

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 28 OCTOBER 1987

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 28 OCTOBER 1987

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. K. R. Lingard, Fassifern) read prayers and took the chair at 2.30 p.m.

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

Railway Service, Beenleigh and Holmview

From Mr Goss (67 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will provide a complete service for railway patrons from all train services to Beenleigh and Holmview.

Warwick Dairy

From Mr Littleproud (227 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will support the Warwick Dairy and resist all moves toward its closure.

Amendments to Education Act

From Mr Schuntner (105 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will desist from making amendments to the Education Act which will eliminate independent education boards.

Balance between Public Ownership and Private Enterprise

From Mr Innes (2 336 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will amend the Land Act and the Integrated Resort Development Act so as to maintain a balance between public ownership and private enterprise particularly on Barrier Reef islands.

Strategic Plan for the Broadwater, Southport

From Mr Veivers (5 200 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will support the Gold Coast City Council's proposed amendment to its strategic plan for the western shores and the adjacent waterway of the Southport Broadwater.

Petitions received.

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed—

Report of the State Fire Services for the year ended 30 June 1987.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Proclamations under the Forestry Act 1959-1984

Orders in Council under the Forestry Act 1959-1984

Regulations under—

Local Government Act 1936-1987

Hospitals Act 1936-1984

By-laws under—

Dental Act 1971-1987

Education Act 1964-1987

Rules under the Hospitals Foundations Act 1982

Report and Financial Statements of the Gladstone Area Water Board for the year ended 30 June 1987.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Briefings to State Cabinet or Ministers by Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence Personnel

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police) (2.35 p.m.), by leave: I wish to acquaint honourable members with the facts surrounding briefings to State Cabinet or Ministers by personnel attached to the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence in Canberra. This has become necessary following recent publicised comments by the member for Sherwood who, for his own obvious political reasons, has not let his lack of knowledge of the facts prevent him from speaking on such issues.

The prime thrust of Mr Innes' remarks on the ABC's *7.30 Report* on 19 October 1987 was his claim that a briefing given to State Cabinet on 26 August 1985 was an attempt to force action in Queensland regarding prostitution and illegal gambling. Such a claim is completely devoid of any element of truth. I am not at liberty to disclose the precise nature of the briefing given to Cabinet members on that date, but it is sufficient to say that it dealt with drug-related investigations and associated murders on an Australiawide basis.

I am advised also that a similar briefing was planned to be delivered to most, if not all, other Australian State Cabinets. This Government strongly supports the role and efforts of the ABCI and is particularly active in giving effect to drug-related operations similar to those that were the subject of the August 1985 briefing. The follow-up action which flowed from the 1985 meeting included another ABCI briefing on 10 July 1986 to about five Cabinet Ministers and another to me personally on 20 January 1987. Further and continuing investigations resulted from the updated intelligence given in those briefings. Nothing in that intelligence related to prostitution or illegal gambling.

To date, the ABCI intelligence has led to the Queensland police heading two major combined police operations in this State. The evidence obtained, as distinct from the intelligence, caused the apprehension and subsequent imprisonment of the offenders concerned.

Finally, I point out that the ABCI is a combined organisation with representatives from all States and Australian Territories and has on its staff experienced police officers from each State or Territory. The ABCI was formed by virtue of an agreement between those Governments, with each member having equal rights. The first agreement was signed by the States on 6 February 1981, and amended on 24 January 1984 and again on 25 May 1984.

I trust that, now that I have placed these facts on the record, honourable members opposite will be less inclined to let their imaginations make up for their lack of knowledge on such issues.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Green Paper on Occupational Safety and Welfare Legislation

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment, Small Business and Industrial Affairs) (2.37 p.m.), by leave: I seek to advise the House that my department has prepared a Green Paper on occupational safety and welfare legislation. The proposed reforms will ensure that worker safety will continue to take a very high priority in the community.

This proposal will reduce a number of Acts to a single, all-encompassing Act, with all employers' and employees' duties clearly defined under the same set of guide-lines. It is intended to clarify the entire matter once and for all.

The development of the Green Paper follows lengthy and extensive consultation with industry and union and employer associations to assess problems with existing Acts and will provide guidance as to the direction and extent of occupational safety and welfare legislation. My department will be communicating further with industry organisations to explain the ramifications of the proposed legislation and the role of the continuing Rural Machinery Safety Act.

The proposals would replace provisions of the Inspection of Machinery Act 1951-87, the Construction Safety Act 1971-87 and the Factories and Shops Act 1960-85, and rules and regulations pertaining to those Acts.

It is recognised that the Departments of Mines, Health and Transport have substantial interests in occupational health, safety and welfare matters. Continuing discussions are taking place with those departments, in line with Government policy of reducing the overlap of responsibility between departments. Comment from interested parties will be welcomed, so that the Bill to be presented to Parliament next year will be far-reaching and complete, with the end result being an efficient, streamlined system of safety management second to none.

I seek leave to table the Green Paper.

Leave granted.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Townsville/Thuringowa Water Supply

Hon. M. J. TENNI (Barron River—Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services) (2.40 p.m.), by leave: A number of completely misleading statements were made in this House yesterday by the member for Thuringowa concerning the urgent need for an emergency water supply for the joint cities of Townsville/Thuringowa. The statement by the honourable member had little to do with a genuine appraisal of the water problems facing both cities. However, it did have a great deal to do with the ALP's obsession with wringing the last drop of political advantage out of the construction by the Townsville/Thuringowa Water Board of the emergency pipeline from the Haughton River to the Ross River Dam. In so doing, the ALP has tried to con the rate-payers of both cities into believing that the State Government has a deep-seated dislike of Townsville. If that is the case, the State Government has a funny way of showing its bias.

As I indicated in this House only recently, the Queensland Government has outlaid or is committed to outlaying an estimated \$14.7m on the Ross River Dam improvements.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr TENNI: There was nothing from the Federal Government; nothing from Opposition members' socialist mates in Canberra.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr TENNI: They do not like that.

Furthermore, the State Government has contributed substantially to the cost of relocating the Flinders Highway and the railway because of the expansion of the dam. Many millions of dollars has also been outlaid providing additional carrying capacity in the Haughton main channel and pumping station, which brings the water from the Burdekin River to the Haughton River, to accommodate the urgent water needs of Townsville/Thuringowa. This "dislike of Townsville", to quote the honourable member, must be rather odd.

Despite the refusal so far of the Federal Government to help the twin cities, the State Government has made the firm offer to meet 30 per cent of the cost of the proposed

pipeline from the Haughton River to the Ross River Dam. On current estimates, that amounts to a grant of \$4.5m.

The points I have just outlined make absolute nonsense of Mr McElligott's political diatribe in this House yesterday. The facts are that the Queensland Government has only one bias, and that is that this Government is 100 per cent committed to helping the rate-payers of both cities overcome this very serious water problem. It appears that the member for Thuringowa never goes out in the tropical sun without his political blinkers on.

The proposed \$18 a megalitre charge by the Queensland Water Resources Commission for water from the Burdekin scheme is an extremely good deal for Townsville/Thuringowa. The commission has done its very best to calculate those charges on a long-term basis to reduce the financial impact on rate-payers. In fact, the rate-payers would have had to meet a cost several times higher had the charges been calculated on a short-term basis.

Unfortunately, there is little anyone can do about the honourable member's allergic reaction to the truth concerning the Haughton-Ross River Dam pipeline. Every time the commission attempts to explain the basis of costing, Mr McElligott suffers a temporary loss of hearing and logic.

The commission has adopted the very reasonable policy of asking Townsville/Thuringowa to meet only a fair share of the cost outlaid by the State Government alone in bringing the water from the Burdekin Dam site to the Haughton River. I repeat that a clear distinction has been made between the outlays of the State Government and the contribution made by the Federal Government, which met the actual construction cost of the Burdekin Falls Dam only.

It is equally dishonest for the member for Thuringowa to attempt to make political gain out of the recent problems associated with bringing an emergency water supply to the drought-affected sugar cane farmers at Giru. It is no secret that the contractual problems associated with faulty pipes were a temporary setback. However, the facts are that the goal was to provide an emergency water supply by way of the Haughton main channel to the farmers to ensure the survival of next year's cane crop. This goal has been met and, even with the present temporary pumps and diversions, the commission already has the capacity to meet the water needs of Townsville/Thuringowa. It is totally dishonest to suggest that the adequacy of the contractor's work, which is likely to be the subject of future litigation, resulted in the loss of the present Giru sugar-cane crop. The facts are that the present crop was about to be harvested long before the construction of the Haughton main channel was completed.

I can see no good point in arguing with the honourable member on the merits or otherwise of the Stage 2 work to increase the capacity of the Ross River Dam. The people of Townsville/Thuringowa are well aware of the fact that the severe drought has made the alternative pipeline project from the Haughton to the dam an absolute necessity. They are also well aware of the fact that the chairman of the joint water board, Alderman Brian Dobinson, has used every opportunity to turn the water problems of their cities into a political slanging-match.

The chairman is so lacking in modesty and common sense—like the member for Thuringowa—that he has conducted most of the negotiations with the State Government through the *Townsville Bulletin* instead of through normal business channels. Having worked in two levels of government, I do not believe that this is an acceptable or responsible way for a chairman of any board to conduct himself or herself.

The proposed changes to the board, which are presently under consideration by the Local Government Minister, are likely to see the appointment of an independent chairman, who I am sure will devote his or her energies to helping the rate-payers instead of playing politics. Let me inform the House that I support the Minister for Local Government 100 per cent on the proposals put forward. The member for Thuringowa quite illogically opposes these changes—and I ask all honourable members to listen to

this one—even though the proposed new board would remove the bias in favour of Townsville and give equal representation to both cities.

I can well understand now why the member for Thuringowa must have found his previous employment so restricting. Given his wonderful knack of turning fact into fiction, I can imagine that he was never cut out to be a researcher at James Cook University.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Temporary Dredge Pipeline, Coomera Island

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Primary Industries) (2.47 p.m.), by leave: There has been considerable comment in the media following a statement made by the member for Sherwood—I am sure that his colleagues will bring my remarks to his attention—concerning a temporary dredge pipeline across Coomera Island. The honourable member appears to have been misinformed on this issue, so I take this opportunity to place on record the true facts.

The temporary dredge pipeline works within the tidal wetlands on Coomera Island were authorised by me. That authorisation was subject to Discovery Bay Developments Pty Ltd (Sanctuary Cove) complying with specific conditions of operation.

The conditions included removal of all debris, the restoration of the inner-tidal profile to pre-work levels to allow natural regeneration of mangroves and marine plants, and an obligation to have the pipeline works undertaken in such a manner as to create no unnecessary damage to adjacent intertidal lands. Coomera Island contains large areas of salt-marsh, which is a major breeding ground for the salt-marsh mosquito, a major pest in south-east Queensland.

In 1984, my department, together with the Gold Coast City and Albert Shire Councils, the Queensland Institute of Medical Research and Griffith University, undertook a major study within the Coomera Island wetlands to determine whether salt-marsh fisheries could control mosquito larvae. This study also investigated alternative methods of mosquito control, one of which was aerial spraying with mosquito larvacide.

Fisheries officers from my department have published two reports on this work in scientific journals. One report deals with fishes of the salt-marsh and their diet, whereas the other report looks at the control of mosquito larvae by fish.

My department also suggested an alternative method of mosquito control to aerial spraying, involving the construction of a network of shallow drains within the salt-marsh to allow regular contact between mosquito larvae and predatory fish. This method is now being further assessed and developed by the local authorities in consultation with my officers.

All work carried out by the Department of Primary Industries was funded by the Queensland Government and this work was completed in December 1984. Other aspects on Coomera Island were supported and funded by local authorities, Griffith University and the Queensland Medical Research Institute. The fisheries value of Coomera Island has been well documented.

The pipeline across the island will have little, if any, impact on the fisheries and conservation value of the area, provided that the work is carried out as specified. The pipeline work is continuing and inspections will be made at the conclusion of the project to ensure compliance with the requirements of the permit.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr D'ARCY (Woodridge) (2.50 p.m.), by leave: In an article in today's *Logan and Albert Times* the Minister for Local Government, Mr Hinze, made an attack on the Bryants Road situation that has been under review for some time. In that article the

Minister stated that no representation had been received from me about that matter. I know that it is a matter of political expedience for him to have a lapse of memory.

I wrote letters to the Minister on 18 December 1984, 12 February 1985, 7 August 1985, 25 September 1985, 20 May 1986 and 7 July 1986 in which I made representations to him and pointed out that on the particular crossing involved a child had already been killed. That was prior to the recent accident. If the Minister is playing politics in order to get a leadership vote for himself from the member for Springwood, it is a shame that he has to use——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! How is the honourable member personally affected?

Mr D'ARCY: He has named me in the article as having made no representations. I have cited the six letters involved, and I have received replies to those letters.

This particular road has been a sore point for a long time. During that campaign, as you yourself would be aware, Mr Speaker, the Minister came down to that area and made certain promises. The work has still not been carried out. I have previous correspondence from him, including the last letter of 7 July 1986, in which he promised that lights would be installed at that crossing. I am saying that it is a shame that either his press officers or his staff have misled him with the information.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

1. Electricity Supply, Coconut Island

Mr SCOTT asked the Minister for Northern Development and Community Services—

“With reference to the Answer to my Question 14 on 27 October—

(1) Are individual houses on Coconut Island to be metered?

(2) Will the scale of tariffs applicable on Coconut Island relate to those applying at isolated mainland centres?”

Mr KATTER: I will carry on from where I left off yesterday. The situation is exactly the same as anywhere else, except that solar hot water systems will be used and a gas stove will be used instead of an electric stove. I will come to the reason for that in a moment. It has been worked out on the basis of eight kilowatt hours per day, which is the same as Brisbane, less the solar hot water system. The electricity will produce a very conventional sine wave.

(1) The answer is simply: yes.

(2) A firm of economic consultants advised us to use solar, then an interdepartmental committee advised us, after an engineering study was done costing some \$50,000, I might add, and recommended——

Mr Scott: Who by?

Mr KATTER: I can subsequently provide the name of the engineering firm to the honourable member. I cannot remember it at present.

The whole array will cost approximately \$600,000, which is about \$30,000 a year for the next 20 years. With some 30 consumers, it should cost each of them about \$1,000 a year. It is hoped that there will be virtually no ongoing costs except, of course, for the batteries. After all, that is the sort of question that needs to be answered in what is, after all, an experimental project.

Mr Scott: It is a Mickey Mouse show, and you know it.

Mr KATTER: It is a Mickey Mouse show, is it, carried out by Westinghouse, which is one of the biggest companies in the world? The honourable member would describe the Westinghouse project as a Mickey Mouse show. That is a rather peculiar statement; but, of course, that would be typical of the honourable member's statements.

As the cell price falls from its present price of about \$10 a watt, it is felt that with the Government bulk-buying the price will be reduced to \$2 a watt, and then it is hoped that the use of the diesel generator will be phased out altogether and the use of the cells will be phased in. However, at this stage, the Government does not want to buy a lot of cells, because they are enormously expensive, and at this stage the Government is not bulk-buying.

Mr Scott: You wouldn't impose this system on the rest of the people of Torres Strait, would you?

Mr KATTER: Mr Speaker, I accept the honourable member's interjection and I must state that, if he was doing his job at all, he should be aware of the enormous difficulties faced in getting anything repaired in the Torres Strait. When the windmill that was responsible for the water supply on Mer Island broke down, it was out of action for almost four weeks, and a bloke had to be flown over there on some four or five occasions to fix it.

Those are the sorts of difficulties and problems with providing water supplies. I do not want to have those difficulties with the provision of electricity, so the department is striving to create a system with no moving parts whatsoever. I do not want any mechanical parts that can break down. That is what is being done. There are replacement inverters. They have no moving parts; but, if one breaks down, it can simply be moved off line and another one plugged in to replace it. In fact, that is the only working part that can break down.

My department and I are confident that at all times all of the charges will be in line with those on the mainland. There will be a peak costing of \$2 a watt. A tracking device will be used to cut the number of solar cells necessary down to 60 per cent of those presently needed. With the provision of solar hot-water systems and, possibly, solar freezers for the cray-fishing industry up there, the costs will be far cheaper than those associated with the running of a diesel unit.

2. Lockhart River Aboriginal Reserve

Mr SCOTT asked the Minister for Northern Development and Community Services—

“(1) Have any changes been made to the area of the Lockhart River Aboriginal Reserve since the Deed of Grant in Trust legislation was passed by this House?

(2) If there were changes, have they required gazettal and what was the date of such gazettal?

(3) Have changes involved an exchange of land with national parks and what area was involved?

(4) Has this land a specific title description and what is it known as?

(5) Has a major forest clearing program been undertaken on this exchange land or other land adjacent to it to provide cattle grazing areas?

(6) What area has been cleared to date?

(7) Is clearing also being carried out for part of a new access road to the Lockhart River township?

(8) When will this road be gazetted?

(9) Will he table a map of the area indicating the location of such land exchanges and clearing projects if they have taken place?”

Mr KATTER: (1) Yes, there are changes. There has been a swap of land with the national park.

(2) I refer the honourable member's attention to the *Government Gazette* of 24 October 1987, pages 653, 654 and 655.

(3) My department is awaiting advice from the Department of Lands as to the details. Those details will be provided in due course as soon as they are received from

the Lands Department. The National Parks and Wildlife Service inherited a cleared area and there will be a swapping of a section of rainforest for that cleared area, which obviously is most useful for the cattle industry. Rainforest is what the National Parks and Wildlife Service is after.

Mr Scott: Are you going to enlarge that cleared area?

Mr KATTER: If the honourable member has any problems with that, I would be only too happy to listen to him and make any adjustments that might be necessary, as long as they are acceptable to the council. Of course, it is the council that is receiving all the consideration and it is in agreement with all of these things.

(4) No, not to our knowledge.

(5 and 6) The cleared area that will be rented out to a body that will be controlled by the local council is very far north of the community, down in the Nundah area. Virtually no clearing will take place. I have looked at the area and I would not have thought there were more than 50 or so trees per thousand acres in that area. It is already an open area with very few trees on it. It will be replaced with improved pasture.

(7) Yes.

(8) Under discussion with the Cook Shire at the present moment are all of the gazetted roads, because it is also the road into Portland Downs. The Cook Shire is very, very sensitive about what will be done with that road. At the moment it is the subject of discussion with the Cook Shire.

(9) Yes.

3. Proposed World Heritage Listing of North Queensland Rainforest Areas

Mr HYND asked the Minister for Tourism, National Parks and Sport—

“With reference to the amount of national parks in the North Queensland wet tropics—

(1) What countries are represented on the World Heritage Committee?

(2) What is the term of office of each member country?

(3) How are countries selected for membership of the World Heritage Committee?

(4) Is democratic government a feature of the lifestyle of the countries represented on the World Heritage Committee?

(5) Does the record of these countries in the management of their environment qualify them to sit in judgment on the proposed nomination of Queensland's rainforests for inclusion on the World Heritage List?”

Mr MUNTZ: (1 and 2) I appreciate the honourable member's concern for the various countries involved in the World Heritage listing, as all Queenslanders should be concerned. There are 21 countries represented on the World Heritage committee. They are divided into three groups of seven, with one group being replaced every two years. In other words, each country serves for a six-year term. The names of the countries and the expiry year of their terms of office are—

1987	1989	1991
Brazil	Australia	India
Cyprus	Lebanon	Canada
Federal Republic of Germany	Norway	Yemen
Jordan	Sri Lanka	Mexico
Guinea	Turkey	Tanzania
Libya	Algeria	Greece
Zaire	Malawi	Bulgaria

I wish to expand on the details of some of those countries. Brazil has a military dictatorship and is commonly known as the AIDS land of the world. It is knocking down its bit of remaining rainforest at the rate of an area the size of a football-field every three minutes. That gives some idea of that country's concern for rainforest. Of course, Libya is run by Colonel Gaddafi. India has no rainforest left. The majority of the countries on that committee have little or no rainforest left. What annoys me and other Queenslanders is that the national Government is prepared to submit a recommendation to those countries to determine the future of our rainforests and our heritage.

The first group of countries will go out of office at the end of the next ordinary session of the general conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO). This session is due to conclude on 24 November 1987.

(3) Article 9 of the World Heritage Properties Convention provides that members of the World Heritage committee "shall be chosen by lot" by the president of the general conference of UNESCO.

I am sorry to say that the fate of many Queenslanders rests on the roll of the dice or on a lucky—or unlucky—dip from the barrel. We will not know until later this year the names of seven of the 21 countries whose representatives will determine whether Queenslanders are to be thrown onto the unemployment scrap-heap, and industries and towns closed down.

Mr Comben interjected.

Mr MUNTZ: It is a fact, whether the honourable member likes it or not. If he wants to support it, that is okay.

Australians are well known for their gambling instincts, but I am sure that none of us wants the livelihood of our fellow Australians to be decided by the toss of a coin, the roll of a dice or a lucky dip.

Opposition members interjected.

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

Mr Comben interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Windsor!

A Government member interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I do not need any suggestions from my right. I call the Minister.

Mr MUNTZ: The truth hurts.

(4) Democracy is certainly unknown in quite a number of the countries presently represented on the World Heritage committee. These countries can be categorised as follows—

Commonwealth countries	7	(of which 5 are republics)
Kingdoms	2	
Republics	11	
Libya	1	

I have not endeavoured to categorise Libya as I do not think that even the most undemocratic of the other 20 countries would want to be grouped with Colonel Gaddafi's dictatorship.

I do not intend to mention names, but suffice it to say that democracy is certainly not a strong feature of the life-styles of at least one-third of the countries represented on the World Heritage committee. Some of these are under military rule, others have no Parliament, and most are one-party regimes. In addition, civil war and other military

and civil conflicts unhappily upset the life-style of the people of some of the other countries represented on the committee.

In the circumstances I have outlined, I cannot imagine that the nomination of Queensland's rainforests will receive the careful consideration that it deserves from the representatives of the countries concerned when they are so involved with their own internal troubles—very similar to the members of the Opposition in this Parliament.

(5) As regards forestry management—the short answer to this part of the honourable member's question is, "No". On the other hand, Queensland's record of wet tropical rainforest and national park management is outstanding; this fact is recognised internationally.

Mr Comben: That is rubbish!

Mr MUNTZ: Queensland is second to nobody in the world in national park management. The only place that comes anywhere near to Queensland is New Zealand.

