexist and that future employment in either industry need not suffer at the expense of the other. The Government is well aware of the Conondale's tourist potential and associated employment prospects and will consider them in future management-planning.

Another fallacious claim by the conservationists is that logging threatens wildlife. The Conondale Range Fauna Study, commissioned in 1982, refutes this claim and explodes the myth that birds, such as the rare eastern bristle bird and the marbled frogmouth, are threatened with extinction. The study also uncovered two rare bat colonies living in a disused mine shaft. They are now protected by the department.

A number of local organisations, including the Maroochy Shire Council and the Sunshine Coast Tourism and Development Board, support the department's commonsense management of the Conondales. For the past 60 years the department has managed the Conondale forest in a most responsible manner, and I have every confidence that they will continue to do so to preserve the unique beauty and environmental integrity of the area.

To ensure that responsible conservation bodies, such as the Queensland Wildlife Preservation Society, are able to voice their ideas, I hope that the Forestry Department remains willing to listen to their submissions and to judge their worth.

Fraser Island has special management problems because of the various types of land administered by several departments. The major types under Crown control are State forest, national park, vacant Crown land and the beach.

For more than half a century, the Department of Forestry has played a major role in the forest management of Fraser Island. The effectiveness of these management practices in conserving the environment in its present aesthetic state is attested to by the large number of people who have turned to Fraser Island for recreation in recent years.

For the past few years, the Department of Forestry and the National Parks and Wildlife Service have been developing and servicing, in areas under their respective control, recreation facilities in the form of camping areas, information centres, and walks and drives. These facilities are much appreciated by the public and are well maintained in a clean and tidy condition.

However, along the coast, particularly on the eastern side, which is commonly known as Back Beach, a considerable area of beach and adjoining frontal sand dunes are not under the control of the Forestry Department or the National Parks and Wildlife Service. It is this part of Fraser Island that receives the heaviest use, particularly during school holidays and during the fishing season when the tairāwhiri are running. So far this area has not, for recreation use, been managed by any controlling body, with the result that indiscriminate dumping of litter and garbage has made an unsightly and generally unacceptable mess of a popular section of the beach.

In places, uncontrolled camping and heavy exploitation of native vegetation for fuel have resulted in denudation and unacceptable levels of damage to a sensitive dune environment. This year the problem was addressed with the passage of the Fraser Island Public Access Act. This legislation established the Fraser Island Recreation Authority, consisting of the Ministers administering the Forestry Act and the National Parks and Wildlife Act, and the Fraser Island Recreation Board, consisting of the Conservator of Forests and the under secretary of the Department of The Arts, National Parks and Sport. These bodies are charged with administering the provisions of the new Act.

A prime objective of the Fraser Island Public Access Act is to prevent damage to the sensitive environment of the Fraser Island recreation area, including all Crown land on the island. For the first time, there will be one body—the Fraser Island Recreation Board—controlling the development of recreation on the island and ensuring the maintenance of established recreation facilities and the environment of areas used by the public.

As agents of the board, the Department of Forestry and the National Parks and Wildlife Service will carry out the actual development, maintenance and rehabilitation works. This will broaden involvement by the Department of Forestry, and the department will be more and more in the public eye on Fraser Island. I am sure that the expertise demonstrated so far by the Department of Forestry in managing production forests and State forest-based recreation on the island soon will be evident in the beach area also.

The Fraser Island public access legislation provides for the issue of permits and the collection of fees for entry to and camping on the recreation area. It is expected that fees will apply to visits from 1 February 1986. Fees collected, together with other funds to be made available, will enable the board to instigate a campaign to clean up the present unsightly garbage along Back Beach, to establish and maintain appropriate rubbish dumps, to set up a system of rubbish bins and, in time, to provide more well-planned and better-maintained recreation facilities for camping and day use.

Mr Davis: As you live on the Darling Downs, what would you know about Fraser Island?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: Probably not very much, but it would be as much as the honourable member for Brisbane Central knows.

Mr Davis: This is another brief.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: This matter has been discussed in this Chamber.

The scale of fees has been set after consulting with several Fraser Island user groups and should be well within reach of the average family and tourists. In particular, the \$10 per vehicle per visit levy and the \$25 charge for a camping site for a week are relatively small when compared with the outlay required for a suitable vehicle for use on the island.

Mr Burns: Which residents did they talk to about this before they set the fees? Who were they?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: They talked to users.

Mr Burns: Which users? I cannot find any users who state they were consulted.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I have spoken to people from my electorate who go to Fraser Island. Fraser Island is pretty close to the Darling Downs.

Mr Burns: What about giving me a couple of names.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: For a start, Vivian Brown.

The legislation must be seen as a positive approach to a problem that has developed over the years. In the near future, the Department of Forestry, as one of the operating bodies for the Fraser Island Recreation Board, will be involved in the island clean-up operation and members of the public will be able to see the value of the permit fees levied.

In respect to the management of rain forest areas under the control of the Department of Forestry, I commend the Minister and his department for the very responsible approach adopted. Public concern for rain forests obviously stems from the alarming rate at which the world's tropical rain forests are being cleared.

A Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) report presented at the recent World Forestry Congress in Mexico, which the Minister attended, claimed that 11 million hectares of tropical rain forest were disappearing each year. The Food and Agriculture Organisation report said that the problem was not due to commercial timber-harvesting but mostly the result of pressures for wood for fuel and agricultural uses. These problems do not apply in Queensland, where management of the tropical rain forest in Crown ownership is well controlled.

The area of rain forests in Queensland is 1 237 000 ha, made up of the following tenures—

State forests and timber reserves	665 000 ha
National parks	303 000 ha
Other Crown lands	162 000 ha
Freehold	107 000 ha

More than 90 per cent of Queensland's rain forests are Crown owned. Of the total rain forest estate, two-thirds is held in an undisturbed condition, including 25 per cent preserved in national parks.

State forests are managed according to a policy of multiple-use management which integrates a number of rain forest values including recreation, education, flora and fauna habitat protection, water-catchment protection and scientific study with timber production.

Of the total area of north Queensland's rain forests in Crown ownership, only about 25 per cent is zoned for timber production. Selective timber-harvesting is carried out according to sound scientific principles and strict environmental guide-lines. Research evidence shows that selective logging is a valid component of multiple-use management. Results show that typical virgin rain forests do not begin to make positive volume growth until logged and that logging captures some of the trees that would die if left in the virgin condition. No species of flora or fauna has been threatened because of logging.

Rain forests have an immense regeneration potential and regeneration in terms of both species and individual tree numbers and of the canopy structure is rapid. The rapid re-establishment of a continuous canopy ameliorates the short-term visual effect of logging. Strict management guide-lines applied to harvesting operations are the result of a program of hydrological research carried out by the Department of Forestry beginning in the late 1960s.

Mr Davis: Brian——

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I am sorry, I do not have time.

Mr Davis: I wanted to congratulate you—top reading.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I thank the honourable member for that—nine out of 10.

These studies have led to the clearer understanding of the fundamental processes at work in the humid rain forest environment. They have shown that with pre-logging planning, well-engineered logging roads, well-built stream crossings, restrictions on wet-season operations and the retention of stream buffer strips, water quality in rain forest catchments is maintained. Management of these values must be seen in the context of the whole of the Crown-owned rain forest. The rain forest zoned for logging forms a complex mosaic with undisturbed rain forest. Apart from national parks, unlogged areas include steep areas which would be prone to soil erosion if logged. Unlogged areas also include unproductive areas of high recreation potential, scientific areas and stream buffer strips.

No species of wildlife has become extinct as a result of selective harvesting. The diversity created by the mosaic of logged and unlogged rain forest tends to foster rather than to restrict the diversity of fauna populations. In summary—the rain forest resource in Queensland has many values, which at least in Queensland have long been appreciated.

Although conservation today has become a popular and emotive issue, it should be well remembered that the first conservationists in this State were its professional foresters. The high media profile afforded the conservationist movement often ignores the very responsible management practices employed by these dedicated officers. No nation on earth can afford the total Garden of Eden approach by locking away all of its natural resources.

I commend the Queensland Government on the way in which it has provided for a balance of preservation, conservation and production in rain forest areas. I commend also the Department of Forestry on the development of a selective harvesting system within the principle of sustained yield. Coupled with detailed sales management and environmental controls, this system may well serve as a model for other countries, particularly those with tropical rain forest, to follow.

I turn now to overseas forestry aid. Because Queensland is located in a tropical and subtropical environment and because the Department of Forestry has pursued a vigorous forest management policy over many years, officers have developed skills that are being highly sought after in other parts of the world, particularly South East Asia. It seems that, in that part of the world, because of the need for fuel and the pursuit of agriculture, people are putting pressure on rain forests. It is understandable that they should seek the skills of the Queensland Forestry Department to put their management of forests on a sound basis.

In conclusion, I congratulate the Minister on the way in which he handles his portfolio and I support his Estimates.

Mr BURNS (Lytton) (5.27 p.m.): Crime is Queensland's fastest growth industry. When the Premier and Treasurer talks about a boom, he should put crime at the top of the list. If anyone wants to enter free enterprise in National Party Queensland, he should become a crook; he will be amply rewarded. Half the crimes in this State go undetected and offenders are not prosecuted. If a person does not want to enter criminal activity, he should go into crime protection. Because of the Government's failure to

provide sufficient policemen, another growth industry in Queensland is crime protection. People have been forced to turn their homes into fortresses. They are forced to use locks, security grilles, alarms, patrolmen, intruder-protection devices, safes, bolts, record-protection cabinets, cameras and barred windows. The use of devices by citizens to protect their homes and to turn them into bunkers to protect themselves from the criminals in the community, who go undeterred in our streets, make security agencies one of Queensland's major growth industries.

In June 1984, it was estimated that four types of crime cost Queensland \$140m a year. Burglary, car-theft, shop-lifting and arson are reflected in high insurance premiums and cost of goods and services. According to Mr John Hall, State manager of the Insurance Council of Australia, burglary claims have risen 400 per cent in five years.

Some big insurance companies in Queensland are considering bringing in a two-tier home insurance system—grading premiums according to the suburb's high or low burglary risk. Some local companies have been working towards the new scheme for the past two years. They have identified the high-risk areas and adjusted accordingly the availability of household theft and burglary policies. That matter is being examined closely by them.

Everyone must pay for the National Party Government's failure to live up to the purpose of the Police Department as spelt out in the report of the Police Department, which was tabled today. The report states that the purpose of the Police Department is to contribute towards the well-being of persons in Queensland by protecting life and property, preserving order, preventing and detecting crime and apprehending and bringing to justice of offenders. Honourable members know that that is not happening. They know that the police are not doing that. I am critical not of police officers but of the Minister for not providing sufficient manpower to do the job. Day in and day out, the Government talks law and order. However, it does nothing about practical law and order in the streets and in the homes in the suburbs. Day in and day out, crime has increased in the last 12 months. Homicide offences have increased by 14 per cent, serious assaults by 10 per cent, breaking and entering offences by 6 per cent and motor vehicle thefts by 9 per cent.

The clear-up rate for breaking and entering offences in this State is 16 per cent. On the Gold Coast, where all the tourists go, the clean-up rate is only 8 per cent. The clear-up rate for stealing offences involving motor vehicles is 24 per cent for Queensland and only 11 per cent for the Gold Coast. Only 37 per cent of robberies are cleared up. In other words, 63 in every 100 criminals get away with it. Only 28 per cent of robberies are cleared up on the Gold Coast.

I turn to the increase in juvenile crime, crime committed by kids who will be the future criminals. Juvenile crime is up 18 per cent. As many as 55 per cent of break and enter crimes are committed by kids; 43 per cent of stealing offences are committed by kids; 29 per cent of malicious damage is done by kids and 43 per cent of motor vehicles are stolen by kids.

The Government has programs such as the Year of the Family and other stunts, but it will not spend a buck on additional police officers and additional facilities. Police stations are closed at either 9 o'clock or midnight, and no police officers are available. A few mobile patrols operate. The Government spends a miserable sum of money on police activity, yet it claims to maintain law and order. That is bull; I cannot put it any other way.

In the Queensland Police Department's portion of the Treasury submission to the Commonwealth Grants Commission it is stated—

“Another possible factor to be taken into account is that people will not usually commit crimes if they expect to get caught. In other words, the likelihood of detection is relevant to their decision whether or not to commit an offence.”

Those are not my words. That statement by the Police Department is contained in the Treasury submission to the Commonwealth Grants Commission. It states that people

will not commit crimes if they think that they will be caught. Criminals know that they will not be caught.

Recently, my own home has been burgled a couple of times. On telephoning the police station one is told, "Recently, 140 break and enters of vehicles have occurred in the Morningside area." I was told that 14 break and enters in the Morningside area alone occurred the night before my home was broken into. The story goes on. I will recount more incidents as I go on.

People are not even reporting crimes. When my home was broken into, people said to me, "Don't worry about reporting it. The police can do nothing about it." Most of the time the police officers say that they can do nothing about it, and they arrive hours after the event. I do not blame the police. The men are just not on the ground to provide the facilities.

If the estimates of the Bureau of Criminology in Canberra are correct, 40 per cent of crimes are not reported. Can honourable members imagine what the figure would be if all crimes were reported? People do not complain, because they know that nothing can or will be done.

I remind the Minister that in November 1984 I wrote to him on behalf of Mr and Mrs Knight, the proprietors of Helm Imports, who told me that they were robbed prior to Easter 1980. Mr and Mrs Knight asked me to ascertain the outcome of the matter. As I said, I wrote to the Minister in November 1984. The Minister acknowledged my letter and told me that the matter would be investigated. I have not heard from the Minister since. If they do not get any answers, people will say, "What is the use of complaining to the police?"

Mr and Mrs Knight complained to me, as their member of Parliament. I get on fairly well with the Minister. I said to them, "Do not worry. Bill Glasson will answer my query." However, the Minister has not taken any action other than to acknowledge my letter.

The letter that I received from Mrs Knight reads as follows—

"Just prior to Easter 1980 we learnt that one of our representatives, Mr Bob Burandt, had sold goods belonging to us which had an approximate wholesale value of \$130. We notified the Woolloongabba C.I.B. of this and after they investigated the matter, Mr Burandt was charged. That was 4½ years ago and we still do not know the outcome of this matter."

I repeat that in November 1984 I wrote to the Minister and asked him to inform me of the outcome. The Minister acknowledged my letter, but has not told me the outcome. The Minister cannot tell me that he cannot do better than that. Eleven months have elapsed. Surely those people are entitled to know the outcome of that matter. Why the hell would people go to the police if they cannot even get an answer to a request? Four years after the event, and 11 months after I wrote to him, the Minister has not given an answer.

Queensland has the lowest ratio of police to population of any police force in Australia. On page 134 of the annual report the statistics of the Police Department show that Queensland has one police officer for every 532 persons, compared with one for 515 in New South Wales, 474 in Victoria, 433 in Tasmania, 418 in South Australia, 493 in Western Australia and 216 in the Northern Territory. When one considers this State's vast distances and scattered population, that is a scandalous state of affairs.

However, it is even worse when one considers the police to population strength in the south-east region, where, according to the police union, the ratio is 1:994. Since 1980, serious crime in the south-east region has increased by 22 per cent, general crime has increased by 17 per cent and police strength has increased by only 9 per cent. In the year to June 1984, more than 8 500 serious crimes were committed on the Gold Coast. The crime increase on the Gold Coast was easily the highest of any Queensland district, despite complaints by the Gold Coast police about the need for increased numbers.

Mr Syd Atkinson, the former Deputy Commissioner of Police, giving evidence before the Commonwealth Grants Commission, said as follows—

“In Dunwich on Stradbroke Island—”

and last night the Premier promised additional police officers for the electorate of Redlands, where a by-election is to be held shortly—

“if I may break in, there are three policemen to a population of 3 294 for an area of 274 kilometres, and there would certainly be a number of visitors which we could add to that, plus the transients.”

Three policemen to 3 294 residents! The Government misuses statistics to con the people by talking about there being one policeman to every 532 people.

Last night, the Premier suddenly discovered that there was a problem in the area of Redlands. People in the electorate of Redlands face the same problem as others in new, developing areas, in that the South East Queensland Electricity Board will not even connect street lights until large numbers of houses have been built.

Anyone who has built a new home in such an area has ample evidence of breaking and entering offences and thieving. Anyone who wants the evidence need only ask builders about the stoves, tiles, kitchen cupboards, tins of paint and electrical gear that are stolen. Any professional builder has a mobile van in which he packs all of his material and equipment. Nothing is left on the job; there is no security. The police say that there is just no way of providing protection. A stove stolen from one area can be installed in a house in another. It is scandalous that SEQEB will not provide street lights for protection in those new areas, where the young people—the battlers—are striving to make a go of it. I hope that, when they vote in Redlands, they remember the way in which the Government has treated them in the provision of police protection.

The Cleveland Police Station is controlled by Wynnum. The people in the Redlands electorate take a stand and say that they are not part of Brisbane, but the Government tags their area onto the Wynnum district. Cleveland is an old, established area, in which the State's first sugar-mill was established years and years ago. It is not a latter-day suburb; it is an old suburb. A sergeant is on duty at Cleveland until midnight. Between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m., two officers are on mobile patrol. Anybody who rings up is connected to the city or to Wynnum. An officer has to travel eight or nine miles to get there. In my own area, when shops in the Cannon Hill K mart complex were broken into, the policemen who investigated came from Oxley. What sort of service is that?

A week ago I was in Japan, where policemen are being put in little huts overnight in areas where they are needed. In areas in which there are no police stations, an officer is available overnight. What is happening in Queensland? The National Party close suburban police stations. With a population of between 55 000 and 60 000, the Redlands area does not constitute a police district in its own right. It is controlled by Wynnum. A police station should be built at Capalaba, to afford that area the protection to which each and every person in the community is entitled. It is the Government's responsibility to provide that protection.

At Morningside, in my electorate, 13 police are stationed. From Sunday to Thursday, the hours of duty are 8 a.m. to midnight. Anybody who wants to commit a robbery should do so between midnight and 8 a.m. If he waits till midnight, the police will have gone home. On Friday and Saturday nights the station is open until 2 a.m.; so a robber waits until 3 o'clock. It is crazy. What sort of police force do we have? The police themselves complain. They say, “It's not fair, Tom. We can't do the job.” The Government cuts back on over-time and is involved in all sorts of scandalous misuse of the policemen. The Government hides behind the policemen and is failing to do its job as a Government. I am not criticising the Minister personally; I am criticising the Government.

In the Wynnum police district, 1 061 breaking and entering offences were recorded last year and only 262 were solved. Wynnum has 67 uniformed policemen and 10 civilians—no detectives, and no technical or scientific staff. That total of 77 must cover Redland Bay and all of the islands in Moreton Bay. In the booming area of Redlands

are 55 000 people. Seventy-seven people must look after that area as well as my electorate. The average annual percentage population growth in that area between 1981 and 1984 was 3.4 per cent—the highest in the South Brisbane Region. It covers 600 sq km, and South Brisbane covers 200 sq km and Oxley 200 sq km, also. South Brisbane has 162 policemen and Oxley 129; but Wynnum, with its much greater area, has only a staff of 77, including civilians. No wonder the people down there are concerned; no wonder an issue in the by-election campaign is the need for additional police to protect their homes and their children.

The incidence of stealing and the unlawful use of motor vehicles increased in 1984-85 after a decrease in the previous year. Is it any wonder in those areas, where there are so many unemployed youth? The bus service closes down at week-ends and the policemen go home at midnight. When those youths want to get home, they take a car.

If any facet of the Government's activities highlights its failure, it is the lack of protection of people's property. The low clear-up rate of 28 per cent in 1983-84 fell even further to 24 per cent in 1984-85. Out of every 100 cars stolen, 18 are never recovered and are completely lost. Young people who have saved up all their lives and put money into a bank account or have invested in an interest-bearing deposit start to pay off a car but, when they come to the place where the car has been parked outside a dance or a picture theatre, the car is not there. Finance companies do not worry about the failure of the police to find the car or the lack of police attributable to the car's being stolen. The finance company just tells young people, "Keep paying." Today, throughout the community, young people are paying off cars that they will never again drive because the Government has failed to act.

I have written to the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police in respect of the Wynnum North area of my electorate—an area in which cars have been stolen and burnt out. Twelve months ago, two cars belonging to members of the same family were stolen from the same place. Honourable members could see in Pritchard Road in my electorate or near the port of Brisbane the burnt-out bodies of the cars—the evidence of stolen cars that have been vandalised and burnt—because the Government has failed to act.

In a submission to the Minister for further finance and staff resources, police officers pointed out that, in many cases, people do not report cases of theft. It must be remembered that theft will not occur if the offenders think that they will be apprehended.

I have a report that, in my electorate, 90 incidents of car-park breaking and entering offences have occurred at the Morningside Railway Station. Officers of the Police and Railway Departments said that anyone who leaves a vehicle in one of the 53 park-and-drive facilities or at other suburban car-parking facilities is putting the vehicle at risk. The police officers have told me that under-age offenders get a screw-driver, jam it into the lock on the door of the vehicle, and turn it. In the morning some days ago, I discovered my Holden Commodore—the vehicle supplied by the Government, I might add—in the middle of the road with its lights flashing. I found out that although the offenders had not jammed a screw-driver into the lock on the door, they had jammed other things into the lock.

After I telephoned the local police officer, he arrived at my home at approximately 11 a.m. I was told, "Tom, they have been right through the district. A car belonging to the lady up the road has been run off her property and into the dividing property fence. The car from up the road has been driven across the road." The police officer said that the offenders must have been mugs. Anybody who knows his way about can steal a Commodore because Commodores are so easy to steal. Why does the Government not do something about theft? Why does the Government not start to put pressure on car-manufacturers to improve the locks on cars so that, at least when the car is locked and put into a garage, it can be expected to be in the same place the following day instead of being in the middle of the road with the lights flashing and the doors jammed.

Mr FitzGerald: You could make a fortune if you were to design a good lock.

Mr BURNS: Car-manufacturers can make a great deal of money out of designing other things; there is no money in designing a good lock. Without any problems relative to security, car-manufacturers are selling cars, and that is what they are in business to do.

The next item I wish to canvass is the intimidation of senior citizens, which has become one of the fastest growing crimes in Brisbane. Senior citizens have become a major target for con men, crooked tradesmen, the sick and the perverted. Files kept by the Police Department show that a staggering array of offenders was taking advantage of the elderly people in the community. Apparently, the culprits include pick-pockets, bogus tradesmen, religious fanatics, purse-snatchers, burglars, sex offenders and confidence tricksters. My mother and father are getting on in years, and I have no doubt that many of the honourable members in this Parliament have elderly parents and worry how they are getting on at night-time, especially when one reads about elderly women being raped in their homes by lunatics and about old people who cannot defend themselves being bashed by burglars. People who go round with meals on wheels see the doors locked and wonder what would happen if fire broke out inside the houses. I remember reading about an old lady who died in her home because she could not get out and the fire brigade could not get in. That was reported by fire brigade officers and is their statement, not mine. It makes me realise that law and order and the principle of protecting the ordinary person in this community have failed as objectives of the Government.