For a study of the status of rainforests in the relevant countries, I refer the honourable member to the report *Conversion of Tropical Moist Forests*, commissioned by the United States Natural Academy of Sciences, which was published in 1980. This report points to numerous examples of clear felling of forest areas.

Forests, other than rainforests, occur in most of the countries represented on the World Heritage committee. Again, the story is generally one of mismanagement of the environment, resulting in Germany, for example, in the destruction of forests by acid rain.

Finally, I repeat that Queensland has not sought, and does not want, Commonwealth interference in the management of the timber and other industries associated with wet tropical rainforest areas. World Heritage nomination is nothing but an attempt by the Commonwealth to centralise power in Canberra.

4. Conservation of Southern Moreton Bay Region

Mr HYND asked the Minister for Tourism, National Parks and Sport—

"(1) What steps has the State Government taken to ensure conservation of the southern Moreton Bay region?

(2) What role is the Jumpinpin Broadwater Nature Conservation Planning Committee playing in the State Government's overall strategy for this area?"

Mr MUNTZ: (1 and 2) I thank the honourable member for his question and the interest that he shows in the environment of the Moreton Bay region.

At the outset, I want to emphasise the importance of this region. It is an area which extends from Russell Island to the Gold Coast Broadwater and is considered to be Queensland's most valuable estuary.

As honourable members who are keen fishermen would know, the Jumpinpin section is renowned as the best bream fishery in the State. In addition, the Logan, Pimpama and Coomera Rivers also support whiting and flathead as well as sand and mud crabs. In fact, recreational boating and fishing in the area is estimated to be worth more than \$80m a year, and generates thousands of jobs in the tourist industry. Sometimes it is not appreciated what recreational fishing does for the tourist industry and the number of people who are involved in that area.

The Queensland Government has always recognised the ecological and recreational value of this area to the people of this State and the Government has taken a number of steps to ensure the best long-term use of the islands. As far back as 1970, the Government approved in principle that this area should be kept in its natural state for recreational and kindred purposes.

In 1974, the *Report by the Working Committee on Long Term Planning of the area between Jumpinpin Bar and the Nerang River Bridge* was accepted by the Government

and tabled in Parliament. This report recommended that as many islands as possible should be retained in their natural state with as little development as possible. Since that time, the recommendations of this report have been implemented by the State and by local government in town-planning provisions.

Honourable members should also be aware of the work by my colleague the member for Albert in forming the Jumpinpin-Broadwater Regional Nature Conservation and Study Committee in 1980. This committee includes representatives of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, the Fisheries Department, the Gold Coast Council and the Albert Shire Council. As a result of this committee's recommendations, my Cabinet colleague and I announced that the Government would be giving high priority to a program of conservation and management planning for the southern area of Moreton Bay.

The current conservation strategy will consolidate this program permanently by the gazettal of environmental parks over the islands. The Crown is already proceeding with the resumption of Coomera Island and Woogoompah Island, and other lands included in the strategy are part of Tabby Tabby, Eden, Cobby Cobby, Stingaree and Short Islands, Behm Creek and south of McCoy Creek.

As honourable members would know, the Gold Coast and the adjoining areas have experienced a huge influx of people. No doubt, these people are southerners who are dissatisfied with the life-style of Labor-led States. Now is certainly the best time to plan for national parks, recreational works, environmental parks and fish habitats in this region. It must be noted that the Government is ever mindful of the need for public access to these areas, and I assure honourable members that this is a major planning consideration in the overall strategy for the area.

5. Defamation Action between Premier and John Sinclair

Mr COMBEN asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

“How much money has already been paid and how much money is still owing to solicitors Morris Fletcher & Cross by the Queensland Government in relation to the matter of *Sinclair v. Johannes Bjelke-Petersen*, concerning defamation, from 1977 to date?”

Mr CLAUSON: Records indicate that since 1977 a sum of \$40,604.10 has been paid to Messrs Morris Fletcher and Cross, solicitors, in respect of the action between Mr John Sinclair and the Honourable the Premier. This sum represents \$17,100.60 professional costs of Messrs Morris Fletcher and Cross and counsel's fees of \$18,464.00, with the balance being expended on outlays. No money remains outstanding in relation to this matter.

6. Horticultural Production

Mr STEPHAN asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

“With reference to the horticultural production in this State and the ability of producers to be able to more than meet our consumption on the home market—

(1) What market opportunities exist for our horticultural products overseas to expand the export of horticulture?

(2) Is any research to be undertaken to endeavour to identify and expand these markets?”

Mr HARPER: (1) In recent years there have been a number of significant changes in the export potential of horticultural produce. The major metropolitan cities of south-east Asia, such as Singapore and Hong Kong, are now importing large quantities of western-style fruit and vegetables which are sold through modern supermarkets. There is also a softening of attitudes towards horticultural imports in other east Asian markets, such as Japan and Taiwan. Currently, the east Asian bloc is the fastest growing region in the world economy. Opportunities also exist in Europe and North America. Nevertheless, competition in world markets is fierce and many problems such as inadequate

shipping and airline services, storage, and quarantine restrictions are still to be overcome. A long-term presence in the export market requires a commitment to consistent supply and quality from both growers and exporters to meet the needs of overseas buyers.

In July this year, the Queensland Horticultural Export Council was established to assist the development of horticultural exports from Queensland. The council is industry-based with representation from growers, exporters and the transport sector. The council has already encouraged the development of a north-bound shipping service which is now capable of transporting Queensland produce within acceptable storage periods to markets in Asia. The potential for exports from Queensland has been demonstrated by the success of the ginger and citrus industries and with the rapid growth of Chinese cabbage and broccoli exports to Hong Kong in the last few years.

As well, the marketing research and extension section of my marketing services branch is undertaking a range of projects aimed at assisting industry to expand the export markets for horticultural products and further research is planned. The section is undertaking a project directed at generating an international listing of market opportunities for horticulture. It will provide a basis for the Government to formulate policies for horticulture development in Queensland. Research will concentrate on south-east Asian markets in the first instance.

The section is carrying out a review of the export potential for fresh passionfruit with co-operation of growers in the Nambour area. Other initiatives include development of a market entry strategy for exotic and tropical fruits into Japan; export marketing systems and directions for small crop industries in co-operation with the Australian International Business Centre and the further development of an information base on export marketing opportunities for fresh and processed mango products in co-operation with the Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing.

(2) My officers are also carrying out research into post-harvest handling and quarantine problems of importance to exporters of a variety of horticultural produce.

7. Consumer Debt

Mr STEPHAN asked the Minister for Employment, Small Business and Industrial Affairs—

“With reference to recent press comments where it is claimed private individuals made up to 70 per cent of bankruptcies by overcommitting themselves, particularly with the use of credit cards, and that easy credit is blamed for the estimated \$23 billion consumer debt, to the current blow out in consumer debt and to the large percentage of family income committed to repayments—

(1) Is this causing concern in the consumer sector?

(2) Will he consider remedial action or consumer education, a step which could be considered to manage finances better?”

Mr LESTER: (1 and 2) Bankruptcies of all kinds, whether personal or business, are a matter of serious concern. Preliminary and unverified figures released by the Federal Attorney-General indicate that the total number of bankruptcies in Australia increased by 34 per cent between 1985-86 and 1986-87. However, the Queensland figure was slightly lower.

It is expected that, when the final figures for personal bankruptcies in 1986-87 are released in the Federal Attorney-General's annual report, they will continue to be the more numerous category, as has been the case in recent years. That was the expectation before the crash of the stock-market.

The extent of such non-business bankruptcies reflects, in part, the inability of some people to manage their personal finances. Nevertheless, the continuing increase in both personal and business bankruptcies throughout Australia is largely the result of a depressed economic environment and historically high interest rates which the Federal Government has imposed in an effort to recover from its own economic mismanagement. High

interest rates reduce the ability of borrowers to repay the principal of loans and, accordingly, repayments extend over longer and longer periods.

Consumer education about the dangers of overextended credit is, of course, a poor substitute for a healthy economic environment in the nation as a whole. Nevertheless, the Consumer Affairs Bureau of my department is well aware of the needs in this area.

In addressing the issue it has produced a number of excellent booklets covering a range of financial management issues, including *A Guide to Personal Finance* and *Manage the Business of Living*. Also, through media releases and radio segments the bureau warns consumers of pitfalls in the use of credit facilities.

Although the Consumer Affairs Bureau is obviously doing a great deal in this area, I also feel the financial institutions themselves have a moral obligation to ensure that their customers are aware of the problems that can occur with overuse of credit.

Whilst these institutions are prepared to accept the profits created by the provision of credit, I am not satisfied that they have acted as responsibly as they might have so far as credit education is concerned. I emphasise that. At least the Queensland Government is doing something to ensure that the people are informed of the consequences.

8. Consumer Affairs Bureau Inspectors

Mr BRADDY asked the Minister for Employment, Small Business and Industrial Affairs—

“With reference to the Consumer Affairs Bureau’s current employment of inspectors based in Brisbane and Rockhampton—

(1) What specific plans does he have to assign such inspectors to other Queensland centres?

(2) When will such additional inspectors be appointed and in what number and to what centres?”

Mr LESTER: (1 and 2) I have already announced that it is my intention to establish regional offices of the Consumer Affairs Bureau at Southport and Townsville. The timing of the establishment of these offices will, of course, be determined by the availability of funding and staffing resources.

In the interim, consumers, small-business people—this Government has also given consumer protection to small-business people—and primary producers outside the Brisbane metropolitan area and Rockhampton continue to be well served by district industrial inspectors located at 22 country centres. The district industrial inspectors have been trained to handle consumer matters. As far as I am aware, they are doing a very good job.

9. Water Supply, Woorabinda Community

Mr BRADDY asked the Minister for Northern Development and Community Services—

“With reference to the continuing serious lack of water at the Woorabinda community and the poor quality of the existing water supply for the approximately 1 000 residents despite water supply expenditure there—

Why has not urgent action been taken to remedy the problems and for how much longer will the residents have to suffer the serious water deficiencies?”

Mr KATTER: The detailed answer to that question is unavailable at present. I can certainly provide the honourable member with details of the problems being experienced at Woorabinda.

Mr Braddy: I know those. I want to know the solutions.

Mr KATTER: At this stage there are no solutions to the problem. A report is expected during the next two or three days.

During the past two years, approximately \$400,000 has been expended on the problems at Woorabinda. My department had to bring in expertise from local government, because that sort of expertise is unavailable within my department.

The honourable member would be better off using his time to secure the \$60m that the black people of Queensland are not getting but which the rest of Australia is receiving on a per capita basis. If some of that money could be provided at Woorabinda, I am sure that a more than adequate water supply would be made available.

10. Development of National Parks

Mr McPHIE asked the Minister for Tourism, National Parks and Sport—

“As the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service has taken action to involve private enterprise in the development of some national parks, how can business best participate in this area which has traditionally been seen as a Government role?”

Mr MUNTZ: I am pleased to advise that the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service has actively sought private-enterprise input into the development of some national parks. In an effort to minimise the drain on the tax-payers of Queensland, the service, with my full support, is seeking to involve private-enterprise development in areas where they possess the expertise and experience.

A recent study tour of the United States National Parks and Wildlife Service by a senior officer of the service, Mr Jim McEvoy, has shown that such joint development can be most beneficial provided that strict guide-lines are implemented and complied with. I assure honourable members that the expertise exists within the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service to monitor such projects.

In July of this year, I asked the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service to establish a marketing and commercial operations function to provide specialist support to the interface between national parks and the tourism industry. This branch, set up on a trial basis, has been most successful and is now looking to expand its activities further.

Private enterprise involvement in national park development represents a positive step forward in providing the type of facilities required by the ever-increasing number of national park visitors, whilst allowing the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service to devote itself to the management of the park's natural resources. With this in mind, any proposals submitted to the service will receive the most detailed scrutiny to ensure that any development will assist public visitation without compromising the integrity of the national park.

11. Trade Union Membership

Mr McPHIE asked the Minister for Employment, Small Business and Industrial Affairs—

“As some 12 months ago the latest Australian Bureau of Statistics figures showed trade union membership was declining in Queensland, has this trend continued, does he consider the trend likely to continue in the future and, if so, what is the reason for this trend?”

Mr LESTER: Since November 1976 there have been three official surveys on the extent of trade union membership. Those surveys were taken in November 1976, March to May 1982 and August 1986 by the statistics bureau. The figures from those surveys show a consistent decline in the proportion of all employees who are trade union members. The decline is evident across all States and Australia as a whole. In Queensland, the proportion of all employees who were trade union members declined from 53 per cent in November 1976 to 45 per cent in August 1986. It is obvious that the unions are not doing the right thing by their members. The consistent downward trend over such

a long period is unlikely to have been reversed since the most recent survey was taken in August of last year.

As with all associations to which people belong, their continued membership depends on the extent to which the organisation provides benefits to them and also on the costs that they incur through belonging to the organisation. It seems that, in the case of trade unions, some may not have served their members' interests as well as they could have and may have cost their members a considerable amount in lost wages as a result of unnecessary disputes. The irresponsible action that was taken by union-leaders during the SEQEB dispute is certainly a case in point.

The extent to which the downward trend in union membership is therefore likely to continue in the future will depend on the ability of unions to behave responsibly and in the interests of their members and, in so doing, encourage employees to remain as members of a union.

12. Police Station, Mount Crosby/Karana Downs

Mr LICKISS asked the Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police—

“What is the timetable for construction and operation of the proposed police station in the Mt Crosby/Karana Downs locality?”

Mr GUNN: The Department of Works has programmed to call tenders for the construction of the Mount Crosby Police Station complex during January 1988. The operation of the police station will depend upon the completion of construction work.

13. Fire Services, Karana Downs/Mount Crosby

Mr LICKISS asked the Minister for Corrective Services, Administrative Services and Valuation—

“When will adequate fire services be provided to serve the Karana Downs/Mt Crosby area and, more particularly, when will a fire station be erected and staffed in this area?”

Mr NEAL: I am aware of the needs of the area referred to by the honourable member. Effective fire services are provided to all urban areas of the State by the State Fire Services.

The Karana Downs/Mount Crosby area will receive due consideration, together with other areas of the State, for the provision of funds from the 1988-89 loan program to establish a fire station.

14. Tourist Industry

Mr SHERRIN asked the Minister for Tourism, National Parks and Sport—

“With reference to the outstanding performance of the tourism industry in Queensland—

What are the relevant statistics of the performance of our tourism industry compared to that of the other Australian States?”

Mr MUNTZ: I am pleased to answer this question today from the honourable member for Mansfield as it gives me an opportunity to highlight the achievements of the tourism industry in Queensland.

With regard to travel trends—the Domestic Tourism Monitor, which is a State-by-State comparison, reveals that over the last seven years Queensland has been growing at twice the rate of the rest of Australia—that is 6.4 per cent compared to 3.2 per cent. The main points for the year to 30 June 1987 are—

- The national increase of total domestic visitor nights was 1.9 per cent compared to Queensland's 9.8 per cent.

- Queensland's share of the domestic market increased from 23.4 per cent to 25.2 per cent.
- NSW/ACT suffered a decline in interstate visitor nights to receive only 28 per cent, whereas Queensland increased its share to 31 per cent.
- With intrastate visitor nights, Queensland again increased by 14.2 per cent compared to a national average of just 1.8 per cent.

The domestic traffic through our airports has also increased dramatically, with Cairns and Coolangatta increasing passenger movements by some 26 per cent and 17 per cent respectively. Throughout the remainder of Queensland a general increase of 6.4 per cent in passenger movements still reflected more trade than that experienced in the rest of Australia, with just over a 3 per cent increase.

I refer finally to the investment statistics on purely tourism-related projects. While the New South Wales Tourist Minister, Mike Cleary, has paid Queensland a large compliment by admitting New South Wales has at last reached the same level of investment as Queensland, his figures are somewhat wrong. New South Wales has added into its "purely tourism related projects" figures from projects such as Darling Harbour. Were Queensland to list all developments such as World Expo 88 and the Brisbane International Airport, its figure would certainly exceed \$5 billion.

It is clear that Queensland is not only leading the way in tourism and tourism development, but is also the envy of other States.

15. Junior Coaching Sports Assistance Program

Mr SHERRIN asked the Minister for Tourism, National Parks and Sport—

"With reference to the highly successful Junior Coaching Sports Assistance Program that operates within his portfolio—

- (1) What is the estimated number of young Queenslanders who have benefited from this program?
- (2) What is the amount of Government funds that have been provided for this scheme since its inception?"

Mr MUNTZ: (1 and 2) As the member for Mansfield has so rightly pointed out, the Queensland Government's Encouragement to Sport Scheme has been highly successful in assisting the youth of the State. In fact, the budget is nearing \$6m and is similar to the national budget for sport. Queensland manages its scheme with a staff of six and serves a great number of young people. However, the Commonwealth Government squanders on promotion and administration the same amount as Queensland spends on youth.

Since the scheme's inception in 1972, when the Queensland Government introduced the first assistance scheme for sport in Australia, almost \$40m has been distributed via the 10 measures of assistance that make up the scheme to the 81 recognised State sporting associations and their affiliated clubs, zones and regions.

It is interesting to note that since the scheme was introduced in Queensland, the Commonwealth Government and every other State Government have followed suit. They have seen the value in such a scheme and have endeavoured to follow Queensland's programs in assisting young people.

The junior coaching subsidy scheme forms the corner-stone of the assistance packages to sport. Many, many thousands of junior sportspeople have been financially assisted under this measure. It has always been this Government's policy that any reasonable application received for junior coaching subsidy will be approved, as the Government firmly believes that correct coaching is the foundation of good sporting achievement. Subsidy is paid on junior coaching expenditure at the rate of 25 per cent. Since 1972 this subsidy has amounted to \$9,735,286. The scheme in Queensland is the envy of

sportspeople throughout the rest of Australia, where other Governments only pay lip-service to assisting their dedicated and aspiring junior sportspeople.

16. Lease of Crown Land for Residential Purposes

Mr EATON asked the Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying—

“(1) Will he seriously consider making Crown land available on a long-term lease basis for residential purposes, considering the average Land Administration Commission auction prices of freehold blocks average \$20,000?

(2) Will the Government look at the following options, namely, (a) survey fee: \$150, (b) first year rent in advance \$150 to \$200 and (c) development cost up to \$4,000, which represent a saving of over \$15,000 to home owners which would also create a very large yearly saving in interest rates?”

Mr POWELL: On behalf of the Honourable the Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying, and in view of the length of the question, I seek leave to have it tabled and incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

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

(1) For over 20 years my Government has adopted and followed a policy of disposing of residential lots under freehold or freeholding title. Such a sale is at or following public competition and the terms for payment of purchasing price, at the option of the purchaser, are as follows:

- (A) Pay a deposit of 50 per centum of the purchasing price and the stamp duty immediately at the time of sale and pay the balance of the purchase money in three (3) equal instalments to include principal and interest at the rate of 10 per centum per annum on the balance of the purchase money remaining unpaid for the time being.
- (B) Pay a deposit of 30 per centum of the purchasing price and the stamp duty immediately at the time of sale and pay the balance of the purchase money in five (5) equal annual instalments to include principal and interest at the rate of 11 per centum per annum on the balance of the purchase money remaining unpaid for the time being.
- (C) Pay a deposit of 15 per centum of the purchasing price and the stamp duty immediately at the time of sale and pay the balance of the purchase money in ten (10) equal annual instalments to include principal and interest at the rate of 12 per centum per annum on the balance of the purchase money remaining unpaid for the time being.
- (D) Provided the purchase price, stamp duty and deed and assurance fees are paid in full immediately at the time of sale, a discount of 10 per centum of the purchasing price will be allowed. However, a deed of grant will not issue over the land until the development or improvement condition, if any, has been fully complied with.

An alternative method of disposing of residential allotments under the Land Act is under special lease. In view of the development costs involved, this procedure is not often followed. The term of a special lease is normally for thirty (30) years and special leases can be freehold if certain statutory prerequisites are met.

These days residential lots are normally serviced before sale and are sold as serviced lots.

If it were decided to dispose of residential serviced lots otherwise than above, under a long term leasehold title, an amendment to the Land Act would be required.

In such event it would appear desirable to dispose of residential serviced lots following public competition. In such case the annual rent of, say, 3% of the purchasing price, would have to be reserved and such annual rent would normally have to be reappraised at regular periodic intervals.

Regard would also have to be had in relation to development costs outlaid in servicing the residential lots.

In my view, the present policy of disposing of freehold or freeholding residential lots is the correct approach and should be retained. I see no benefit in making serviced residential lots available on a long term lease basis.

(2) Survey fees these days can be expected to exceed \$250 per lot. Normal development costs (including contribution to roads, drainage services, water, sewerage and electricity) can

be expected to exceed, say, \$12,000 per lot. If a freehold or freeholding title is sold, the survey costs and the development costs would be included in the upset or purchasing price and such price is payable as set out above by the purchaser.

If a long term lease approach were to be adopted, then either the survey fees and development costs would have to be carried by Government, or the purchaser would have to pay them in cash or on fairly short-term terms.

It is difficult to see how survey fees and development costs can be carried by Government if all the purchaser is paying is a rent. Many years ago, when perpetual leases were given for residential lots, such lots were not initially serviced and in a lot of cases the development costs were borne by councils.

In conclusion, I believe the policy of disposing of serviced residential allotments under freehold or freeholding title is the correct approach in our present community. The terms and conditions upon which residential serviced allotments are offered by the Crown are more beneficial than those offered on the commercial market.

17. **Tourism in Mulgrave Electorate**

Mr MENZEL asked the Minister for Tourism, National Parks and Sport—

“What are the results of a study conducted into tourism in the Mulgrave Electorate including a proposal to build a chairlift on The Pyramid at Gordonvale?”

Mr MUNTZ: In March 1987, Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation personnel conducted an inspection of tourism potential in the hinterland area of Cairns and the southern part of the Mulgrave Shire. Enormous potential was identified during this inspection, including the development of attractions such as—

- Bramston Beach
- Babinda Mill
- The Boulders
- Josephine Falls
- Pyramid Rocks
- Lake Barrine
- Deeral Aboriginal artifacts. Village/museum
- Fishing opportunities.

That survey was carried out at the request of Mr Menzel, who recognises the value to that area of tourism.

In particular, the natural attractions of the area, for example, the Boulders/Pyramid Rock provide a significant opportunity to develop further attraction-based tourism projects to underpin the development of accommodation in the region. Opportunities that may exist include the establishment of a mill tour and cane-train ride from Babinda mill to the Boulders Park. The Deeral Aboriginal project, which already produces high quality Aboriginal artifacts for the industry, is also likely to provide a major attraction for the region.

With respect to the chair-lift to Pyramid Rock, it is considered this is an individual project and any feasibility or further study should be the responsibility of any intending developer. However, it is the corporation's view that a major strategy plan for tourism should be developed for the region to upgrade, and strengthen the attraction base for the area. At this time corporation funding of such a study is not available. The corporation's development division is currently assessing outside sources of funding that may be available to undertake such a study.

18. **Palmerston Highway**

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

“What is the progress to date on the Palmerston Highway and has a date been set for the completion of the road and when will the bridge be started on the final section?”

Mr HINZE: Work is proceeding according to program on earthworks and drainage on the final 1.6 kilometre section of reconstruction between Innisfail and Milla Milla. It is anticipated that this section will be completed in late 1988 or early 1989. Progress will be dependent on weather conditions in this very wet area. It is anticipated that work will commence on the bridge before June 1988.

19. Establishment of Prison at Borallon

Mr HENDERSON asked the Minister for Corrective Services, Administrative Services and Valuation—

“With reference to the proposed Borallon Prison—

- (1) Why was Borallon chosen and after what investigations?
- (2) What advantages did the site have over others which may have been considered?
- (3) Will the lack of a bus service to the prison be a disadvantage and, if not, what is the reason?
- (4) What benefits will a prison at Borallon confer on the local community?
- (5) What does he consider to be the disadvantages and how may they be alleviated?”

Mr NEAL: (1) A number of sites in south-east Queensland were investigated, but Borallon was regarded as the one that most met the requirements for the establishment of a maximum/minimum security prison.

(2) As I indicated in (1), the site met more of the requirements than the other sites investigated. Some of the areas suggested did not have the facilities to service a prison of the size contemplated for Borallon. Others were too close to private residences. Consideration was given to the establishment of two smaller prisons in more decentralised areas. However, cost factors prevented any such strategy being implemented.

(3) The lack of public transport to the site will be a disadvantage. There are, however, groups within the community, which with financial assistance from the State Government, provide transport for families and friends of prisoners who do not have private transport.

(4) The economic effects on Borallon and its surrounds will be quite significant. It is anticipated that approximately \$5m per annum will be injected into the local community by way of salaries and, where practicable, by way of contracts for the supply of food and other maintenance items.

(5) Everything possible will be done by my department to alleviate any inconvenience that might be caused to nearby residents as a result of the construction of the prison. The prison will be situated on the site so that it will not be plainly visible from the perimeter. The latest security devices will be incorporated in its construction to minimise the possibility of escapes.

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

As the House has had two days of questions upon notice, I now ask all Ministers to table their answers so that they can be incorporated in *Hansard*.

Whereupon the following questions and answers were laid on the table—

20. Death of Giant Clams

Mr HENDERSON asked the Minister for Northern Development and Community Services—

“With reference to recent newspaper reports relating to the death of giant clams in the vicinity of Lizard Island where some 30 per cent of clams have died recently—

- (1) How extensive is this epidemic of death?

(2) What is causing it?

(3) What is the Queensland Government doing in order to ensure the survival of the giant clam?"

Answer—

(1) Instances of premature clam death on Lizard Island were noted in 1984, and rapid action by the then Minister for National Parks, Mr McKechnie, resulted in the establishment of "Clam Watch", a program which resulted in the tagging of 436 clams. As a result of that program, the deaths of 157, or 36 per cent, of the tagged clam population were monitored. It was further observed that the great majority of the deaths occurred during the winter months. It is important to note at this stage that, although clam mortality is very high in certain places—for example, Lizard Island and Thetford Reef—the phenomenon is by no means widespread, being limited to only a handful of reefs in the total system.

(2) The chief suspect for the deaths is an as yet unidentified parasite of the genus *Perkinsis*, similar to the parasite *Perkinsis Marinas* responsible for similar fatalities in the commercial oyster beds of southern California. *Perkinsis Marinas* infects a large variety of bivalves, but infection is fatal only in the commercial oyster and a few other species. A *Perkinsis*-like organism has been detected in a large variety of bivalves, including the tissues of dead giant clams, as far south as Heron Island. No such organism has been detected in Moreton Bay.

(3) I praise the efforts and assistance of the relevant Minister, Mr Muntz, the James Cook University, the Australian Institute of Marine Science and Mr Bob Lester of the University of Queensland for their contributions to the research. I have informed Mr Muntz of the readiness of my department and its officers to assist him in any way.

Northern Development has been involved with three giant clam farm projects. Two are on Fitzroy Island and another is planned for Magnetic Island. These farms can, it is hoped, resupply depleted areas of the reef.

21. **Board of Secondary School Studies**

Mr UNDERWOOD asked the Minister for Education—

"With reference to the Board of Secondary School Studies—

(1) How much money is going to be saved by instructing the board's various sub-committees not to meet until further notice because of a shortage of funds due to the State Budget?

(2) Is this just a ploy by him to ensure his objective of destroying the Board of Secondary School Studies by effectively shutting down the sub-committees?"

Answer—

(1 and 2) This year's 1987/88 Budget allocation to the Board of Secondary School Studies reflects the general budget strategy placed upon all areas of Government.

The staffing of the Board contains a large number of seconded Subject Masters and teachers and because these are seconded to the Board on a calendar year basis, the number of seconded staff at the Board for the remainder of 1987 is in excess of the number that the Budget allows.

The frequency of meetings of Subject Advisory Committees and Subject Sub-Committees have been reduced. These committees have been requested to reduce their meetings to handle only essential items for the 1987/88 financial year. It is anticipated that this will save approximately \$20,000 of taxpayer's money.

The decision to ask Subject Advisory Committees and Subject Sub-Committees to meet to handle only essential items was made by the Board itself. To suggest that the Board of Secondary School Studies should be exempt from budget responsibility affecting all elements of Government is clearly absurd.

22. **Education Officers (Special Duties), Return to Class Room Duties**

Mr UNDERWOOD asked the Minister for Education—

"With reference to the returning of teachers to the classroom who have been staffing areas such as resources, materials development, curriculum development etc. as a result of the State Budget—

(1) How many such teachers have received notices directing them back to the classroom?"

- (2) From which sections have they been removed?
- (3) What is the percentage staff reduction in each section affected?
- (4) How many of these highly skilled people have resigned or intend to resign with the intention of taking higher paid jobs in the private business sector?
- (5) Will those returning to the classroom, bearing in mind that many have been away from teaching for years, be required to take refresher teaching courses and, if so, at what cost?"

Answer—

(1) It is estimated that approximately 100 to 110 teachers on secondment as Education Officers (Special Duties) will be required to resume classroom duties from the beginning of the 1988 school year.

(2) Teachers who will be returning to the classroom are drawn from all sections of the Department including Head Office Divisions (such as Curriculum Services, Primary Education and Secondary Education) and Regional Offices.

(3) Across all sections of the Department, approximately one in two (or fifty per cent) of Education Officers (Special Duties) will return to teaching duties.

(4) This question is unable to be answered. To date there has been little reaction from officers who will return to teaching next year. As is usual, a small number of teacher resignations which have been tendered by Education Officers (Special Duties) who are now required to return to teaching had been anticipated, as the officers concerned had previously indicated their intention to resign in order to pursue further study, travel for an unspecified period of time or to undertake other activities for which leave is currently not available.

I have had no indication of whether any officers are leaving for "higher paid jobs in the private business sector."

(5) Some of these teachers have been absent from the classroom for periods of approximately one year only. Very few officers have been on secondment for protracted periods of time. It is therefore unlikely that the majority of these teachers will experience any serious difficulties upon their return to teaching.

Furthermore, all such teachers will be granted the full six weeks Christmas vacation period to allow them sufficient preparation time for their return to teaching duties. It should be remembered that Education Officers (Special Duties) are professionals, as are classroom teachers, and as a consequence would maintain their membership of professional associations and their involvement with in-service activities.

23. Shire Councils, Discrimination against Heavy Vehicles

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

"(1) Notwithstanding small cracks in the road surface, is it lawful for a shire council to permanently discriminate against a particular description of traffic, such as vehicles over 9 tonnes gross vehicle weight, on a council road servicing an area which has no other road access?

(2) Will such action unfairly discriminate against property owners, builders, contractors, tourist coaches and truck operators?"

Answer—

(1) The Local Government Act 1936-1987 provides that a Local Authority may close any road or part of a road permanently or temporarily against any particular description of traffic.

This power may only be exercised, however, where another road is available for use by such traffic in the place of the road or part of the road that has been closed.

(2) In the circumstances you have indicated—yes.

24. Local Authorities, Imposition of Charges on Roads

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

"Is it lawful for a local authority to impose a charge on a road which is the only road or form of access to a township in a shire?"

If the honourable member could supply more specific information in relation to the matter in question, I will have it examined.

25. Gas Production in Kemmis Creek Area

Mr RANDELL asked the Minister for Mines and Energy and Minister for the Arts—

“(1) Are there any plans to drill for and produce gas in the Kemmis Creek area near Nebo in the Mackay region?

(2) Will he give any other relevant information, for example, time-tabling and production?

(3) Will the Townsville area be supplied from this source?

(4) Will consideration be given to running a gas pipeline to the Mackay-Sarina area to supplement future development there?”

Answer—

(1) There are no definite plans for the production of gas from the Kemmis Creek area at this time.

The Kemmis Creek Area is part of Authority to Prospect 364P held by Median Oil NL and granted for 4 years from 1st March 1986. The aims of exploration are to prove resources of methane (coal gas) available in coal seams and to test the ability to extract the gas at a suitable rate.

Initial exploration has been carried out at Broadmeadow, some 20 km north of Moranbah, where 3 wells were successfully completed. These wells will be fracture stimulated, dewatered, and gas production rates assessed later this year.

Further drilling is planned in the Authority to Prospect to highlight areas where coal seams of the northern Bowen Basin may have greatest gas extraction potential.

The Kemmis Creek area is being considered as a target for future evaluation.

(2) No definite information can be given at this time on time-tabling or production.

There is no doubt that there is a large resource of methane inferred in coal seams of the northern Bowen Basin. The success or failure of the project will depend on the ability to extract gas at a suitable rate for economic viability.

(3) Provided there are sufficient resources of methane which can be extracted at suitable rates and at a reasonable distance from Townsville so that gas can be piped economically, Townsville could be supplied from this source.

(4) The Mackay-Sarina area could also be supplied from this source, subject to similar qualifications.

26. Pit Bull Terriers

Mr De LACY asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

“With reference to the recent widespread publicity in the United States in connection with pit bull terriers and their attacks on people—

(1) How many of these dogs have been imported into Queensland?

(2) How many are currently in quarantine in Queensland?

(3) Is he in agreement with the importation of these dogs into Australia and, if not, what action does he propose to take to prevent them coming into the State?”

Answer—

(1) Quarantine is a Commonwealth Government responsibility.

While legislation administered under the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Act by my colleague the Honourable Bill Glasson, M.L.A., Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying, provides this Government with controls on the introduction or keeping of species exotic to this State, the importation of animals into Australia is a Commonwealth Government matter. Individual States could put up a case to ban a given breed, species, or country of origin, but such a case would need to be substantiated.

When animals have been released from quarantine stations, they are regarded as 'landed' in Australia, and are no longer under movement restrictions in terms of quarantine legislation.

Importation of pit bull terriers into Australia has occurred through New South Wales and Victoria, but I am not aware that any of these dogs have reached Queensland.

Over the past two years, three pit bull terriers have been imported into Eastern Creek Quarantine Station, Sydney and a further two are to arrive ex U.S.A. within two weeks. None of these is destined for Queensland residency.

Thirty pit bull terriers were imported from the U.S.A. via U.K. and Hawaii during the past two years into Spotswood Quarantine Station, Victoria but none of these was destined for Queensland residency.

(2) The quarantine station in Queensland was closed by the Commonwealth Government on 30 June 1984, and animals to be imported into this State serve any detention periods elsewhere.

(3) My information relating to attacks on people by pit bull terriers in the U.S.A. indicates that the animals in question were either specifically trained to attack, or subjected to management or environments which animal behaviourists indicate can induce aggressive behaviour.

Given this and the comments by the managers of the two quarantine stations 'that all pit bull terriers introduced into Australia to date have been placid and very tractable', I do not believe that it would be possible to sustain a case to prevent the introduction of this breed.

27.

Wealth Tax

Mr BORBIDGE asked the Premier and Treasurer—

“With reference to proposals from within the Federal ALP caucus for the implementation of a wealth tax—

(1) Does he consider such a proposal, if implemented, would have a devastating effect on economic growth and investment?

(2) Did the Prime Minister, as Parliamentary Leader of the Federal ALP, give any indication during the Federal Election Campaign that his Government may implement such a tax?

(3) Have any Members of the ALP in this Parliament expressed opposition to this latest Labor tax plan?”

Answer—

The deliberate and insidious campaign being mounted within the Federal ALP caucus for the introduction of a wealth tax represents a serious threat to Australia's future prosperity.

A wealth tax would crush initiative, enterprise, risk-taking and the incentive to work harder.

It would destroy capital accumulation and saving.

Even more insidious is the proposal by Senator Walsh, the Minister for Finance, that a wealth tax would have to be extended to cover the family home if it were to bring in sufficient revenue for the Government.

This shows that the Labor Government will stop at nothing in extracting every last possible cent from long-suffering taxpayers to support its addiction to big spending and big Government.

We should be especially concerned that the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, has denied that a capital gains tax would be introduced.

I have no need to remind you what happened when the Prime Minister strenuously denied that a capital gains tax would be introduced.

The lack of opposition to a wealth tax from the ALP in this Parliament clearly demonstrates where they stand on this proposal which is at the heart of the socialist philosophy of reducing everyone in Australia to the same level of mediocrity.

At 3.30 p.m.,

In accordance with the provisions of the Sessional Order, the House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY**Estimates—Ninth Allotted Day****Estimates-in-Chief, 1987-88****Tourism, National Parks and Sport****Department of the Arts, National Parks and Sport**

Hon. G. H. MUNTZ (Whitsunday—Minister for Tourism, National Parks and Sport) (3.30 p.m.): I move—

“That \$19,867,000 be granted for ‘Department of the Arts, National Parks and Sport’.”

I am pleased to be the ministerial head of a portfolio that includes three such important areas as tourism, national parks and sport. They are closely interrelated, as they all draw many interstate and international visitors to Queensland. All three make a significant contribution to the economy of the State. In introducing the Estimates of my department, I intend to cover these three important areas in order of my portfolio title.

Firstly, as regards tourism, I am sure that all members in this Chamber will agree with me when I say that tourism in Queensland is booming and that, as a consequence, all sectors of society are gaining some benefit. This situation has not arisen accidentally. Long gone are the days when Australians automatically thought that an overseas tourist product was better than the home product.

Back in 1979 this Government set about creating the climate for the boom of today. It then created what the Opposition refer to as one of those dreadful quangos—in this case, the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. But what a quango! It has achieved results in partnership with private enterprise of this State—the people who do not mind a hard day’s work and who do not mind a few blisters if there are good prospects for a fair dollar in return. That is what this State and its successful tourism story are all about—a partnership between Government and private enterprise.

Of course, Queensland has all the other perfect tourist ingredients, which are hard to equal around the world, such as abundant sunshine, the world’s best beaches and coastline, authentic last-frontier country, the best national parks in the southern hemisphere, the Great Barrier Reef and, more importantly, a stable Government. Where does one stop when the list is endless, when Queensland’s attractions are compared with those in other countries? Together they provide the best therapy for twentieth-century stress. They exist right here in Queensland. We were well out of the blocks and helping to make it happen when the other States heard the starter’s gun and followed in our wake with similar quango legislation. In fact, many other States asked Queensland for advice in that regard.

Since 1979 the corporation has expanded its mandate to promote and market tourism and travel, to encourage development of the industry, to provide tourism and travel services and to participate in tourist and travel ventures or development projects. In the eight years of its existence, the corporation has become the most innovative and entrepreneurial tourism body in the nation. It is an extremely frugal, cost-effective organisation.

When the corporation was formed, it had 259 staff. By 1982 the staff level had reached 290 and it has remained at that level since. It may be said, “Well, so what?” Let me indicate how the corporation has managed to dramatically increase productivity.

Revenue from the sale of products has increased sixfold. This has enabled the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation to increase the proportion of its budget, which is self-funded, from 19 per cent in 1979-80 to over 37 per cent last year, and an expected 42 per cent during this current financial year. In straight dollar terms, that

represents an amount of \$11,500,000. Add this to the \$15.13m from consolidated revenue and the \$259,000 carried forward to arrive at the budget of the corporation for this year.

During the life of the corporation, tourism in Queensland has been transformed from a low-key domestic industry to a multibillion dollar national and international business. I certainly have no hesitation in placing on record my admiration of the leadership given the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation by its chairman, Sir Frank Moore, ably supported by a very dedicated and professional team of men and women working under him.

The tourist industry means jobs and it is now responsible for about 145 000 jobs in Queensland. The value of tourism to the Queensland economy is \$9 billion. Canberra constantly quotes tourism at 6 per cent of the nation's Gross Domestic Product, so its strong standing will be appreciated.

The highly esteemed Boeing report into tourism, commissioned by the Government and the QTTC, predicts that tourists will spend \$21 billion a year in Queensland by the year 2000. That amount almost equals the present amount that is spent on tourism across Australia today.

Construction in Queensland is at an all-time high. Some \$1.2 billion of tourism development is currently under construction in the State, with a further \$3 billion committed. About half of all investments in new tourist infrastructure in Australia are taking place in Queensland. When the investment is narrowed down to tourism development outside capital cities—in other words, when provincial Australia is compared with provincial Queensland—the figure jumps to almost 80 per cent. In other words, 80 per cent of the developments are happening here in provincial Queensland.

The infrastructure is there, proof that the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation has lived up to its mandate to help shape and develop a broad-based, sophisticated tourist industry that is capable of attracting and satisfying visitors from all corners of the globe. This Government, on behalf of the QTTC, quite rightly takes credit for that development.

This National Party Government has created an environment that has given business confidence in Queensland and encouraged massive investment development in tourism. That investment is now drawing visitors to Queensland in their droves.

In terms of training for the tourism industry, the corporation continues to play an active role. As a direct result of measures taken by the corporation, the number of tourism and hospitality courses offered in the State has grown from only 14 in 1981 to 68 last year. Enrolments have jumped from 3 000 to 10 000.

Without a shadow of doubt, the highlight of the last year was the corporation's active involvement in moves to establish a Centre for Studies in Travel and Tourism, with a Chair of Tourism at James Cook University in Townsville. This Chair of Tourism will be the first in Australia. It is being jointly supported by the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation—this Government—the Australian Tourism Industry Association and the Australian Federation of Travel Agents. Private enterprise has been encouraged to donate \$4m to fund the project. It will be the first time that funding for formal studies has come from the industry it seeks to serve.

The Queensland Government, through the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, is the front runner with an ongoing commitment of \$100,000 for research and \$80,000 to assist with the Chair of Tourism each year for the next five years. Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation research and development manager, Jeff Weigh, has been appointed the first director of the Centre for Studies in Tourism and Travel. I commend him on the expertise and professionalism that he has brought to that area of the tourist infrastructure in Queensland. The centre will provide a much-needed focus for tourism research and greater access to tourism data, which will lead to more effective research in the tourism industry. It is also the first world-class tourism research and tertiary training facility to be established in the South Pacific region. The centre is open and takes its first students in 1988. That is what I call a Bicentenary gift

to Queensland from Queensland. It amounts to a partnership between private enterprise and Government initiative.

In the areas of publicity—advertising, research and market research; that is the business of selling tourism—spending by the corporation has increased five times to \$6m. Channelling more money into these areas is a more productive use of funds. More than \$500,000 is currently being spent on a national advertising campaign for the very successful Sunlover Holidays, which will increase general awareness of Queensland as a tourist destination and bring more domestic tourist dollars into the State.

Money spent on research is reaping the benefits of increased development investment in Queensland's tourist infrastructure. The corporation has taken the terror out of research by providing easily accessible data on which financiers and developers can base industry decisions. Marketing by the corporation is taking on a new direction. Internationally, resources are being channelled into positioning Queensland as a focal point for South Pacific tourism.

Attention is being given to developing a wider range of packaged holidays more suited to the different segments of the Australian and New Zealand markets. These holidays will be more experimental and offer more activities and adventure. A range of farm holiday packages has also been developed as a pilot program to take advantage of this growing market.

The corporation has adopted a more aggressive marketing and promotional attitude towards winning conventions, conferences and seminars, particularly in the blossoming field of incentive travel. The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation's key role in encouraging development of world-class convention infrastructure is recognised by the successful bid by Tourism Brisbane and the Gold Coast Visitors Bureau for the 1991 Lions International Conference, which could bring up to 50 000 visitors to the State.

This financial year, the corporation will provide \$1.3m as special assistance to regional tourist associations. This compares with a mere \$121,840 in 1979-80. Tourism is one industry that is committed to decentralisation—this Government always has been committed to it—and in fact no other industry is better suited to it. The corporation is spreading the benefits of tourism across time and space. All regions of Queensland now benefit all year round, which is very important.

Through its activities, the corporation acts as a seeding organisation. The corporation has established a high-profile development department to assist investors, developers and local communities with tourist projects. Again I commend people such as Mr Martin Cooper, who is now the acting manager of that department. The professionalism, expertise and management that such people have brought from private enterprise to a Government-orientated corporation is outstanding.

The corporation's development and research activities attract investment to the State. That will continue in the years ahead. That, in turn, attracts more tourists, whose spending has helped to make tourism the State's most prosperous industry.

Queensland is getting more visitors, both domestic and international, than ever before. Last year, although domestic tourism remained our mainstay, 500 000 international visitors came to Queensland. Boeing predicts that by 1990 that figure will rise to 1.1 million, representing nearly half of all international visitors to Australia. I believe that Boeing could have perhaps underestimated what will really happen in the 1990s. This projected increase in the flow of visitors to Queensland will mean 225 000 more jobs for Queenslanders between 1985 and 2000, with 66 000 of them being created by 1990. We all have a tourist responsibility. Everyone has heard the saying, "I'll take you anywhere twice—the second time to apologise!". Well, in tourism there is no second chance. We must do it right the first time. It is a highly competitive industry. Put simply, if we do not match the needs of visitors, this tourist traffic may well go elsewhere. It behoves us all to guard against complacency. The industry and the Government have to go out and sell the attractions and the diversity of this great State.