Moreover, the problems are compounded by the many cases of hidden victimisation. I instance cases of offences committed against elderly people who do not wish to report the crime. The reasons for that are known only to the elderly, but they would include shame and the humiliation of having to admit that they had been stupid and had contributed to instances of cases that have not been reported. I can give an example in my electorate of a house-painter who charges \$600 as a deposit and who, after having sanded a portion of the wall, takes off and is never seen again. The police are after that person because he has been bludging on old people. He has been getting away with it because police officers have so many other jobs to do besides spending time chasing that offender.

In the last few minutes that I have available this afternoon, I wish to talk about Government action in respect of drug offences. During the last few days, the Government announced that it would co-operate in the Noah drug operations. I congratulate the Minister on taking that action.

It is to the eternal disgrace of the Queensland Government that it has not co-operated previously in the Noah drug detection operations. As the Minister would no doubt be aware, Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia have co-operated in the joint task-force. It is a pity that the big drug-pusher never gets caught but that the drug addict does, although nothing is dirtier or filthier than drug addiction.

The Queensland Government has a history of not co-operating with Federal authorities and has a history of using State rights to protect criminals—the Brian Mahers of the world and the people who are lauded and held in high regard by this Government because they have a great deal of money. Such people became millionaires by bludging on ordinary people. They have got it by ripping off the system to suit themselves. They are the ones who were touted round this place by the National Party as leading lights, the people who the community and the kids in the street should all look up to. It was suggested that people should take a leaf out of their book and follow them. They were lauded and protected because of their money.

It was Queensland which fought against the establishment of the National Crime Authority. Instead of having a Federal authority take on drugs in the north, the Premier said, "Give us the planes and other equipment." Do members know what he would have done with them? He would have flown to Kingaroy or to his son's property or taken a holiday somewhere in the damned thing! With his interference in the Police Air Unit and the use of its aeroplanes to junket backwards and forwards to Kingaroy, is it

any wonder that the Federal authorities said that they ought to have some involvement——

Mr FitzGerald interjected

Mr BURNS: A Government member is attempting to interject about drugs. The Minister's own report states that there are only 28 detectives under the control of a detective inspector, plus four female public servants and one female uniformed officer to handle the drug scene throughout Queensland. Drugs are the most massive multi-million-dollar criminal activity in the world today. That activity has grown in Queensland.

The magistrate at Cleveland said in court that his area was becoming the marijuana capital of Queensland. But what has the National Party done other than to scream, shout, carry on and prosecute a few kids who smoke a bit of marijuana? It has done nothing about the big blokes, because they mean money, because they have money, because the National Party stands for money, because the National Party loves money and because it could not care less whether it is drug money or otherwise. The sweet smell of corruption wafts straight over the sweet smell of marijuana—the pot-growers' society! The National Party is the pot-growers' party of this nation. It has supported it; it has nursed it; it has nurtured it; it has looked after it. The National Party has done nothing about it under any circumstances——

Mr SIMPSON: I rise to a point of order. I take offence at the remark that we are the pot-growing party of this nation. That is offensive to me. We know that it is the Labor Party that wants it in its back yard.

Mr BURNS: He cannot take a point of order. The Premier's son was growing pot on his farm. The Premier's son had pot growing on the farm.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Randell): Order! The honourable member for Lytton has been warned once today. If I warn him again, he will be forced to leave the Chamber. The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr McPHIE (Toowoomba North) (5.48 p.m.): A few moments ago, the honourable member for Lytton (Mr Burns) said that there is nothing dirtier than people who peddle drugs, yet it is his party that is trying to legalise the use of drugs. The ALP has as part of its policy the legalising of the taking and growing of drugs.

Mr MACKENROTH: I rise to a point of order. The member from Toowoomba is misrepresenting our policy. Our policy is not to legalise marijuana, or the smoking of marijuana.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr McPHIE: It is very interesting to hear that the Australian Labor Party has changed its policy.

I have been a member of this House for only two years, and I have learned two things about the speeches of the honourable member for Lytton; either they are in a light vein and are most entertaining or, alternatively, as members heard this afternoon, they are grossly exaggerated, emotive and quite incorrect.

The honourable member for Lytton suggested that this Government should radically and significantly increase the number of police in this State. Such an increase would not solve any more crimes, nor would it stop the commission of crimes. If police numbers in this State were doubled, the first thing the honourable member would do would be to complain that there were too many and that the Government was turning Queensland into a police State.

The honourable member was also quite incorrect—the Minister will back me up in his summary—when he said that Queensland's crime statistics are worse than those in other States. In fact, in most cases they are far better than those of other States and other countries throughout the world.

Crime is part of society as we know it today. The difference in Queensland is the excellent job that the police officers of this State are doing. On the subject of police numbers, I believe that the Government has hit a responsible and realistic balance with the force out in the field. I congratulate the Minister, the commissioner and the men on the most excellent job that they are doing.

Time will not permit me to comment in any depth on a widely diversified range of activities covered by this Minister's portfolio. Much as I might like to range free over all areas, I will confine my remarks mainly to two particular areas, land tenure and forestry, both of which are of considerable interest to me.

I note from the Minister's speech that \$20.79m is to be granted to the Department of Lands. This, of course, covers the total for the Land Administration Commission and includes the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board, the rabbit control authority, the administration of the Barrier Fences Act and the Brisbane Forest Park operation, as well as the somewhat more mundane work of the Lands Department.

In dealing with the nominated areas on which I intend to speak, I am sure I will show honourable members that the department's policy objectives have been definitely achieved in the past year and that the State has received good value for money expended. I am confident that the year ahead will prove to be the same.

I congratulate the Minister on his initiative in implementing a major reorganisation of the Land Administration Commission during the past year. It was the first review in the department's 115-year history. This reorganisation will surely give the department a new, revitalised image and will ensure more efficient operation. That will be to everyone's advantage.

In the same period, significant changes have been made to land tenure in Queensland, to provide a more up-to-date, streamlined, and better-managed system. The Land Act has a long history. It is one that has been regularly updated to meet changing needs, requirements and demands by the community for security of land tenure. The public demands a land-tenure system that provides security of title and ease of transferability, security for financing, security during any development phase, security for designated land use and certainty with respect to effective land-use controls.

As mentioned by the Minister, the Government's policies during the year have moved to ensure this security as well as to prevent unlawful occupation of Crown lands and to ensure coexistence of tenures in the lands and mining areas.

Queensland is a large State with many and different land conditions. In order for it to prosper, there must be a range and variety of land-tenure types to meet these many different situations as they occur. The Government deliberately fosters a freehold-type tenure structure but, at the same time, it recognises other situations that have to be adequately catered for so that appropriate balances may be kept in our community. Thus the land-tenure system gives a certain interest in land, be it freehold, freeholding, perpetual, terminable or mere occupancy rights, and such interest can be cut up and have further interest arising therefrom. Of course, that means that the original interest granted by the Crown is itself capable of division and subdivision, and that derivative interests can be created from it. Clearly, all such interests have also to be capable of protection and, where appropriate, alienation.

The Queensland Government can stand on its record on what it has achieved in this regard since coming to office. Urban allotments are no longer leased, but are sold for an estate in fee simple. Lessees of existing auction perpetual leases and perpetual lease selections can pay out their total rent commitments and receive freehold title. Provision exists for land contained in special leases, where not over a reserve or not required for public purposes or future development, and reasonably improved, to be sold for an estate in fee simple. The term leases of grazing farms, grazing homestead and settlement farm leases have been converted to grazing homestead perpetual leases, with a tenure in perpetuity. Provision exists for grazing homestead perpetual leases, upon meeting certain criteria, to be converted to freehold. Special provisions have been made

for stud holdings to ensure that Queensland maintains its ability to produce quality merino sheep and beef cattle.

Today's announcement that changes are to be introduced so that Crown land leases can be held in perpetuity will give greater security of tenure in remote areas of Queensland. Maximum-area limitation expressed in hectares is now expressed in a living-area standard, and the restriction on holding two or more tenures substantially in excess of two living areas now applies solely to the tenure grazing homestead perpetual lease. Administratively, where a pastoral lease does not substantially exceed a living area and is held by qualified individuals, it is permitted to be surrendered and a new lease as a grazing homestead perpetual lease issued in lieu thereof.

Clearly that is a record of which the Government can be justly proud. It is a credit to the Minister and his departmental staff, especially their leader, Mr Wally Baker, in simplifying and rationalising requirements and regulations in this area.

The department's involvement in other areas has been listed by a number of speakers. I have heard great detail about weed control and pest legislation today, which are vital to the continuing prosperity of the State. These matters have been well and adequately covered by other Government speakers.

The Government can take pride in its involvement in the Brisbane Forest Park. The Brisbane Forest Park Administration Authority was established in 1977 to control 25 000 ha of multi-use park to the north west of Brisbane. The park is centred mainly on the Taylor and D'Aguilar Ranges, and the land is owned by the Forestry Department, the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Brisbane City Council. The park was created as a result of community demand for a forest park recreational area close to the highest concentration of population in Queensland. The authority preserves the rights and responsibilities of the land-holders to manage their lands for the purposes for which they were originally dedicated.

Brisbane Forest Park provides a range of outdoor recreational opportunities that are compatible with the preservation of the park's natural values and the historical use of the area for timber production, water catchment and nature conservation. Over \$4m has been spent on developing and improving the recreational facilities in the Brisbane Forest Park since the authority came into being. Last year, a \$10m road program that will link the park with Wivenhoe Dam was begun. That will enhance both areas, to the benefit of the people of Brisbane, the people of south-east Queensland and tourists.

Over 1.5 million people visit the park each year, and that number is increasing. However, I am sure that many Brisbane people are unaware of the natural beauty to be found in the park, which is virtually sitting on their back doorstep. The park has significant tourism potential. It has been forecast that, by 1990, three million people will visit the park each year. If they spend \$20 each, that will amount to a tremendous amount of tourist money for the State. It will be money well spent.

A number of programs involving the Brisbane Forest Park have begun, and some have already come to fruition. A vegetation survey has been carried out and a reference specimen collection is in the process of being established. When completed, that will be very significant; but, given the ongoing nature of such a program, and the variations in the specimens and in the number of participants, it may never be fully completed. An economic study has been undertaken of the benefits of the park, as has a study of Aboriginal use of the park.

Augmentative research grants have been made available for particular aspects of the development and management of the park. Special sets of maps, some relating solely to tourist use of the park, have been produced. Other grants relate to studies into the control of fires.

Promotion of the Brisbane Forest Park is well under way. The excellent Go Bush program is aimed at encouraging city-dwellers to come to the bush to see at close hand the bush environment and its benefits. Education and enforcement programs are in hand, and many of these are being managed by volunteers, who are very important. An

ongoing planning and development program is in place, and it is significant that the 1978 plan for the development of the area is now under review. Maintenance of the park is well attended to. The many walks in the park should be taken by everyone, and one of the attractions just happens to be called McAfee Lookout.

The Brisbane Forest Park represents value for money because it is a developed asset. The Government has a rational approach to conservation that has been developed by the members of the Brisbane Forest Park Administration Authority, and I congratulate them on achieving their objectives. The Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police is getting value for money from them.

After the dinner recess, I will deal at some length with forestry, because it involves a number of important industries. But before getting down to the fine print, I will speak about conservation.

Mr Milliner: You wouldn't have a clue about conservation.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.

Mr McPHIE: Just before the dinner recess, the member for Everton (Mr Milliner) said that I would not know anything about conservation. I take issue with him on that. I have a wide experience with the land. I have spent pretty well a lifetime on the land. I have been a farmer; but, more importantly, I have taken an interest in conservation matters and what they involve.

When I read articles on conservation, I wonder whether those responsible for them have ever really taken a personal interest or whether they have simply picked up statements and catchcries and then made emotive statements as if they know all about the conservation issues involved. So often they are one-eyed, tunnel-visioned statements that contain unproven assertions and conclusions that conflict with scientific findings, the results of surveys, observable evidence in the forests and opinions of experienced and knowledgeable foresters.

Often such do-gooders sabotage important parts of the economy that provide employment in remote areas. Frequently, those people take up a cause without looking at the facts or visiting the area concerned. So often they are against new developments of any sort, anywhere, irrespective of what is involved. Perhaps a social and economic impact study should be conducted into the trendy people who so often endeavour to block balanced development or, as in the case of forests, try to stop controlled operations. I cannot remember any of them ever handing over his or her own home or land for return to its original state. On the contrary, although they have their own piece of country with which they are happy, they direct their own selfish attitudes straight at others—at their land, businesses, developments and jobs. Really, they are working to the detriment of the economy of the State and the nation.

Conservation and development are fundamentally linked. Honourable members must acknowledge that the basis of communities on this Earth is that living resources must be used to satisfy human needs; but the use of those resources must be at a sustainable rate and with the minimum long-term effect on the environment. The forestry policies of this Government are for controlled and balanced development. The Government's realistic, responsible and commonsense policies permit logging of forest resources at a rate that is compatible with the conservation and ongoing management of this living resource. Full allowance is made for recreation usage. A balanced, sustained-yield program allows for the harvesting and regeneration of the State's forests and is not in conflict with the definition of true conservation and development.

That might be in conflict with the trendy ideas that come from the noisy honourable members opposite. I notice that the Opposition's self-proclaimed and noisiest conservationist, the honourable member for Windsor (Mr Comben), is not even in the Chamber. Last week, to the detriment of the poor old tortoises and ducklings, which he claimed he was protecting, the honourable member jumped in the pond in the Botanic Gardens.

He did that in an attempt to stop the boy scouts from running an eel-catching competition. What a ratbag conservation idea that is! He is not a true conservationist at all.

Under the Government's management programs, the State's forests will continue in perpetuity. I compliment the Minister for what has been done. The Government can be very proud of its outstanding record in this field. Since the Government came to power in 1957—admittedly in coalition—the area of State forests has more than doubled to 4.4 million hectares. As the Minister pointed out, Queensland has 55 per cent of Australia's rain forest. Contrary to what Opposition members and emotive conservationists say in their letters to newspapers, 67 per cent of Queensland's rain forest is still in a virgin state. Also contrary to their claims, rain forests are renewable. When they are destroyed by cyclones, they renew themselves. In the Cape Tribulation area, I have seen where a great deal of rain forest has been flattened but has regenerated naturally.

Mr De Lacy: Flattened by the National Party.

Mr McPHIE: I have seen areas in which that road was constructed. It will be of great economic benefit to north Queensland. Less than a year after the road was constructed, I drove over it. I could see where vegetation had regenerated at the side of the road. The area is not being smashed, damaged or obliterated; it is being used sensibly to the advantage of the people and to the State.

Mr Palaszczuk: You don't know what you are talking about.

Mr McPHIE: I do know what I am talking about. The honourable member has probably never been north of Archerfield. He has been out there in his own little hollow. He writes articles and makes definitive statements about conservation. He would not even know what day it was. Does he know what day it is?

The forestry industry is supporting many other industries. The forestry industry is a most important industry in this State. This year, log timber processed was 1 187 000 cubic metres. A great deal of timber was used in industry in this State and also exported.

The statistics on the industry are a little bit old. They are not up to 1984-85 standards. In the wood, wood products and furniture industries in Queensland, 633 establishments employed 11 520 persons. Of course, the number of family members affected is much higher. \$147.8m was paid in wages on a turnover of \$563.3m. The industry is thriving. It is part of the life-blood of this State. In no way should it be knocked as a result of rare conservation statements by people who do not know what they are talking about and who do not consider the economic factors involved.

Associated with the industry, in the paper, paper products, printing and publishing areas, 271 establishments employed 10 324 employees. \$162.2m was paid in wages on a turnover of \$582.6m. A vast amount of timber from this State is used for housing. I am referring not only to Housing Commission homes but also to other houses in this State. Timber is used in the construction of the majority of houses in this State. Timber is used in almost every home. The number of homes in which timber is not used is very few.

The Vote for the Minister's department is \$20,275,000. \$21.5m has been allocated for capital works in forestry development.

I congratulate the Minister and his staff. I join with the honourable member for Condamine (Mr Littleproud) in paying a tribute to the recently retired Conservator of Forests (Mr Jim Smart) and congratulating him on the excellent work that has been done. The department has received value for the money that it has spent. The objectives of the department are being achieved.

I have not mentioned a number of projects of a less important nature.

Time expired.

Mr De LACY (Cairns) (7.23 p.m.): I want to speak principally about the forestry section of the Minister's portfolio. If time permits, I would like to raise a few issues in relation to the police and lands sections of his portfolio.

As I intend to speak about the forestry, and as I come from north Queensland, it is obvious that I wish to speak about rain forests, particularly the north Queensland rain forests, which have been the subject of considerable debate in recent years, not always informed debate. The rain forests have been catapulted into media headlines by conservation protests against logging on the Windsor tablelands a couple of years ago and this year at Downey Creek, and, of course, by the Cape Tribulation road fiasco.

Tropical rain forests currently occupy about 800 000 ha in north Queensland. This area is 0.07 per cent of Australia's land area. It is only 0.3 per cent of Queensland. It is therefore only a very tiny proportion of the total area available for exploitation. However, forests of any kind are extremely scarce resources in Australia. The fundamental consequence of this is conflict over appropriate use. Should they be logged for timber, cleared for farming, preserved for conservation, exploited for tourism, protected as catchments or reserved for wilderness? It is fair to say that a large section of society now views the rain forest as being of more importance for values such as environmental protection, recreation and tourism than for timber production.

In the past two centuries of European occupation of Australia, approximately half of the rain forests in north Queensland have been cleared. Unfortunately, much of that rain forest was cleared without good reason. Very often forests in general and trees in particular were seen as impediments to development and, unfortunately, in some areas that is still the case.

Of the original 1.2 million hectares, only 100 000 ha is securely protected in national parks. The Queensland Forestry Department controls approximately 62 per cent of all existing tropical rain forest north of Townsville. It is this area that is currently the focus of a land-use dispute between the Department of Forestry and the conservation movement over the relative worth of the many values of the rain forest.

The dispute revolves round a number of issues. The first is the excessive exploitation rates. This principally refers to logging but, in some cases, to mining. For many years, the Department of Forestry allocated saw-log quotas far in excess of presently understood sustained yield. From 1947 until 1978, the quota stood at about 200 000 cubic metres. In recent years, it has been about 130 000 cubic metres. By 1986, the annual quota will drop to 80 000 cubic metres, and there will be no more accessible virgin rain forest.

The second issue is environmental degradation owing to poor management of logging. Despite all the nice-sounding words of the honourable member for Toowoomba North, much of the logging that has taken place in north Queensland rain forests has not been carried out in accordance with satisfactory environmental guide-lines. Despite research evidence as early as 1969 supporting the need for strict controls—

Mr McPhie: Is that your opinion?

Mr De LACY: That is my opinion. The honourable member for Toowoomba North will find that it is the opinion of any person who knows anything at all about rain forests.

In 1981, for the first time, environmental guide-lines were introduced. Those guide-lines were not applied until 1983, after the conservationists blockaded Mount Windsor. The environmental guide-lines were applied in the rest of Australia by 1976. Why would environmental guide-lines now be in force if, in the past, the loggers and millers abided by accepted conservation practices?

The third issue is the lack of need for rain forest timber. In Queensland, only 10 per cent of timber production comes from tropical rain forest. Of it, about one-third is used for cabinets and veneers for the luxury market. Two-thirds is used for structural purposes and therefore would be easily replaced by plantation timbers.

The fourth issue is the enormous conservation values of the rain forest. Partly because of their rarity in an otherwise arid environment, rain forests are of particular value in Australia, especially to people who have any sense of place, history and heritage. Some members of the National Party might not subscribe to those values. The flora and fauna remain poorly known and all the arguments regarding gene pools for the future apply especially to Australian rain forests. In the absence of clear evidence to the contrary, one must assume that logging disrupts and destroys part of this heritage value.

The fifth issue is recreation and tourism values. It is quite clear from the few studies currently undertaken that tourists come to north Queensland to see tropical rain forests as much as anything else. Currently, a program called the reef and rain forest package is being put together to encourage tourists to visit Queensland. The tourism economy is an undeniably important part of north Queensland development, and access to virgin rain forest will increase the opportunity spectrum for visitors.

The sixth issue is employment. Being a Labor Party member, that is very important to me, as it is to all other members of the Labor Party. Because of the cut-out of virgin forests by 1986, timber-related employment is likely to drop sharply. A 40 per cent cut in saw-log quotas will occur in that year. This topic has been incompletely addressed by the Forestry Department. Plantation employment opportunities should be considered more carefully, along with the recreation management of forests.

The history of the timber industry in north Queensland extends back to the very first settlement. However, the expansion and consolidation of the sawmilling industry occurred in the Second World War. In 1947, the State Government decreed that all logs purchased from Crown land in north Queensland be milled in north Queensland. From that developed a substantial industry in secondary processing. In the post-war period, two inquiries that have been undertaken into the timber industry in Queensland have affected the development of forest policy in north Queensland. Those inquiries were a commission of inquiry in 1949, under J. D. McLean, set up by the Hanlon Government, and a committee of inquiry in 1959, under the chairmanship of W. M. McLean, established by the Nicklin Government.

The 1949 inquiry was the most comprehensive and summarised the position in the following way. Firstly, the total log cut of 252 000 cubic metres for 1948-49 substantially exceeded the estimated annual growth of 75 000 cubic metres. It is worth reflecting that, in 1949, the predicted sustained yield from north Queensland rain forests was 75 000 cubic metres, whereas today the Forestry Department estimates a sustained yield of 80 000 cubic metres. In other words, the estimate has changed little in the past 40 years. Secondly, the commission found that there were adequate resources of standing timber to justify a substantial increase in cut, but unsuitable access prevented such an increase. Thirdly, it said that ply and veneer manufacture could be substantially increased from the then-existing log supply, because a substantial quantity of logs suitable for veneer was being sawn.

The recommendations of the commission were accepted by the Government of the day and set a pattern for north Queensland rain forest utilisation that has applied to the present day. Under those recommendations, the accumulated mature and overmature resources would be harvested at a rate in excess of current growth, but on the clear understanding that the harvest would ultimately have to be reduced to the sustainable yield of the forest. Unfortunately, that crisis point has been arrived at right now. The process of reducing the yield began in 1978, with a series of quota reductions from the 200 000 cubic metres that prevailed between 1947 to 1978 to 130 000 cubic metres for the following five or six years. I repeat that, from 1986, the harvest will be down to the sustainable yield level of 80 444 cubic metres.

The programmed reduction in allocations of saw logs also involves a significant change in log size and quality. The transition to second-cycle cutting will generally have a substantial impact on harvesting economics. Although substantial rationalisation has already taken place within the north Queensland industry, the changing volume and

nature of the harvest that is now foreshadowed raises a number of questions that need to be addressed by both industry and Government.