Another important area of my ministerial responsibility is the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service, which is responsible for nature conservation in Queensland, including the day-to-day management of the Great Barrier Reef marine park. Its mandate is derived from several Acts of Parliament and agreements between the State and Commonwealth Governments.

In keeping with that mandate, the primary purpose of the service is to, "Advocate and foster harmony between mankind and our environment, thereby facilitating the well-being of humanity and safeguarding the integrity of nature". This purpose statement is quoted directly from the strategic plan published by the service. It reflects the balanced approach to conservation which is sought by this Government and ably carried out by the service.

The operation of the service on a regional basis, with a high level of delegation afforded to regional directors, enables most of the day-to-day management decisions to be made at the local level. A positive result of this is a faster response to public needs and a closer liaison with the tourism and leisure industry in Queensland.

A review of the service's program management structure during 1986-87 identified the need for some important new initiatives. Among these was the need to enhance marketing and fund-raising activities to cater for the increasing demands from the tourism industry and for the growing popularity of national parks.

In July this year I implemented policies which provided for the regulation of certain commercial activities on national parks. Increasing use of national parks by film-makers, tour-operators and food-vendors, etc., had created a number of management problems for the service. These are now able to be managed through a system of permits and charges applying to such uses.

Consistent with current Government directions, the service is continuing to encourage private enterprise to provide facilities on some of our national parks. Several commercial activities have already been established. These include white-water rafting at Barron Gorge national park, a cruise operation on Lake Barrine and licensing of a mobile kiosk at Lake Eacham.

Other projects that are currently under way are the creation of a tourist development at Heathlands; restaurant facilities at Fleay's Fauna Centre, which is a world-class educational and tourist facility and a credit to the service; and St Helena Island. A further mobile kiosk is also being considered for Josephine Falls.

I have directed the service to give priority during 1987-88 to addressing the growing need for camping grounds and tourism facilities and to arrange such developments where they are compatible with the natural values. Tourism is a partner with national parks and national parks are in partnership with tourism.

The management of financial and other service systems is also undergoing change. The change focuses on increasing efficiency and effectiveness through the use of modern technology and operating procedures. Systems to be implemented in 1987-88 include a revised administration system for the commercial harvesting of kangaroos, Stage 1 of a computerised records system to operate throughout the State and a networked office automation system based on microcomputers. A detailed review of the allocation of resources throughout the service will also be undertaken to ensure that high-priority programs are adequately supported.

To achieve widespread appreciation and acceptance of the important role that the Queensland Government plays in relation to conservation management, provision of education and information is essential. In order to achieve this, the service's extensive publication program will continue. Emphasis is shifting from the production of basic information sheets to more in-depth interpretive publications and signs. Initiatives such as the quarterly newspaper, *Ringtail*, and the RNA show display will continue, while special publications such as the calendar will substantially depend on obtaining appropriate support from the private sector to underwrite production costs.

Conscious of the problems associated with increasing human visitation to crocodile habitats, the service has taken a pro-active approach by providing educational information by way of distribution of leaflets and erection of warning signs.

Mr Littleproud: It is a pity that people take the signs away.

Mr MUNTZ: That is part of the problem that my department has to face and part of the ongoing costs. As the honourable member for Condamine has mentioned, it is a pity that people are not more responsible. The majority of people are responsible, and those people who abuse the system unfortunately endanger the lives of others.

Field surveillance has increased and research activity is continuing. Research is essential to understanding the animal and enabling sound management decisions to be made. The east coast relocation policy which covers the area from Cooktown to Rockhampton is now in place. A major breakthrough has been achieved in understanding the response of kangaroo populations to commercial harvest. A population model has been developed and field validation of the model will continue in the coming year. I am hopeful that the Commonwealth Government will adopt a more reasonable attitude towards the matter of kangaroo quotas as my department presents it with an ever-growing body of scientific data which supports the Queensland Government's policies.

The preparation of legislation has commenced to allow for management of the natural resources and recreational potential of Moreton Island. I believe this legislation, modelled on the successful initiatives introduced in regard to Fraser Island in 1985, is essential to ensure the long-term protection of the abundant natural values of the island. I believe it is essential that this Government moves to ensure that Moreton Island is made available and developed as a national park for the benefit of people in the south-east corner of Queensland and, in particular, Brisbane. This initiative is another example of how Queensland is able to manage and protect its natural areas without outside interference.

The Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service will receive an allocation from consolidated revenue funding of \$18.7m for this financial year. The overall budget available to the service, including the Special Projects Fund and the Special Standing Fund, is approximately \$26.7m. An amount of \$2.1m has been provided from the Special Projects Fund for such projects as capital works on parks and the acquisition of further land for park purposes. It is intended to use these funds as follows—

- \$626,250 will be spent on the provision of new facilities and the redevelopment of visitor facilities on many national and environmental parks throughout the State. These include Eungella, Mount Spec, Josephine Falls, Hinchinbrook Island, Kondalilla, Natural Arch, Bunya Mountains, Cania Gorge, Mount Zamia, Noosa, Binna Burra, Main Range, Lady Musgrave Island, Isla Gorge, Porcupine Gorge, Moreton Island, Blackdown Tableland, Jardine River, Edmund Kennedy, Mon Repos and Lake Broadwater.
- \$416,250 will be provided to construct and renovate staff accommodation throughout the State. This will enable staff to reside on park sites, thereby meeting the needs of the visiting public.
- \$224,250 will be provided to upgrade fencing, firebreaks and internal roads in the Central Highlands and Cape York. This will benefit neighbours and is in keeping with the service's good-neighbour policy.
- \$400,000 will be spent on the development of access roads to national parks. This money will be paid to participating local authorities that will be responsible for the carrying out of the actual roadworks. A major contribution will be made to the Bauhinia Shire for the road to Carnarvon Gorge.
- \$424,000 is allocated for the acquisition of national parks, including extensions to the scenic rim and Mount Maroon; consolidation of Kondalilla and Obi Obi national parks; and commencement of acquisition of lands adjoining Pumicestone Passage.

During 1987-88, work will commence on the acquisition of lands for a major environmental park within the Jumpinpin wetlands between Brisbane and the Gold Coast. This area is a valuable recreational fishery and is also of significant importance to water-birds. Action is also continuing to acquire parks and reserves within the mulga region of Queensland to enable the State to have significant national parks in all 13 terrestrial regions of the State.

The third major area of my portfolio concerns sport in Queensland, which plays an important role in the daily lives of most of the people in this State, whether it be as a result of their participation in the social, recreational and competitive aspects or because of their interest in the achievements of others.

Mr De Lacy: Do you think we will win the Sheffield Shield?

Mr MUNTZ: Of course we will win the Sheffield Shield. We have done it before and we will do it again.

Mr Prest: In what year did we win a Sheffield Shield?

Mr MUNTZ: We won it in spirit.

In today's ever-changing society, with its frustrations, tensions and stress, sport can provide an outlet to alleviate some of the unacceptable side-effects of our life-style and can also be beneficial in contributing to the general health of the community.

Traditionally, sport has been served by a vast army of voluntary workers who provide so much of the money and energy necessary to keep sport operating throughout this State. I pay tribute to all those in this State who serve sport in that unselfish, volunteer capacity. They are the backbone of our sports structure.

The Queensland Government was the first Government in Australia to recognise that Government had a role to play in assisting sport to become more proficient in all areas, whether it be coaching, administration, umpiring or refereeing, so that sport would be better equipped to meet the challenge of the 1980s. We were the first Government to create an effective Ministry and Division of Sport and to become the pace-setter in Australia in providing financial support on a regular basis to that vast volunteer army of sportspeople.

Since the initial measures of assistance were introduced in 1972, the original encouragement to sport scheme has been augmented, added to and upgraded so that now there are the following 10 measures of assistance that make up the scheme—

- (1) Subsidy assistance for the coaching of juniors in sport—\$1 for each \$4 expenditure by the sport, with a maximum subsidy of \$3,750 per club per sport.
- (2) Subsidy assistance for the provision of facilities for playing of the sport—\$1 subsidy for each \$5 expenditure by the sport.
- (3) Grants to the recognised State governing body of sport to assist in sending properly selected State teams out of the State.
- (4) Grants to the recognised State governing body of sport to assist with the staging of national and international events here in Queensland.
- (5) Subsidy assistance to the recognised State governing body of sport to assist with administration costs—\$1 subsidy for each \$2 expenditure by the State body, with a maximum limit of \$200 per week.
- (6) Subsidy assistance to the recognised State governing body of sport to assist with the employment of State directors of coaching—\$1 subsidy for each \$2 expenditure by the State body, with a maximum limit of \$200 per week. Consideration can also be given under this measure for subsidy assistance on the employment of regional directors of coaching in some sports.

- (7) Subsidy assistance to the recognised State governing body of sport to assist it in running seminars for officials, that is referees, umpires, administrators, coaches, etc.—\$1 subsidy for each \$2 expenditure by the State body, with a maximum of \$3,500 subsidy payment in any one financial year.
- (8) Grants to gifted sportspeople—State open-age standard.
- (9) Grants to assist with the staging of Queensland State titles, championships or events of equivalent status in regional or provincial areas.
- (10) Grants are provided under the regional sports talent assistance scheme to talented junior sportspeople who have the potential to attain State age standard.

In terms of all measures, funds are directed to properly constituted State sporting bodies and their affiliated clubs, zones and regions that participate in open, organised and competitive sport in Queensland. At present, there are 81 separate and distinct sports acknowledged and assisted by my department in terms of the guide-lines laid down by the Government for the administration of the scheme.

These measures reflect the Government's philosophy that the funds appropriated for the scheme be distributed to sport on the basis of the greatest good for the greatest number and at the same time embrace the youth area of sport as a first priority. For example, last financial year, about 36 per cent of the assistance funds were directed to the youth area for coaching assistance. Also, new or additional facilities for playing sport were subsidised to an amount exceeding \$1.2m. This measure had an input to the construction of facilities for projects throughout the State in the 1986-87 financial year valued at over \$6m.

Both of those measures are of benefit to sport at the grassroots level in all areas of the State. They have an important flow-on effect of providing facilities that become the focus for community life and activity. The capital facilities program also provides for many man-hours of employment throughout the State.

The three levels of government—Commonwealth, State and local—all have a responsibility to provide assistance to sport. The role of each level of government fits into a broad framework that sport readily understands. It is a logical pattern, because sport has its national, State and club framework. Hence, the Commonwealth Government finds the funding for national teams travelling overseas to world championships; sports administration costs at national body level; national coaching programs; the staging of international and world events in Australia; the national high performance sportspeople; and national standard sports facilities.

Complementing the Federal Government area are the States with their individual sports assistance policies and programs. I have outlined this Government's assistance scheme and the philosophy behind that scheme.

The Committee can be assured that the Queensland scheme is the envy of both sport and Government in the other States of Australia. It delivers the assistance where it counts: on the sports-fields and in the administration of the sport.

An examination of the annual reports of other States will show that each State has a large departmental apparatus with all the earmarks of a bureaucratic empire to deliver its sports benefits, all of which must be paid for at the cost of eroding the funds available for direct assistance to sport.

I do not question the need for sport to gain expertise and to develop new techniques. However, I do make the point that Governments should assist sport to develop itself and not attempt to play Big Brother by employing so-called experts to tell sport what they think it should do. Sport has the expertise, knowledge and will to direct its own course and is constitutionally empowered to do so. What the sports need is a financial assistance package to help them get on with the job at hand.

One of the important aims in administering the Government's Encouragement to Sport Scheme is not to interfere with sport in its executive role. I know that sport in

Queensland appreciates that philosophy. Local authorities throughout the State also have a role to play in assisting sport at regional and club level, and councils throughout the State provide assistance to their local sporting groups in many and varying ways. There is evidence that progressive councils are doing much in their areas to foster the development of sport.

The Government's sports dollar is found from consolidated revenue and from the Sports and Youth Trust Fund which is made up from the revenue received from the Soccer Pools and Gold Lotto.

In 1987-88, it is proposed to expend \$4.97m in servicing the State's sports assistance scheme. Projected expenditure will be—

	\$
1. Junior coaching	1,200,000
2. Capital facilities	1,200,000
3. State teams travel	500,000
4. Staging national events	126,000
5. State administration costs	500,000
6. State directors of coaching	580,000
7. State seminars	90,000
8. Gifted sportspeople	550,000
9. Regional talent assistance scheme	90,000
10. Regional State championships	68,300
Special allocations—	
Grant to the Sports Medicine Federation	10,100
Contribution to the decentralised units of the Australian Institute of Sport in Queensland (diving and squash)	58,200
Total	<u>\$4,972,600</u>

The 81 sports that are played in all areas of the State will benefit from the funds available to the scheme on an overall "greatest good for the greatest number" basis, with a small proportion of special funding for the shop window of sport—the high-performance State and national champions.

I give a firm assurance that the State Government will not interfere in sport's traditional and constitutional role of implementing its aims and objectives either individually or collectively. My department's record of encouragement and assistance to sport under the provisions of the Encouragement to Sport Scheme is a proud one, and one that is unequalled in Australia.

As honourable members are aware, my department has responsibility for other areas such as the film and video registration office, the National Estate program in Queensland and the Winston Churchill Memorial Trust. An account of their continuing activities is given in the department's annual report which was tabled on 16 October.

In conclusion, I thank the staff of the Department of the Arts, National Parks and Sport and its statutory authorities, Mr Stan Wilcox and Mr Pat Smith, the under secretary and deputy under secretary of the department, as well as members of my parliamentary committees for their assistance since my appointment to the portfolio in December last year.

I look forward to constructive contributions by honourable members to this Estimates debate.

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

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) (4.01 p.m.): In the comments that I make, if I criticise the Government, I hope that the Minister accepts it as constructive criticism. That is the way in which my comments are made.

Firstly, I congratulate the three people who were mentioned by the Minister—Stan Wilcox, Pat Smith and Gary Gilbert—on their promotions. Over the years, I have dealt with those three gentlemen in their work as public servants and I, as a member of the Opposition, have always found them to be very easy to deal with.

I commence by asking a question of the Minister. I am not attempting to be smart or pinpricking, but in the annual report that the Minister tabled two weeks ago, the financial statement showed an amount of \$4,500,900 having been expended by the Division of Sport. However, that statement also shows that the amount expended for 1986-87 was \$4,972,600. When I read that, I wondered whether some money may have come from a different account that I had not picked up. However, today the Minister cited the amount of money to be expended on sport in 1987-88 as being \$4,972,600. When he replies, I would appreciate the Minister's informing me whether the amount that is being expended on sport this year is the same as last year or whether it has been increased by the inflation rate, which I assume is the case if the amount has been increased from \$4.5m to \$4.9m.

The Queensland Government really crows about the fact that in 1972 it started the Encouragement to Sport Scheme. I agree that it was the first Government in Australia to start such a scheme. However, it is sad that the Minister attempted to criticise other Governments in Australia by saying that he had six people on his staff in that division and by trying to compare that with the staff of other State Government departments. I have read the annual reports of the sports departments in the other States and I do not see how a comparison can be made. Other States combine the racing department with the sports department or the recreation department with the sports department. It is very difficult to compare the expenditure in Queensland with the expenditure in other States. Each State has a different set-up. It is difficult to put the two of them together and then say, "Well, this State is doing a better job than any other State."

I give credit to the Queensland Government. I am a sports administrator and I know the job that is being done. I firmly believe that it is time that the Government had a close look at its assistance scheme for sport and at the need to expand the way in which financial assistance is given to clubs. I would be the first to agree that it would be very difficult to get any sporting club to complain that the Queensland Government is giving it money! All people involved with sport appreciate the Government's assistance. However, I do not think that the scheme presently operating is the best one available. I say that because the present scheme—particularly in regard to assistance to junior coaching—is being manipulated by the clubs that know how to use the system.

I think that all members in this Chamber, including the Minister for Sport and previous Ministers, know the tricks that different sporting clubs get up to in order to get money out of the scheme. I do not think that people should have to do that in order to get money from the Government. I will not say what the tricks are, because clubs may think that I am dobbing them in.

All honourable members are involved in some way in sporting clubs in their electorates and are certainly aware of the way in which people manipulate the system that presently operates. In spite of that, nobody wants to do anything about it, simply because at least money is being given by the Government to sporting clubs. However, that is not good enough as a way to go about distributing funds. Clubs at the bottom end of the scale, because they do not have the smart operators on the board of directors or on their management committees, are not getting assistance. Those clubs do not know how to use the scheme.

It is about time the Government found a new way of directing assistance to sporting clubs, especially junior sporting clubs. I suggest that it could be done on a per capita basis for sports that have registered junior players. Perhaps the Government could look

at a way of distributing funds to those sports from the State level, through the association level, and down to the club level. If the Government did that, a fairer system of getting money out to each and every sporting club would result.

The sporting association that I am involved in received approximately \$378 from the Division of Sport during the last financial year. Members of the club's committee thought that that was just wonderful because assistance had been obtained. I am not knocking that assistance, because it is good; but I look at the level of assistance that is given to other organisations, such as roller-skating rinks, that receive \$3,750. They are really private enterprise organisations which set up a club and use the financial assistance to pay wages to people who teach roller-skating. Those organisations can get \$3,750, which is 10 times the amount that my sporting association can obtain, yet the sporting association I am involved in caters for 2 500 people, 1 000 of whom are in the junior ranks. When the association I am involved in receives an amount of \$378 while other organisations receive a larger amount, I do not think that that is a fair system. It is certainly true that the money is being distributed, but I do not think that it is being distributed fairly.

The Government should look at establishing a new system. I say that in the hope that my comments are taken as constructive criticism of the scheme that presently operates, and are taken in a constructive spirit. As a person who is involved in sport, I would like to see Government money being distributed among the greatest number of people—thereby ensuring that as many people as possible receive some assistance.

I ask all honourable members to stop and think about this: recently, I received from the Minister a list of those who will receive assistance from the Government this financial year. Honourable members need to think about sporting clubs in their electorates that do not appear on that list. They are the organisations I would like to see receive some assistance. Quite frankly, the major portion of funds for coaching assistance—and that is what it is called—is not really going into coaching assistance; it is going into the administration and running of clubs, and into building up the facilities of those clubs. I doubt that anyone could prove me wrong about that.

This Government spends millions of dollars on racing. Just recently I became aware that the Government made a gift of \$30,000 to the Roma race club, which holds two meetings a year. Compare that with the measly assistance that is given to sport. When I have raised this matter before, the argument has been that the racing industry must get that assistance because the money comes from the TAB. That is a very false argument. The fact of the matter is that this Government receives, by way of raffle tax from sporting clubs, exactly the same amount that it gives back to those clubs as coaching subsidies. Sporting clubs are receiving from the Government the money that they originally gave to the Government as raffle tax. Naturally, different clubs will pay different amounts and receive different amounts. The raffle tax should be abolished.

The Government should consider making more money available for sport. The reality is that this Government amasses enormous amounts of money from the licensing fees it charges sporting clubs. It receives that money because people drink in those clubs. The argument that the Government uses in relation to the TAB is not used in this case. It does not say, "Let's put some of that money back into sport."

One of the other things that I would like to raise concerning sport, and which quite upsets me, relates to the amount of media coverage that is given to women. I think that the relationship of women in sport—

Mr Littleproud: Have they got long dresses?

Mr MACKENROTH: That would be a stupid comment from the honourable member; there is no doubt about that. That is the real problem with women's sport—male chauvinists like the honourable member. There is no doubt at all that chauvinistic statements like that—

A Government member interjected.

Mr MACKENROTH: It will be in *Hansard* tomorrow, do not worry about it.

If honourable members look at the Sports Extra section of the *Courier-Mail*—

Mrs Nelson: How many women have you got over there?

Mr MACKENROTH: I am talking about women in sport.

In the Sports Extra section of the *Courier-Mail* of Monday, 19 October, only 5 per cent of the total coverage was given to women. More than 50 per cent of that 5 per cent was taken up by a picture of a nice young lady. The associated article contained only one line in which she said that she disagreed with a levy. However, as she is a nice looking girl her picture, which is equivalent to more than 50 per cent of the total space attributed to women's sports, appears in that section.

Last Monday's Sports Extra section of the *Courier-Mail* devoted 2½ per cent of its total coverage to women's sport. That is a disgrace. As I have said previously, I am involved in a women's sporting organisation. It is one of the largest sporting associations in Queensland. The *Sunday Sun* is the only newspaper that will cover that association's sporting activities.

Mrs Nelson: There is no-one up in the press gallery.

Mr MACKENROTH: I do not care. They would not print it, anyway.

The Federal Government produced a 100-page report about the lack of media coverage of women's sport. The *Courier-Mail* devoted three paragraphs to that report. There is no doubt about it, that newspaper stands condemned.

Mr Muntz: Women in sport in Queensland are far better off than those in any other State. We don't discriminate against them at all.

Mr MACKENROTH: I know the Government does not discriminate.

I will return to my point about different people receiving different amounts of money; men's bowls received \$1.5m, women's bowls received \$144,000; men's cricket received \$860,000, women's cricket received \$11,000.

Mrs Nelson: That is because the men who are running the organisations make the decisions about who gets the money. Who can change that?

Mr MACKENROTH: I ask the member for Aspley not to get upset. I am not criticising the Government for the fact that the *Courier-Mail* reports in that manner; I am talking about community attitudes.

The report on women in sport really sums up the attitude of Australians to women in sport. The report states that, in the Geelong triathlon in November 1984, the first male competitor home received two return tickets to Hawaii; the first woman received a bicycle. They were running in the same race. The only chance the woman had of receiving the trip was if her husband won the race. That is only the start; things get worse. In the 1985 Devonport triathlon the first male home received tickets to Hawaii, the first woman received a trophy and the first junior male received a trip to Melbourne. That is an example of community attitudes.

This year I was at the State netball titles and newspaper staff turned up to cover the sport. I will not mention the particular newspaper because the attitude of all of them is the same. Many photographs were taken of the games. One of the problems of getting good photographs of netball comes about because photographers are not sent along often enough to gain experience with the sport. They know how to take photographs of Rugby League because three photographers are at every game, but they do not know how to take good photographs of netball. On this occasion many photographs were taken but the very best thing that came out of it was that the photographer was sent back on the Monday to find one particular girl to see if she was prepared to be featured as a model in *Blitz*. There was no coverage of the sport.

Honourable members can examine the sports coverage of the *Courier-Mail*, the *Daily Sun* or any of the rest; it is all the same. Last week-end the State female softball titles were held in Cairns. The only mention of that in the press was the results that were given to the newspaper by the sporting organisation. The thousands of people in this State who play softball would have been very interested to know what happened in Cairns. The largest participation sport in Queensland is netball, yet it receives no press coverage.

Mr Muntz interjected.

Mr MACKENROTH: I can tell the Minister that there is nobody in the press gallery, and, even if there were, they would not report this speech, anyway.

The fact is that the largest story on netball in the last 10 years was not about the fact that Australia had won five out of eight world netball titles but the fact that netball associations will not allow mixed netball on their courts. The associations will allow men's netball but not mixed netball, that is, men and women playing in the same team. I have yet to see women and men on the same team running around Lang Park or playing cricket over at the Gabba. I think if anyone suggested that, the people of Queensland and the media would laugh at them. The biggest story given to women's netball in the last two years is the one I am holding in my hand. That is a disgrace. That needs to be addressed.

Mrs Nelson: Just to compound your story, I tried to get resources for female gymnasts. It was stony ground. No-one was interested. They were the best in Australia, but no-one was interested. I got no support whatsoever.

Mr MACKENROTH: That would be right. No-one would listen.

As I said, women's netball has more players than any other sport in Queensland. When it came to sponsorship——

Mrs Nelson: That is the private sector that I am talking about.

Mr MACKENROTH: I am speaking about private-sector sponsorship. I have continually tried to get private sponsorship and the largest amount of money that has been received is \$180. Yet I can go down to the junior football and see running around little seven-year-old boys whom a firm will sponsor for \$500. That is because it is a boys' sport.

Fathers stand condemned along with the media. On Saturdays when I go to netball there might be 800 young children playing but I would be lucky to see 10 fathers. However, if one goes to the football, all the fathers are there. Fathers do not want to go along and watch their daughters play sport. They just do not take any interest.

It is about time people started taking an interest in women's sport. The reality is that if a male wins a national title, he receives recognition throughout this land. If a woman wins a world title, she is lucky to get a mention in the newspapers.

Mr Randell: What about Dawn Fraser?

Mr MACKENROTH: Anyone can cite a couple of examples. In her prime Dawn Fraser was kicked out of swimming by men.

I wanted to speak about many other matters. Other members of my committee will speak about national parks and tourism. I specifically wanted to speak about sport. I hope that the Minister takes on board my comments and examines the funding of junior sport for boys and girls. In addition, I hope that the Minister examines the scheme that I proposed, that is, a per capita scheme. If such a scheme were implemented, I think that the Government's money would go to those in greatest need.

Mr HINTON (Broadsound) (4.22 p.m.): It is my pleasure to support the Minister in the presentation of his Estimates. I point out that it is the intention of the National

Party this afternoon to concentrate on the National Parks aspect of the Minister's portfolio.

I could not help but take note of the remarks of the member for Chatsworth and his apparent inability to observe the women on the Government side. It is ridiculous to suggest that the media and the Australian public have failed to recognise sportswomen when one thinks of women like Glynis Nunn who have played such a prominent role in sport. I suggest that the honourable member has not been reading the newspapers very well. The Evonne Goolagongs of this world would be rather upset to hear the honourable member's comments because the women in sport across Australia have played a very prominent role. Certainly the Australian public is very, very proud of them, even if some members of the ALP have failed to notice them.

I congratulate the Minister on the way in which he has handled his portfolio and the members of his staff, particularly those involved in the national parks area.

I commend in particular the Director of the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service, Dr Graham Saunders, who in recent times has been absent owing to illness. Everyone is very pleased to see Graham back at work. Everybody appreciates the great job that he has done. In his absence, Mr Herb Bonney, the acting director, has also done an excellent job. The members of the national parks committee, of which I am one, have been very pleased with the work that those men have done, the advice that they have given to the Government and the manner in which they have conducted the operations of the department.

I might say that the department is understaffed because of the financial constraints that have been placed upon the Government. A budget of some \$27m has made it very difficult to adequately staff the national parks throughout Queensland. The dedication, enthusiasm and effort that the staff have put into overcoming any problems is a great credit to them.

I have gone on a couple of excursions with the Minister to look at some of the national parks in Queensland. I, and no doubt my colleagues, have been greatly impressed by the dedication, enthusiasm and work that has been put into creating the national parks and maintaining them under what I believe to be fairly difficult circumstances.

National Parks is a growing portfolio, and this Government can and will have to channel greater resources out of its Budget into that area. The Minister has taken the job to heart. I am very, very impressed by the manner in which he has handled his portfolio and I once again congratulate him.

Today it is my role to give this Chamber some idea of the history up to this point in time. The year of 1975 saw the turning point in the fortunes of nature, conservation and national park administration in Queensland with the establishment of the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service, as promised by the Honourable the Premier in the run-up to the 1974 election. Much had already been achieved, but it was time for a major step forward. Cabinet approved the setting up of the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service, and the necessary legislation was passed by Parliament, received royal assent on 15 May 1975 and was proclaimed on 5 June of that year. Since that time there has been a marvellous growth throughout the service.

From the Department of Forestry the new service inherited a well-established national park ethic that saw national parks as the nation's Crown jewels. In other words, national parks are sacrosanct areas to be preserved for future generations to enjoy. The cardinal principle to be observed in the management of national parks is set out in the relevant section of the Forestry Act, which states that they "shall be the permanent preservation, to the greatest possible extent, of their natural condition." "Sacrosanct" is the key word in any consideration of national parks, and I believe that every conservation-minded person in this State—and I am one of those people—takes that to heart and wishes to see those conditions enacted. The Act required that the Conservator of Forests had to exercise his powers appropriately to achieve that objective, which he did.

From the Department of Primary Industries the new service inherited the 1974 Fauna Conservation Act, which for the first time extended protection to all species of Queensland's native birds, mammals and reptiles and made provision for new concepts of fauna refuges and reserves, as well as a proven method of kangaroo management, which was scientifically based and superior to that of any other State for the very extensive areas, the large populations, the annual harvest and the concealing habitat that pertains for so much of this range of marsupials in Queensland. I am pleased that the honourable member for Warrego is present in this Chamber this afternoon, because his electorate has a serious problem with kangaroos. I know that he supports the remarks I have made.

Mr Comben: What about Bayfield national park?

Mr HINTON: The honourable member for Windsor wants to talk about Bayfield national park and I am pleased that he has raised this matter. Last Thursday in the Yeppoon Town Hall I debated with him the future of Bayfield national park. He was very eloquent in his remarks. However, he suffered one massive flaw and one which he is still reeling from. As I pointed out at that meeting, he is a member of the permanent Opposition of this State and in that condition he is unable to achieve anything. That is where the Government has an enormous advantage and it certainly does not intend to lose that advantage. The Government has created a large number of national parks and has an unexcelled record of creating national parks across Queensland. I suggest to the honourable member that, if he looks right across Australia, there are few States that could match Queensland's record.

The Government is constantly criticised—and the honourable member for Windsor raised it last Thursday night—for not having 5 per cent of Queensland's area under national parks. In fact, it has 2 per cent. The honourable member is quite right in saying that this is similar to Victoria and Tasmania, but one must look at the topography of those two States. To a very large extent Queensland is a large and arid State and there is no point in setting aside as national parks areas out near Boulia—in the desert areas, as Western Australia has done. It serves no purpose if the national park areas are not unique. They will become breeding grounds for kangaroos and other pests if they cannot be adequately managed with the available finances.

The Government is proclaiming unique and special areas as national parks. Victoria and Tasmania have large amounts of mountainous and high-rainfall country which lend themselves to being national parks far more than many areas in Queensland. The Government is constantly criticised about its areas of rainforest. I suggest that no other State in Australia has a record as good as Queensland's. Some 53 per cent of the rainforests in Queensland are still in their original condition, and 80 per cent of those are in national parks. Probably no other State or nation could match that, except perhaps New Zealand. Opposition members need to think very, very carefully before they continue the line of criticism on which they have embarked.

I have made very clear my position on the proposed Bayfield national park. The undeclared area of some 4 600 hectares immediately north of Corio Bay that is not covered by authorities to prospect should be gazetted as national park. I believe that that will occur. Proclamation is not too far down the track. There is a great deal of support for it by Government members. Opposition members want that to happen in one day. Such things do not happen in one day. I can assure Opposition members that the area will be gazetted as national park. An unequivocal assurance has been given by both Mr Gunn and Mr Ahern that they will see to it that it becomes a national park. I believe that the majority of the members of Cabinet also support that view. The proposed Bayfield national park has some of the best beaches in Australia and some of the best melaleuca and heath areas. The area is ideally suited as a national park. In my election campaign, I promised to work for it. I am doing that, and I can assure honourable members that I will be successful in bringing that about.

I return to the record of the department that I have been asked to speak about today. The service received experienced and dedicated staff—I am talking about the Forestry Department—enthusiastic at the exciting prospect of working together to bring in a new era of service to the public and to the conservation of nature. In its first full year of operation, the fledgling service had 87 salaried staff, 84 wages staff and a budget of a little under \$2.3m. I suggest that honourable members compare that with the \$27m that is proposed today.

Mr Mackenroth: Do you mean National Parks department? You said “Forestry Department”.

Mr HINTON: I am talking about the National Parks department. I ask the honourable member to listen to what I am saying.

Eleven years and five Cabinet Ministers later, there are 249 salaried staff, 272 wages staff and a proposed budget for 1987-88, as the Estimates show, of \$27m. What have we to show for that growth? Is it justified? I believe that the answer, as I shall show, is a resounding “Yes”. The area of the service estate, the range and diversity of responsibility and the service to the public have all greatly expanded and represent a tremendous step forward.

Opposition members should listen to this—especially the bloke with the beard. At 30 June 1976, there were 299 national parks totalling 1 153 350 hectares and 53 environmental parks totalling 26 950 hectares. By 30 June 1987 the estate had almost tripled, with 3 427 268 hectares in 314 national parks and 46 368 hectares in 147 environmental parks. It must be borne in mind that to a very large extent environmental parks represent the smaller areas of a more transitory nature. The growth in the National Parks department is very rapid and one with which the Queensland Government is and should be justly proud.

In all, 16 parks were declared in 1977-78, having a total area of 935 182 hectares. That is a brilliant effort, particularly considering the amount of opposition and the amount of flak that is thrown at the Government and its National Parks department. The figures I have cited adequately demonstrate that such criticism is totally and utterly misplaced.

Lakefield national park was declared in 1979. 528 000 hectares in area, it is Queensland's largest national park, with outstanding birdlife habitat and diversity. It is one of the more important national park areas. I was very pleased to visit Lakefield national park with the Minister. I was very impressed by the dedication of the officers there. I might say that, although we spent a day there, we failed to catch a barramundi, which was a disappointment. Despite the fact that there are supposed to be many barramundi in the area, they seem to be harder to catch than one thinks.

We were very impressed by the management and the quality of the staff at that park. The Lakefield national park is a unique area that exhibits a wide diversity of capeland area. Thousands of people now travel to the cape in four-wheel-drive vehicles, and they will be able to enjoy that area for many years to come.

It has long been Government policy to secure in the national parks system as wide a representation as possible of all of the natural ecosystems of which intact samples, more or less, are found. The Lakefield national park is a particular example of that policy. That fact was reaffirmed by the Premier in last year's policy speech when he said that a further growth in national park estates will occur during the next three years, with appropriate representation from Queensland's 13 biogeographic regions.

I would like to see the establishment of another national park in the Mount Etna area of my electorate. I am sure that the honourable member for Windsor will agree with me on that. Mount Etna is a cavernous limestone phenomenon near Rockhampton. It is currently being quarried for the production of limestone for the cement plant that is owned by Central Queensland Cement at Parkhurst. As far as industry is concerned, that is a very important plant. However, as the Mount Etna Caves contain a colony of

a unique species of bent-wing bats, which, I believe, represents about 80 per cent of that species worldwide, I am concerned that the caves are in danger of being quarried by that company in years to come. Something must be done about that. I am pleased that the honourable member for Windsor and the Minister are nodding their heads in agreement. I have shown the Minister that phenomenon. I was very pleased with the courtesies that were extended to the Minister and me by the speleological society. The Minister and I inspected the area, and I assure honourable members that this Government is determined to do something about that problem.

One way of alleviating the problem would be to find alternative sources of limestone for that plant. This Government has made a commitment to industry and it does not intend to break that commitment. Therefore, alternative limestone sources must be located. An independent survey of alternative limestone sources should be undertaken. The parent company of the Rockhampton plant, namely, Central Queensland Cement and Lime, has substantial limestone deposits at Bracewell near Mount Larcom to the south. The limestone is transported as clinker to Brisbane via Gladstone. Cement is then produced at Darra at costs fairly comparable with those involved in the production of cement at Rockhampton. There are grounds for suggesting that alternative sources of limestone could be provided for that plant.

I can say without reservation that the company is not anxious to pursue this line of action, but I certainly am. An independent assessment should be made into alternative limestone sources. In that way we would learn the facts and determine whether Government assistance or other assistance is necessary to utilise alternative limestone sources for that plant, so that the plant can produce cement without endangering jobs in Rockhampton. That is very important. I give a commitment to the people of Rockhampton that there is no way that I would allow their jobs to be endangered by this particular move. I am absolutely adamant that that unique cavernous mountain, with its Resurrection Cave and its unique bat species—the little bent-wing bats and the ghost bats, which use its cavernous areas as their habitat—must be preserved. I am certainly committing myself to that course.

I congratulate the Minister on the job that he has done within his portfolio. I have been very impressed by his enthusiasm and his dedication to his job. His committee is one of the best in this National Party Government. His committee has also been suitably impressed by the job that he has done, and I hope that he keeps up the good work.

Mr COMBEN (Windsor) (4.40 p.m.): It is always interesting to follow the honourable member for Broadsound in a debate. He has a different view of conservation matters from that of the rest of the National Party voters. He also seems to have a different view of the Bayfield proposals from that of the Premier and the Cabinet. Honourable members know that the Premier proposed an environmental park in that area.

The honourable member says that he will create the Bayfield national park. However, two-thirds of it is committed to an environmental park to be given in trusteeship to Mr Iwasaki. The other two-thirds—the National Party talks about two-thirds going to Iwasaki and two-thirds going to mining leases—is committed already to mining leases.

Mr Mackenroth: That makes one and a-third.

Mr COMBEN: Yes, that makes about one and a-third. That is a typical addition of the National Party. Honourable members have already seen its additions in winning elections on minorities.

Mr Simpson: Have you lost your piece of paper?

Mr COMBEN: Yes, I have lost a piece of paper.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr COMBEN: I wish honourable members would leave me alone. My wife is in the gallery—and look what they're doing to me! If the rat pack opposite would show a little decorum, I would stick to the subject.

What I cannot understand about the Bayfield proposal is what is happening with the Iwasaki proposal in the southern parts and also what is happening in the northern areas. Why has RZ Mines (Newcastle) Pty Ltd announced recently that it has a large potential mineral deposit up there containing some 2 billion tonnes of mineral sands?

An article in the *Australian Financial Review* of 15 October 1987 states—

“A spokesman for Strategic Minerals said yesterday the detailed feasibility study would not be completed before 1989 and the joint venture partners had not determined any proven ore reserves.

He said that in view of the low grade, a large plant worth at least \$100 million would be needed to make any project viable.

‘It is only a probable reserve but we are excited at the size,’ he said.”

However, last night the Minister for Mines appeared on Statewide television saying, “There is this marvellous ore body up there. We can’t make it a national park. We have got 2 billion tonnes of pure rutile, pure mineral sand up there, and we are going to go gung-ho and we will be able to restore the area.” The truth is that there is a vague area of low-grade mineral and it will cost a great deal of money to extract it.

Why is there a mineral sands authority to prospect in that area? Four years ago, the then Minister for Mines, the Honourable Ivan Gibbs, released a special report which stated—

“Coastal land exchange means a . . . GOOD DEAL . . . for Queensland.”

It was a beautifully coloured brochure showing past relinquished mining leases, present mining leases and national parks. The Minister said of the Capricorn Coast—

“Mining leases relinquished add up to more than 7 300 hectares.

The most northerly agreement returned a 29 hectare lease near Stockyard Point, south of the military training reserve. This has been added to an extensive area of vacant Crown Land.”

On the map it shows that only one small mining lease is retained in the Bayfield national park area. It is along the coast south of Stockyard Point, almost down to Corio Bay.

That large mining lease that Strategic Minerals Corporation NL and RZ Mines (Newcastle) Pty Ltd are examining at present was not there four years ago. Suddenly we wake up—and the member for Broadsound also wakes up, because he admits in some of his local press releases that, whilst exploring the possibilities of the declaration of the national park, he discovered the mining lease. The Government has only recently granted that mining lease. It is totally contrary to what was expected in the special report in which the Mines Minister at the time said that he would be examining the potential—

Mr Hinton: That’s a misrepresentation. I discovered how big the deposit was, not the mining lease.

Mr COMBEN: The honourable member for Broadsound stated in the local press how large the mining lease was. But it was not there four years ago. Only recently has it been put up. The Government never had the intention of declaring that area a national park. It is a total con and a total misrepresentation to the people of Rockhampton. This poor innocent back-bencher seated at the back of the Chamber—this new chum who is wet behind the ears—is in actual fact being brought down—

Mr HINTON: I rise to a point of order. I ask for a retraction of that, Madam Chairman.

Mr COMBEN: Which part?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mrs Harvey): Order! The honourable member for Windsor will retract—

Mr COMBEN: Which part?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will retract whatever the member for Broadsound has asked for.

Mr COMBEN: I do not understand what he has asked for.

On a point of order—I do not understand what the honourable member has asked for. I have said that he is wet behind the ears, which is a colloquialism. There is nothing objectionable in that.

Mr HINTON: I nominate the part “wet behind the ears”, because I can see that the honourable member’s ears are absolutely dripping!

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr COMBEN: I withdraw.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr COMBEN: I withdraw.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I will not have honourable members engaging in a slanging-match by way of points of order. A point of order has been taken and the member has retracted the statement. I ask the honourable member for Windsor to proceed.

Mr COMBEN: The situation in central Queensland is that the honourable member who is naive, who has been conned by the National Party, who has gone out on a political limb and said, “I will deliver a national park”, cannot deliver.

Mr Milliner: It might be further advice from Mr Sinclair, do you think?

Mr COMBEN: In actual fact, it probably is. That is the kind of advice that the honourable member gets.

Four years ago, the previous Minister for Mines stated—

“The remaining narrow sand mining lease area along the strip of coast south of Stockyard Point contains small but high grade mineral deposits.”

A complete trick has been perpetrated upon the people of Rockhampton because, in spite of 20 years of negotiations, a mineral sands authority to prospect has been applied to that area within the last four years. It is obviously not this Government’s intention to deliver Bayfield national park. It is a total furphy. Two-thirds of it are already covered and the other third will be given to Mr Iwasaki. Where is the commitment? Where is the concern for the average person in Queensland? There is no concern.

Members of the Opposition proffer a positive alternative. We believe that the people of central Queensland deserve better treatment. We believe that the central coastal region of Queensland is an area that needs important national park projects. The length of coastline between Baffle Creek north of Bundaberg to the southern boundary of the Shoalwater Bay army reserve is 300 kilometres, if measured in a straight line. Important nature conservation, recreation and historical values exist within that coastal region. Bustard Bay was the site of the first landing in Queensland by Captain James Cook, on 23 May 1770. Sir Joseph Banks gave the first indication of the nature conservation values of that area in his journal, which states—

“We landed near the mouth of a large lagoon . . . here we found a great variety of Plants, several however the same as those we ourselves had before seen in the Islands between the tropicks and others known to be natives of the east Indies, a sure mark that we were upon the point of leaving the Southern Temperate Zone and for the future we must expect to meet the plants &c. a part of which at least have been before seen by Europeans.”

Mr Lee: Rips your heart out, doesn’t it?

Mr COMBEN: It does indeed. I am glad that I have convinced Mr Lee that he should be a conservationist. I am glad also that he is on side. The next thing will be that he will grow a beard!

This part of the Australian coastline is where northern tropical influences overlap with the subtropical environment, which leads to a wide ecological diversity. The Labor Party's alternative plan for central Queensland is to properly preserve that diversity and maintain it in a series of national parks. A series of national parks has been on the drawing-board for 10 years but has never been implemented by this Government—more particularly, never implemented by this Minister.

The recreational values of this coastal region are extensive. Future recreational demands are likely to be high from Gladstone—a rapidly expanding industrial city—Rockhampton, Bundaberg, inland towns, and from southern Queensland. These extensive nature conservation, recreation and historical values have led to large numbers of proposals for national and environmental parks being put forward over the last two decades. Conflicting with all of the major park proposals are interests of heavy mineral sand mining.

This conflict in land use has led to a paucity of parks. No other similarly industrialised or populated part of the whole eastern Australian coastline has less land reserved for nature conservation and recreation. The land-use conflicts between nature conservation and sand-mining that have occurred elsewhere on the eastern Australian coastline, for example, at Fraser Island, Myall Lakes and, currently, Moreton Island, indicate that a series of major conflicts are most likely along the central Queensland coast. That is already evidenced over the granting of some mining leases at Agnes Water and now, of course, at the proposed Bayfield national park.

It is contended that the escalation of those land-use conflicts along the central Queensland coast will not be in the best interests of both nature conservation and mining. Such land-use conflicts are likely to prevent the finalisation of park proposals and, therefore, the preservation and management of important areas for nature conservation. Furthermore, they will cause extensive adverse public reaction to mining and, in some cases, to the conservation needs.

The aim of what the Opposition is proposing is to determine a conservation strategy whilst being cognisant of mining and other land uses. Such a conservation strategy necessitates the development of a series of probably compromised solutions between nature conservation and mining. What is different between the Labor Party's proposals and those of this Government—

Mr Lee: Don't miss all those pages.

Mr COMBEN: I just did. They have got long words in them.

The difference between the Labor Party's proposals and those of the State Government is that the Labor Party will in fact implement its proposals and will look at the conservation and recreational values. It seems to us on this side of the Chamber that this Government has only one eye.

Mr Muntz: You can't do that in the Opposition.

Mr COMBEN: We can do it from the Minister's side of the Chamber.

Mr Muntz: You will be there for ever and ever.

Mr COMBEN: We will do it from the Minister's side, and we will be doing it shortly.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr COMBEN: Are you keeping any control?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mrs Harvey): Order! The member for Windsor will not reflect on the Chair by telling the Chair how to do the job.

Mr COMBEN: I did not tell the occupant of the chair how to do the job; I just asked her if she was doing it.