A position paper prepared in 1981 by the Forestry Department on timber production from north Queensland rain forests, which has been the subject of considerable debate, poses two important questions—

- (1) How can the available log volume be best processed to maximise the return on investment?
- (2) Can the existing industry be further rationalised to provide economic processing units capable of converting the reduced log volume into high-quality, high-value products?

I have posed an equally important question—

- (3) How can the decentralised employment potential of the timber industry be best realised?

It may well be that further industry rationalisation is imperative. Clearly, positive action will be needed to ensure that each species is converted to the highest value and use for which it is suited in order to improve the economics of harvesting and processing the changed log resource.

The point I wish to make—and make as strongly as possible—is that the Forestry Department has been remiss in its planning. In fact, it has been guilty of abysmally poor planning of the exploitation of north Queensland's timber resources. This financial year, the industry faces the crunch—the moment of truth—when the annual quota is cut by 40 per cent from 130 000 cubic metres to 80 000 cubic metres. According to the position paper I have already referred to, approximately 2 000 people are employed in the northern timber industry—600 directly and 1400 indirectly. The total value of timber production is in the vicinity of \$30m. What will happen to those 2 000 people? Can we expect a 40 per cent reduction in employment, which will affect 800 people? If so, what kind of plans have been put into place to accommodate such change?

The point I wish to make very strongly is that this will happen anyway. It has nothing to do with conservation campaigns or with the greenies at Downey Creek. I believe that the Forestry Department officers—and perhaps the Minister as well—are happy that conservation blockades have taken place at Downey Creek, because when the crunch comes later this year or early next year, when the quotas are reduced so substantially, the blame or odium may be transferred to the conservationists rather than being sheeted home to the Forestry Department. As the person in charge of that department, the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police should take the blame for not having planned to take account of such a contingency.

Cuts in the quota have been known since 1947, which is almost 40 years ago. It is also a fact that the long-term, sustainable yield concept for forestry management has been a policy since as long ago as 1959. From where will the Government obtain timber supplies for north Queensland?

Based on previous usage figures, there is a need for 200 000 cubic metres per annum, and the sustainable yield is only 80 000 cubic metres at present and for the future, ad infinitum. The people of north Queensland face particular problems brought about primarily by the geographic location of the region. With the projected shortfall in projected wood supply early next century, and if north Queensland saw-log requirements cannot be met by local production at that time, significant difficulties could be experienced by the north Queensland community in terms of both supply and cost.

In the same departmental position paper prepared in 1981, it was forecast that by the year 2010, a net saw-log deficit from native forests would be of the order of 310 000 cubic metres in the north Queensland area. That deficit can be made good only by a

large-scale reforestation program, or by imports from other areas. The position paper goes on to state—

“It has been assessed that, assuming continued production from rainforest at the sustainable level, a plantation estate of some 20 900 hectares is necessary to make up the anticipated deficit from native forests.”

I turn now to examine what is being planted. The Forestry Annual Report for 1985 shows that 630 ha were planted during 1984-85 in north Queensland. According to figures produced by the Forestry Department, north Queensland will need 21 000 ha, which would take approximately 30 years by planting at the rate of 600 ha a year, to make up the shortfall.

In the meantime, 3 781 ha have been planted in southern Queensland. It may be said that perhaps a bigger need exists in southern Queensland for forestry products but, on the evidence in my possession, that is contrary to the facts. My colleague the member for Bundaberg (Mr Campbell) spoke in the Chamber on 24 September about the alarming oversupply of plantation softwood in south-eastern Queensland. He exposed what appears to be potentially a major scandal, and I hope that the Minister addresses himself to some of the points raised in the honourable member's speech. However, to summarise the points that were made, the honourable member said that successive Forestry Ministers have been promising the public grandiose pulp-mill projects in southern Queensland for the best part of the last two decades. As the honourable member so eloquently said, it is a “multimillion-dollar con”. Phantom projects—to add to the multitude of other phantom projects for which this Government is becoming famous—have been mentioned. Woodlands allegedly contracted to build a pulp-mill by 1968. However, after deferring that for more than a decade, the company finally dropped it, after selling to CSR. The honourable member went on to say—

“Then APM was to harvest the Crown's pulp crop as well as its own Caboolture-centred crop at a mill to be built on Bribie Island. That was about five years ago.”

The Government offered Australian Paper Manufacturers free timber, free power and free water supply and labour at McDonald's wages, but the company still could not get the project off the ground. The honourable member went on—

“The latest consortium, headed by Ekono Oy, was to build its mill at Owanyilla, but that was deferred three times before it finally fell through.”

I wonder whether honourable members know that the Forestry Department is spending \$23m a year, planting trees in southern Queensland for which there is no market?

The document titled *Summary Tables relating to the Public Accounts*, which is part of the Budget papers, shows that \$281m of accumulated loan funds has been invested in planting softwoods—4 411 ha last year—which are not wanted and not needed. Presumably the public would expect some return on that money but, the way things are going, they cannot expect any return at all. I ask the Minister: Has the department adjusted its planting program downwards in the light of the collapse of the pulp-mill promises? The ridiculous situation exists in which plantations which are not needed are being established in south Queensland, whilst, in north Queensland, quotas are being reduced. North Queensland is heading for a crisis situation, but very little is being done. It seems that the forestry policies are dominated, like this Government, by a rural rump from south-east Queensland.

Whilst I have a moment, I want to state my position on the logging of rain forests in north Queensland. I oppose the claim that says that there must be logging, just as I oppose any claim that there must be no timber-harvesting in the rain forests in the north. Rather, I believe that all parties with an interest in the rain forest resource should recognise that rain forest lands have capabilities for producing many resource values, including timber values. Given this basic land capability for timber production, I believe that the suitability of particular areas for timber production still has to be determined in relation to socio-economic factors, such as community attitudes and the economics

of production—or the economics of other usages, for that matter. I also believe that the assessment of suitability should be an open, consultative process, and I put it to the Minister that that would be an unusual process in Queensland.

In terms of the north Queensland situation, I see a blanket ban on timber production as being unrealistic, except as an ambit claim position from which the conservation movement will hopefully maximise the area of rain forest allocated primarily for biological conservation in national parks. Equally, I personally oppose any move to log any particular rain forest area where the royalty return to the community does not at least cover the costs to the community in terms of direct forest management and administrative costs.

It is clear that, with the impending log quota cuts in the north Queensland timber industry, the industry will be rationalised one way or the other over the next few years. It is equally clear that the economic significance of the industry within the region will also be greatly reduced. This process of rationalisation should not be a laissez-faire accident; rather it should be the result of deliberate planning undertaken co-operatively by the State and Federal Governments in close consultation with the north Queensland community.

Such a planning exercise should aim to—

expand the area of rain forests in national parks to ensure that all rain forest types are adequately conserved; and

only allow timber production on publicly owned rain forest lands where it can be shown that timber production is compatible with the conservation objectives for the region concerned.

Time expired.

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (7.43 p.m.): In rising to consider the many and varied responsibilities that the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police administers, I particularly direct my attention to the Queensland Police Force and the State Emergency Service.

In these times of change and turmoil, most people recognise the great importance of a police force that is trained, disciplined, reliable and respected and, for the most part, that is what Queensland does have. However, the police face great difficulties in the future, and I do not think that those difficulties will be resolved if the Government merely looks from day to day to try to resolve the problems as it sees them. Indeed, the time has come for the Government to look a long way down the track and make up its mind about the basic structure of the way that the people of Queensland will regard their police force.

The Queensland Police Force has traditionally faced an extremely difficult position in the community. It is caught betwixt and between. What is it to be? Is it to be a uniformed and disciplined paramilitary force or is it to be something else—people within the community with just a little extra power; effectively public servants with powers under the law? I do not believe that anything can basically be resolved about the problems that face the police force until the Government faces this decision squarely and makes up its mind about what the police are to be. Are they a paramilitary force or are they powerful public servants? Because of the nature of their duties, the only proper way to approach the police is to presume them to be a type of paramilitary force and then construct the methods in which they work round that presumption.

Mr Fouras: Fond hope.

Mr GYGAR: If the honourable member will listen, I am sure that he will see that there are many good reasons for this.

Because the nature of their duties has absolutely no parallel in the public service, the police need a system of leadership and supervision. The only parallel is found in quasi-military organisations. If we are to have that leadership, that supervision and that

chain of command and discipline that is necessary in our police force, we have to look at that model.

If any further argument is necessary to establish that, I suggest that we have only to reflect upon the incidents that occurred at Mount Coot-tha, somewhat famously, a short time ago. What was the basic cause of those incidents? It was a break-down in the system of control and supervision. There did not appear to be a firm system of one NCO being in charge of certain operations, with the member doing those operations clearly answerable up the chain of command. From the public record, it appears that the problem was that these people were answerable to no-one. When any person is answerable to no-one, it is impossible to have efficiency.

We owe it to the men themselves to provide them with a framework of certainty in which they can operate and under which the system can supervise them. That is no reflection on the men. No army has two or three generals with a million privates and no-one in between. All armies have a structure of command in which everyone knows to whom he answers at all times. That means proper co-ordination of the job to be done.

Mr McPhie interjected.

Mr GYGAR: If the honourable member considers the Mount Coot-tha incident he will realise that it could not have occurred if the steps-and-stairs system of command had been in operation.

Other things lead me to that conclusion. For example, policemen are pushing for early retirement. That is understandable. One has only to watch the 6 o'clock news to see the sorts of duties that they are involved in to recognise that even a fit 50 to 55-year-old is not suitable for such duties. We have demonstrations, affrays and seizures taking place.

A Government Member: Ha, ha!

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member may laugh, but those are not the sorts of circumstances into which a responsible organisation should put 55-year-old men and women in front of the yahoos and yobs, who are parading in the street, and force them to wrestle and struggle with them. Come on, does the Government want these men——

Mr Miller: Why not?

Mr Littleproud: They are experienced officers.

Mr GYGAR: One honourable member asks, "Why not?" Another said, "They are experienced officers." Experience does not do any man much good if he has 30 or 40 of these yahoos coming down the street at him not obeying responsible laws. They are there only to cause trouble and get into a punch-up. If honourable members want to throw men of that age into such an affray, they have much less respect than I have for the men and women with experience in the force. I do not think such officers should be placed in those circumstances. The Government must construct a system that does not demand it of them. Of course, our present system demands it and they will respond, as always, and carry out their duties.

As one honourable member interjected, the military has different systems. The sort of system that the military has involves a 20-year-service retirement pension. If that is appropriate for the military service, it is not inappropriate for the police.

Other systems could be introduced to save the loss of experience involved. The time has come to consider clearly the need for a separate officer stream to provide experienced leadership in the police force. The present system is such that, by the time men work their way through the ranks to the higher levels of police work, they are already approaching retirement. The onerous nature of the duties placed on them over the years has led, in many instances, to retirement because of ill health.

In looking to the future, long-term leadership is needed and, at the moment, the police force has that in the commissioner. What has been shown by that stability over the years is to be encouraged. The only way to encourage stability is to ensure that access is available to higher ranks by younger people with years of service in the police force in front of them. It cannot be done with a system in which everyone is in the same stream.

An obvious need exists for an early identification system of men and women who can be groomed for higher rank and be given the training—if necessary, extensive training—detachment overseas, access to tertiary institutions and access to the best places of training in the world, in the reasonable expectation that, in their years of service ahead, the State and the people of Queensland will receive a great return. A need exists for this streaming early in careers to identify the future leaders of the force and to make sure that they will be properly trained and equipped to do their duties for extended periods. That will increase the level of expertise at the top of the force and bring a greater depth of experience and expertise into the police force, and a greater longevity of service in the senior ranks.

It will also enable those men and women who have served with distinction for 20 or more years to determine that they want to slow down a little, and they have earned that right. If, after 20 or more years of service, they decide that they have done their duty, they want to step aside and they want a little more stability and safety in their home life—an increasingly important factor—they should not be penalised. They should be allowed the honour of early retirement with a decent return by way of pension or other service so that what they have done can be recognised.

Mr Miller: Have the police asked for this? Is this your idea or the idea of the force?

Mr GYGAR: Unlike the honourable member for Ithaca, I am capable of original ideas and do not need to have them fed to me by others.

The modernisation and reconsideration of the police force involve a number of other factors, some of which are already happening. The increasing use of computerisation facilities in the police force to allow the earlier tying together of facts raised in investigations, the earlier tracking of potential criminals and the earlier tracking of arrested persons and motor vehicles is a definite advance and is to be applauded. However, the introduction of technology could go further. I do not think that there would be any honourable member who has not been to a police station and watched highly trained policemen taken off the duties that the community expects them to carry out to play hunt and peck on an ancient typewriter sitting on the desk. Some of the typewriters are older than the policemen trying to drive them.

Word-processors were invented many years ago and I hope that, before too long, that knowledge seeps into those who are responsible for purchasing equipment for the police force so that that sort of technology is available to ensure that there is a maximum effective usage of trained police manpower doing police duties, not clerical duties. Certainly the reports must be produced, but it is my suggestion that it is far more economical and cost effective, and a far better use of police manpower, if secretarial jobs are performed by secretaries so that police officers are available to carry out police work for the maximum amount of time. If that means that the clerical staff at all levels attached to police stations must be increased, so be it. It is just not right, in a community that is crying out for police, for police officers to be locked up in police stations and elsewhere pecking away on typewriters trying to produce reports that could be produced more economically, more quickly and more efficiently by less highly trained people who would cost the tax-payers of this State far less to employ.

It goes without saying that there is unanimous agreement in this State that more police are needed. Regrettably, though some concessions were made in this year's Budget, they are not enough. Equally regrettably, honourable members will now find that the police force will be turned into a political football during the Redlands by-election campaign. It is said that nothing so concentrates the mind of a politician as a redistribution

or an election. At the moment, we have both. There will be a great concentration of minds on how the fat can be pulled out of the fire.

Because the polls have shown that the people of the Redlands electorate want more police, honourable members are to be told that more police will be provided. What we will not be told is where the police will be taken from. Will it again be from the Gold Coast, where there is a crying need? Will it be from the suburbs of Brisbane, where police officers are already overworked, with huge areas to be covered by few patrols, and where one relatively minor accident can tie up the entire available police resources for one-quarter of Brisbane. In my electorate, usually one car patrols an area which, even in light traffic in the middle of the night, is a 20-minute drive from one side to the other.

I do not mind if the Minister has his arm twisted and if he is conned into jumping up on a soap-box somewhere and saying that more police will be provided for Redlands. We all except that; we all know that the people of Redlands will not get them. It will be like the rail line for Redcliffe. However, when the Minister does that, he should tell us where they are coming from, or from which section of the Budget the extra money will come to pay for those extra police.

Mr Lee: They are not coming from Moorooka; I can tell you that.

Mr GYGAR: If I have anything to do with it, they will not come from Stafford, either.

I can tell the Minister how to raise a quick \$60,000 for some more police in Queensland. I suggest that he take note of the radio and television advertisements about the wonderful achievements of the Queensland Government that the National Party is currently running at tax-payers' expense. Those advertisements are costing Queensland tax-payers between \$45,000 and \$60,000. The Minister should stop that political grand-standing and put the money into providing more policemen. For that price, the State could employ two additional policemen for the Redlands electorate.

As I said at the beginning of my speech this evening, the police have a great deal of support in the community. What should be done is to make sure that that support is reinforced and supported. I suggest that, to do that, a few simple things must be done. Everybody knows what is going on round this town. Why cannot the Minister and the police force recognise it, do something about it and, in that way, increase the standing of the police force? It has been said before, but let me go through the list again. Blind Freddy can have a bet in a casino in this town on any night he wants to. I would suggest that not one honourable member in this Chamber would not know of three places that we could all tramp down to in the Valley right now——

A Government Member interjected.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member claims that he has not had a misspent youth. So be it.

It is notorious! The Minister cannot say that it is not happening. He knows it, the commissioner knows it and every policeman in town knows it. Honourable members know it and the public know it. For Heaven's sake, either acknowledge it and legalise it or put a stop to it, because it is making the police force look like a joke, and it does not deserve that—from the Government or from anyone else. I do not care whether the Government legalises the casinos, but it should do something about them. As long as the public have a perception in their minds that the police are turning their backs on notorious offences being committed day after day in this town, there will be a smell over the police force that it does not deserve. It is simple; just close them down.

Another thing that happens round the town—it is acknowledged by just about every motorist—is the use of police kill sheets. The Minister may deny it as much as he likes in this place; but if he went out and spoke to any sergeant of police, he could tell the Minister what the figures are. Police are told to go out on the road and not to come back until they have issued a certain number of tickets. If they fall short of the quota,

they are carpeted. We know it is happening; the public knows it is happening. Again, the police force does not deserve that. Although ordinarily a proper exercise of police discretion would be to issue a warning, because they are below the line and liable to get into trouble, they will book the first motorist who goes past. That is not the way to carry out police work effectively. Again I say to the Minister: our police force deserves better. Members of the force look to their political masters to protect them from things such as that. If the Government does not do that, it is failing the police.

The other joke is radar traps.

Mr Littleproud: I thought it was you.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member has been looking in a mirror again.

About 50 per cent of radar traps are used deliberately to catch people who are going down hills. They are placed 10 metres before signs depicting a change in speed limits. Anybody who lives in Brisbane can name the favourite haunts used for radar traps.

Mr Littleproud: Go on—name 10.

Mr GYGAR: There is one near the cemetery at Toowong. It is located at the bottom of a hill. Does the honourable member support the positioning of radar traps in such a location?

Mr Littleproud interjected.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member agrees with me. Let *Hansard* record that the honourable member agrees that that is an inappropriate location for a radar trap. A number of locations used for radar traps are inappropriate. They are used purely and simply so that police officers can write a few tickets and obtain revenue. The Queensland Police Force deserves better than that.

Police officers need the Minister's support in one other area, which is random breath-testing. Everyone knows what is happening. The Minister would be surprised how many cars in this city have intermittent defects in their tail-lights. How many cars are pulled over because the police thought that the cars had something wrong with their tail-lights and because they just happened to think that they might smell alcohol. The driver is then asked to breathe into a bag. However, a further check reveals that the fault was only intermittent and that the tail-lights were not faulty at all. The Minister knows what is happening, the police know what is happening and the public know what is happening. It is just not good enough. I say again to the Minister that the Queensland Police Force deserves better than that. If police need the authority to stop motorists, give it to them. That is what they are saying to the Minister when they carry on with this nonsense about defective tail-lights or the amazing eyesight of members of the Queensland Police Force who can spot bald tyres at 100 yards on dark, wet nights and pull over a driver and say, "We just thought that you had a bald tyre and we would like to check it." By allowing those farces to continue, the Minister is not doing justice to the police force in this State.

I acknowledge the presence of Brigadier Whiting in the lobby. I apologise to him for running out of time before saying a few words about the State Emergency Service. As he has heard most of my comments before, all he need do is read my last speech. He will see that I said that I think better things can be done in the SES. The many volunteers who give hours, days and sometimes weeks of their time for the good of the community of Queensland deserve the recognition and applause of this Committee and of the whole State. Our SES——

Mr Glasson: You are the first member to mention it tonight. Not one Opposition member mentioned the SES.

Mr GYGAR: I am glad to acknowledge the service of the volunteers. I ask the director of the State Emergency Service to examine again what I said last year and to think about it for the fourth time.

Mr NEAL (Balonne) (8.3 p.m.): I am pleased to take part in the debate on the Minister's Estimates. As other members on the Government side have covered most of the functions of the Minister's portfolio, I shall deal with the role of police officers in the community and also touch on the State Emergency Service.

The honourable member for Stafford referred to the Queensland Police Force. That the policeman's role in the community is a difficult one would be a gross understatement. The community at large expects police officers to be all things to all men. They expect them to be on tap when they are needed for all sorts of reasons. Many people forget that police officers are part of the human race and have the same problems, same commitments, same feelings and same family demands as everyone else.

The honourable member for Stafford said that the Queensland Police Force should be turned into a paramilitary force. I do not believe that we want such a force. Police officers should be part of our community, because that is what they are. Queensland is not a banana republic, although the Federal Government seems to adopt that attitude at present. I do not think that a paramilitary police force is needed. As I said, police officers should be part of the community.

Police officers should be part of the community. They have an obligation under their oath of office to ensure that the laws are upheld. The manner in which police officers carry out their duties is the basis on which community respect or lack thereof is earned. If a person has had a good experience when dealing with the police, that person is likely to have a good opinion of them. Alternatively, if that experience has been bad, it is likely that the reverse will apply.

I cannot see how having a paramilitary police force would have any public relations benefit. I believe that it would serve only to alienate the police force from the community. I can only speak highly of the police officers in my electorate who have carried out their duties during my term as member since May 1972. With very few exceptions, the police officers in my electorate have enjoyed the respect of the community and, in many cases, enhanced that respect. I find it difficult to believe that my electorate has been favoured and that the standard of the police force throughout the State is not as high as it is in the electorate of Balonne.

I believe that Queensland does have a dedicated, disciplined and hard-working police force that is well worthy of respect and support. As I said earlier, opinions of the police force are formed as a result of experience. To that end, the police force has an important public relations role to play.

An innovative step taken by the department during 1984-85 was the establishment of training courses at the police academy for police officers appointed as community liaison officers. That program is unique in Australia. It afforded the department the opportunity of further developing the skills of police officers to enable them to deal with the complex problems associated with what might be termed a pluralistic society.

Each of the 27 police districts throughout the State has a community liaison officer. The primary responsibilities of these officers are to foster, train and encourage police at a local level to undertake lectures to all types of community groups on aspects of crime prevention. In my own electorate, I have attended lectures given by police officers at various service clubs and other organisations. Those officers also act as liaison officers with ethnic and minority groups. They co-ordinate special projects on road safety and liaise with community-based groups, as has occurred in my own electorate.

The introduction of community liaison officers throughout the State has enabled the department to extend the services provided to primary and secondary schools on special safety education projects. Community crime-prevention initiatives have also been extended throughout the State, and house-holders can now avail themselves of a free security service advising them of the anti-theft devices and procedures that can be undertaken. The police have also taken a keen interest in supporting the activities of the Queensland Safety House Association.

During the year, members of the Public Relations Branch organised a seminar at the University of Queensland on child abuse and the criminal justice system, which was sponsored by the Australian Crime Prevention Council. That seminar went for four days and was attended by representatives of hospitals, police departments and children's services departments throughout Australia. The Public Relations Branch has been involved in the "stranger danger" campaign at schools, shopping centres and elsewhere. That campaign has been well received by the public and particularly by the children in the community.

The "lock it or lose it" campaign has also proven to be a very successful public relations exercise. It is making members of the public more aware of their responsibilities in securing their motor vehicles and property. Police involvement in community activities brings the police force closer to the community at large. I take this opportunity to thank the Commissioner of Police and his staff for the assistance that they have rendered to me over the year.