As Minister for environment and planning in a Labor Government, I can inform the Minister that my door will always be open to him, as I know that he will not bring any hard problems in to me, because he is never interested in the hard problems or the hard solutions that are necessary in the conservation area.

What the Labor Party is proposing is that there be a number of major conservation areas that will be reserved and that major national parks be created at Deepwater, Eurimbula, Rodd's Peninsula, Curtis Island and Bayfield. A number of small environmental parks of local importance will also be proposed and will be implemented by a Labor Government. The difference between approaches is that the Labor Government will have an overall strategy, for both State development and State conservation. That way, both sides to the argument will be able to say, "Yes, this is where we are going. We know that we can go and have a mining exploration lease in that area and we are not suddenly going to be taken on by the State Government, by the State Opposition and by the conservation movement." The conservation groups will also know that they will have a major input into major proposals for national parks along that coast.

Mr Lee: Whose side are you on?

Mr COMBEN: I am on the side of the conservationist, common sense, rational economic development and conservation strategic planning.

The proposals that the Labor Party will put forward will be implemented. The Opposition believes that there has to be a regional strategic plan in that area so that it can go ahead and so that the mining-developers will know what they are doing. It will be known that there will be economic development for the towns between Bundaberg and Rockhampton, but at the same time there will be sufficient conservation for conservation groups and those interested in conservation recreation, and there will be recreational areas as well.

It is a major proposal. It is still being refined. The Labor Party looks forward to launching it very shortly in Rockhampton—in actual fact, in the Broadsound electorate—to show people that the Labor Party can come up with alternative proposals and important proposals which are major items for discussion in Queensland.

Mr Hinton: You can come up. I would love the publicity.

Mr COMBEN: I thought the honourable member would love the publicity. I loved the votes on the night that I got the numbers up there. The public meeting was attended by 200 people; there were five members from the honourable member's branch and the other 195 supported everything I said.

In the short time left to me I wish to raise a couple of other matters and say something about the general administration of national parks in this State and the general standard of the average field and administrative officer in the National Parks and Wildlife Service. In the field I have always found a great courtesy, efficiency and commitment from the officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service who run the State's national parks. They are the front people of the service.

I also convey a word of commendation to Dr Saunders. As has already been said by the member for Broadsound, Mr Hinton, Dr Saunders has recently had a spot of illness and we are very pleased to see him back in harness. I am sorry that he is not here this afternoon. I did go over to say "Good day" to him but I found that he was not there. I ask the officers present today to pass on our best wishes and congratulations to him for being back on deck. He does an excellent job for the Minister. He is an excellent public servant whom we in the Opposition look forward to working with in the very near future.

In the four minutes left to me I wish to raise a few matters about the issue of rainforests, about which much has been heard. There has been a lot of scare-mongering,

misinformation, fear tactics and, at times, pure lies. It is time that the debate was returned to one of truth and rationality. I shall answer one or two of the matters that have at times been raised by the Minister about World Heritage listing.

Mr Muntz: Is Mr Eaton going to support these comments?

Mr COMBEN: Mr Eaton will certainly be supporting these comments because we on this side have a policy into which both Mr Eaton and I have had an input and on which we both agree. The one thing that we have always agreed on, even during our periods of minor disagreement, is that the National Party is not presenting a rational argument and that it is misusing and misstating the facts.

In the *Courier-Mail* of 26 August this year the Minister said that the listing "would throw 1 200 people out of work and eventually cause local economies in the areas involved to crash". On 21 August this year in the *Cairns Post* the Minister is reported as saying—

"The listing . . . is a wilful waste of job opportunities and present employment for North Queenslanders—3 000 in fact—and thousands more when we look at what will be stifled in the tourist and timbers industry."

On the same day in the *Australian Financial Review* the number had increased again. This time it was 6 000. The article stated that the listing "would claim 6000 jobs through its effect on industry". Four days apart and there is mention of 1 200 jobs, 3 000 jobs, 3 500 jobs and 6 000 jobs. The Minister cannot even be consistent.

Mr Eaton: They pushed the wrong buttons on the calculator.

Mr COMBEN: Yes, he pushes the wrong buttons. He just puts a few noughts in there.

Mr Gygar: The situation was getting worse day by day.

Mr COMBEN: It certainly was, according to the Minister. There were a whole range of problems.

Mr Muntz: I am concerned for the people of north Queensland.

Mr COMBEN: The Minister may be concerned about the people of north Queensland but he has never let the facts get in the way of a good argument. It is a good headline—6 000 jobs. The facts are that in north Queensland at the present time about 650 jobs are on the line.

Mr Muntz: Try to sell that in north Queensland.

Mr COMBEN: The Minister will have the research any day now that will prove that.

The Federal Government is out there trying to minimise the destruction, guaranteeing many of these people jobs and guaranteeing that there will be a good package of compensation. Where was this Government with its compensation package when over the last five years hundreds of jobs have been lost in the timber industry? Not one penny of compensation! Yet now the Queensland Government is demanding \$100m for that area to compensate for the loss of 650 jobs that we on this side of the Chamber are committed to keeping. The Minister is a hypocrite and he is deceitful in what he has been saying to the people of north Queensland.

Mr MUNTZ: I rise to a point of order. I find the remarks offensive and I ask the member to withdraw them.

Mr FitzGerald: They are unparliamentary.

Mr MUNTZ: Yes, they are unparliamentary and I ask him to withdraw them.

Mr COMBEN: I withdraw.

What I am saying is that the Minister's comments about the Federal Government's compensation package are totally incorrect.

Time expired.

Mr HENDERSON (Mount Gravatt) (5 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to support the Minister in the presentation of his Estimates.

It is always interesting to follow the honourable member for Windsor. Of all the members of the Opposition who are closely identified with the conservation movement, the honourable member for Windsor is the most closely identified. In fact, he is even starting to look like a boobook owl. I think that is tremendous.

The simile is probably not complete because obviously the honourable member would lack the wisdom of an owl. I will give the honourable member for Windsor a bit of advice. If he is going to go home tonight and lose any sleep or chew his nails about Bayfield national park, I suggest that he will be wasting his time. If the honourable member is at all concerned about Bayfield national park, I would simply suggest that he settle down because it is in very capable hands indeed. The matter is being very capably looked after. I can assure the honourable member of that.

Mr Comben: Will it be declared?

Mr HENDERSON: It is being very, very capably looked after.

I found it very interesting that in his speech the honourable member for Broadsound made some reference to the bent-wing bat. As a Queenslander, I would be more than disappointed if the bent-wing bat cleft at Mount Etna were not preserved. Like the honourable member for Broadsound, I personally would not tolerate the destruction of that bat cleft.

Madam Chair, recently I was wandering uptown and I noticed that quite a deal of construction is going on in Brisbane——

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mrs Harvey): Order! I advise the member for Mount Gravatt that the correct term of address is "Madam Chairman".

Mr HENDERSON: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

As I was saying, I was wandering uptown and I noticed boarding around some of the building sites in the city. Being a rather inquisitive individual, I had a little peek through the holes in the walls, and I noticed a number of people——

Mr Lee: What did you see?

Mr HENDERSON: It was very interesting——

Mr Mackenroth: He's been running around, peeping in little holes.

Mr HENDERSON: When one gets to my condition in life, one gets no other kicks out of life and that is what one has to do——

Mr Mackenroth: Your condition or your age? Tell us what you mean.

Mr HENDERSON: The honourable member can interpret it in whichever way he wants.

I noticed buildings in the process of construction. It seems to me that four steps are involved in constructing a building. First of all there is a vision, a tremendously exciting concept. The next step is the laying of the foundations. Then people are employed to construct the building, and finally it is built. I believe that the history of the National Parks and Wildlife Service places it into those categories.

I want to pay a particular compliment to four people. First of all, I will examine the vision stage. Honourable members have already heard from the member for Broadsound how much national parks have grown over the last 12 years. I pay a compliment

to the honourable member for Cunningham for his efforts when he was the Minister responsible for national parks, tourism, sport and the arts. Tony Elliott really did an excellent job. It was while he was Minister that the real vision for national parks in this State started to emerge.

Then the stage was reached at which the foundations were laid. I place on record my admiration for the Honourable Peter McKechnie. At a very difficult period he had the job, as the responsible Minister, of really laying the foundations of a solid and effective National Parks and Wildlife Service in this State. It was to the great credit of Peter McKechnie that that was done, and done effectively. Of course, in doing that he had to get together a group of competent professionals.

I believe that the National Parks Association and the National Parks and Wildlife Service in this State consist of some of the best people to be found anywhere in Australia.

Finally the stage is reached at which all the bits and pieces have to be put together. It is like a jigsaw puzzle. It is to the great credit of the present Minister that he is doing that in a very, very capable manner.

I can stand in this Parliament and say again to the honourable member for Windsor that I have no doubt whatsoever about the future of the proposed Bayfield national park, and that confidence arises from the fact that there is a competent Minister in charge of that area. Determination wins the day and there is a fair amount of determination on the Government benches.

In taking this opportunity to speak in this Estimates debate, I wish to bring to the notice of members certain activities relating to the management of some of Queensland's most beautiful natural areas. This is an exciting story and is really tremendously interesting. I again pay a compliment to the current Minister who has presided over this story. Members will be aware of the current moves by the Federal Labor Government to once again interfere in areas that are legitimately a State Government responsibility. I refer to the callous and poorly-planned attempt to have vast areas of north Queensland listed on the World Heritage List. I say "callous" because this plan shows scant regard for the families and businesses that currently draw their livelihood from the careful management of rainforests in the north. It is poorly planned because, apart from failing to take any notice of the feelings and attitudes of north Queenslanders, the Federal Government has shown a distinct lack of understanding of the current conservation policies of the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Queensland Forestry Department, which already manage these areas very effectively. I stress that point. I am certain that the honourable member for Mourilyan would agree that these two services are very effective. I can see the honourable member agrees because he is nodding his head. These two services manage north Queensland very effectively.

Without dwelling on the issues in north Queensland, I would like to warn members that Queensland faces the same threat in the southern part of the State. It is my opinion that the north Queensland World Heritage listing fiasco is only the tip of the iceberg. I believe that the Federal Labor Government plans to declare other areas in the future, such as the great sandy region which incorporates Moreton Island and Fraser Island. I categorically declare my total opposition to any move to make such a declaration over these areas. Apart from the gross invasion of the legitimate rights of States which are incorporated in such actions, it is also totally unnecessary. It is clear to me that the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Queensland Forestry Department in the case of Fraser Island and the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service in the case of Moreton Island are quite capable of carrying out their legitimate management roles on these islands and have the track record to prove it.

Mr Ardill: After the sand-miners have ripped the guts out of places like Blue Lagoon.

Mr HENDERSON: The honourable member for Salisbury knows so much about conservation that he believes the "conservation" is where one goes to study for a music degree.

By example I refer to the current management arrangements on Fraser Island. Up until 1986 no charge was levied on visitors to Fraser Island. Costs were continually escalating in an effort to develop facilities on the island up to the level expected by the public. Litter was a continuing problem for both the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service and Forestry Department staff, whose efforts—although not in vain—were certainly not enough to meet the ever-increasing demand placed on them by the public.

With the establishment of the Fraser Island Recreation Board—it is interesting to note the debate in this Parliament on the Bill to establish that board and the attitude of the Opposition, who opposed it almost every inch of the way and who have since been proved to be totally and utterly wrong—the dual management presence of both the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Forestry Department officers and the implementation of entry and camping fees, the public has witnessed a transformation of Fraser Island.

Mr Milliner: When was the last time you were there?

Mr HENDERSON: I was there just recently.

Mr Milliner: How long ago?

Mr HENDERSON: To have a look at the camping grounds.

New camping grounds have been established with offices built to cater for the needs of the public; general facilities have been upgraded; new roads pushed through and some existing roads boarded to make the island far more accessible; a new information centre has been established at Rainbow Beach; housing and communication for staff based on the island has improved; and litter and rubbish removal has been addressed with the placement of wire bins and rubbish trailers along the beach. Local staff carried out that work and additional employment was created. With the support of this Government, all this has been achieved with one objective in mind: to allow access and recreation opportunities to those members of the public who request it but at a modest price so as to effectively manage and preserve this most unique natural reserve for many hundreds of years to come.

Yet again I place on record the fact that it is to the greatest credit of the Honourable Peter McKechnie, the Honourable Geoff Muntz and the Honourable Bill Glasson that this has been achieved. I think that it is a marvellous achievement and one of which this Government can feel very, very proud. It will certainly be of benefit to the people of Queensland.

While I am paying compliments, I think that it is also worth while pointing out the role played by the Minister for Education, the Honourable Lin Powell. I admire the fact that the Minister has "Fraser Island" almost written on the walls of his heart. He has an abiding interest in Fraser Island. When a champion like Lin Powell is prepared to stand up and fight for Fraser Island, I can assure honourable members that it is in good hands indeed.

Mr Gygar: He's fouling up education because he's spending too much time on Fraser Island.

Mr HENDERSON: The honourable member would be a typical product of some education system, and his ignorance is exceeded only by the fact that he knows nothing.

Another hallmark of the Fraser Island scheme was the level of local involvement in the planning and implementation of the scheme. I understand that every effort was made to take into account the views and desires of local residents, businessmen and business women and visitors to the island. Once again our Federal colleagues could learn from this example.

Mr Gygar: Go to the bottom of the next page.

Mr HENDERSON: Again the honourable member keeps interrupting. With his Rambo attitude to most things, he would probably picture Fraser Island as the location for a game of Skirmish. That would probably be the extent of his interest.

Sure, when these charges were introduced the visitation numbers fell substantially—but this is not unique. I am informed that when similar charges were introduced in the United States, a similar phenomenon occurred but now visitation figures have surpassed the initial figures and are continually growing because upgraded and additional facilities are being made available through these increased collections.

Mr Milliner: Have you got a song and dance act, because the comedy is not very good.

Mr HENDERSON: I am most disappointed in the honourable member because I always thought that he appreciated a good show even if they are the ones that I look at through the holes in hoardings.

Mr Milliner: I do, but this leaves a lot to be desired.

Mr HENDERSON: The honourable member seems to be enjoying it.

The same is happening at Fraser Island. Already, visitation figures are rising and are approaching those that occurred prior to the introduction of these charges.

Mr Lee: A very serious question: where do you stand on Toohey Park? Do you want it cut up or don't you?

Mr HENDERSON: Just leave it up to us. The honourable member should not worry about it. I keep telling him that he should not worry about it. It is in capable hands.

The present visitation figures are indeed a grand effort and one which should not go unnoticed.

It has now been decided that Moreton Island access and camping should proceed along similar lines. I fully support that notion and encourage the Minister to push ahead with this proposal as well. Approximately 98 per cent of Moreton Island is national park and, to preserve this important sand island, a close management presence is vital. The management model now being developed provides the legislative authority to manage Moreton Island for the benefit of all visitors. I emphasise that it is for the benefit of all visitors. It provides control of development of facilities and over the various roads and public facilities already on the island. It also provides a control over the activities of undesirable elements who can make life unpleasant for both residents and visitors alike. I have no doubt that the outstanding transformation of Fraser Island can be duplicated on Moreton Island, under similar management guide-lines.

These examples are similar to others throughout Queensland where the State Government, pursuing its proper and legitimate role, is capably managing areas of significant conservation value. The Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service, as Queensland's nature conservation authority, I believe employs highly experienced and competent staff who have an outstanding record of achievement. I am confident that the conservation needs of Queensland are quite safe in the hands of the Honourable the Minister and his officers.

I believe that we can rely on a balanced approach to conservation problems, and a continuing expansion of the national park estate in accordance with a rational and scientifically sound model. There is no need for Federal Government involvement in Queensland management of the natural environment. If it is like everything else that the Federal Government does, it would probably ruin it anyway.

It gives me a great deal of pride to support the Minister. I wish him all the very best in the future. We have set ourselves on a most exciting path indeed, and I am very proud to be a part of it.

Hon. W. D. LICKISS (Moggill) (5.15 p.m.): I congratulate the national parks authority. The first national park was declared in Queensland in 1908. That was at Witches Well, which covers 324 acres of Tamborine Mountain. That area was proclaimed as a national park under the State Forests and National Park Act on 29 March 1908. Since then this State has come a long way in setting aside land for national parks. In doing so, it is running into problems as to who should really control those lands.

Before I discuss regional planning in relation to national parks, I turn as well to environmental parks. When considering the question of how land—which is the basis of all national parks and all lands, for that matter—is held in relation to Commonwealth/State relations, I firstly pay tribute to the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, Dr Graham Saunders. I have only just learnt that, of late, Dr Saunders has been anything but well. Together with my Liberal Party colleagues, I wish him a speedy recovery. He is an excellent officer who has done a marvellous job for Queensland by introducing cohesion into the national parks situation. Queensland cannot afford to do without the services of a person of his calibre. I wish him a very speedy recovery and hope that he will soon return to very good health.

The question of setting aside land for national parks is really a question of land status. The World Heritage listing of north Queensland rainforests is an example of how the Commonwealth Government, not having the constitutional authority to do what it is trying to do, is seeking devious means by which to achieve control over what is virtually land that is held in the realm of the State.

Land in Australia is held under two categories. It is all held under the realm. It is a question of which realm is used to hold it. Under the Constitution, the Commonwealth has power to hold land, but it can only hold land for a purpose for which it can legislate. The setting aside of national parks and environmental parks, the alienation of land for development, subdivision or any other purpose is not the role of the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth has rather narrow powers in relation to the purposes for which it can legislate, and thus the purposes for which it can hold land. By virtue of the Commonwealth Lands Acquisition Act it can obtain land for its own purposes. Under those conditions, the land must be acquired by the Commonwealth on just terms.

The Commonwealth Government is trying to find a devious method by which it can override the States to control the lands of the States. That is really what the so-called World Heritage listing is all about. A foreign power can enter into a treaty with the Commonwealth Government. Under the Commonwealth's foreign affairs powers, the Commonwealth can legislate for that purpose and can therefore direct how land shall be held and how land shall or shall not be dealt with. That is a very devious means. Under the Constitution, it was never intended that that power should be given to the Commonwealth. I am not only blaming the present Commonwealth Government but also previous Commonwealth Governments, which have done exactly the same thing. Governments seem to become power happy when they get to Canberra. They defy the purposes of the Constitution, which is federalism; a diverse and even spreading of powers between the States and the Commonwealth and not a concentration of all powers in Canberra.

All honourable members are aware of the intervention of the Commonwealth in the Franklin Dam project in Tasmania. The Commonwealth also used its powers to set aside land for Aboriginal purposes. I believe that it is virtually the right of all States to look after their own Aboriginal people.

Aboriginals in this State are no different from Greeks or any other race of people. However, until the Constitution was amended by referendum, the Commonwealth did not have the power to legislate for the Aboriginal inhabitants of this State. All it did was to bring the Aboriginal inhabitants of this State and in Australia into line with all of the other races of people in Australia. The amendment does not give them special powers to legislate for those people any more than it gives them special powers to legislate for any other race or class of persons in Australia. The Federal Government is

emphasising its determination to gather power in the hands of the centralised Government in Canberra. Therefore, it is not passing strange to see that in an endeavour to grant the Northern Territory Statehood it alienated approximately 50 per cent of the Territory under Commonwealth law, and not "State" law. That is against the spirit of the Constitution and against the spirit of federalism.

All the Federal Government is doing in north Queensland is saying, "We are going to list this on a World Heritage basis and, if we do that, of course, we have the power to make laws and then we will control you whichever way you go." That is morally wrong and it is about time that the people of Australia woke up to the fact that, if they want a federation in Australia, they have to fight for it. That land comes under the realm of the State of Queensland, not under the realm of the Commonwealth of Australia.

The sooner that those divisions are recognised and made and people are made aware of what is taking place in Australia, the sooner we will get back to a system that will disperse powers as envisaged by the Federal Constitution, that is, the Commonwealth having certain constitutional powers and the States having the residual powers as sovereign powers in their own right.

Having said that, I deplore the intervention of the Commonwealth into north Queensland. It is morally wrong and constitutionally wrong. The Federal Government is using gimmick means to control the State. The people of Queensland and Australia ought to wake up to that gimmick. If it can happen in Queensland, it can happen in every other State—it already has in some States. Of course, by its intervention, the Federal Government is making an absolute mess of the Northern Territory. The way that the Northern Territory is going, it will never become a State. When I was a Minister, I pointed that out to the people of the Territory. I have since been invited back to present papers on the Statehood of the Northern Territory. On the last occasion I presented a paper, it was very well received because what I said previously has now come to fruition.

In paying a tribute to the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service, I say to the Government that, although on the one hand it has to set up national parks within the 13 terrestrial regions, as they are called, it also has to set some land aside for future generations. It is egotistical of us in our generation to say that we are going to determine the whole future of Queensland down to the nth degree. Future generations will want to make decisions on how they will deal with the development of land. The Government has a right to develop the land to the extent that is required of it in this State. It does not have a right to cause urban sprawl and set up something in one place and something in another place that is unrelated. In our approach to the future, we should look at things not only on an urban or town-planning basis and contain ourselves in that regard and economise on the use of land, but we should also be looking at regional concepts.

The development of Moreton Bay is not a matter solely for greater Brisbane, or the Redcliffe City Council, or the Gold Coast City Council or any other council that borders on it, it is a matter for the consideration of the whole region. To develop and plan the area properly is a multidisciplinary activity. The Brisbane forest park impinges on a number of shires and municipalities. In years to come, perhaps in the year 2000, who is to say that some of that park will not be required for another purpose? It should be set aside in a virtually undeveloped form and managed and controlled within a regional concept for future generations. That is what conservation and proper planning are all about.

Many of Queensland's national parks are set aside and reserved virtually for future generations, because we do not know what the requirements of future generations will be.

Mr Lee: We have wanted regional planning for years.

Mr LICKISS: In fact, we had regional planning. I claim that I was responsible for having it introduced into an Act supervised by the Co-ordinator-General. It was unfortunate that in Whitlam's time, because of the advent of the Department of Urban and

Regional Development, this State panicked. That Commonwealth department was a political move to try to by-pass State Governments completely, to weaken them entirely, and to set up regional administrative councils in Australia with administrative powers and delegated authority from the central Government. That was the Whitlam idea, which would have been carried out by Mr Uren.