I refer now to the State Emergency Service. As the Minister said earlier, although the member for Stafford spent only one minute on the subject, he has been the first member of the Opposition in today's debate to say one word about the State Emergency Service. I am sure that everyone—everyone but the Opposition, apparently—is aware of the tremendous assistance and support rendered by the SES to all communities in Queensland.

Mr Fouras: How do you make that out?

Mr NEAL: We have not heard Opposition members speak about it. The member for South Brisbane is very vocal tonight.

In 557 counter-disaster operations in 1984-85, the 26 500 members of the service contributed 50 862 hours of effort, which is equivalent to 24½ man-years. Those figures speak for themselves. The success of the operations revolves round the training that is undertaken by local SES groups in preparing to help their communities. Training must include all aspects of counter-disaster management operations. I am pleased that the SES organisations in my own electorate, which are well organised, have taken part in group-training schemes and assisted communities affected by floods, fires and storms.

A review of the service's 1984-85 annual report reveals that it has become a principal counter-disaster force. As well as being the largest in Australia, it is, in my opinion, the most effective. As it moves forward in its development, it will make a greater contribution to Queensland. I note that the SES is keeping abreast of modern technology. The report reads—

"Participation on the Queensland Government Telecommunications Strategic Planning Committee has enabled the requirements of counter-disaster and emergency communications to be fully reflected in the State Government Q-NET satellite network development. The provision of a transportable earth station in the purchase of the Q-NET pilot project hardware will greatly enhance the ability to respond to a major disaster event anywhere in the State. Tests of this asset are to be conducted in the 1985-86 year to develop deployment procedures and to evaluate various equipment support options for the station."

That is excellent. Obviously the SES will keep abreast of and utilise modern technology whenever it is available.

Over the last 10 years, the SES has made a major contribution to Queensland. Volunteer members have provided affected communities with timely help to facilitate a return to normal life-styles. Citizens throughout the State have been assisted. Last year Roma was affected by serious hailstorms. Kin Kin was also the scene of a disaster caused by a storm. On 18 January this year, the hailstorm that hit Brisbane resulted in a disaster of major proportions. Damage totalled in excess of \$130m. A total of 1 811 SES volunteers assisted 3 168 house-holders affected by the storm. Many ordinary citizens joined with the service members in helping Brisbane residents.

The value of the Government's concept, established in 1974, has been proven time and time again throughout the State. Notwithstanding that, of course, the Government has not heard any acknowledgment from members of the Opposition, even when the issue is as current as the storms that occurred as recently as yesterday and Sunday. The State Emergency Service has been operationally active in the years since 1974, and I am sure that all honourable members would indeed be grateful for the State Emergency Service becoming well established throughout Queensland.

The citizens who perform emergency services are worthy of the highest praise from everyone. The people in my electorate give their time readily, and it should be remembered that, while they are carrying out work for the SES, they forgo leisure activities in which they might otherwise participate. I pay tribute to the people in my electorate for the contribution they make.

I am sure that the same can be said about the people of Brisbane, as they, too, would support and appreciate the work of the SES. In all areas in which the SES has become involved, I am sure the people appreciate and acknowledge the tremendous service that is being provided. As I mentioned previously, as recently as last Sunday, 105 members of the State Emergency Service provided assistance at 131 storm-damaged homes. That kind of action is very worthy of the support of the Queensland Parliament, including members of the Opposition. I am surprised that Opposition members have not so much as mentioned the contribution that was made by the SES volunteers last Sunday.

The SES will continue to play a tremendous role. I realise that the Government has co-ordinated its efforts in the provision of heavy trucks and winching gear, boats and similar equipment, and I thank the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police for the equipment that has been provided throughout my electorate.

It must be remembered also that contributions made by the Government engender enthusiasm. That is a matter that this Government has not overlooked, because the enthusiasm flows from the top of the State Emergency Service. It is important to ensure that that enthusiasm is carried to individual volunteers in the field because, if enthusiasm does not emanate from the top of the organisational structure, it cannot be expected that the volunteers will be enthusiastic. From the point of view of volunteers, Government support is an important part of the successful operation of SES. Enthusiasm has been engendered by the various schools that have been conducted to train volunteers. All things considered, the SES is doing a very good job throughout the State.

I will not go into the various other aspects of the Minister's portfolio except to say that I appreciate greatly the assistance rendered by the officers of the various departments controlled by the Minister. To those men, I offer my thanks for their co-operation and assistance at all times. Such co-operation certainly makes a parliamentary representative's job much easier, and I appreciate the courteous attention that I have received. I support the Estimates presented by the Minister.

Mr PREST (Port Curtis) (8.19 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to join in the debate on the Estimates for Lands, Forestry and Police. It was very pleasing to listen to the speech made by the honourable member for Lytton, because he presented a worthwhile exposition of the problems that exist in society today. He pointed out the inability of the Government to come to grips with the problems caused by an insufficiency of police officers which, because of the penny-pinching methods that the Government adopts, has resulted in an increase in burglaries.

The member for Toowoomba North (Mr McPhie) followed Mr Burns in the debate. He said that an increase in the number of police would not solve the problems facing the community. He was speaking on behalf of the National Party, which believes that there are sufficient police in Queensland. That might be correct, if the police in this State were not used for political purposes; in other words, if they were allowed to go about their normal duties instead of being used by the Premier and Treasurer for political purposes.

One of the most disgusting incidents I have ever witnessed here in Brisbane—it does not happen in country areas to the extent that it happens here—occurred at the time of the opening of this session of Parliament. In the street outside Parliament House I saw the police abuse their authority. They chased people, who had every right to be in the street, into the Botanic Gardens and then followed them and continued to harass and arrest them. I am certain that the action of the police on that occasion did nothing at all for the image of the police force. I am also certain that the members of the force were acting under instructions from the top. No doubt the commissioner, like a good little boy, obeyed his instructions from the Premier, who runs Queensland as a police State.

The honourable member for Toowoomba North said that there are sufficient police in Queensland, but that statement contradicts what the Commissioner of Police had to say in his annual report. He made a similar comment in a letter to the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police on 30 September. In the introduction to his report, the commissioner said—

“I have estimated that, at the present time, the Department is some 463 officers short of the manpower needed to cope with the work currently available.”

I repeat “currently available”. A former Minister responsible for police (Mr Hinze) once admitted that police on the Gold Coast took until the following afternoon to get to the scene of a reported burglary. That just goes to show how overworked the police are.

From time to time, one hears that people are moving into this State at the rate of thousands a month—or at least, that is the propaganda published by this Government. In spite of the increase in population, there will be an increase this year in the number of police of only 104. The commissioner also said—

“During the year, 242 police officers were inducted into the force and the wastage rate was 153 caused by retirement, resignations, dismissals and deaths, giving a net gain of 89. As mentioned earlier, the manpower problems of this Department still exist. Pressures imposed by population growth and a crime rate which continues to increase place extraordinary demands on all serving police officers.”

The Opposition is saying that there is an acute shortage of police in this State. Because of its penny-pinching methods, this Government is denying the people of Queensland proper police protection. The Opposition also condemns the Government for using the limited police in this State as a political tool of the Premier.

The commissioner also said—

“Lack of manpower in many areas has certainly hampered our desires to improve on the high standards established in recent years. Notwithstanding, my officers have achieved a crime clear-up for the year of 51.05 per cent . . .”

In other words, only every second person in Queensland who commits a crime that has been reported and investigated by the police is eventually brought to justice.

The honourable member for Lytton said that many crimes in Queensland are not reported and are therefore not recorded in the Police Department files.

The report later refers to the incidence of various serious crimes in this way—

“In the categories of more serious crime such as homicide, robbery, serious assault, rape, attempted rape, false pretences, stealing and unlawful use of motor vehicles and breaking and entering, there were 58 132 offences reported which represented an increase of 3.2 per cent. This indicates that the rate of increase slowed considerably over the previous year when it attained a level of 9 per cent. The clear-up rate, however, fell slightly by 1 per cent from 34 to 33 per cent.”

Only one in every three persons committing such a crime is brought to book. I will not take up the time of the Committee unduly with those matters because every honourable member has been given a copy of the 1985 report.

The Commissioner of Police also said that, because juveniles are unemployed, have so much free time and are not supervised, they are committing many crimes. Parents should certainly take much more interest in what their children are doing and with whom they are associating.

Mr Milliner: This Government could not care less about the unemployed.

Mr PREST: That is quite so. Unlike members of the Government who do not give a hoot about employment problems, the honourable member for Everton has deep feelings for the unemployed. As long as Government members have one or two jobs and live in luxury, they do not give a hoot for the young people.

Mr Milliner: Many of them will be unemployed after the next election.

Mr PREST: That is true. Everything points to the fact that the Premier is trying to save the hide of some of his members by the redistribution.

As I said, the primary cause of juvenile crime is the foolish illegal activities in which youths become involved because they are unemployed, their parents are at work and they have so much time on their hands.

Later in the report, the commissioner said that an associated problem that appears to have reached alarming proportions in our society is child abuse. The member for Balonne said that, earlier this year, a four-day seminar was held at the university and that it was attended by distinguished people who outlined their points of view. I read about that conference. It was very enlightening. What has the Government done about the problem?

It has established a committee to investigate child abuse. It is headed by the member for Greenslopes who formerly was a primary school teacher and did not know there was such a thing as child abuse. One day the children wrote a composition and told her of their experiences. Someone must have told her that what was written indicated child abuse, and she has now become very interested in it. The Government has allocated a miserable \$10,000 for the investigation into child abuse that is to be carried out by the committee chaired by the honourable member for Greenslopes.

Mr Fouras: Do you know that the Juvenile Aid Bureau is shockingly understaffed when dealing with the SCAN teams and child abuse? They are shockingly understaffed; there is not enough of them.

Mr PREST: There is no doubt about that. I have heard the honourable member for South Brisbane speak very forcefully about welfare problems, especially child abuse, and about the very limited amount of money that this State, in comparison with the Labor States, particularly New South Wales, provides to combat child abuse.

The Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect (SCAN) Committee, which was set up in 1978, is doing a very commendable job but, because of a shortage of money, very little is actually being done to bring the culprits to bear and to protect the young children.

One of the most important things that I wish to speak about tonight is the use of drugs in Queensland. As the honourable member for Lytton said, only a very small team has the job of detecting the suppliers of drugs in this State. Admittedly, there has been a marked increase in the number of young people apprehended, convicted and fined for the illegal use of drugs of various descriptions. However, what is worrying is that the suppliers—the drug-pushers—never get caught.

I agree with the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr Lionel Bowen) that the banks should report to various authorities when, at any one time, a person banks more than a specified amount of money. Many ways can be found to launder drug money, and that happens effectively now.

Because of the protection offered by this National Party Government, the drug industry in Queensland is growing; indeed, it is thriving. It cannot be doubted that it has the Government's support.

Mr Fouras: Even an employee on the property of the Premier's son was growing it.

Mr PREST: Well, as I said, the grower is usually not convicted. On that occasion, the driver of the bulldozer on the property had to take the blame. That is why the Assembly is not told why planes land at The Ten Mile, who travels on them, what they take there and what they bring out. Honourable members are not told what the Government plane is used for. Surely the Assembly has the right to know.

Mr Glasson: That is just about as low as you can get.

Mr PREST: No, it is not low at all. Once the Opposition mentions drug-pushers, Government members try to cover up. That is one instance in which marihuana was grown on The Ten Mile and a worker on the property was taken to court for the offence.

Mr Ahern: You are a joke.

Mr PREST: I am not joking; I am fair dinkum. I think that it is terrible. No doubt the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern) may have known this was going on. In fact, I ask him: How long has it been going on?

Mr Ahern: All I know is you are a joke.

Mr PREST: That may be so, as long as I do not try to cover up for anyone who grows or pushes drugs; that is the main thing.

I will now address the very important problem in this State of the carnage on the roads. Each year an increasing number of people are being killed on the roads. What is the reason for that? As I have said previously in this Chamber, various Ministers have a role to play. The problem is not an easy one to solve. The Minister for Police (Mr Glasson), the Minister for Transport (Mr Lane), the Minister for Justice (Mr Harper) and others all have a role to play.

From time to time one hears that the road carnage is caused by alcohol. Therefore, the police have a job to do to see that alcohol is not served to those under the legal drinking age and is served in limited quantities to those who wish to drive. A greater effort must be made to combat drink-driving. The Minister for Transport has a part to play in relation to the roadworthiness of vehicles, and the Minister for Main Roads is responsible for the road system and the condition of the State's roads. I could go on and on.

The Government sits back and says that while it is keeping the number of road fatalities to fewer than 500 per year, it is doing its job. On 4 September, the Royal Automobile Club of Queensland said that highway patrols were a "publicity stunt". A press article on that subject reads as follows—

"The Royal Automobile Club of Queensland claims police highway patrols could be an effective road safety measure; but not while they remain 'Claytons' patrols.

Formation of the highway patrol was supported by the RACQ, claiming a highly visible police presence on the highways had been proved, time and time again, to have a markedly sobering effect on drivers who may otherwise be tempted to act irresponsibly.

'But,' said RACQ senior vice-president, Mr A. J. Love, 'it appears the State Government has used the highway patrol not as a genuine weapon to be used against the road toll, but more as a cheap publicity stunt.

'There is strong evidence, backed by the Police Union, that little has been spent on the highway patrol apart from the cost of applying highway patrol identification to existing police vehicles.'"

Last year, because the supplier could not provide sufficient vehicles for the department, not all the money allocated was spent. Although that was allowed to happen,

there is a lack of police patrols on the roads. No doubt, if more vehicles were provided, the police manpower would not be sufficient to man the vehicles. A visible police presence on the road ensures that motorists obey the law. Even if only one life a year was saved, the money would be money well spent. Although in the past the Government has claimed that the road toll has been reducing, the number of people killed so far in 1985 is well above the number for the same period last year. The fact that 11 or more people are killed on week-ends alone proves that the Government must get off its butt, change its attitude and do something positive about road safety in this State.

Mr STONEMAN (Burdekin) (8.39 p.m.): I begin by commending the Minister and his staff on the way in which they represent the best interests of the people of the State in the administration of the various departments of the Minister's portfolio. The Minister's door is always open. I commend the Minister and his departments for the understanding and humanitarian approach that they adopt in the best interests of the people of Queensland.

Having had about 26 years of very close and personal association with the Minister, I can say with great sincerity that I have a good knowledge of him and of his attitude to the community and to life generally. Therefore, I find completely devastating the comments of the previous speaker about the attitudes adopted by the Minister and the officers under his control. Most genuine members of the Opposition would acknowledge that the Minister is held in high esteem, not only in his electorate but also throughout the State. He is a man of absolute integrity. I would hope that what the honourable member for Port Curtis (Mr Prest) said was only a joke. It was a poor reflection of community attitudes.

I commend the departmental heads who work with the Minister—Mr Wally Baker, Chief Commissioner, Land Administration Commission; Mr Terry Lewis, Commissioner of Police; Mr John Kelly, the Deputy Conservator of Forests; Doug Grant, Executive Director of the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board; and Kevin Whiting, Director of the State Emergency Service. Together they form a formidable team and one of which this State and the Queensland Government can justifiably be proud.

At the moment, something that touches all of Queensland is the attitude of the Queensland Government towards tourism leases and the development of tourism and leases generally. Tourism is a vital component of the Queensland economy. Because my electorate touches on an area that has large tourism potential, I have a personal interest in the matter. Like many other honourable members, each week I fly up and down the coast of Queensland and see a huge expanse of land of which, I am sure, we are all proud. There is an untapped potential that needs to be tapped. In many instances, the Lands Department is the landlord and, in the general sense, has the ultimate responsibility.

The need for the State to exert its responsibility is perhaps nowhere more strongly felt than in the field of planning. Left unchecked and unguarded, the development of tourism is sometimes blighted. Appropriately planned, tourism development can be a powerful instrument of environmental enhancement. As I am a person who travels up and down the coast, I believe that I have some realisation of that.

International tourism is one of the largest and most widespread industries in the world today. Virtually every country has some form of tourism, and many countries, ranging from small Caribbean nations to major European countries, depend heavily on it for their economic livelihood. The State of Queensland will obviously and increasingly depend for its livelihood on tourism and the way in which tourism develops.

A number of studies indicate that in Australia, and particularly in Queensland, a vast domestic travel market remains untapped. However, despite the importance of tourism, only recently have any serious attempts been made to plan tourism development carefully, and to gauge and to control the impact.

Over the past two decades, international tourism has been one of the most rapidly growing industries in the world. The tourism industry in Australia is of considerable economic significance and deserves greater recognition. The Australian tourist industry

must cater for the Australian tourist, who constitutes the bulk of the actual and potential market.

If Queensland is to compete successfully in the international market-place, the tourist product must also appeal to overseas visitors. Overseas visitors have a greater impact on overall economic activity in Australia than do domestic tourists. The growth of the tourist industry will depend largely on consumer demand. Consumer expenditure on travel of a discretionary nature can be affected by economic uncertainties.

It can reasonably be expected that during the next decade domestic tourism will grow at an annual rate of about 5 per cent. It has been argued that, with good and adequate promotion overseas, tourism in Australia could grow by 10 per cent per annum. The Queensland tourist industry, therefore, will depend on the rapid development of Queensland's tourist attractions, the aggressive promotion of those attractions by industry and Government in Australia and overseas, reduced air fares, and, in particular, more innovative fares for both domestic and international scheduled flights.

I wonder where the Federal ALP commitment is to a no-frills air service to north Queensland, because every time I come to Brisbane—admittedly at the State's expense—I note how expensive it is. It is always a change upwards, never downwards. I welcome the recent changes in respect to approval of more air charter flights from selected overseas destinations. Tourism facilities consist not only of accommodation such as hotels and boarding-houses but also of recreation and sports facilities of great variety and, of course, all the necessary infrastructure, such as transportation and utilities. Although international experience indicates that, in the longer term, well-conceived investments in tourism accommodation facilities show a satisfactory financial return, the supply of accommodation has often failed to increase in line with demand.

In many countries that are developing tourism, it has been difficult to interest the private sector in investing in hotels and other forms of accommodation. Apart from lack of experience, two features of hotel investment seem to account for the reluctance of investors.

The first is that relatively large amounts of capital have to be tied up in fixed assets over a long period—20 to 25 years—with the risk of changes in market conditions, political and social framework, and so on. The second is the strongly seasonal demand, which is particularly pronounced in resort areas.

Many Governments in both developed and developing countries have attempted to overcome the reluctance of private investors to finance hotels and other forms of accommodation through a variety of incentive schemes. They include providing cheap or free land, equipment grants, exemption from import duties, liberal depreciation allowances and tax holidays, loan guarantees, long-term Government loans and interest rate subsidies.

In the majority of developing countries, tourism has only recently attracted the attention of Governments as a sector warranting special economic policies and institutions. The Queensland Government is encouraging tourism development. The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation is operating very efficiently and effectively. It is encouraging the development of tourism facilities throughout Queensland. The Government appreciates that infrastructure costs in tourism development are very high, especially if land acquisition cost is to be a factor.

The usual approach of the Government, either with or without competition, is to grant a terminable lease, which may or may not have freeholding rights associated with it, or, alternatively, a perpetual lease. Such leases would incorporate development conditions under which a specified amount of money would have to be spent on specified development works. Any development would have to comply with the standards of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation.

Every application is thoroughly investigated and considered. Large investment money is involved and the Government is always mindful of the fact that it has a responsibility to create a suitable environment in which appropriate development can take place. The

Government is also mindful that tourism can contribute to regional development and decentralisation and can be a major stimulus to sustained growth in non-metropolitan areas. It is also aware that the development of a new resort has a great impact on land values in the environment area and that normal additional infrastructure works are required.

I believe that the Queensland Government is presently considering the upgrading of tourist leases. Large finance is required to establish tourist facilities, financiers have requirements and a risk factor has to be considered. It is very necessary that Queensland has leases of an appropriate type to cater for the many circumstances that will arise. Clearly, the present law can be improved, and I believe that the Government is considering an improvement.

Another part of the responsibility of the Minister is the reorganisation of the Lands Department. Most honourable members would be aware that the present Lands Department was established in 1862, which makes it one of the oldest in the Queensland administration. The review of the department in 1983-84 was undertaken to overcome a growing gap that was perceived in community needs for service and the ability of the department to respond to that demand.

I have a personal knowledge of the work required to review, inspect, assess and report on such matters as pastoral leases. I was the lessee of a large pastoral lease when an application was made to renew it. It took the local Lands Department commissioner many days to inspect, measure and report on the matters required by the department. When it is realised that that was a very small part of Queensland and the process had to be repeated many times over, one understands the monumental problems to be addressed by the department. Grazing homesteads with freeholding leases have now been converted to perpetual leases. Permits to occupy and special leases are very important in my electorate, which has an extensive coastline. Many people have a little beach hut on an area of land to which they can escape for relaxation at a reasonable cost.

The department's review resulted in a restructuring of the department's operating divisions aimed at—

- making better use of the department's work-force, both individually and collectively, to increase efficiency and effectiveness; and

- providing a framework to collect external information, using the information for strategic planning and ensuring that the department changes to respond to the identified community trends.

The realisation of those aims is providing the missing link needed for the department to manage its own evolution while meeting community needs and adapting to the changing environment.

It is necessary to recognise that in 1985 the Department of Lands fulfils what I believe to be the historical land administration role of administration of the Crown estate. Functions of that administration include—

- leasing of and dealing with Crown land for various purposes—for instance, agricultural, pastoral, industrial, residential and recreational/tourist;

- closer settlement—for example, the brigalow scheme—settling large numbers of primary producers on areas of older large pastoral runs, which has largely been completed;

- sales of freehold land;

- administration of rural financing schemes, specifically the Young Farmer Establishment Scheme and the Dairy Farm Reconstruction Scheme;

- urban Crown land development for residential and industrial use in all areas of the State;

- acquisition of land for Crown purposes;

- administration of roads and stock routes;

- research into land degradation, rangeland weeds and animal pests; and

improvement of the public estate for development conditions on leases of Crown land.

To my mind, the major challenge now is to determine the future role of the department. Its historic landlord role is diminishing, but the need to guide the utilisation of our State's land area with a growing population indicates that the department's responsibilities are increasing. If the department is to move from the historic landlord role, which is a reactive and process-oriented one, to a more active community-oriented role, which is a pro-active and results-oriented one, strategies and tactics will need to be developed that will deal with the features of the future operating environment. The key features reflect both internal and external pressures on the organisation. Some of the major pressures and their impact on operations are—

- increasing demands for a scarce land resource;
- technological changes;
- increasing accountability of managers; and
- continued restriction of staffing and budget growth.

These internal and external pressures combine to dictate two clear strategic goals—

- adoption of a pro-active estate-manager role in land administration, using policies and practices developed from a competitive marketing approach to service delivery; and

- productivity-improvement achievements in existing administration activities.

My personal belief is that the development of new communication technology will allow for a rapid increase in the capacity of departments to achieve the utmost for individuals and groups whilst at the same time maintaining the interest of the total community in the best possible way, by selective and planned integration of various systems.