Unfortunately for the Commonwealth, because Queensland had regional planning and because 10 regions had already been established, the Federal Government had to adopt Queensland's regions. That frustrated its efforts. Rather than getting rid of regional planning, because certain people found it inconvenient to administer, it should have been strengthened. The regional concept of planning that had been established in Queensland was Queensland's only saving grace during the period of the Whitlam Government. Queensland beat the Whitlam Government at every move, and kept control. The Queensland Government would have lost control if the Department of Urban and Regional Development, under the direction of Mr Uren, had set up its regional councils to finance local authorities and by-pass the States. The Whitlam Government was well on the way towards doing that.

It was a mistake to abandon regional planning. What the Queensland Government should be doing is introducing regional planning into Queensland on a very rational basis; otherwise, a great deal of piecemeal development will take place. One might ask what the National Parks and Wildlife Service has to do with regional planning because national parks are where they should be by virtue of the type of terrain, the type of land, the type of environment, the type of animal-life and the type of vegetation that can be found in a certain area. The answer is that as soon as it is known what the resources are, a region is designated; therefore, development occurs around those resources and they can be adequately protected. Who would decide to undertake development of a kind that has occurred in Queen Street without a plan for that development? The larger the scale of development, the more planning that is necessary.

I would like to see national parks, environmental parks and land which is used only partially at this stage of Queensland's development put aside and properly incorporated into regional plans. Unless transport and everything else is incorporated into a regional concept, Queensland is heading for disaster. Time is running out. I certainly think that a move in that direction should be made right now.

Much has been said about national parks. National parks are set up under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1975-84 and are protected by that Act. Specific protection is provided by the recently gazetted National Parks Regulations. It seems passing strange that the National Parks and Wildlife Service is given authority to manage national parks; yet environmental parks, although differing in some respects, are virtually in the same category in terms of setting land aside for a specific purpose, with minor—not intensive—development allowed. They are set up under the Land Act 1962-85.

The catch-22 situation that the Government found itself in when it attempted to set up Bayfield national park was that an environmental park was to have been set up under the trusteeship of Mr Iwasaki. The Government suddenly found that it had to back off because one of the conditions applying to establishment of an environmental park is that mining tenures cannot be granted in respect of the land. If a mining tenure is already granted in respect of the land, the Government would have no option but to exclude that area from an environmental park. The Government in fact had no option; it had to back off because it was unable to proceed with the establishment of the environmental park, as it would lock up the area to exclude any mining tenure.

Another important factor in the establishment of an environmental park is that a trusteeship can be given either to a local authority or to a private person. If a trusteeship were given to a private person, the next set of problems to be overcome would arise from that person's right to make by-laws. The State Government would have no control over those by-laws. The granting of a trusteeship to a private person would mean that people could virtually be prevented from going across the land, except under certain

conditions. Therefore, the citizens of Australia would be subject to restrictive conditions—not imposed by a Government but by a private person.

I make a plea to this Government to place environmental parks under the control of the National Parks and Wildlife Service and establish them under the National Parks and Wildlife Act. It is ridiculous to have various pieces of legislation and regulations that all mean the same thing coming under different heads of administration when the specialist department for dealing with such matters is the National Parks and Wildlife Service. Environmental parks are not a Lands Department matter. The Department of Lands deals with Crown tenure. I therefore strongly recommend that environmental parks be taken out of the control of the Minister for Lands and placed in the control of the Minister for National Parks.

Again I have much pleasure in congratulating the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service. An excellent job is being done by Dr Graham Saunders and his staff. By having regional planning that fitted in with other regional plans, they could be helped in that job and, in the case of environmental parks, multidisciplinary activities and multidisciplinary professional expertise could be utilised to help that development. National parks should be always kept under the control of either the local authority or the Crown and not given to private people in trusteeship. That is extremely dangerous. If it is done, people's heritage is being given away.

I have confined my comments to national parks, environmental parks, the history of land tenure and the way in which the Commonwealth has to be excluded from buying into something which does not concern it. This State is able adequately to manage its own estate, and the estate of Queensland comes under the realm of the State of Queensland, not under the realm of the Commonwealth.

As I mentioned before, the Commonwealth has rights to acquire land for the purpose for which it can legislate. Recently, with all the hullabaloo from the Minister for Justice, I found it passing strange to hear some of the remarks that were made about the lighthouse up the coast. Quite frankly, the money was paid over, the equity was established and the Commonwealth owned the land. The question was that the State had not given title. I was quite amazed that the Minister, who is a qualified solicitor, knew so little about the conveyance of land and the question of land tenure.

The Commonwealth has its role to play. It can acquire land. Even if freehold title, which is the best title that can be given to land in Queensland, is given to land, the Crown reserves certain rights. A peppercorn rental is reserved, as are mineral and petroleum rights. It has been the practice that when the Commonwealth has acquired land in this State for the purpose for which it can make laws, the State transfers to the Commonwealth the residual right to minerals and everything else, and the Commonwealth then has absolute rights. It is a question of Government's straightening out the land tenure system, knowing where it is going and certainly not making silly statements about whether in fact the Commonwealth owns the lighthouse site or not. That was a ridiculous statement and it only lessened the opinion of others about the State's administration and Commonwealth/State relations.

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Condamine) (5.33 p.m.): I am pleased to join in this debate. I would like to make some comments about the contribution made by the member for Moggill. I was interested to hear all of his comments, but in particular those criticising the Federal Government for intervening in States' rights and saying that it is counter to the idea of federalism. I would only hope that he could convey those same feelings to John Howard, the Leader of the Federal Opposition. It will be recalled that when John Howard was in north Queensland he was reported as saying that he supported not only sustained-yield logging but also World Heritage listing. An article in *Mareeba's Tablelands Advertiser* of 21 October stated—

“What great latitudes being the Leader of the Opposition affords both State and Federal politicians.

Take little Johnny Howard's visit 'a la World Heritage Listing' last week.

Remember Johnny, he came up to save the tin industry, lose an election and then fade into oblivion . . . until last week.

True to Australian opposition government form, Little Johnny put a foot in both camps when he said that he supported the World Heritage listing and sustained yield logging.

I'll bet his party advisers told him that having a foot either side of the fence would ensure more votes than backing a particular side of the WHL argument."

I am pleased to see that the member for Moggill has his foot on one side of the fence, namely the side of the sovereign rights of Queensland.

I would like to make a couple of comments about the contribution made by the member for Windsor. I have noted in various addresses that he has made in this place that he is very devoted to the cause of the environment—full stop. I would advise him that a responsible Government, such as that in Queensland, certainly considers the environment to be vitally important. However, other matters must also be considered. That being the case, the Government will come up with the right decision in relation to any part of Queensland that needs to be conserved. At the present time the honourable member's interest is in the Bayfield national park. He speculated that a definite decision has already been made about that. Certainly discussions have taken place in Cabinet but as yet no definite decision has been made. However, I can assure the honourable member that the right decision will be made, having regard to all things that must be considered.

Of course, that only highlights the policy in Queensland, and now I wish to highlight some of the great advantages that we in Queensland have when it comes to setting up national parks and conserving wildlife. It has been claimed by the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service that this State has the greatest range of climatic regions of any State in Australia, it has the greatest range of land types and it has the greatest range of flora and fauna in Australia. That is simply because Queensland has such a large land mass and a long coastline.

The service has identified 13, what it calls, biogeographic regions, and I will list some of them to give the Committee some idea of the range of land types and regions. There are the mulga lands of south-west Queensland, the sandstone and gorge country of central Queensland, the channel country, the brigalow belt stretching from the Darling Downs up through central Queensland and in behind Bowen, the Mitchell grass plains around Longreach and Hughenden, the tropical wetlands around Ingham, the tropical rainforests, the subtropical rainforests in the southern part of the State—I even have one of those at the Bunya Mountains in my electorate—the sand dunes along the coast—the member for Mount Gravatt spoke about the great sand dune area from Moreton Island right up to Fraser Island and there are the sand dunes at Shelburne Bay on Cape York Peninsula—the Great Barrier Reef and also the open forest country that I imagine is pretty well represented in areas around the Gulf of Carpentaria and on Cape York Peninsula.

Under the direction of the Government, the National Parks and Wildlife Service is doing a great job in identifying the location of these various regions. Having identified them, it then very carefully selects an area that will preserve as much of the general variety of nature in the State. That is a pretty important thing to do. It is one thing to go out, buy a huge area of land and lock it up, but that is not a very good use of money. It is far more efficient to use what capital the State has to buy an area of land that best represents and best conserves and preserves all the various types of flora, fauna, and landscape.

I am told that in the parks that have been set aside in the four regions from the Cape York Peninsula south to the wet tropical coast around Ingham and Gordonvale, to the central coast around Mackay and in south-east Queensland, the National Parks and Wildlife Service now has represented 80 per cent of the total diversity of nature. That is a pretty good record.

Another thing to be considered when choosing the site of a national park is its proximity to the centres of population. A perusal of a map of Queensland with the location of the State's national parks and environmental parks shows they are scattered right along the east coast of Queensland, including areas of lesser population. But it is important that there be many national parks that can be reached by day trippers from the centres of population. That enables people from all over the State to take advantage of this form of recreation. That is not the case in all of the States of Australia. A perusal of the maps of the other States of Australia shows that South Australia and Western Australia have locked up an enormous area of land per head of population. Although those States have about 10 acres per person as national parks, much of it is remote desert and in places remote from the centres of population. That sort of thing must be kept in mind.

I am aware that Queensland has more to do in this field. In the presentation of his Estimates the Minister said that the service is planning to get something that is representative of the mulga country of south-west Queensland. I must confess to a certain amount of ignorance of this. Until a couple of years ago I had never been through the mulga country. When I drove through it I commented to some officers that there were miles and miles of that country and that it was not very difficult at all to conserve it. However, I was advised that the greater percentage of the mulga country of south-west Queensland is not in its natural state. Honourable members would be aware that many graziers bulldoze the mulga or lop it to feed their stock. What I thought was natural mulga country was in fact stuff that had been severely modified by mankind.

In areas further out there are huge mulga trees over 100 years old towering 30 and 40 feet. I have not yet seen them but I am told that that is the sort of thing that needs to be preserved. Officers of the service have been out in the country looking at those areas. They will not make a hasty decision. I understand that by selecting an area that represents 3.1 per cent of that sort of region they can in fact lock up 92 per cent of all the varieties of nature, be it flora, fauna or land types, that are represented in the mulga country. I commend the department for having the common sense to go out there, take a close look at the land, survey it properly and identify what needs to be done.

It is true to say that occasionally there has been opposition to national parks. Earlier this year I accompanied the Minister on a trip to the Carnarvon Gorge and was made aware of the good-neighbour policy. Some people hold the opinion that national parks are completely ignored and therefore harbour all sorts of vermin, making it undesirable to live beside them.

One evening when I was at the Carnarvon Gorge all the local graziers converged on the lodge and met with the Minister and his departmental officers. They talked about their good-neighbour policy and straightened things out. Since that time I have become aware that the same policy is followed in the Bunya Mountains region. People live on freehold land on the Bunya Mountains and others live just below the mountains. Those people gather together and, in an advisory capacity, talk with the officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. They seem to be quite happy that this good-neighbour policy should continue.

The people who live in the mulga country have to be convinced that a similar policy will work out there. Some of the properties are running one sheep to 20 or 40 acres, and there are not many men on the ground. They are frightened of dingoes and other pests, including pigs, that are found in mulga country. Once the Government is able to sell the policy to the people—and "sell" is the important point—it will be able to buy the 3.1 per cent of that land that contains 92 per cent of the total diversity of nature found in that type of country.

I was interested to read a recent address by Dr Graham Saunders in which he spoke about national parks and conservation matters in Queensland. He made reference to the role of the Commonwealth Government. The Federal Minister responsible for this area is now John Brown. The previous Minister was Barry Cohen. Graham Saunders made the comment that, really, the role of the Commonwealth Government is to provide

capital funds so that pieces of land in the various States can be acquired and the States can control those pieces of land. Then the money in the State reserves can be used to develop national parks. As it happens, in recent times that has not been the case. In fact, the National Parks and Wildlife Service had to bid at open auction for a piece of land that it wanted to lock away for conservation purposes. It cost \$2m, and that was \$2m that could have been used to develop national parks.

Mr Lee: They touched them for \$2m.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: One could put it that way, yes. It was certainly a waste of public money.

It is important that the public should be able to use the whole of a national park. From time to time the comment has been made that much of the national parks remains unseen and untouched, yet small parts of the parks are being destroyed by overuse. That happened at the Bunya Mountains national park. Discussions were held and an attempt was made to draw up new plans, to select new camping sites, to reduce the size of one major camp site and to put more sites in the park. That works. The limitation, of course, is money. The Government has been spending its money to acquire more Queensland land before it is taken up under other tenure. Hopefully there may be a change of heart on the part of the Federal Government. Now that a good representation of the various areas of Queensland has been set aside, they should be opened up so that people can have access to them.

In the course of my research I came across a book that contained some interesting facts. The book is called *Nature Conservation Reserves in Australia (1986)* by Mr C. J. Mobbs. The book lists all the nature conservation reserves in Australia. It also points out that all the States, the Commonwealth and the Northern Territory have their own legislation covering national parks. In the Northern Territory there are national parks controlled by the Federal Government and national parks controlled by the Northern Territory Government. It is interesting that the Queensland Government was the first Government to put the word "environmental" in a departmental paper and in legislation. The book to which I have referred made interesting reading. It lists all the different types of parks, ranging through national parks, conservation reserves, historical sites, recreation areas and game reserves.

Each State has its own particular range of parks and sets different kinds of conditions. It seems to me, after perusing the book, that the highest-ranking park in terms of pure conservation and strict control is the national park. I have some very interesting figures on the numbers of national parks in the various States of Australia. New South Wales has 66; the Northern Territory has 7, which combines the Australian Government national parks and the Northern Territory parks; Queensland has 304; Victoria has 30; South Australia has 12; Western Australia has 55; and Tasmania has 13. Queensland has five times the number——

Mr Prest: Is that the area?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: No, that is the number of parks.

Mr Mackenroth: What is the area?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I will give that later on. This Government has tried to spread the parks over the State so that people can have access to them and the different regions are covered.

Mr Prest: What about the percentage of land in the State?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I will come to that in a moment, but this is interesting stuff.

Not enough detail is given in this book, but the situation could occur where the environmental parks and nature reserves are akin to national parks. I have added the figures together, and the following table illustrates these figures—

	National Parks	Environ- mental Parks	Nature Parks	Total
New South Wales	66	180	..	246
Northern Territory	7	13	20	40
Queensland	304	141	..	445
Victoria	30	87	..	117
South Australia	12	184	..	196
Western Australia	55	1 261	..	1 316
Tasmania	13	38	32	83

Queensland does extremely well in that kind of comparison, too. It might be interesting to look into the reason why Western Australia has 1 261 environmental parks.

Mr Muntz: That says we have the most decentralised representation of fauna and flora anywhere in Australia.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: Yes, it does, and I have said that before. These figures bear out the number of national parks in Queensland, which is more important than the size. It means that it is easier for people to reach the core of those parks.

That is a pretty good way to compare like with like. The honourable member for Port Curtis raised the matter of the percentage of land area, but when one refers to a comparison of land area in the State, one has to remember that not all States are the same size. Queensland is bigger than New South Wales. New South Wales has approximately 3.34 million hectares of land that is set aside in national parks.

Mr Mackenroth: The percentage of the State is the relevant figure.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: It is relevant to what I am saying. Queensland has a bigger area. The percentage of New South Wales land in nature reserves is 4.3 per cent. Queensland has 3.37 million hectares of land set aside in national parks. That is slightly more in area than that in New South Wales, but it represents only 2.02 per cent of the State. I accept that point of view.

There is another way of making a comparison. Statisticians and academics, such as my good friend the honourable member for Mount Gravatt, Mr Henderson, are good at this. A comparison can be made by looking at the number of hectares per person that are in nature reserves in each State. New South Wales has 0.61 of a hectare; and Queensland has 1.32 of a hectare. That figure might be shot to pieces because Queensland is developing and getting a larger population. Statistics are only good at certain times. Of the three comparisons that I have given to this Chamber, probably the most important one shows the number of national parks Queensland has and their spread over the State.

I will now take a few moments to be a little parochial. In presenting his Estimates, the Minister referred to further development and the money that will be spent in developing different projects around the State. I was pleased to note that the two national parks in my electorate, the Bunya Mountains and Lake Broadwater parks, will benefit. The Bunya Mountains is a subtropical rainforest area, and I have referred to the good-neighbour policy in that area and the work done with the advisory committee and the people from the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service. The service is working towards the establishment of more tracks and camping grounds in the area, and I commend the Minister for that.

The Lake Broadwater area is quite unique. It is a lake of 600 acres but is only a part-time lake. In a good season there is 600 acres of water about 3 to 4 feet deep in the lake. A large social function was held there recently in the hall beside the lake and

the police were chasing a couple of young fellows on motor bikes around the 600-acre bed of the lake. At the moment there is no water at all in the lake. It represents a unique phenomenon in terms of a natural reserve. In the area there is a natural history association which has been funded by this Government and is carrying out some extremely good scientific research work.

Accompanied by senior officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, I made a trip out west. We came back and opened a new camping ground. We then went to the headquarters of the natural history association. Various scientific data is stored in the association's filing cabinets. It has microscopic slides of various items, collections of fossils and so on. Although I am a layman, I could appreciate that the association was putting together something that was quite significant. The senior officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service were very intrigued with the quality of the work that was being done.

In conclusion, I congratulate the Minister and previous Ministers on the contributions that have been made. Reference was made to the fact that the member for Cunningham, when the Minister, put a lot of thrust into the position. He was followed in the portfolio by the member for Carnarvon. The present Minister is carrying on that thrust and doing a great deal of good work. He is ably assisted by Dr Graham Saunders and his staff.

I have refrained from making any comment on the departmental officers of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation and the Division of Sport because I have not worked with them. I am chairman of the Minister's national parks committee. However, I appreciate that the departmental officers are doing great work, especially in the field of sport. That is one area in which I have a great deal of interest. It is interesting to hear the comments not only from Queenslanders but also from interstate sportspeople who come to Queensland for various sporting carnivals. They make specific reference to the great work that is done by Queensland in that field.

I congratulate the Minister on the work that he is doing. I appreciate what has been done in terms of conservation in Queensland.

Mr MILLINER (Everton) (5.51 p.m.): Madam Deputy Chairperson, in rising to speak in this debate, I fully endorse the remarks made by the honourable member for Chatsworth.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mrs Harvey): Order! Could I yet again remind members of this Chamber—it is becoming a bit monotonous—that my correct title is “Madam Chairman”, not “Madam Chair” or “Madam Chairperson”.

Mr MILLINER: Madam Chairman, please accept my apologies.

I endorse the remarks made by the member for Chatsworth, particularly those he made about Mr Wilcox and Mr Smith. I have found those persons to be very approachable public servants. They are doing a very good job. In this debate I wish particularly to discuss tourism. However, firstly, I wish to comment on a sports matter that concerns me. Last week, when I was in Cairns, a State softball title was being conducted in that city. I was disturbed somewhat to hear a woman at that carnival say that, because of the costs involved in taking teams to country cities and towns, all State titles should be held in Brisbane. The major country areas of Queensland are entitled to their fair share of State titles, whether it be in junior or senior sport. That woman was out of order in stating that it costs a lot of money to transport teams from Brisbane to Cairns. Obviously, it costs a lot of money to transport sporting teams from Cairns to Brisbane. The costs should be shared by the people in the provincial cities and towns and those in Brisbane so that sporting events can be held throughout the length and breadth of Queensland.

Tourism is one of the major areas of growth in this State and nation. An ever-increasing number of tourists are visiting Queensland and Australia. That has happened for a number of reasons. One must be fair and pay tribute to the Commonwealth Government, particularly the Federal Minister for Tourism, Mr Brown, for his embarking on a campaign with Paul Hogan in the United States of America. There is no doubt

that that campaign has been very successful in attracting a large number of tourists to Australia and to Queensland. The tremendous development that is taking place in the Cairns area is proof that there is growth in that industry. Tourism has a significant effect on the community. One only has to look at the increase in crime on the Gold Coast to see that a lot of the problems are created by the massive increase in tourist numbers.

Mr Gately: Have a look at the crime in Cairns.

Mr MILLINER: That is what I am saying. One only has to look in tourist areas to see that a tremendous number of crimes are being committed in those areas.

Mr Gately: How about talking about crime and the drugs in Cairns?

Mr MILLINER: It is all related. It covers a vast area. I am not singling out the Gold Coast. I am saying that there has been an increase in crime in tourist areas. More police should be put into those areas to help cope with the problem.

Of course, crime is not the only problem that is associated with a large influx of tourists into an area. Tremendous planning of the tourist industry is necessary to ensure that Queensland receives the maximum benefits from that industry.

As the Minister would be well aware, Mr Wilcox is very heavily involved in the surf life-saving movement and has a very fine reputation in that movement. I am concerned that not sufficient planning is going into developments. In particular, I refer to some of the developments that are taking place on the Sunshine Coast and on the Gold Coast. Those developments will be attracting many tourists who will be using the beaches and swimming in the ocean. A lot of tourists, particularly Japanese tourists, are not aware of the dangers involved in surfing. Many resorts are being constructed without provision for the incorporation of surf life-saving facilities.

A massive tourist development is taking place on the Sunshine Coast at Yaroomba. That development is being undertaken by the Coeur de Lion company. The Regency Hotel group will be operating a hotel in that tourist complex. Many people will be using the surf beaches in that area, which is approximately 2 kilometres from the nearest surf life-saving centre. All honourable members are aware that life-savers are volunteers who do a tremendous job on a week-end basis.

Tourist developments involve more than town-planning considerations. When they are approved by local authorities, planning must take place to ensure that surf life-saving and associated facilities are provided. Therefore, detailed planning must take place to ensure that all of those facilities are provided by the time that a particular tourist complex is completed.

Another aspect that must be considered is defined tourist areas. The Sunshine Coast is a classic example of that. Tourists are attracted to an area for various reasons. In many cases fishermen are attracted to a particular place for the fishing. That creates a conflict of interests between commercial fishermen and recreational fishermen. What were once good fishing beaches on the Sunshine Coast have now been destroyed because of commercial fishermen who have been putting in nets and cleaning the lot out. The day after commercial fishermen have fished an area, recreational fishermen—often tourists—can be seen trying to catch fish without success. Planning should take place to ensure that those tourist areas are fully utilised by tourists. When a conflict of interests exists, it should be resolved in the best way possible.

Tourism creates employment. Many people regard the tourist industry as the panacea of all the problems that are associated with unemployment. I am concerned that we could reach the stage at which people are overtrained in the hospitality industry. An ever-increasing number of TAFE and other courses are being run by organisations in order to provide people with formal qualifications in the hospitality industry.