In the few minutes that remain, I wish to touch briefly on the role of the State Emergency Service in the field of communications and police matters. That subject-matter was highlighted by previous speakers when they referred to undermanning. Criticism levelled by honourable members highlights the fact that members of both State Emergency Service and the Queensland Police Force are often required to be on tap in different places at the one time. In times of emergency, there is an expectation within the community that the SES and the police force will provide emergency service when other services have failed.

As a member of the Queensland Government Telecommunications Strategic Planning Committee, I have become familiar with the development of the State Emergency Service communications system. The network has been developed from the humble beginnings of a few single-channel radios in civil defence days to a viable, modern and effective network employing state-of-the-art technology. These networks have been put to the test on many occasions, and have proven their worth as a viable tool in counter-disaster management.

Major Development of the network commenced in 1976 with the installation of ultra high frequency (UHF) repeaters for local communications in Brisbane and major east coast provincial cities. Local Government has assisted in the provision of sites in a number of areas, including my own electorate, where the repeater is installed in the water-tower which overlooks a considerable area. At Mount Inkerman in the Home Hill district, the Police Department has recently updated its operations, and that will considerably enhance the role of the police force in that area of north Queensland.

State Emergency Service interest in satellite communications began early in 1978, when the Commonwealth Government called for expressions of interest in a domestic satellite, then called Domsat. As we all know, Aussat is now a reality and Q-Net will be commissioned shortly. This facility will fill a long-standing need for high grade communication in the remote areas of our great State. Q-Net will provide enhanced communications in times of disaster, and the State Emergency Service is playing an

active role as a member of the Queensland Government Telecommunications Strategy Planning Committee, in the development of Q-Net. That committee includes Mr Lance Bickford from the State Emergency Service and Mr Tom Noonan from the Police Department.

The nature of the State Emergency Service is such that it has the ability to withstand major disaster events, or is capable of providing rapid restoration. A pool of equipment is maintained for rapid deployment into disaster areas, and flexibility exists to cope with foreseeable events.

I pay tribute to the volunteer communications officer and operators, without whom the networks would not be viable. They have contributed long hours of service in training and operations, and their dedication to the service deserves the highest possible praise.

In the few minutes that remain, I commend the Minister for agreeing with the need for a police presence at the construction site of the Burdekin Falls Dam. That police station was opened on 27 May, as is mentioned in the Queensland Police Department's annual report for 1985. For the benefit of honourable members, I read from page 93 of the report to highlight one of the aspects of police operations which on many occasions is overlooked. It states—

“Members of the Townsville Emergency Squad were called to help in the apprehension of a gunman at the old Didgeridoo Zoo near Ayr on 25th October. The offender had shot the caretaker for no apparent reason and had opened fire without warning. The Emergency Squad was called in after the gunman had fired upon the first police officers to arrive at the scene and after negotiations had failed to talk him out of the building. Members of the Squad used tear gas to cover their entry to the building and the gunman was apprehended without any further injuries to any of the participants.”

That paragraph says it all.

When the chips are down, everyone expects the police to be there. As Opposition members previously mentioned, when a break-and-enter offence is committed and a policeman does not attend the scene of a crime, people will say that the police force is undermanned. The same is true of members of the State Emergency Service. At times when there are no emergencies or disasters, people question the role of SES. As a police officer in my area said, “I thought those Emergency Service people were a group not to be supported. Now I know better.”

Time expired.

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (9 p.m.): In this debate on the Estimates of the Department of Lands, the Department of Forestry and the Police Department, for which the Minister is responsible, there are many subjects about which one could speak. Traditionally, the Queensland Lands Department has been a trend-setter in many fields in Australia. I refer principally to the fact that over the years, particularly under Labor Governments, the department looked at the aggregations of land in Queensland and devised schemes to subdivide them to ensure that families were able to move onto the subdivisions and set up pastoral and agricultural enterprises. If one looks back through the last 70-odd years in Queensland, one finds that the Lands Department introduced a tremendous number of schemes that benefited this State's development. They were beneficial to many families that were enabled to establish themselves in the pastoral and agricultural industries.

Of the more recent schemes, I mention the Brigalow Land Development Scheme. Despite the problems that many people in the area faced initially because of low cattle prices—the Minister would know all about that—that Brigalow Land Development Scheme has been an unquestionable success. It put a tremendous number of families on the land and enabled them to earn a living and develop their properties to the stage at which they contributed not only to the economy of this State through the export of beef cattle but also to the economy of the nation.

Tremendous changes have occurred in my lifetime, particularly when the soldier settlement schemes were implemented out in the Charleville area and other areas of western Queensland. Large land-holdings were split up into smaller family blocks on which people were able to earn a living. I suppose that the introduction of that concept at that time was detrimental to the Labor Party, because a great many of those families became Country Party voters. Whether they will remain National Party voters is, of course, another story. After the war similar developments occurred throughout the State.

Following the soldier settlement schemes, the Lands Department introduced a considerable number of other schemes under which large aggregations owned by overseas companies and combines were split up into family developments. I am not certain of this, but I believe that in the Minister's area round Aramac and Longreach a number of major land-holdings were split up to allow families to develop smaller properties. They were able not only to earn an income and become good Australians—as family people they always were—but also to develop Australia's pastoral industry to its fullest extent. In a number of other areas the agricultural industry was developed.

Following the introduction of the Brigalow Land Development Scheme that I touched on earlier, the character of a great many areas of Queensland was changed. I can remember as a young lad driving through some of those areas and seeing the problems that the settlers faced. It is now a pleasure to go back there and see the development of the pastoral and agricultural industries. In the 1950s and into the 1960s there was a lot of criticism of the old Queensland-British Food Corporation scheme in the Peak Downs——

Mr Lee: Tell us about Peak Downs.

Mr CASEY: Did I hear someone mention Peak Downs? It is the honourable member for Yeronga, would you believe, talking about Peak Downs. If he was given a compass and a map, I do not think he could find his way out there. Originally Peak Downs was set up by the British Government in co-operation with the Queensland Government in order to produce food for the people of the United Kingdom.

Mr Wharton: How much did it produce?

Mr CASEY: It produced a tremendous amount of food for the United Kingdom. If the Minister and other members were honest, they would acknowledge that it helped the people of Britain over a starvation period following World War II.

Because of the big aggregation of land, the scheme did not work properly at the time. It should be remembered that it was a British Government scheme, not a Queensland Government or Australian Government scheme.

Mr Lee: Come on!

Mr CASEY: Obviously the honourable member does not know the set-up at that time.

Mr McPhie: It was not very successful.

Mr CASEY: The Peak Downs area has been split up in the way that former Labor Governments wanted to split it up. It has come back to the family-farm concept. Family farmers have developed farms and are making good incomes and are also contributing to the economy of the State and the export economy.

The latest grain forecasts—and I will deal with them a little later—reveal that the Central Highlands area has the greatest potential for grain-growing in the State. I am sure that the Minister knows and recognises that.

The Queensland-British Food Corporation concept was a good one. It helped to develop that part of Queensland and, very shortly, we in that area will be looking for an extension of the railway line from Clermont to Blair Athol that will hook through to Mackay, where an export grain terminal has been developed. When that is done,

many more areas in that part of Queensland will be developed. I have a practical suggestion to put to the Minister later about what action he and his department should be considering.

The concept was proven by the Queensland-British Food Corporation. It was a conglomerate that did not work properly but now the area has been split up into family farms, which are working well. The Labor Party finds nothing wrong with that, and the old Country Party saw nothing wrong with it. I do not know how the National Party feels about it, because it is somewhat different. Thanks to the concept of the Queensland-British Food Corporation, another area of Queensland has developed.

Because of the coal mines developed in that area, the railway line runs from the port of Mackay to the Central Highlands hinterland. In addition to the Bowen Basin coal mines, there are the steaming-coal deposits at Blair Athol, which are being exported through the port at Dalrymple Bay. The railway line is now running through some of the best potential grain-growing areas in Queensland. Recent reports I have studied indicate a potential tremendous increase in grain-growing in that area.

The railway line from Dalrymple Bay to Mackay and the Central Highlands will lead to the further development of the grain-growing areas round Kilcummin and Dysart and the Logan Downs area, which belonged to the late Charlie Russell, the doyen of the Country Party in Queensland.

In the 1960s, a report was compiled by the Queensland Department of Primary Industries, the Federal Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the Queensland Lands Department in which the Suttor River area, which is north of the railway line to which I referred, was considered. The Suttor River is one of the major tributaries of the Burdekin River system, and the land through which it flows is some of the best undeveloped agricultural land in Queensland. The huge tracts of land on the downs are ripe and open for further agricultural development.

A week and a half ago, I was privileged to fly over that country with my colleagues on the parliamentary committee of industry, small business and technology. In a light aircraft, we flew north from Clermont, over Avon Downs, just north of Logan Downs, and really had a look at the Suttor River country. Some time ago that country was earmarked by various Government departments as providing an excellent opportunity for the development of further grain lands. Indeed, the Suttor River country provides one of the few opportunities remaining in Queensland for opening up further lands for closer development, and that is what the Lands Department has been on about for a long time.

Administration is not the only function of the department. It is renowned for considering land that can be opened up for further agricultural development, and in that respect, the Minister for Lands must give further consideration to the Suttor River country. You, Mr Row, as the representative in this Parliament of the people of the Hinchinbrook electorate, would well know that, back in the 1920s, Tully, which is in your electorate, was recognised as being ready to be opened up for further development. The Government of the day, which happened to be a Labor Government, developed the land, and it is now one of the greatest sugar-producing areas of the State.

The Lands Department has always been responsible for opening up additional lands for family farm development or for pastoral development. It has seen Queensland through the war years, through the soldier settlement schemes and through the brigalow schemes, and now it must begin to look at areas of the State that can be opened up for closer subdivision so that family farm concepts can be established. The Suttor River land is one such area.

I suggest that the Lands Department take a further look at the Suttor River area, because things have changed considerably since the 1960s when the first real study was carried out. A railway line provides access to a port in Mackay at which silos have been built to store grain prior to its export from this State. When the first study was made

of the Suttor River, that development had not occurred. Now it adds weight to the viability of the development of the Suttor River land.

A tremendous number of properties in that Suttor River area can be further subdivided and put under grain production for the benefit of the people of Queensland and to the advantage of the export opportunities of the State. I ask the Minister for Lands to look at that. It has been 20 years since the Lands Department considered the subdivision for further development of major properties. It has been more than 20 years since the Brigalow Land Development Scheme was brought into being, with the assistance of the Commonwealth Government, to open up further areas of the State for closer development. New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia have no further opportunities for closer farming areas, but Queensland still has that opportunity, and the Suttor River area represents one of those opportunities. Unless the department moves in and does something, it will be too late.

Another point I make relates to reserves properly set aside and surrounding the provincial cities of the State. Those lands can be used by the people of the area for recreation. Because of the Government's policy on freeholding land, over a period of years areas of special reserves that were set aside have been freeholded by people who have made a fortune from subdividing them. In some cases the Government has handed over to the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation some reserves for development. I refer to areas in Mackay and East Mackay. Because it is in my electorate, I refer to an area just west of Mackay, upstream on the Pioneer River from Caneland. A development scheme is currently being considered by some developer or other who wants to establish a marina and goodness knows what else there to make a profit out of it.

Mr Glasson: That "profit" is a dirty word.

Mr CASEY: To me, "profit" is not a dirty word. The Minister knows that full well. The only time that "profit" is a dirty word is when it involves a developer taking away from the people of an area the only available lands that can be set aside for recreation purposes for the future of the next generation and the generation after that. That is whom I am speaking on behalf of tonight, not me. I am not speaking about whoever wants to make a quid out of the development.

Mr Newton: You are against development.

Mr CASEY: Oh, shut up! The honourable member does not know what he is talking about. When he brings me the red bananas that he speaks about, I may take some notice of him.

The point I am making is that those areas that can be used for recreational purposes should be set aside for the next generation. Unless that happens, when the next generation is born, those areas will not be available.

I know the area as well as I know the back of my hand. If a marina is to be established there, the area will have to be dredged to about 40 feet to make provision for the tide and the floods in the area. If boats are to be able to use that area at both low and high tides, a great deal of dredging will be needed. The rise and fall of the tide in the Pioneer River is something like 6 metres—18 feet. The river can rise to something like 30 feet at times of flood.

Mr Newton: We want more development and more tourism.

Mr CASEY: Oh, shut up! The honourable member does not know what he is talking about. I will talk about Mackay; when it comes to speaking about Caboolture, the honourable member does not even know much about that.

If the Government is not careful, the people of that area of Mackay will lose one of the best opportunities to provide land for the recreation of the future generations of Mackay. Because of the Government's policy on the freeholding of land, that is what has happened in all provincial cities.

My final point relates to the Police Department. For some considerable time, I have been advocating the appointment of additional police to the Mackay area.

The Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police and the Commissioner of Police know that during the last decade and a-half, Mackay has been one of the fastest developing areas in Queensland. Although I am not prepared to say it publicly, in Mackay the stage has been reached at which the strength of the police force is not properly matching the city's needs. More police are needed in that area.

Mr MENZEL (Mulgrave) (9.20 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to speak to the Estimates of the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police.

I commend the Minister for his visit to Cairns on the week-end. He took part in the Fun in the Sun Festival. On the lighter side, one would not believe that the Minister took part in a crocodile race. In fact, he won the race, and I congratulate him on contributing to the Fun in the Sun. Well done!

The previous speaker, the honourable member for Mackay (Mr Casey), said how bad it was for people to be given freehold land. How many Opposition members own freehold land? They are all clamouring to make sure that they have freehold land.

A Government Member: I wonder how much he's got?

Mr MENZEL: I have no doubt that he has plenty. Since I have been a member of this Assembly, people from the Labor Party have said to me, "Will you make representations for me to get my land converted to freehold?" That is how hypocritical some Labor people are.

Mr Booth: They don't understand their own people, do they?

Mr MENZEL: The honourable member is correct. They want leasehold land for everyone else, but they want freehold land for themselves. Tell me someone who does not want freehold land for himself. Everybody who owns a little bit of dirt wants freehold title, and rightly so. We do not want to go back to the Dark Ages. We do not want all this commo talk of socialism and leasehold land. One must practise what one preaches.

I turn to some matters that affect my electorate. While the Commissioner of Police is in the lobby, I request that the Malanda Police Station be upgraded to a two-man police station. We always hear that there are insufficient police to go round. However, I make the request again. A new police station is urgently needed in Atherton. I am serious about that. It is something for which I have been pushing for some time. I hope that the Minister or the Commissioner of Police can do something about the matter as soon as possible. At present, the police station is overcrowded. A 24-hours police service is needed on the Atherton Tablelands. I do not believe that the present police service in Atherton is adequate. Because Atherton is expanding and because of the increasing quantity of drugs being grown on the Atherton Tablelands, a 24-hour service is necessary.

Police should not be too worried about getting convictions. I do not want that statement to be misinterpreted. Police tend to carry out a great deal of surveillance on drugs with a view to obtaining a conviction. Up to a point, that is fair enough. If the whereabouts of a cannabis crop is known, it should be sprayed and killed with 2,4-D. If somebody is silly enough to smoke it and be affected by the 2,4-D, that is probably a bonus. It might be a punishment for smoking pot. If the person responsible for growing the marijuana cannot be found, it should be sprayed. The plants should be destroyed as soon as possible.

Because Opposition members probably do not know much about the two police helicopters, I ask them to listen to what I have to say. I commend the Minister for the excellent job that he has done, especially for the provision of a police helicopter for rescue and police work in north Queensland, part of which I represent.

Mr Booth: Do you reckon that story "by hell he copped her" is right?

Mr MENZEL: I am not sure what the honourable member for Warwick is talking about.

I do ask that, when Bob Hawke comes up to Queensland at tax-payers' expense and wants the use of the police helicopter, the Minister refuse his request. On his most recent visit to north Queensland, the Prime Minister travelled by VIP jet. He was not satisfied with that. An air force propeller plane had to be acquired to fly him round north Queensland at tax-payers' expense.

Mr Davis: How petty can you get?

Mr MENZEL: That is disgraceful. The honourable member for Brisbane Central supports that man.

I ask the Minister not to provide Bob Hawke with the police helicopter when he goes to north Queensland on one of his frequent fishing trips.

I congratulate Wally Baker, the chairman of the Land Administration Commission. I have had occasion to make various representations to the Lands Department. Wally Baker and his staff do an excellent job, as do the Police Department and the Forestry Department. A high degree of co-operation is evident. I commend the officers of those departments.

I turn briefly to the police force. One of the most innovative sections of the police force is the scientific section. It provides a wide range of forensic services to the police throughout the State. The scientific section is divided into four sections, namely, crime scenes examination, laboratory and instrumental examination, ballistics, and botanical identification and entomology studies.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr MENZEL: I will deal with a few of them, just as I will deal with the honourable member for Brisbane Central.

Members of the crime scenes examination section, all of whom hold science degrees, are the most qualified and best-trained crime scene examiners in Australia. The Queensland crime scenes examination section is better than that of any of the Labor States.

In February 1985, a scientific section was established in Townsville and, in December 1985, a scientific section will be established at Southport, thus providing all police with ready access to the expertise of those officers.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr MENZEL: I do not know whether the honourable member for Brisbane Central robs banks in his private time—I do not know what he does—but he seems to be terribly worried about it.

Approximately \$200,000 has been spent in the last three years equipping the laboratory and instrumental examination section. This equipment, together with the availability of scanning electron microscopes, has provided the police force with laboratory facilities comparable with those anywhere else in Australia.

Of the four members of the ballistics section, three members are ballistics experts, and that does not include the honourable member for Brisbane Central (Mr Davis). During the year, the ballistics experts gave evidence in the Northern Territory and Papua New Guinea Supreme Courts. Those officers are to be commended on doing that.

Time is getting on so I congratulate the Minister on the job that he has done and once again commend him for helping to make fun in the sun in Cairns. It is much appreciated.

Hon. W. H. GLASSON (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police) (9.29 p.m.): I take this opportunity of thanking the members who made contributions to the debate on the Estimates of my portfolio of Lands, Forestry and Police, including the

State Emergency Service and the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board. No fewer than 19 speakers have made contributions to the debate. I hope to be able to cover most of the points raised by them.

I will begin with the honourable member for Chatsworth (Mr Mackenroth), the Opposition spokesman for police. I regret that he spent his entire time denigrating the police force.

The first specific matter raised by him concerned a gentleman by the name of Milan Crnjanin. I am advised that this particular matter is the subject of civil action and I am therefore not prepared to make any statement at this stage. I will be looking into the allegations made by the honourable member on the aspect of unlawful betting activities and the conduct of any police officer involved.

The next matter raised by him concerned the findings of the Police Complaints Tribunal in regard to a complaint made by Carol June Ashley on behalf of her sons Mark and Michael. As my colleague the honourable member for Mount Gravatt (Mr Henderson) pointed out earlier in this debate, the tribunal is an independent body and not subject to the influence of the commissioner or myself. In this particular case, I consider that I need go no further than repeat portion of a letter sent by the tribunal to Mr M. Ashley on 17 September 1985.

The letter reads—

“The Tribunal is of the view that there is insufficient evidence to justify or to sustain any charge either criminally or departmentally, against any person in respect of the complaints made by yourself and your mother on behalf of your deceased brother Mark.

Despite the seriousness of these allegations, the Tribunal is in no doubt as to the correctness of its decision. In coming to this conclusion, the following factors were carefully studied and taken into consideration:—

- (a) the information related in the complaints;
- (b) the information related in various statements by yourself and your mother;
- (c) evidence given by yourself and your mother before the Tribunal;
- (d) the evidence from 18 civilian witnesses;
- (e) the replies to your allegations by the police officers concerned;
- (f) the evidence from 11 police witnesses;
- (g) the medical evidence where applicable;
- (h) official departmental documentation;
- (i) the transcripts of Magistrates Courts hearings relating to the hearing of various charges;
- (j) background information on all concerned;
- (k) the results of the Tribunal's own enquiries.”

I move now to the contribution made by the honourable member for Cooroora (Mr Simpson). I endorse his very clear exposition of the real objectives of conservation, and the manner in which my Forestry Department is achieving its objectives through its multiple-use policies in areas such as Fraser Island, the Conondale Ranges and north Queensland rain forests.

I confirm that further extensive areas of rain forest will be made available to extend the existing Palmerston National Park to 14 000 ha. It is seen as the ideal site for an international tourist development, including a canopy walkway, if that proves feasible.

The honourable member for Cooroora referred also to the concept of an SES/police team to cope with disasters, which was positively demonstrated following the Kin Kin storm. I thank the honourable member for his encouraging remarks. I will comment on other contributions concerning the State Emergency Service made by other honourable members later in the debate.

I deal now with the speech made by the honourable member for Ipswich (Mr Hamill), who once again took the opportunity to make allegations against my colleague the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze). In reply to a question addressed to me last Thursday, I referred to the manner in which applications for road closures are dealt. If he refers to that reply, he will find it is spot on. I make no apologies for what occurred.

In response to the honourable member for Ipswich, I indicate that all applications for road closures are properly investigated. As I have already stated, the Maralinga application would be considered when the new road is constructed and open for public use. The applicant's engineers were informed of that. The road has not been closed—I emphasise that—and no application has been received by the Lands Department for the opening of the new road.

As I have already said, the honourable member for Mount Gravatt answered the accusations made by the member for Chatsworth. I commend him for the able way in which he was able to put his finger on the relative information. He commented also on the transition of the Police Department into the technological and computer age. He covered that matter fully and well.

The member for Murrumba (Mr Kruger) is not present in the Chamber. He expressed concern about his area. He commented on a matter relative to Mr Miran-Khan. I will give consideration to his remarks and provide him with the requisite information.

The honourable member for Murrumba commented on several police matters in his electorate. A recent assessment of the Petrie Police Division revealed that more space is required at the Petrie Police Station. The Department of Justice, which shares the building with the Police Department, is being asked to advise whether it will require the space used as a police station and, if so, when. When advice is received, a decision on a police complex on the department's land at Petrie will be made. It is true that the Petrie division is creating more demands on the personnel stationed there. An additional vehicle was supplied in June of this year. Three marked and two unmarked vehicles are now working from the station.

The honourable member mentioned difficulty in contacting the Petrie station. It is acknowledged that on occasions the station is unmanned while its members are patrolling the division. To provide immediate response at the station, it is intended to install a Mastercall Minder telephone in the next few weeks. This system will divert telephone callers to the district headquarters station at Redcliffe and also enable a person calling at the Petrie police station to speak to a police officer at the Redcliffe station, which is always staffed.

I turn now to the contribution to the debate made by the honourable member for Sherwood (Mr Innes). I assure him that the South Brisbane Police Region will be given close consideration when the 100 additional police officers approved in the Budget are being allocated by the commissioner.

The honourable member for Hinchinbrook (Mr Row) referred to the work undertaken by officers of the Forestry Department in the area of his electorate. I can assure the honourable member that I am also very pleased that the interdepartmental committee concerned was able to reach a satisfactory solution to the allocation of Crown land for agriculture and forestry in the Herbert River area.

With regard to the destruction of vermin in State forests, my department adopts, and will continue to adopt, a policy of maximum co-operation with land-holders to minimise the problem. As the honourable member points out, there is a large proportion of non-rateable land in the shires such as Cardwell. However, he will also realise that much of this land is steep and unproductive and that on managed forestry areas, roads and other infrastructure are provided and used by the public at little or no cost to the shire concerned.

Development of further State forest parks in all areas of the State is under constant review, and development is limited only by the funds which can be made available for

this type of development. If the honourable member has a proposal involving State forest in the Tully area, I would be pleased to have it examined.

The honourable member for Ashgrove (Mr Veivers) mentioned a report provided by some members of the Police Department and made some comments on it. I will follow up those comments. I do not know whether the honourable member has carried out any examination to verify the statements made by the Queensland Police Union in the August edition of its journal in regard to the Police Air Unit and the alleged savings to be made if the department followed its suggested courses of action. The department is at present collating material to write to the editor of the journal regarding the matters raised in that article.

In accordance with the honourable member's suggestion, I will examine the matters raised in the article and also the aspects raised here today, and I undertake to provide him with information at an early date.

However, I do take very strong exception to allegations made by members of the Queensland Police Force and members of the Queensland Police Union in a journal. The opportunity was taken to degrade the work and efficiency of the Commissioner of Police. I do not think it behoves members of the police force to embark on that kind of activity. I can assure the honourable member that the police officers elected to positions of responsibility in the union most certainly did not appreciate the action taken by some of the police officers; nor do I.

In his usual fashion, the honourable member for Roma (Mr Cooper) demonstrated his practical knowledge of the role played by the department and in particular the work carried out by the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board. I thank him for the contribution he has made to the debate, and I also thank the other members of my committee—the honourable member for Balonne (Mr Neal), the honourable member for Toowoomba North (Mr McPhie), the honourable member for Burdekin (Mr Stoneman) and the honourable member for Mulgrave (Mr Menzel). All of the honourable members I have mentioned have demonstrated an in-depth knowledge and appreciation of the work carried out by the department.

I would like to respond to a number of matters raised by the honourable the member for Salisbury (Mr Goss). Firstly, the commissioner's annual report is one of which I am very proud—and I said that when the honourable member first made the allegations. One can see that a great deal of work has gone into it, and the commissioner can certainly not produce it until it is printed by the Government Printer.

The honourable member has seen fit to level criticism at the figures published. The Police Department has nothing to hide and all figures in that report can be supported. The method of recording crime and the clean-up rate is consistent with that used in other States. There is nothing peculiar about the way in which the figures are compiled for the State of Queensland.

The honourable member for Salisbury mentioned lack of response to complaints. Although he did not give details of these two complaints, this situation should not occur again, for recently the two stations in his area—Upper Mount Gravatt and Acacia Ridge—have been linked to one common telephone number in the metropolitan area connected to the headquarters PABX. This system allows for a citizen to ring his local station and if he is not answered within 40 seconds, the call is switched to the headquarters switchboard, where prompt attention is always available.

It is unusual for the honourable member for Salisbury to question the effectiveness of the Police Complaints Tribunal. Is he really criticising the tribunal because of his friendship and support for Inspector John Huey, whose actions were the subject of investigation by senior police and the Police Complaints Tribunal and, as a result of these investigations, whose rank was reduced to an inspector, grade 3?

The member for Salisbury regularly supports police officers whose conduct is in fact reprehensible. I cite his strong support for Detective Sergeant L. R. Dickson who was subsequently charged under the police rules with 168 offences of misconduct. Dickson

was prepared to jeopardise the future of countless children in this State by having them convicted of offences which they had not committed. I am pleased to inform the Committee that Dickson is no longer a member of the Queensland Police Force.

The honourable member for Salisbury mentioned that his electorate was serviced by the Upper Mount Gravatt and Acacia Ridge Police Stations. It was only in the last few days that the Commissioner of Police approved the upgrading of the Acacia Ridge Police Station to senior sergeant status, the addition of another constable and the consideration by the priority committee in November of the appointment of additional staff. Although the honourable member claims that he has no police station in his electorate, he may not know that the Police Department has land in the Park Ridge/Browns Plains area, on which it is intended to build a police complex as soon as funds are available.

The member for Condamine (Mr Littleproud) drew attention to the necessity for the Government to take account of the views of responsible conservation organisations. I admire his attitude. It might be said by different groups and by members of the Opposition that the Government is not conservation-minded but it, like the Forestry Department, is more conservation-minded than most people in the different environmental movements who demonstrate about so many things. I can assure the honourable member that, through my own office and the Department of Forestry, I conduct a constant dialogue with the conservation movement, and legitimate views are always listened to.

I turn now to the contribution of the member for Lytton (Mr Burns). I give him 100 marks for performance, but only 60 marks for information. He said that there were no detective staff at the Wynnum Police Station. I am surprised and astonished at the member's lack of knowledge of his own immediate area, and I will cite the figures. For his information, I advise him that eight detectives are attached to the Wynnum Criminal Investigation Branch and eight detectives are attached to the Cleveland Criminal Investigation Branch. A needs assessment of the Wynnum Police District has recently been carried out, and the matter of additional staff for this area is presently receiving attention.

I also advise the honourable member that the police force of this State co-operates with the Federal authorities, and there is no way that the big blokes referred to by him receive any favourable consideration, as he implied. In several cases, the Queensland Police Force has co-operated with Federal police, Customs officers and other Federal agencies to apprehend large-scale importers of drugs. The Maher case referred to by the honourable member is irrelevant, because Maher was charged and convicted under Federal law.

The honourable member alleged that the Premier's son was growing pot. The facts are that an employee of the Premier's son was growing marijuana, that an investigation by police resulted in his arrest and conviction, and that he was immediately dismissed by the Premier's son. I take strong exception to the allegations made by the members for Lytton and Port Curtis. I wonder how low they will stoop to try to gain political kudos. However, their statements did not surprise me.

The member for Toowoomba North (Mr McPhie) is a very valued member of my committee. He referred to the reorganisation of the Lands Department and the changes in status of auction perpetual leases and perpetual lease selections. The honourable member made special reference to the chairman of the commission and the officers of the Lands Department. It is worthy of note that not one member on the other side of the Committee paid a tribute to those officers who work so hard to provide a sincere and dedicated service to all members of this Chamber, irrespective of their political philosophy. The honourable member referred also to the sound management of forestry in Queensland and complimented the staff of the Forestry Department and the Lands Department.

The honourable member for Balonne spoke of the operations of the Police Department in his electorate and its assistance in overcoming problems there. He spoke also of the very efficient and effective operations of the State Emergency Service, and his appreciation

of the work done by the citizens who make up the SES in the electorate of Balonne. I thank him for his contribution.

The member for Cairns made a lengthy contribution to the debate. I will try to answer the points raised by him.

He claimed that only 100 000 ha of rain forest in national parks is adequately protected in north Queensland. He ignored the fact that 90 per cent of Queensland's rain forests are adequately conserved in State forests and national parks. Environmental protection and tourism are compatible with timber production.

The honourable member for Cairns raised five main issues. Firstly, he referred to allegedly excessive exploitation of timber. It is well known that the rate of utilisation of an accumulated virgin forest resource can legitimately exceed the long-term rate of sustainable production. That is not very hard to follow. In 1949, the committee of inquiry into the timber industry recognised that and recommended then that the cut be increased in the short term to expand the timber industry and contribute to the development of the north. It was recognised also at the time that the cut would have to be reduced to the long-term sustainable level during the second cutting cycle. That stage has now been reached.

Secondly, the honourable member for Cairns claimed that degradation had been caused by the poor management of logging. It is not correct to say that control of logging operations was not implemented until 1983. The Forestry Department, through timber sale agreement conditions, has always applied logging controls. However, following extensive hydrological research in tropical rain forests during the past 20 years, logging guide-lines have been further developed and refined. At the present time, a very high standard of environmental control has been established over rain forest logging, a fact which has been admitted by leading members of the conservation movement.

Thirdly, the honourable member for Cairns spoke of a lack of need for rain forest timbers. Most rain forest timbers are specialised cabinet woods that are highly prized and in great demand. The actual volume used is limited by availability, not by demand, and there is no reason to suppose that that situation will change.

Fourthly, the honourable member claimed that flora and fauna have not been fully investigated. It is a fact that much research remains to be done on rain forest flora and fauna. It is also a fact, established through research done by the Department of Forestry, that conservative, selective logging does not result in the loss of rain forest species.

The fifth point made by the member for Cairns related to tourism values. The contention that tourism and timber production are mutually exclusive cannot be substantiated. My view is that tourism and conservative timber production by selective logging are highly compatible, and there is no reason why either should be sacrificed under competent forest management.

A sixth point made by the honourable member for Cairns related to an alleged reduction of employment as a result of poor forestry planning. I refute the allegation of poor planning. As the honourable member pointed out, the need to eventually reduce the rain forest cut to the long-term sustainable level was spelt out as far back as the 1949 inquiry. Consultation with the industry on that reduction has been under way for some time.

Reviews of allowable cuts were undertaken in 1978 and 1981. On those occasions, various options were discussed in depth by the department and the north Queensland timber industry. On both occasions, options were adopted to suit the economic state of the industry at the time and allow the industry time to restructure. The industry itself has now established a central marketing organisation and is planning further restructuring to cope with the reduced cut and the changed nature of the resource to apply from 1986.

In recognition of the fact that north Queensland's timber requirements could not be supplied from the rain forest resource in the long term, the Government has initiated a softwood planting program at Ingham and Kuranda.

Mr Campbell interjected.

Mr GLASSON: The honourable member for Bundaberg should undertake a little research into the statistics relative to the softwood plantings throughout the State. We are not planting a resource that is wasteful or unwanted.

Total area planted to date in north Queensland is approximately 7 800 ha, and planting is proceeding at a rate exceeding 600 ha per annum.

Mr Campbell interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Cross-firing in the Chamber will not be tolerated.

Mr GLASSON: There is no alarming over-supply of plantation softwoods in south-east Queensland. I point out that the primary objective——

Mr Campbell interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warned the member for Bundaberg about cross-firing in the Chamber, and he has ignored my warning. I now warn him under Standing Order No. 123A.

Mr GLASSON: The honourable member will go to the chip-heap if he is not careful.

There is no alarming over-supply of plantation softwoods in south-east Queensland. I point out that the primary objective of those plantations is to produce saw logs for local timber production, not pulpwood.

Current forecasts of supply and demand for sawn timber indicate that demand will continue to exceed local supply well into the next century, even if all land presently available and earmarked for this purpose is planted as planned. These plantations are, of course, also capable of producing large quantities of pulpwood from early thinnings, and, despite the honourable member's cynicism regarding pulp-mill projects, the Government is still receiving firm inquiries regarding the utilisation of available pulpwood. Only today, discussions were held in that regard. Whether or not they come to fruition, the plantations will be required to reduce the saw log deficit. Therefore, the Government is fully justified in proceeding with the plantation program as planned in south-east Queensland.

The honourable member for Stafford (Mr Gygar) made one of his worst contributions in this Chamber, but I do acknowledge his recognition of the efficiency and the efforts of the State Emergency Service.

He referred to a casino in Fortitude Valley. Although ethnic groups play games at premises that, because of their method of operation, are not unlawful, it was possible recently to gain evidence of unlawful gaming against 11 persons, and similar action has been taken on several occasions. That was publicised, but the honourable member must not have seen or heard of those charges or chose not to mention in his speech the prosecution of those people.

The allegation that police are told not to return to the station unless they have issued a specified number of traffic tickets is ludicrous, as is the honourable member's statement that, to get revenue for the Government, 50 per cent of radar traps are set deliberately to catch drivers going down hills. The statement regarding the improper use of kill sheets is also ludicrous.

I have already mentioned the contribution by the honourable member for Port Curtis, and I will not expand on that.

The member for Burdekin (Mr Stoneman) referred particularly to tourism developments with the Lands Department. He spoke also about communications and their increasingly important role in the State.

The member for Mackay (Mr Casey) spoke of different methods of settling people on the land. He reverted to the days of the Labor Party Government and the cutting

up of large properties. That was when Queensland had land banks and, when leases expired, the Government moved in and cut up parcels of land on which to settle people. The leases were for grazing homesteads, grazing farms or grazing selections. Following World War II, some of the selections—not all—were excluded for ballot by returned soldiers. Irrespective of the Government that put it in place, that was a commendable scheme, and it occurred during the time of the ALP Government when land banks were available.

A lack of experience and a changing economy forced people to make decisions that proved in later times to be not the best.

Mr Casey: That is not true. The brigalow scheme proved that.

Mr GLASSON: The honourable member for Mackay has had his say.

I come now to the brigalow scheme.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Under—

Mr Casey: You have been saved by the bell, Bill.

Mr Glasson: Like hell I have! I would love to have a go at you. I'd kill you.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr Casey interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the member for Mackay under Standing Order No. 123A.

At 9.55 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Under the provisions of the Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 25 September, I shall now put the questions for the Vote under consideration and the balance remaining unvoted for Lands, Forestry and Police.

The questions for the following Votes were put, and agreed to—

Lands, Forestry and Police—

	\$
Department of Lands	20,798,090
Balance of Vote, Consolidated Revenue, Trust and Special Funds, and Loan Fund Account	393,343,286

Progress reported.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr BURNS (Lytton) (9.57 p.m.), by leave: A few moments ago, the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police accused me of being unaware of the facts in relation to the number of police stationed in my electorate. I quoted from page 113 of the annual report of the Police Department, which was tabled in this House today. The section titled "South Brisbane Region" shows that Wynnum has 67 uniformed police, no detectives or PCs, no technical and scientific personnel and 10 civilians, making a total of 77.

I suggest to the Minister that those who write his speeches for him have a look at the department's report. I quoted those figures when I compared Wynnum with Oxley and South Brisbane. Those figures are straight from a report that was tabled by the Minister.

Mr Campbell interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bundaberg should contain himself.

POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**Second Reading—Resumption of Debate**

Debate resumed from 25 September (see p. 1385) on Mr Glasson's motion—

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

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (9.58 p.m.): The Opposition proposes to support the Bill, which deals with the sale of unclaimed property. The first of the two main amendments provides that when unclaimed property is to be advertised for sale by auction, the department needs to advertise it only once, whereas previously it had to advertise three times. I can see no reason why that should not be changed. The advertising of an article on one occasion should be sufficient.

The second major amendment deals with the disposal of unclaimed property of a value not exceeding \$2,000. At the discretion of the Minister, it may be disposed of to a Government department. I ask the Minister to explain to the House why he has chosen a figure of \$2,000. I can see no reason for it. If the Police Department is to dispose of unclaimed property, irrespective of the value of that property, if it can be of use to the Government, it should be disposed of in that way. If a person wishes to claim the property at a later date, obviously the provisions of the Bill still apply. I do not know why the Minister has placed a limit of \$2,000 on that provision.

The other matter that I wish to raise about the proposed amendments to the Police Act relates not to unclaimed property but to property that is claimed from the Police Department. The incident that I relate is one that I have discussed with the Minister and he assured me that he would investigate the matter. Last week, a young person rang my electorate office and told me that, in May of this year, police officers came to his home and searched his premises for drugs. Of course, a warrant is not needed to search anyone's property for drugs. The officers who searched the property found, in the back yard, a motor cycle that did not have a number on its frame. The police told the young person that they considered the motor cycle had been stolen and that they were going to take it away. The motor cycle was taken away by the police officers in May.

The young person continually chased up the police to find out when his motor cycle would be returned. In October, he was informed that the police had the motor cycle frame X-rayed, that the number had appeared and that the frame of the motor cycle had never been reported stolen. That proves that the property had not been stolen, so it was his lawful property. The young person was quite able then to go to the police station and collect it.

Imagine his surprise when, last Wednesday morning, he went to the police station and asked the police to return his property and was told that he would have to pay \$45. When he questioned the police about that charge, he was informed that the \$45 was the police towing charge to have the motor cycle towed from his home to the police station so that the police could prove that the motor cycle had not been stolen.

I telephoned the commissioner's office and spoke to an officer, who informed me that it was police policy that, if anything was taken from somebody's home, he would have to pay any cartage fees when he reclaimed that property and that he would have to pay storage fees if it was necessary to store the property. It is almost like a Government standover racket. The Government is standing over people and saying, “We will come into your home, take your property and, when you want it back, you will have to pay us.” That is what happened. It is a disgrace.

An Opposition Member: It is typical of what they do.

Mr MACKENROTH: It is.

The Minister has promised to give me an answer, and I believe that he will do so. The opportunity to discuss this matter has arisen, and I hope that the Minister will be able to give me an answer. He has just sent me a note for me to see him tomorrow. I will. I have discussed the matter with the Minister. I do not dispute that he has always

taken up matters that I have raised with him. A particular incident has been raised with me. It is not only this one \$45 matter that I am raising; I am talking about police policy. I do not think that the Minister should have a police policy that requires people to pay for the return of their property.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members to lower their voices.

Mr MACKENROTH: Mr Speaker, if you prefer, I can raise my voice.

In his response on the Police Estimates, the Minister said that I denigrated the police force. I dispute that. I spoke about the practices of a couple of police officers. In no way did I denigrate the police force. In general, the police force does a good job in the community. That does not mean that, if one police officer or a group of police officers do the wrong thing, they should not be criticised in this Chamber. I will continue to criticise people when I have proof that they have done something wrong. I believe that I had proof of the matters that I raised today. The evidence that I quoted was obtained from the Magistrates Court. The information that I related in reference to Detective Pugh consisted of his answers to questions in the Magistrates Court.

I do not believe that raising that matter in Parliament in any way denigrates the police force as a whole, and I do not believe that police officers should be protected by using the smoke-screen of saying that one particular person cannot be criticised because it denigrates the whole of the police force.

In conclusion, the Opposition supports the amendments. A couple of other Opposition members will speak later.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (10.5 p.m.): The Liberal Party will support the amendments and, indeed, any amendments that will help to encourage efficiency and expedite matters dealt with by the police force. Of course, the emphasis on assisting convenience relates to the matters that have been raised today. Reference has already been made to the lateness of the receipt of the report.

Earlier today I mentioned some statistics. I will deal with them as they relate to overall efficiency of the police force. The table that indicates the number of population to police on page 134 of the annual report is somewhat misleading in terms of the reality of police on the ground. Nevertheless, the chart shows that the Queensland Police Force has the highest population in Australia to service. Queensland has 58 more persons per police officer than Victoria; 100 more than Tasmania; 114 more than South Australia and 316 more than the Northern Territory, which, of course, is a very far-flung area and perhaps some discrepancy can be expected. Queensland has 40 more persons per police officer than Western Australia and approximately 15 more than New South Wales. In other words, the Queensland Police Force has more people to service than any other police force in Australia.

A complaint that has already been raised is that the police officers are over-extended. I will focus on a particular area. After closer analysis of the figures, I indicate that that chart is misleading because it clearly includes all staff, not merely the operational staff on the ground who are, shall we say, at the forefront of patrolling and policing.

Although other figures that I cited today indicate a worse position, I will accept the figures of the department regarding the actual number of people patrolling on the ground. In regard to the regional strengths shown on chart 11, page 113, of the annual report, in association with the listing of crimes, I wish to draw to the attention of the House the fact that the South Brisbane Police Region, which includes Ipswich and Oxley, which come within my electorate, South Brisbane and Wynnum, has the highest population, the highest murder rate in the State, the highest attempted murder rate in the State, the highest serious assault rate in the State, the highest number of break and enters of dwellings in the State, the highest total break and enters, the highest incidence of malicious damage, the highest incidence of stealing and unlawful use of motor vehicles, the highest drug offence rate, yet—absolutely the worst by a mile—the lowest ratio of

police to population. On the department's own figures, the ratio is 1:1 082.9 persons. In contrast, the Far Northern Police Region ratio is as low as 1:493.

A clear relationship exists between the worst police situation and an appalling police situation by any State standards or any standard throughout Australia. It is directly related to the highest incidence of all manner of serious offences, and I leave out disqualified driving and offences against public order. I am talking about the types of offences that strike some sort of fear and terror into the minds and security of people living in an average suburban home.

Recently, I understand, there was a special injection of police personnel into the Taringa Police Station. Following a rash of breaking and entering offences in the Toowong/Taringa area, the local manpower was supplemented. After several months of that augmented police force, the officer in charge at Taringa was able to announce a dramatic drop in the incidence of offences in the area. That is exactly as one would expect and is the proposition that one has put forward today and on previous occasions. I reject the view of the member for Toowoomba North (Mr McPhie) that, regardless of the number of police, people will commit offences. That is absolute nonsense. He must have been talking out of the back of his neck. The situation is serious. There is a direct relationship between the number of police on the ground and the incidence of offences.

If the Taringa Police Station, with an augmented staffing, was able to report a dramatic drop in crime in the area, the question one asks is: At the expense of whom? Obviously, that augmented staff came from somewhere else. The results at Taringa, I suggest, prove that a proper and sufficient police force could result in a decreased crime rate and a better sense of security for people and their property throughout the State.

I particularly and quite bitterly refer to the South Brisbane area. The rate of crime there is a shocker and is directly related to the state of manning. Perhaps my area is not the one with the greatest incidence of breaking, entering and stealing, but some shop-keepers in my electorate have had half a dozen break-ins over the last 18 or 24 months.

Mr Lee: My own electorate office has been broken into.

Mr INNES: Yes. Malicious damage has been done to local facilities. It happens because police are not in sufficient numbers to cope with the size of the population and with the clear evidence of the rate of crime in the area.

The matter is serious, but the Government has not responded to it. It is not that sufficient people are not seeking a place in the police force. In the last three or four weeks, I have contacted the commissioner's office pursuing inquiries by the sorts of people I would have thought would make outstanding police officers. I have been informed that the list involves a wait of almost a year. Numerous fine young men and women wish to enter the Queensland Police Force which, at this stage of the country's economy, is an attractive career option.

As I have already said, the Government is engaged in all sorts of pork-barrelling, false priorities in the face of the clearest possible evidence. Without engaging in the police union's statistics, which are more significantly unfavourable, and taking the Minister's own report, albeit at this late hour, one is able to demonstrate that the Government does not have its priorities in their correct order of importance, bearing in mind the essential governmental functions that it should be providing. Police protection is an essential function. The correct order of priority must return. Another 400 police officers in addition to those provided for in the Budget should be employed so that people throughout the State, and in the South Brisbane Police Region in particular, live in a reasonable sense of security for themselves, their families and their property.

Mr UNDERWOOD (Ipswich West) (10.15 p.m.): In the conduct of police investigations, justice must not only be done, it must also be seen to be done. As the record shows, I am not in the habit of publicly querying police work but, in the case to which I will refer, I am under an obligation to raise a number of matters about a police

investigation that is in progress, which are of grave concern to me. I believe that they cast serious doubt on whether justice is being done.

My involvement in the case I will outline does not begin tonight. It started when I was obliged to make a public statement to clear the name of the many fine citizens who attended a demonstration to protest against the tragic injustice of the sackings that took place at the South East Queensland Electricity Board in Ipswich.

I will not discuss tonight the communications that ensued between members of the police force, the Queensland Police Union and me, because such matters will soon be the subject of a meeting that will be held among all parties. The police investigations began on 17 August 1985. On 20 August, the police announced that they were looking for a professional arsonist in association with a fire that occurred at Reid's in Ipswich. It was also announced that the police believed that some indications showed the crime was a professional job. It was further stated that, on an initial investigation, it was suspected that juveniles were responsible for the commission of the crime, but that police were tending to move away from that theory because the result of the crime was so complete.

On 21 August, it was reported that the Criminal Investigation Branch was still following the line of inquiry that indicated the crime was committed by a professional. On 22 August, an identikit photo and a drawing of this professional provided by a witness was published along with a report that stated that police thought that the suspect was 30 to 35 years old, approximately 2 metres tall, with fair complexion and sandy hair, and that it was thought that the suspect was not a resident of Ipswich. The CIB was still working on the theory that a professional had committed the crime.

On 23 August, it was reported that the Ipswich detectives, in possession of the previously published witness's drawing, believed that the suspect had attended a demonstration in Ipswich on 15 August. The police restated that they were still working on the theory that the suspect was a professional and not a person from Ipswich, and that the suspect was 30 to 35 years old and approximately 2 metres tall, with fair complexion and sandy hair. That restatement was made eight days after the demonstration was held on 15 August. On 24 August, my statement was published.

From information made available to me, my statement obviously stunned some police officers. Subsequent to these events taking place, two young, unemployed Ipswich lads aged 17 and 19 years, were arrested and charged with the crime, in stark contrast to the police description that was contained in the progress reports of their investigation. It is my duty to ask the Minister to investigate the cause of my grave concern.

The police investigation to which I refer is the one being conducted into the cause of the fire that occurred on 17 August 1985 at Reid's in Ipswich. That crime has wrought social, physical, emotional and financial havoc on very many Ipswich citizens. The pressure is on the police to deliver the goods and solve the crime. I, and I am sure the Minister, want all of the evidence collected to be made available so that the full facts of the matter can be given judicial consideration.

I shall use only the initials of the individuals involved in the investigation so as to protect their public identity, but they will be known to the police and thus to the Minister. I now ask the Minister—

(1) Is it true that the police investigating the fire at Reid's have failed to interview and take statements from witnesses who can give evidence to support an alibi for the defendants JM, WF and GJ?

(2) Is it a fact that the police who investigated the fire at Reid's intend to produce at the committal hearing only evidence that will support a conviction of those charged and intend to suppress other evidence in the possession of police that throws doubt on the guilt of the accused?

(3) Is it a fact that the police investigating the fire at Reid's have, only as recently as 14 October 1985, charged a potential witness with complicity in the fire

so as to prevent that person giving evidence at the hearing of the committal proceedings?

(4) Is it true that one AW, who is alleged, by virtue of police information, to have been a party to the break-in and subsequent arson at Reid's, has not been charged with any offence relating to the break-in and arson that occurred at Reid's?

(5) Is it true that this AW who, at the very least—according to information supplied to the police—is an eyewitness to the alleged arson that occurred at Reid's will not be called by the police as a witness at the committal hearing?

(6) Is it true that one of the witnesses upon whom the police intend to rely and who is being advanced as a credible witness, is presently a patient at the Barrett Psychiatric Centre?

Those are serious questions about matters that could permanently affect the lives of the persons involved. They require the Minister's investigation and response. All I ask is that all the facts and all the evidence be collected and made available so that justice is done, and seen to be done.

Mr PRICE (Mount Isa) (10.20 p.m.): I want to take up some time this evening to mention some of my concerns about the police force, particularly in my own electorate. The Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police (Mr Glasson) must be getting a little sick of listening to complaints, particularly after the Estimates debate today, but not having had a chance to speak in that debate I would ask for your indulgence, Mr Speaker, to allow me to mention a few of my concerns in the hope that the Minister can perhaps do something about them.

The annual report of the Police Department was tabled only this morning. I did not receive my copy until about midday, and that did not give me time to study it fully. The financial statement in the report showed that \$209m-odd was spent by the Police Department last year. Obviously money cannot buy a good police force; however, \$209m is a considerable amount. Whether the community is getting value for that money in some areas is questionable.

The member for Sherwood (Mr Innes) mentioned police priorities, and rightly so. It is along those lines that I would like to develop my argument. My concern lies in my own electorate, which is being disadvantaged in its share of that money to the extent that it might even be becoming the dumping-ground of the Police Department. I have had conversations with rank-and-file police officers in Mount Isa and the smaller provincial towns in the north west, and also with a senior police officer here in Brisbane. All of those conversations have confirmed my reservations about the police force in general and about Mount Isa in particular. What beats me is why it is the same old story—it is a continuing saga.

Last week-end I arrived in Mount Isa at about 12.30 p.m. and went home to have lunch. I was informed that the telephone had been ringing all the morning, and it rang again after I arrived home. The caller wanted to meet me urgently but would not give his name over the telephone. He said that he had been calling for a couple of days. I had to meet him in the bar of one of the local clubs, where there were plenty of people. I sat down with him, and for the next hour and a-half he harangued me about his treatment by the local police over a charge of driving under the influence of alcohol. He accepted the arrest; it was a fair cop. He was taken to the police station and put into a cell. When the time came for him to be questioned, he alleges that he was pulled out of the cell, taken into the questioning-room, thrown upon the floor, jumped on and kicked, in order, in his own words, to soften him up before particulars were taken. Just discussing that incident was enough to bring tears to his eyes. He said that he would never have previously believed the regular reports in newspapers of police brutality and bashings. Finally he found out. He gave me his name but asked me to tell the story without any particulars. He was terrified. He was a shift worker. He had a job, and wanted to keep it.

The policemen in Mount Isa are slightly different from policemen elsewhere. I have been told that there is a Queensland Police Force and the Mount Isa district police force. Basically, the force comprises sound men, but in most areas the force is tainted by a small core of corruptibles. Why is it that, in spite of allegations made to inspectors and statements taken in my office, complaints involving the same police names keep coming to my office? Honourable members may recall that last year, when the then member for Rockhampton asked for a judicial inquiry into the police in Mount Isa, the Minister went ahead with an internal inquiry that came to nothing when everything was denied. There always seem to be denials.

When people are asked if they want their statements to be sent to the Police Complaints Tribunal, the answer is always on these lines, "Please do not do that. We don't want to be stood up and counted. We don't want to be harassed or followed in the street. We do not want our children annoyed by the police." It seems that a protective cocoon is built around the hard core of policemen who perpetrate such acts.

Without doubt, the Police Complaints Tribunal is worth while, but people generally are terrified of it. Perhaps its name should be changed so that the word "Police" is eliminated. People do not really understand what the tribunal is about. They see it as an arm of the police and think that it can only make matters worse for them. Maybe the tribunal should get the message that it must educate the public better.

When a member of my staff or I suggest an approach to the Police Complaints Tribunal, people shy away. Why do people complain about the police, sometimes at great risk to themselves, if their complaints are not true? People do not make complaints, one after the other, simply for the pleasure of making them. Surely some of them must be true. The Police Complaints Tribunal is being expanded to deal with complaints. If all the complaints made to my office were forwarded to the tribunal, they would be found to equal in number those coming from the rest of Queensland.

Police are transferred for good reasons, one of which is to make up the numbers in the district. On my mathematics, the ratio of police to the population of Mount Isa is no different from that for the rest of Queensland, although the figures that I heard earlier tonight indicate that the ratio for Mount Isa is probably a little better than that for the Gold Coast. However, the ratio for Mount Isa is fairly low. It works out at one policeman for 750 people.

Mr Scott: A little while ago, the honourable member for Lytton, in his personal explanation, showed that many of the figures are false.

Mr PRICE: I take the point. I can only go on the statistics that are published.

A senior officer in Brisbane told me that if a complaint is made against a police officer—sometimes even an unsubstantiated complaint—that officer can bet his life on being transferred somewhere. Because it is the most far-flung place in the State, Mount Isa is the city to which police officers against whom complaints are made are transferred.

Officers may also be transferred to Mount Isa to gain promotion. This promotion quest is so competitive that police officers become more interested in the incestuous nature of their own little group.

It is almost as if they are fighting amongst themselves for promotion or for the goodies that are offered through transfers. The situation has reached the point at which it is a case of "them and us". The public is on the outside. I question seriously the motivation of police officers and their priorities.

The subject of police numbers has already been raised. More than 10 years ago, Inspector Corner, who had resigned from the police force, wrote a book that became quite famous in the force and is probably still quoted today. I will refer to a couple of extracts from his exposé to give honourable members an idea of what it was like in Mount Isa in his day, and I ask them to consider how far the force has progressed in that time.

In what Inspector Corner referred to as the tough days in Mount Isa, he said that it took him only a few days after arriving there to realise that gambling, sly-grog shops and betting shops were protected. He was informed by the officer in charge that these offences were allowed to be committed with the full knowledge and consent of the Queensland Government. That is almost too much to believe.

Mr FitzGerald: What year was this?

Mr PRICE: This is towards the end of the war—in the 1940s.

The then Constable Corner made it so hot for the publicans and the sly-grog operators in Mount Isa that a magistrate asked one day whether he was the only one competing against them. He recalled that every night he put one alcoholic constable to bed in a truck on the banks of the Leichhardt River.

Mr FitzGerald: This is 40 years ago.

Mr PRICE: I will work up to the honourable member's Government soon.

Another officer arrived at the police station one day with the DTs and stark naked. Once, when Corner wanted to raid a gambling joint and could not trust another police officer not to tip off the keeper, he and another officer got the suspect policeman drunk and put him to bed. When they entered the joint to case it before the raid, they found a policeman playing there. They rounded up 56 men in the raid and, soon after, the Commissioner of Police visited Mount Isa with the result that a sergeant who had taken no action against the games retired prematurely.

Inspector Corner's book goes on with various little anecdotes. One of them, which is relevant to this Bill, concerns the time when he seized a large quantity of alcohol and took it to the police station, where it was locked in a cell. He claimed that the next morning, when he went to the cell with the sergeant to make a thorough count of the liquor, it was not there. The cell had been securely locked and the only conclusion that he and the other officer could come to was that the men in an adjoining cell had been able to pick the locks and consume the liquor or that a policeman had opened the cell and sold the liquor to the inmates. He was of the belief that the latter theory was more likely. So much for disposable goods!

A decade later, the infamous Jorgensen case, in which two constables were indicted for murder of an inmate in the cells in Mount Isa, occurred.

Last year, the then Leader of the Opposition and member for Rockhampton (Mr Wright) mentioned a case involving police brutality in Mount Isa and requested a judicial inquiry. In the House he mentioned a complaint by solicitors in Mount Isa about a program on a Brisbane television station. The member for Rockhampton questioned the truth or otherwise of allegations of police brutality in Mount Isa.

The Minister may recall that, when Mr Wright raised that matter, he promised to look into it and in fact had an inquiry conducted. In the long run, because of the utter futility of it all, the lawyers withdrew their allegations. They just were not getting anywhere. Yet the complaints continue. I receive complaints day in and day out.

All I ask for in that region, as people do anywhere else, is that the law be enforced without fear or favour. I ask for more of the favour and less of the force. Because Mount Isa has not attracted the cream of the police force, the people of that city have a collective lack of confidence in the police. That is not confined to Mount Isa itself, but applies to the region. A settlement of 1 200 people in the north west has no police at all. I have a whole stack of written statements—I will not go through them all—from people in the small township of Burketown about the activities of the police there. These have all come to me in the last two weeks. At the moment the police inspector in Mount Isa is looking into them. If some action does not come from that direction, I will pass them on to the Minister. They will follow on the two lots that the Minister has received from me in the last month.

I ask the Minister to take a personal interest in my district, which has had a continuing problem. It is all very well for the police force in the south east of the State to pass on its problems to my district. Although most of the police in Mount Isa are conscientious, the city seems to have the continual hard core that it cannot get rid of. They are the ones who cause the problems and the complaints that bring the public's ire down on the police force itself.

When too many complaints appear in the local media, the defence seems to come from the Queensland Police Union, which states that these tactics have to be used on occasions—these are the words that are used—in order to obtain the record of which they are proud. I remind the House that last year the police in Mount Isa claimed a 72 per cent success rate in solving crime. With the State average at only 52 per cent, there has to be a story in that. If Mount Isa has all of these complaints and a success rate such as that, surely if the Minister reads between the lines, he will see that something is wrong.

I ask the Minister to take a personal interest in the district. I do not ask him to conduct an investigation. The Minister always tells members to make a note of individual cases and show them to him. Of course, it goes back to the inspector, who makes some inquiries, and back it comes to the Minister with a report. The Minister either denies the allegation or accepts it and does something about it. That pedantic attitude is not the way to see the attitude of the police in Mount Isa, which is what I am complaining about. I want some sort of inquiry and rectification by the Minister. I want the Minister to understand what I am speaking about.

Mr D'ARCY (Woodridge) (10.39 p.m.): As the Opposition spokesman has said, we have no complaint with the measure before the House. Like the member for Mount Isa (Mr Price), I had no opportunity to speak about police matters in the Estimates debate, which has recently concluded. I take this opportunity to say that in my area I strike much the same problems as were mentioned by the member for Mount Isa. Woodridge is very, very short of police. Perhaps I could help out my colleague from Mount Isa. As a punitive measure, several policemen from my district could quite easily be transferred to Mount Isa. I am sure that the honourable member would not be pleased with that.

Mr Lingard: Come on, Brother Mick.

Mr D'ARCY: The member for Fassifern has previously said that the number of complaints received by the member for Mount Isa indicate there is a soft touch in his area. I should say that the member for Fassifern would be happy if his electorate contained only areas such as Boonah and Beaudesert, because he would be damned pleased to be rid of the area that he cannot handle—the type of area that many of us have to handle. The situation in Woodridge is delicate.

Compared with other States in Australia, Queensland has the worst police cover per head of population. That is proved by the figures. It is passing strange that police can always be found for certain measures within the State but cannot be found for proper coverage of complaints by ordinary citizens, particularly in areas in which such coverage is more than necessary.

It has been suggested that the Police Complaints Tribunal is viewed with some suspicion. I agree with that statement. Citizens are always reluctant to put complaints in writing. The Minister can take the following statement as he likes. At this stage, I am about to encourage people in my electorate to begin taking cognisance of the Police Complaints Tribunal. Everything will be put in writing to the Police Complaints Tribunal and answers will be expected. No satisfaction is obtained from the Police Department. I do not blame the Minister for Police or the Commissioner of Police for that. I know that, when complaints are made, the Minister and the Commissioner do their best to handle them.

The problem in Woodridge is different from any other problem in the State. The Minister will not recognise the problem. In 1977, when I was elected to represent the Woodridge electorate, the people there were known as the nappy brigade. One could see

hundreds of nappies on washing lines in Woodridge. The children have grown up and are now teenagers living in socio-economic conditions that the Queensland Government does not recognise. The police in the area are sympathetic, and most of them do a good job. However, they cannot cope with the problems they are facing in that area.

I give fair warning to the Government and to the Minister that, because of the massive problem arising in the area with large numbers of youths in poor socio-economic conditions, aggression and violence is becoming a part of everyday life in Woodridge. The police cannot handle the problem. They are stymied with paperwork. Because there is no Juvenile Aid Bureau in Woodridge, only the worst cases can be dealt with. Preventive measures are not enforced. The problem is being perpetuated and compounded, particularly if one or two bad policemen are assigned to the area.

Young, untrained, unskilled police want to go out and do their own thing. Recently, a police officer in jeans and a T-shirt, with a gun over his shoulder, arrived at a house. That "uniformed" policeman arrived, out of hours, at a house that he said he was raiding. When the inspector was told about the matter, he said, "That policeman has the best clean-up rate in the area." They have seen too many cops and robbers films.

I warn the Minister that in my electorate a police shooting will take place. I have many good friends in the police force. I do not want to see any of them in that situation. Because of the aggression that is being shown and the stupidity of the police not being able to control the situation, the stage will be reached at which increasingly serious violence will be encountered and a serious shooting will take place within the area. As the media are present, I did not want to say that. However, it will happen.

At present, only the tip of the iceberg can be seen. There are some solutions to the problems. One solution is to have more police officers who are visible, and who are properly trained to handle the problems encountered in the area. Only society will provide the preventive measures. In 10 years' time, the present teenagers will be young people raising families. Many of the problems, which are similar to those encountered in Inala, will disappear. However, those problems now exist in the low socio-economic group.

Unfortunately, the problems are not being handled. Woodridge does not have a Juvenile Aid Bureau. The clergy are screaming. Clergymen, such as Brother Mick, to whom the honourable member for Fassifern (Mr Lingard) referred, are aware of the social problems and are very concerned about them.

Mr Fouras: Beenleigh has a Juvenile Aid Bureau because of political pork-barrelling but Woodridge, which needs a Juvenile Aid Bureau, does not have one.

Mr D'ARCY: That is another point that I want to make. If, when the new station opens at Slacks Creek at the end of the year or the beginning of next year, the promises that are being made to the people of that particular area are kept the CIB will transfer to Slacks Creek and a Juvenile Aid Bureau will be established in the Woodridge area.

I am terribly concerned, and the Government should be terribly concerned, about the problems that are arising and starting to compound in Woodridge in regard to juveniles. The juvenile problem is virtually out of hand, and more trouble than any honourable member would expect will occur in the near future.

Hon. W. H. GLASSON (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police) (10.46 p.m.), in reply: I take on board the comments made by Opposition speakers. The honourable member for Chatsworth (Mr Mackenroth) referred to the Bill. Other honourable members took the opportunity to raise concerns in their particular areas.

The honourable member for Ipswich West (Mr Underwood) made reference to charges and mentioned certain initials. He would be aware that this matter is sub judice. If he has any information, I would be only too happy to talk to him. I suggest that he might take the opportunity of speaking to the appropriate people and bringing the matter to their attention.

The honourable member for Mount Isa (Mr Price) has left the Chamber. I will be happy to discuss his concerns with him.

The honourable member for Woodridge (Mr D'Arcy) mentioned some problems in his electorate, I am well aware of them. I sympathise with people who are faced with problems, such as juvenile delinquency, and with unemployed people who have a lower socio-economic position. I take cognisance of what has been said.

Motion (Mr Glasson) agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

POLICE (PHOTOGRAPHS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 25 September (see p. 1386) on Mr Glasson's motion—

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

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (10.49 p.m.): The Opposition will support the amendments to the Police (Photographs) Act whose main purpose is to differentiate between marked prints and prints. When one compares the amendments with the original legislation that came before Parliament in 1966, one wonders what sort of a complex society one now lives in. The amendments to explain the difference between a marked print and a print that the Police Department can sell are in fact longer than the original legislation which dealt with selling photographs. I wonder where society is headed when things have to be spelt out in such detail that an amendment has to be made to an Act that allows the police to sell prints of photographs. The Government, in order to differentiate between marked prints and prints, has introduced legislation that is longer than the Act.

There is nothing in the Bill to which the Opposition objects, so it supports the legislation.

Hon. W. H. GLASSON (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police) (10.50 p.m.), in reply: I thank the honourable member for Chatsworth for his contribution. I have no comment to make about it.

Motion (Mr Glasson) agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 7, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY INDUSTRY EMPLOYEES' SUPERANNUATION RESTORATION BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 8 October (see p. 1642) on Mr I. J. Gibbs's motion—

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

Mr VAUGHAN (Nudgee) (10.52 p.m.): On Thursday, 21 February this year, the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) announced six points as the Government's terms of settlement of the dispute that then existed within the South East Queensland Electricity Board. They were—

“Power station operators would be required to restore full power and become staff employees with a no-strike agreement.

30 days after the staff agreement has been achieved action would be taken to offer re-employment to dismissed SEQEB employees who wish to re-apply for positions.

Any re-employment would be under the new non-strike contract conditions now in place for new employees with a 38 hour week and ten day fortnight.

Such re-employment would only be offered provided the dismissed employees had not previously engaged in any harassment of existing employees and new employees.

If six months after the employment of any dismissed employee there has been no harassment of other employees action would be taken to restore the employee's superannuation and other entitlements.

Harassment at any time after the six month period would be grounds for dismissal.”

Notwithstanding that the terms of the Premier's proposal were completely unacceptable and virtually impossible to implement, and although power station operators did not become staff employees—and I emphasise that—with a no-strike agreement, a number of the dismissed SEQEB employees have been re-employed. Some returned to work early in the dispute, others were forced back to work through necessity and key men were sought out by the SEQEB management and encouraged to return to work. A number of those who returned to work—specially selected employees—have been allowed to do so without loss of entitlements including, I understand, superannuation entitlements, whereas others have been forced to accept the terms laid down by the Government in the legislation that was enacted at that time.

As I have indicated, one of the terms of settlement offered by the Premier on 21 February was that “six months after the employment of any dismissed employee. . . action would be taken to restore the employee's superannuation and other entitlements.” As six months has passed, and in order to keep faith with those employees who returned to work, the Government has now taken the action necessary to restore superannuation benefits that were taken from the dismissed workers.

Because some employees took their superannuation entitlements when they were dismissed and others did not, and because a number of factors must be sorted out from the situation that presently exists, the contents of the Bill are designed to cover each and every employee who was dismissed from the South East Queensland Electricity Board on 12 February this year and subsequently re-employed.

I have no wish to pass judgement on those workers who will be affected by the legislation. For whatever reason they returned to work and accepted the terms laid down by the Queensland Government, they must live with that for the rest of their lives. If they can have restored to them the conditions that were lost when they were dismissed by the Government last February, that is their good fortune. However, the thing that makes my blood boil in the whole rotten SEQEB affair is that for purely political

purposes, the Premier and Treasurer and Government members have persecuted and crucified good and decent Australian workers, many of whom are returned servicemen.

Some of the men involved had accumulated up to 37 years of service or more, and many were approaching retirement. Those former SEQEB employees have therefore lost tens of thousands of dollars in superannuation benefits because they stood up for what they believed to be their rights in a so-called democratic society.

Mr Burns: Many families have been broken up.

Mr VAUGHAN: Yes, that is true.

I hold the Premier and Treasurer totally responsible for everything that has been done to those workers, because he set out to make an example of them for his own political gain. The Premier and Treasurer prevented the State Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission from resolving the dispute in February, and he used the Governor of Queensland to do his dirty work; moreover, he used this Parliament to deliver the final blow. The actions of the Premier and Treasurer will not be forgotten, and I can guarantee that. Inasmuch as this legislation has been introduced to restore superannuation benefits to those SEQEB employees who have returned to work, I can guarantee that a State Labor Government will enact the legislation necessary to restore loss of superannuation benefits to the remaining former SEQEB employees.

Debate, on motion of Mr Wharton, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—

“That the House do now adjourn.”

Local Government Association of Queensland Conference at Gladstone

Mr PREST (Port Curtis) (10.58 p.m.): I want to draw the attention of the House to an allegation that has been made in connection with a conference held in Gladstone between 9 and 13 September by the Local Government Association of Queensland.

It had been said repeatedly that the conference would be held in Gladstone, and that it would be held at no cost to the rate-payers of the city. Since the conference was held, two lengthy letters have been written by Mr Ken Nicholson, a well-known member of the National Party, which have raised many important points. For instance, apparently Mr Nicholson has information that the conference cost the rate-payers of the Gladstone City Council very dearly indeed and that information indicates that the aldermen of the Gladstone City Council have been having a ball.

I wish to take up only one of the points he made, that is, the assertion that the Gladstone City Council endeavoured to put pressure, which could be interpreted as blackmail, on the bank that conducted some of the financial affairs of the city council. Apparently, the Gladstone City Council informed the bank that the accounts and business transactions conducted by the Gladstone City Council would be withdrawn if the bank did not sponsor a function associated with the conference. According to Mr Nicholson, that function was to be held at a cost of \$30,000.

Although placed under pressure applied by the Gladstone City Council, the bank refused to concede, and I am told that the council has now transferred its business and accounts to another bank. I point out, however, that prior to the conference the bank I refer to had assisted the Gladstone City Council by the provision of loan funds over many years. The Gladstone City Council had borrowed varying amounts over different periods and under various terms of repayment and rates of interest. It must not be forgotten that interest rates in the 1970s were confined to single-digit percentages, and were not charged at the rate of 14 per cent or 15 per cent, which is applicable today. So now all those loans must be renegotiated. I am told that they will be for shorter periods and at the interest rate applicable in the market-place today.

This is a case that should be investigated by the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing and his Department of Local Government. If the allegations are true, action should be taken, because they will prove to be a financial burden on the rate-payers of Gladstone in the future.

The Minister and his department should discover how many loans are involved, the amount involved in each loan, the terms of the loans and the interest rate being charged. If the loans are to be renegotiated, what interest rate will be charged and what will be the terms of the repayments? It is unbelievable that the town clerk, on a salary of \$56,000 a year plus, would advise the Gladstone City Council to take the action that it is alleged to have taken. The town clerk and other council staff should have strongly advised the Gladstone city councillors as to the eventual repercussions should the council carry out its threat to that bank because it had rejected the suggestion or the request, whatever it is called, of the council to sponsor one of the functions at the conference. Although this is only one aspect of the matter, it is very important.

Many of the other matters raised by Mr Nicholson can be answered by the council itself. They relate only to the conference and to where, when and how many councillors travelled. Mr Nicholson believes that more consideration should be given to the rate-payers of the city by the council in its spending. It is obvious that that conference cost much more than the rate-payers are being told, but the important point raised by Mr Nicholson relates to the loans. I will talk about the other matters at a later date, but I would like the Minister to treat these allegations seriously and take whatever action is necessary to see that the rate-payers of the city are not taken for a ride. If the sort of action that is alleged did take place, the council should be brought to account for it.

Australian Economy

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Condamine) (11.3 p.m.): I want to speak about the Australian economy. From time to time, I hear or read informed comment about the economic fortunes of Australia. I feel, however, that most informed discussion on the overall economy becomes swamped by comment that concentrates on only minor factors affecting the overall scene. For example, if the unemployment percentage rises, the emphasis of all comment is directed at reducing the level of unemployment, without fully appreciating that unemployment cannot be addressed on its own. It is in fact a symptom of a sickness in the overall economy.

A recent OECD report listed Australia as having the best growth rate of all countries studied, and that fact was widely publicised. Some supposedly learned commentators then painted a picture of boom. Unfortunately, that is not the case. Worse still, some sections of the community believed that the comments covered all economic factors and now feel that they can demand even more services from the Government.

Quite recently, I read an article by Julian Cribb, who used four key indicators to highlight the dangerous state of Australia's financial position. Although it does not cover all relevant factors, the article does give a wider view of Australia's position than do many articles that I have read recently.

The first indicator that Mr Cribb chose to use was Australia's current account, expressed as a percentage of gross domestic product. Since the early 1970s, Australia's current account has continually been below the acceptable level of percentage of GDP set by the Australian Economic Planning Advisory Council. It can be argued that, to develop the resources of a nation, it is necessary to borrow. However, perhaps one could also make the comment that, as is the case in private enterprise, one must have periods of consolidation. There should be periods when the Government accumulates credits. That has not been the case. Successive Governments of all persuasions, in an effort to appease a demanding public, have been prepared to tolerate continuous deficit budgeting. Short-term political decisions, aimed at winning votes, have replaced sound economic management.

The second indicator chosen by Mr Cribb to illustrate his point was the movement of the long-term interest rates in Australia and overseas. Although it is true to say that

the long-term interest rate has risen both in Australia and overseas, it is noticeable that since 1982 our onshore interest rates are 3 per cent and 4 per cent above the overseas rate.

My understanding is that the Federal Government's tight control of interest rates is keeping our interest rates high for the specific purpose of enticing capital to remain in Australia. I have read that it is calculated that the Australian dollar could slip to US50c if our dollar was to go to its proper value free of our enforced high interest rates. Yet that low level may have to be reached if our export industries are to survive.

The growth in both public-sector and private-sector indebtedness is the third indicator chosen to show Australia's downhill slide. Since 1981, private-sector indebtedness has risen from a level of about 7 per cent to a staggering 20 per cent. I suspect that much of this indebtedness is associated with the loss of profitability of so many enterprises. High labour charges, increased taxation and loss of incentive for private-sector investment, together with high interest rates, would, I believe, be the major causes of this indebtedness. At the same time, our public-sector debt has changed from a figure of 5 per cent of gross domestic product to in excess of 10 per cent.

The Federal Government is collecting more and more taxes and is incurring a bigger and bigger debt. To put it bluntly, our Federal Government is allowing this nation to live beyond its means.

The overall national debt, a combination of both the private and public-sector debt, has grown to an alarming level at about 30 per cent of GDP. Economists point out that only countries in serious financial trouble run their national debt at such a high level of GDP.

The pity of it all is that, although this is pointed out from time to time, and people say how serious it is, we as a nation quickly forget the state of our nation and concentrate our efforts on less important matters without really planning at a national level and taking the long-term viability of the nation into account.

The last indicator used by Mr Cribb in his article was based on our terms of trade expressed in index points. Mr Cribb's statistics show an overall declining trend since 1965, but worse still is the fact that since 1978 this nation has run at an abnormally low level. In fact it has been below the acceptable index level of 100 as used by the Australian Economic Planning Advisory Council.

To summarise quickly—Australia's debt is growing alarmingly; our long-term interest rates are higher than overseas levels; our current account is continually below an acceptable level; and Australia's terms of trade have been declining for years.

The message that Mr Cribb wanted to stress—it is one that I support strongly—is that Australia must pull itself up with a sharp jolt. It is vital that we redefine our national priorities.

I suggest that the public sector has grown at the expense of the private sector. There is now almost one public servant or welfare dependant for every person in the private sector.

Historians claim that the decline of the Roman Empire occurred because the Romans' society reached the same level.

Time expired.

Repetition Strain Injury

Mr BURNS (Lytton) (11.8 p.m.): Tonight I wish to talk about repetition strain injury, that is, RSI, which was seldom heard of a few years ago, but which, in the last two or three years, has become one of the fastest-growing, work-associated diseases or injuries in Australia. It has been round for years. It used to show up occasionally on production lines. We get a good deal of it in the meatworks when people use knives in wet conditions and their wrists go. With modern office equipment, such as computers and processors, RSI has started to affect many more workers.

The causes of RSI—a calculator, a labour-saving word processor or, in one of the worst cases in Queensland, a simple retail store price-stapling gun—look innocuous enough. RSI has assumed the proportions of a major industrial disease, with sufferers often being crippled to the point where they live in constant pain and have to take years off work.

I now cite the case of a worker suffering from the effects of a form of RSI sustained during the course of her employment, and the unfair and unjust treatment that she received at the hands of the workers' compensation doctors.

Her case is well documented with the Workers Compensation Board because she received payment until 5 December 1984. On that day, she was referred by the board to an orthopaedic surgeon named Graham Anderson who, despite several previous diagnoses by various doctors, including specialists, attesting to the fact that this lady suffered tenosynovitis, diagnosed her condition as occupational neurosis. He is alleged to have said that it was a waste of tax-payers' money and that he did not believe in RSI.

Sometimes I worry that people in the Workers Compensation Board may have their own biases and fixations, and decide in their own way to knock back cases. Doctors on orthopaedic boards might have a set against a particular type of injury and make it very difficult for a worker to receive justice.

Payments to this lady were suspended until she was examined by an orthopaedic review board in March 1985. The board ruled that, until she had been examined by Dr Anderson, she had suffered from muscle strain, which was compensable and that thereafter she was fit to resume her normal duties.

This woman remained off work for six months, during which time she consulted the following doctors regarding her ongoing condition: an acupuncturist at Capalaba on 7, 9, 11, 16 and 23 January, 5, 18, 20 and 27 February, and 6 and 13 March 1985; a chiropractor at Capalaba during February and March—specific dates unconfirmed; an acupuncturist/medical practitioner at Morningside on 11, 15, 17, 20, 22 and 29 April, 7, 14, 20, 21 and 28 May and 8 and 12 June 1985; a rheumatologist at Capalaba on 7 June and approximately 24 June 1985; and a medical practitioner at Moorooka every two weeks from 5 December 1984 until her return to work on 30 May 1985.

I find the attitude of the Workers Compensation Board in this case disturbing because, less than one week prior to her visit to Dr Anderson, this woman consulted a specialist, Dr Staunton-Smith, who concluded that she suffered the effects of tenosynovitis. One month prior to this particular consultation, she was examined by another specialist, Dr Bill Douglas, on behalf of the Workers Compensation Board. His diagnosis was consistent with the findings of Dr Staunton-Smith. I understand that, although Dr Staunton-Smith's examination lasted almost one and a-half hours, Dr Anderson's examination lasted about only 10 minutes. I point out that Dr Anderson is not a psychiatrist.

Recent inquiries made from this woman's employer have revealed that the employer approved special sick leave for her on full pay from 11 December 1984, that is, upon the expiry of her normal sick leave entitlements, to 29 May 1985, the day prior to her resumption of duty. I think that that is good from the boss's point of view, but it means that her employer was carrying the load and helping her out, rather than the Workers Compensation Board. The Orthopaedic Board of the Workers Compensation Board comprises eminent specialists in that field of medicine who are responsible for ensuring that workers who hurt themselves or who are injured on the job receive compensation. Their attitude should not be that of one doctor who suggested that his job was to save public money. After all, firms insure their employees against injury in the work-place.

I am angry that the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs, having received representations from the Federated Clerks Union, to which he replied in September 1985, said that, if this woman supplied new evidence to the general manager of the Workers Compensation board, he would be prepared to review her claim. It was also

suggested by the Minister that a psychiatric assessment would be considered as new evidence.

That is an insult to that woman who, after nine years of loyal work for her employer, is now unemployable. Her work has damaged her hands to the degree that she cannot work. She has lost her job, she suffers continual pain and she is still going to the doctor. Yet, the Minister responsible for industrial affairs, who is charged with the responsibility of looking after the affairs of workers in this State, wrote to her and suggested that she should get her head read. That is what he said; that it is a mental condition. It is not. The idea of workers' compensation is that, if an employee hurts himself on the job and it is a work-caused injury, he is paid compensation. This woman did not get a fair go, and most workers in Queensland do not get a fair go when facing medical boards.

Time expired.

Relocation of Tamborine-Oxenford Road

Mr LINGARD (Fassifern) (11.13 p.m.): A recent article in a local newspaper by a writer who is known to be very critical of the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) referred to the fact that the honourable member for Salisbury (Mr Goss) had been mangled by "Big Russ" over the Oxenford Totalisator Administration Board subagency. The article also stated that Mr Hinze had all the answers about the Oxenford Road causeway and that the member for Ipswich (Mr Hamill) was lining up to get his mangling.

My concern is that, in their great desire to get at the Minister and to make a name for themselves, the honourable members for Salisbury and Ipswich have given no consideration to the people in the area concerned and to those in the adjoining electorates. Because of the high esteem in which the people of Queensland hold the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing, the new back-bench members of the Opposition are falling over themselves to attack him. However, in doing so, they are neglecting the wishes of the people who live around Oxenford and in Mount Tamborine.

Mount Tamborine is in my electorate and, clearly, the people who live there are benefiting from the decisions made by the Minister for Main Roads. Recently, the Premier and Treasurer opened the new tourist road named Henri Roberts Road. The construction of that road was financed by a private developer, at a cost of over \$6m, so that the land on the eastern side of Mount Tamborine could be opened up for development and, he hopes, so that he will recover his money and, in addition, make a handsome profit. Clearly, in the true free enterprise spirit, he stands either to lose substantially or to make a handsome profit. However, the ones who have gained are the residents of Mount Tamborine, who can now drive from the heights of Mount Tamborine to Nerang in 10 minutes.

As well as that road, the people now have the magnificent Nerang to Canungra road developments. Both of those roads give access to Oxenford. Not only have those new roads opened up access to Oxenford; they have increased the use of the notorious road bends and bridges round Oxenford. The road went through the areas owned by Maralinga Pty Ltd. To restore and upgrade the previous line of that road would have been ridiculous, as the road surface, the corners and the creek crossings would have had to be reconstructed.

Many accidents and one fatality have been recorded there; no mention of that is made by the Opposition. Neither is mention made of the need for upgrading. To upgrade the old section would have cost much more than \$885,000. Even then, the road would have retained the dangerous sections.

For those reasons the Albert Shire Council decided to build a causeway, with a combination of private, local and Main Roads Department finance. There is nothing unusual about that or about using private industry to provide contract machinery. No criticism was made of the use of private finance or machinery on the Henri Roberts

Road; but as soon as work was done on the road in the area owned by Maralinga Pty Ltd, the young dogs barked.

I quote from a letter in today's *Courier-Mail* from Dr Vonda Youngman, who has been the councillor at Mount Tamborine.

It states—

“The Tamborine Mountain/Oxenford Road, servicing a fast-growing hinterland area carries a high volume of traffic—school buses, milk tankers, daily commuters, residents, tourists—destination Gold Coast and Brisbane.

For years, residents of this area have been regularly floodbound after rain in the hills.

For nine years, while area councillor, I constantly approached the Main Roads Department and Mr Hinze to upgrade this road to a flood-free, all-weather standard.

Surely people living so close to Brisbane are entitled to a flood-free highway!

One by one, the three low creek crossings were raised, leaving only the weir by-pass to be completed.

Flooding could put the weir out for three or four days or longer if the structure was physically damaged by flood-waters.

. . .

Knowing the past history of the road, it is now a delight to travel the new weir by-pass section and find a well-constructed, safe, flood-free road.

Logically, upstream was the place to site the by-pass. It would have been stupid and impractical to build it elsewhere.

. . .

For all those who use it, the new weir by-pass road is a dream come true.”

Clearly in an attempt to get his name in the newspapers, the member for Ipswich (Mr Hamill) is misleading the House. He seems to make a point of doing that. Recently, he told honourable members how he would not stand when *God Save The Queen* was played. He cited an example of doing that in front of a whole group schoolchildren. When I attended the recent Ipswich Rugby League grand final, the crowd was asked to stand for the national anthem. I stress that the words “national anthem” were used. When everybody stood, *God Save The Queen* was played. I noticed that the member for Ipswich was also standing. Clearly, in front of schoolchildren he tries to play the big man, but in front of footballers and supporters he does not have the guts to sit down.

In his recent attack, he also displayed his lack of courage. He used parliamentary privilege to disregard the needs and wishes of the people of the area and he attacked a Minister to gain media coverage. However, the only coverage he and the member for Salisbury (Mr Goss) have received shows that they are being mangled, and that is clear to all honourable members.

Betting at Capalaba Greyhound Racing Club on Metropolitan Races

Mr DAVIS (Brisbane Central) (11.18 p.m.): Before dealing with the matter that I wish to raise in this debate, I should say that I am always amused when members such as the member for Fassifern (Mr Lingard) ask why a member of Parliament does not repeat his allegations outside the House. If this is not the place for us to express our thoughts and wishes, what the hell are we elected for? That is the weakest argument I have ever run across in my life. Have honourable members noticed that, over the years, every time the heat is applied to members of the National Party, the first thing that they say is, “Say it outside this Chamber.”? As soon as a member does that, they belt him with a writ. Nobody knows that better than the member for Port Curtis (Mr Prest), in his dealings with the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze).

I have a couple of things to say to the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing. Last Saturday, I visited the Capalaba Greyhound Racing Club, which, because it has a straight racing track, is unique in Queensland. Lo and behold, I found that no betting was allowed on Brisbane gallopers, yet betting was permitted on Sydney, Melbourne and Southport gallopers.

I have criticised the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) for bowing to Queensland Turf Club pressure by not allowing at the Rocklea trots betting on Brisbane gallops. Honourable members will recall that, at the Rocklea trots, a person used to be able to bet on the Brisbane gallops. However, because of pressure from the QTC to this weak-kneed Government, that betting at the Rocklea trots was stopped. The reason given was that Rocklea was in the metropolitan area.

The Redlands electorate is a large area that takes in Cleveland and the Moreton Bay islands, and I have some news for the Minister. The Capalaba Greyhound Racing Club is outside the metropolitan area and is in the Redlands area. I asked the question, "Why should the Redlands people be treated as second-class citizens? Why should punters who go to that race-track not be allowed to bet on Brisbane gallopers?" It would be fair to say that punters who go to the greyhound racing on the Gold Coast, which is in the province of the Minister in charge of racing, are allowed and have the facilities to bet on all forms of racing. Every Opposition member who belongs to a racing club that conducts race meetings on Saturdays——

Mr Littleproud: Are you talking about demarcation disputes?

Mr DAVIS: Government members are making second-class citizens out of the people in the Redlands electorate. How mean and miserable has the Government become?

Mr Littleproud: Have you got a demarcation line?

Mr DAVIS: It is not a demarcation line. The people who reside in towns such as Dalby in the electorate of the honourable member for Condamine are allowed to bet on the Brisbane gallopers. Why cannot the people in the Redlands electorate enjoy the same facilities as the people in the honourable member's electorate? That is a plain, simple question. Recently, I asked the Minister why that was so. He said, "One of the conditions on which we gave them the licence was that they were not allowed to bet on the Brisbane gallopers." How pathetic and weak can he be?

Mr De Lacy: Terrible! They don't care about Redlands.

Mr DAVIS: They do not care about Redlands.

As the leader of the parliamentary Labor Party (Mr Warburton) pointed out, during the 1980 and 1983 elections, a hospital was promised for the Redlands electorate. It is only now, because of the by-election, that a hospital will be built.

Mr Milliner: What about the railway line to Redcliffe?

Mr DAVIS: That is a classic example. Honourable members will recall the then Minister (Mr Tomkins) drawing that great line on television. Unfortunately, he did not know where the stations would be located. As soon as the Liberal Party candidate was elected, what did the National Party do? That is the last we heard about the railway line to Redcliffe. If, by chance, the National Party were returned in Redlands, it would treat the people of Redlands as second-class citizens. It would treat them in the same way as it treats them by not allowing them to bet on the Brisbane races.

The Labor Party will make sure that the people of Redlands, particularly the people who support the Capalaba Greyhound Racing Club, know that they are being treated as second-class citizens. They cannot obtain the facility that is enjoyed by people residing in electorates represented by Government members.

Time expired.

Interstate Road Transport Bill

Mr ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (11.24 p.m.): The matter that I would like to raise relates to the Interstate Road Transport Bill.

Mr Davis: There is no such thing as the Interstate Road Transport Bill.

Mr ELLIOTT: The honourable member does not know what he is talking about. If he thinks that is the case, I ask him what I have in my hand.

Mr Davis: It is a piece of paper.

Mr ELLIOTT: The honourable member thinks that it is a piece of paper. That shows how much the Opposition spokesman knows about transport.

The matter should have been apolitical. Total agreement should have been reached by all States and the Commonwealth. However, the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr Morris) adopted a smart alec approach in the Federal arena. All States were promised that they would be consulted. The Australian Transport Advisory Council and the working party worked on it. It was promised that it would be shown the final draft of the legislation before it was presented in Parliament. What happened? Of course, the Federal Labor Government reneged on its promises. It did not fulfil its promises. So this legislation is now before the House.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr ELLIOTT: The honourable member for Brisbane Central should be quiet and listen for a moment.

The Federal shadow spokesman, the member for Murray (Mr Lloyd), moved an amendment that this legislation be withdrawn so that consultation could take place between the industry and State Ministers to ensure that it was not riddled with inconsistencies. The legislation has absolutely no regard for civil liberties. It is full of \$1,000 fines for trivial matters.

I believe that the legislation is a travesty of justice. It shows that members of the Federal Labor Government have no morals. They gave an undertaking and reneged on the deal, and Opposition members know it. That sort of thing happens all the time.

Honourable members might ask, "What is this Bill all about?" It is an attempt to bring into the net those people who are now working on IS registration plates, are not registering in any State at all and are paying a lesser amount of registration.

Mr Davis: Why should they get away with it?

Mr ELLIOTT: Those people should not get away with it; they should pay. However, those people should pay only a reasonable amount.

The cronies of the honourable member for Brisbane Central in Canberra are proposing to implement a system whereby a metering device will be required on trucks. Who will have to pay for this metering device? The person who puts it in the truck will have to pay for it, and it will cost a small fortune. Drivers of trucks would be required at any time to take the card out of this machine and show people where they drove, where they stopped, what they did, who they saw, and so on.

Mrs Chapman: An invasion of privacy.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is right. It is an infringement of civil liberties.

It is a little bit like the identity card that the Federal Government will ask people to carry. That Government is like the Gestapo. Federal Government members are a mob of Gestapo operators. It is the sort of thing that honourable members have come to expect and are seeing all the time from this Federal Labor Government.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr ELLIOTT: The honourable member for Brisbane Central knows that the Commonwealth Government has reneged on the deal.

The necessary consultation has not taken place. When people who are involved in the transport industry realise what is happening, they will revolt. They will not wear this sort of attitude.

Quite frankly, the Bill should be withdrawn. Consultation should take place between the industry and the State Governments to ensure that all of these anomalies are removed. If a person's partner is disqualified, he is immediately disqualified from the right to operate his truck. I ask honourable members: Where is the justice in that?

Time expired.

Motion (Mr Wharton) agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.29 p.m.