Some time ago, Mr Mackenroth raised the question of students who had graduated from a hospitality course in November. Of those young people, very few of them had obtained employment in the tourist industry. That issue was of such concern that the

Industry and Commerce Training Commission undertook a survey of those young people who had graduated in November 1986. It was not until 25 May 1987 that the commission sent out a questionnaire to those young people in order to ascertain how they had fared in relation to employment opportunities.

A report from the Boeing aircraft corporation contains an assessment of the number of jobs that will be required in the tourist industry. The report states that there are 28 000 direct room services, 40 000 food and beverage services, 2 000 house laundry services, 2 000 property operation and maintenance services and 5 000 services for administrative duties.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr SLACK (Burnett) (7.30 p.m.): I take the opportunity of joining this debate firstly to congratulate the Minister on the magnificent job that is being done by those involved in the various sections of his portfolio. It is a tribute to his leadership that they have turned in some very creditable performances. I have had the experience of seeing the work that is being done by some of those people in the field and I take this opportunity to pay the tribute to them that I have been very impressed with their enthusiasm and their general responsibility in the field in which they operate.

I have had the opportunity of seeing how moneys appropriated by the Parliament are being spent within this portfolio. I am convinced that, if ever value for money is being obtained, that is what is happening within tourism, national parks and sport.

Recently, I visited a number of large national parks in the remote areas of Cape York. The potential for the whole of that area is enormous. The areas of land set aside in Cape York, one of the great wilderness areas of the world, are a tribute not only to the Government but also to the men and women of the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service who manage them. Not enough can be said about their loyalty, dedication and enthusiasm.

Queensland is fortunate in that it has some of the genuine wilderness areas of the world. It is, of course, a tribute to the management of the Government that those areas have survived and are being acquired and protected. The same could be said of the great north Queensland rainforests. Here we have, after 100 years of utilisation and management, an area which not only has contributed millions of dollars to the Australian economy, but which the Federal Government claims is worthy of World Heritage listing. What is World Heritage listing? What does it mean? What does it gain? Unfortunately, in this case, the sad fact is that World Heritage listing has everything to do with politics and nothing to do with conservation.

World Heritage listing is a function that is undertaken by the World Heritage commission, which is itself a commission formed under the auspices of the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, which is referred to as UNESCO. Australia is a member of UNESCO. In 1974, Australia adopted an international convention sponsored by UNESCO called the Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. Under that convention, nations may nominate areas to the World Heritage commission for consideration for international listing. The procedure is that the World Heritage commission contacts a body, another UNESCO-supported organisation called the International Union for Conservation and Natural Resources (IUCN) to assess that nomination. IUCN is a scientific body and gives scientific advice. If the IUCN's recommendation is favourable, the area is World Heritage listed.

For the World Heritage commission listing to be effective, the nation proposing the listing has to pass legislation pursuant to the convention to give the listing practical effect. In doing that, the Commonwealth of Australia can embark on a quasi-legal procedure to extend the Commonwealth powers at the expense of the States. That is done through the use—or the misuse—of the external affairs powers provisions of the Constitution. It is not the listing in Paris, but the powers that that listing gives to Canberra to impose law within Australia. It has always been accepted and understood that the Commonwealth would not take action to nominate any areas for inclusion on

the World Heritage List without the agreement of the relevant Australian State or Territory Government. In fact, that undertaking was reaffirmed in a letter that the Prime Minister wrote to the Premier on 12 September 1984. On 5 June 1987, what did the Canberra Labor Government do? I say "Canberra Labor Government", as in this instance I could hardly refer to it as a Federal Government representing all the States. What did it do?

The Prime Minister—the very same Prime Minister who gave the undertaking on 12 September 1984—made an announcement that it proposed to list 1.2 million hectares between Townsville and Cooktown on the World Heritage List. In essence, the Canberra Labor Government accepted without question the proposal of the Australian Conservation Council to place a large area of Queensland outside the control of the State Government. Let me put it in perspective: the length of the area is approximately the same as the distance from Brisbane to Gladstone. So much for the consent of the State Government and the Prime Minister's undertaking!

Timing of the announcement was interesting: it came on 5 June, World Environment Day. Of course, the fact that a Federal election was to take place in 36 days' time had nothing to do with it. The Federal Labor Government announced the proposal without any meaningful consultation and without having regard to the people who live in the area. It failed also to give any recognition to what has been achieved by the Queensland Government.

Subsequent events have proved that the Hawke Government rushed in not knowing what it was doing or where it was going. It has become very evident that members of the Hawke Government have not done their homework. No-one is sure what the delineated areas and the proposed boundaries are. The area has suddenly been reduced from 1.2 million hectares to 877 700 hectares, to be precise. More importantly, the Hawke Government called tenders from up to six consultancies to prepare socio-economic studies of Queensland's wet tropical rainforests. I ask: how can an objective assessment be obtained by the end of October? All of this preparation should have been done beforehand if the Canberra Government had any genuine conservation issues in mind; but, no. Honourable members will remember, along the lines of the Fourex jingle, there was an election coming on. The environmental vote of the larger metropolitan areas far outweighed the needs of the people of north Queensland.

The ALP needed the Australian Conservation Council to back it because it was struggling to hold office in the face of some of its support drifting away. This issue was one that would hold supporters in the fold and would give the Hawke Government an opportunity to gain additional votes in marginal seats. The general public really has no concept of what is involved. The issue concerns an area way up in north Queensland. It does not affect the general public directly. It is emotional stuff and members of the general public believe that any conservation is good, so they are all for it. They have no concept of the vastness of the area.

I can remember when the Fraser Island sand-mining debate was raging. Ferry boat operators told me that people would come up from the southern States and expect to be ferried out to the island, walk round it in a day and be ready to catch the ferry back in the afternoon—all because they had the concept in their minds that it was a large sand island, and sand islands are not very big. In reality, Fraser Island is 90 miles, or 150 kilometres, long. It is a misconception on the part of southern visitors, but it illustrates how people who have never been there and do not understand the situation think.

The ALP was well rewarded. The Wilderness Society and the Australian Conservation Foundation waged a determined campaign and advocated a vote for the Australian Labor Party in the House of Representatives. They targeted 11 marginal seats and they claimed that the vote for the forests added 2.2 per cent to the ALP vote in the 11 marginal electorates. They also claimed that four of the targeted electorates were gained by the ALP on the conservation vote and that three electorates were held by the ALP on the conservation vote.

I have seen the areas of north Queensland that are managed by Queensland agencies and I know how well they are managed by professional, dedicated people in both the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Department of Forestry. The areas represent living examples of professional, multiple land-use strategy—a strategy that the Commonwealth Government should recognise.

The honourable member for Windsor spoke about land-use strategy by the States. What did the ALP at the Commonwealth level do? It went out and made an announcement 36 days before a Federal election and then called for socio-economic planning for the area by six consultants. The hypocrisy of the Commonwealth's proposed World Heritage listing is clearly indicated by the area that it has proposed. Nearly 99 per cent of the land nominated is held by the State under Crown tenure in one form or another. The significant areas of coastal lowland forests—rainforest—are totally ignored and excluded. Even last year, without any help from the Commonwealth, Queensland was quietly acquiring those lowland areas for addition to the national park estate.

The member for Condamine made reference to the acquisition of an area of land in Queensland for \$2m. In actual fact, Queensland requested \$5.1m for acquisition by priority of privately owned rainforest land for addition to the national park estate. Nothing was received from the Commonwealth, not one cent. The result was that two prime lowland rainforest blocks near Babinda, put on the market for auction, had to be purchased with limited Queensland funds—National Parks and Wildlife Service funds that were earmarked for other areas.

Only the quick action by the Queensland Government saved those two magnificent rainforest areas from possible clearing and development. In fact, of the 877 700 hectares proposed to be nominated by the Commonwealth, only 11 900 hectares is freehold land. While not wishing to quote figures, I state that 34 000 hectares of rainforest freehold land has been excluded from the area proposed to be nominated. Among this area is much of the sensitive lowland-type rainforest that I have already referred to. Regrettably, one can only come to the conclusion that the Commonwealth Government's approach is not based on sound scientific knowledge or on a requirement to meet conservation needs.

Mr Gately: It would be true to say that it is purely political, wouldn't it?

Mr SLACK: It would be true to say that it was purely political. I believe that my conclusions that I have drawn to the attention of this Committee are irrefutable.

Why have areas of considerable conservation significance been ignored, and why has the Commonwealth declined to participate with Queensland in the acquisition of some of those most sensitive areas? Surely, if the Commonwealth had been genuine, it would not have left Queensland to do the research and to foot the bill.

The conservation effort in Queensland is a scientific and ongoing process. Our national parks are afforded more and more permanent protection than those of any other State, and to supplement those areas large areas of environmental parks, fauna refuges and fauna sanctuaries have been established.

Earlier in the debate an honourable member asked that a statistical comparison be made between Queensland and the other States. Compared with 25 per cent or less in New South Wales, the area of rainforest remaining in Queensland is 53 per cent. That 25 per cent is a generous figure.

In Queensland 25 per cent of its rainforest is conserved in national parks. That represents 15 per cent of the original area compared with 8½ per cent of the original area in New South Wales. To support the Government's case I could quote figures all night. That is something that the ALP has failed to do in relation to its case. North of Townsville, 76 per cent of rainforest is held in virgin condition and only 18.7 per cent is currently zoned for selective logging on a sustained-yield basis.

Let us look at that 18.7 per cent. It is hardly cause for alarm when it is considered that approximately 700 000 hectares is not being logged. It should be considered also

that those areas which have been logged are not readily identifiable from those which have not and are considered to be worthy of listing as virgin rainforest. So what will be the benefits to the area of World Heritage listing? Are the people of the area going to be better off financially? I fail to see how, when 765 people who are directly employed in the north Queensland timber industry will lose their jobs and a \$33m a year industry will close down. Of course, the effects will snowball into all other associated industries and then the situation that prevails within the mining and the grazing industries will be reached.

It is inconceivable that adequate funds could be provided to compensate for the social, psychological and economic dislocation that will be caused. It is suggested that the increased impetus that will be given to the tourist industry will make up for all this. Yesterday I confirmed that Qantas is already unable to handle the traffic on flights in and out of Cairns and is booked out until mid-February.

Mr Gately: That's an indictment on the Federal Government for not allowing more airlines in.

Mr SLACK: That is right. That will remain the case unless the Federal Government is prepared to change its one-eyed attitude towards airline policy.

Then we must ask ourselves: will the area get any more tourists simply because of its World Heritage listing? As I have said, the airlines are already booked out until mid-February. What is the capacity for the area to get more tourists and what is the benefit that will come from the advertising and promotion of the area's being given World Heritage listing? The area already had international recognition. So, as my friend the member for Currumbin said, the answer is "nil".

One thing that is certain is that two Commonwealth Ministers from Sydney, through their departments, will have the say over what happens in the area and that there will be increased red tape and time delays on applications for proposed tourist and other developments. All this will happen as a result of a decree by the Commonwealth Labor Government that, in essence, is proposing to annex—that is what it is—a significant part of Queensland through the dubious, unethical use of World Heritage listing. I was particularly pleased to hear the member for Moggill, the Honourable Bill Lickiss, come to exactly the same conclusions on his own behalf and, I would assume, on behalf of the Liberal Party.

In doing this the Commonwealth Government is overriding the sovereign right of the State Government. It is outside the spirit of the Constitution, but I notice that Labor members opposite have said hardly a word about that during this debate. They know the reality but they do not dare say a word. In the public eye they support the listing but, privately, they know what it is all about. Publicly they dare not say a word against their Federal colleagues.

Conservation is simply sound land use. All honourable members are very conscious of what has happened overseas through pollution, the overuse of chemicals, intensive development and overpopulation. The case of the Black Forest in Germany comes quickly to mind. None of us wish to see that happen in Australia—at least, most of us do not—whether we be Labor, Liberal or National Party and whether we belong to the State or Federal Parliaments.

Honourable members in this place should say to the Commonwealth Government, "Forget about politics,"—that is what this is all about—"don't rush into what you are proposing and give your consultants time so that you can be sure that you have objectively and scientifically assessed the area." I am convinced that if the Commonwealth did this it would find that there would be no need to interfere with the sovereign rights of this State. There is not an election in the wind, and there certainly will not be one in the next 36 days, so the Federal Government should look at this objectively.

In conclusion I wish to reiterate my thanks to the Minister for the support that he has given to me and other members of his parliamentary committee. Over the period

that I have been in this Parliament and been associated with that committee, I have come to appreciate very much what the National Parks and Wildlife Service is all about. It is not realised by the general public that, on any criteria that they like to use, the National Parks and Wildlife Service under its director, Dr Saunders, is so far ahead of its counterparts in other States that it is unbelievable. For the 12 years that it has been operating it has a very proud record and can be very proud of its history.

Mr ARDILL (Salisbury) (7.50 p.m.): I listened with interest to the previous speaker. I waited in vain for him to mention something about tourism in his own area, an area that this Government neglects when it comes to tourism. It is a beautiful part of Queensland that should be promoted as a place to be visited by people who have young families so that they can see what is available in Queensland.

I also listened to the honourable member's rhetorical questions. In regard to the World Heritage listing of north Queensland rainforests—I whole-heartedly support it.

Mr Gately: Shame!

Mr ARDILL: The honourable member for Burnett and the "honourable member for Tweed Heads" have said that there will be no increase in tourism as a result of World Heritage listing. How insular can they get? Large numbers of tourists will visit an area that is considered worthy of such listing.

The honourable member for Burnett says that other States have wiped out their rainforests. Does he believe that because other States have done that, it is all right? In any case, it was back at the turn of the century. My father was involved in the opening up of the Northern Rivers of New South Wales in the first decade of this century. That is when many of the forests of New South Wales were wiped out. That destruction continued until election of the Wran Labor Government. The present Government in that State under the present Minister, Bob Carr, has done something to prevent the wiping out of rainforests.

Mr Gately: Mr Ardill, how are you going to get these tourists in there if it is locked up?

Mr ARDILL: It will not be locked up. The point is that World Heritage listing will bring the tourists, no matter what Government members say.

The people of the great conservation movement of Australia are not fools. Despite what members of the Government say, they are not scoundrels. They are the people who have foresight. Government members are the people who have small minds and no foresight, and that is their problem. That is why this Government is on the way out.

Mr Gately: It's the radical greenies who are on the way out.

Mr ARDILL: Never mind about radical greenies. The honourable member is calling Dr Aila Keto and Don Henry radical greenies. He does not know what he is talking about.

I turn to the subject of sport and recreation. The Labor Party has a policy aimed at the marriage of sport and recreation, which I see as a much more rational approach than the present organisational set-up under the National Party Government. That is not to say that I am in any way criticising the officers of the Department of the Arts, National Parks and Sport, who are doing the best that they can under abysmal political leadership. The under secretary is well known throughout Queensland as a dedicated and energetic officer, and the Division of Sport provides a great deal of support and encouragement to sporting bodies, for which they are very grateful.

However, a more forceful approach to sport and recreation as a means of improving the physical and mental health of the population is seen by the Australian Labor Party as an extremely high priority, and sport and recreation should be under the one umbrella to better serve this purpose. Profits from sedentary activities could be better channelled into activities from which the whole community would receive a benefit through a more

healthy life-style. Our junior sporting bodies deserve all the help that the community can give, both by way of financial support and encouragement in general. Most importantly, much greater assistance and recognition needs to be given to women's sport.

We do not, as a community, give sufficient help towards the capital costs faced by sporting clubs. It is usually left up to a small, dedicated group within each club to use time that they can ill afford to use in conducting the inevitable chook raffle or to run the chocolate wheel for the drawing of the meat trays. The Government then charges them fees for the privilege.

A system of loans as proposed by the Opposition spokesman, Terry Mackenroth, would mean that fund-raising assets could be built by clubs, the funds repaid and used again. The whole community would benefit in two ways. Firstly, a useful venue is provided for the local community. Secondly, young people, who would otherwise be involved in anti-social activities, can be brought into an environment where they can grow as social beings and increase their own self-esteem.

The department should also be more involved in selling the proposition to the general public that sport is a very important aspect of our way of life and is a means of improving the general health and well-being of the community. Too often we hear the negative grouches from people who have no idea of the importance of junior sport in shaping our community life-style and well-being. While I have great respect for the passive recreation side of our green open spaces, I have often been criticised for my strong support for the work and needs of sporting bodies, particularly those catering for juniors. The provision of land for this purpose is now generally accepted by the community as a legitimate activity of local government and I see the State's role as providing financial support and subsidies, particularly in the area of junior sport. While some junior bodies in my area have received some recent support, there are others in great need who are still waiting. If this is general throughout the State, a more aggressive approach is warranted. One source that still remains untapped to provide funds for sporting bodies is the use of poker machines and there is no doubt that an ALP Government will make this avenue of fund-raising available to sporting clubs at the earliest opportunity.

In four years, tourism has expanded throughout Australia, with the number of overseas visitors more than doubling from 900 000 in 1982-83. This has been claimed by tourism authorities to have provided 150 000 new jobs, which represents a 50 per cent rise in employment in the tourism industry, making it the largest employer group in Australia. However, this is not to say that international tourists are the mainstream of the tourism industry. They are not.

Mr Muntz: What caused the growth in the tourist industry?

Mr Palaszczuk: Certainly not you.

Mr ARDILL: That is right. I do not intend to let the keepers of this circus delay my speech. I have little enough opportunity to voice a point of view in this House and when I am given the opportunity I will continue with my speech.

Overseas tourist are not the mainstream of the tourist industry. A recent survey on the Gold Coast showed that hotel occupancy rates for overseas visitors was only between six and seven per cent of the total. Over three per cent came from New Zealand and 35 per cent of visitors staying in those hotels were local couples. The greatest number of travellers are usually domestic travellers within the State concerned. In fact, only in Tasmania and the Northern Territory are there significantly larger numbers generated from outside the State border. It is the travellers from within the State that I want to concentrate on. In Queensland, despite the claims of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, in 1985-86 the State suffered a decline of 0.2 per cent in domestic travel—that is people travelling within the State's border—and it is my contention that the State Government has failed to consider this important market. This is supported by the recent Horwath survey which was published in newspapers last Sunday week.

In Queensland, the State Government has concentrated on glamour projects and glamour resorts beyond the means of average families, and failed to take steps to market holidays and travel for average people, as has been done in some other States, notably New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia. The Queensland Government has allowed rail services to decline to the extent that many towns are now without rail services and many more suffer from totally unsatisfactory timetables. In Victoria there is a rail or rail and bus service to almost every town or locality to which a tourist could possibly go. There is not just one service per week or even one per day: there are 87 services out of Melbourne every day provided by V/Line. This is in a State that has a smaller country population than has Queensland. In Victoria the one fare covers both the train and bus services.

Mr Gately: They want to get away from the Labor Government. That's why they are coming here.

Mr ARDILL: That is within Victoria.

What should be realised and accepted is that visitors particularly from overseas and tourists generally, want to see Queenslanders as they are. They want to see what is unique about Queensland, not an exact replica of what can be enjoyed in their vicinity. Why would tourists spend 36 hours in a plane, at high cost, just to see another tinsel-town replica of their nearby resorts? We are not properly marketing Queensland's vast inland areas, its unique national parks, individual life-style, or Aboriginal cultural heritage as we should be. Nor is Queensland persuading Queenslanders to holiday in their own State.

The number of Queenslanders holidaying interstate is increasing at the rate of 9 per cent per annum—I emphasise that—while the number of Queenslanders holidaying within the State, or at least the number of nights they are staying at holiday accommodation, is decreasing, whereas the all-States average is increasing, and New South Wales, Western Australia and Tasmania are registering significant increases. I am suggesting that New South Wales has achieved this by marketing its capital city, its countryside and its beaches within the domestic market of people with modest means.

Economy-class rail travel, with family cabin-type berths, is within the means of average families. If our rail services were of reasonable frequency and covered areas which people could be interested in visiting, patronage would make them viable.

Many of our young people fly overseas or join a cruise without having seen anything of their own State. They have not seen the vast open spaces or the farmlands and grasslands that abound with native animal life. Many have never seen a kangaroo or emu, except in zoos.

Many of Queensland's country rail and private bus services take the traveller through unique countryside, yet they are not advertised for their tourist value. By inducing tourists and holiday-makers to make use of lower-priced transport services, there is no doubt that more frequent services could be provided, and more frequent services would induce more people to use public transport. Much of the travelling that I have done by private vehicle throughout Queensland could be covered by public transport if it were properly organised and advertised.

The western areas have a life-style which would attract visitors from our own cities, from interstate, and from overseas, if we concentrated on advertising our life-style, our people and our unique features and national parks. Adequate co-ordinated connecting public transport is a must. While coach-operators provide cheap fares and frequent services on the high-density routes, many towns in Queensland are without any service or are poorly serviced by bus, and the withdrawal of advertised rail services, as indicated in the last timetable that was published, will be a further brake on tourism.

The western rail services all amply demonstrate what Queensland has to offer, in air-conditioned comfort, with wildlife clearly visible; but it has taken a crisis situation on the Westlander, with a lousy timetable decimating the patronage, before the first

advertising of that service has appeared. Forty years ago, it was possible to visit the Atherton Tableland by train and return by private bus down the Gillies Highway after viewing the waterfalls and crater lakes, all at modest cost. Now that is only possible by undertaking expensive tours, which families cannot afford.

Mr FitzGerald: You can hire a car.

Mr ARDILL: The honourable member has returned to the Chamber.

What has happened to the bus service to look-outs such as Castle Hill, to places such as the Eungella Range, the Upper Burdekin, Ravenswood and other attractions around Charters Towers?

What about the massive coal mines and the towns in the Bowen Basin and the Callide/Dawson area? The gem-fields and the sharp peaks and rolling downs of Peak Downs and the Central Highlands have no regular services. There is even talk of eliminating the rail service from Townsville to Winton which could bring many tourists to a possible autumn-winter tourist and western life-style resort.

The Carnarvon Ranges and such areas should be sold to the people of Queensland and other States, particularly those in New South Wales and Victoria, if we want to expand our tourist horizons and provide employment for our population.

Mr Gately: You wouldn't know how to get there.

Mr ARDILL: The honourable member would not know how to get to Currumbin Creek.

On the subject of employment—much has been said about the problems encountered by the tourism industry in paying reasonable wages, including penalty rates. In fact, employers in that industry have a huge advantage in that the majority of workers in the industry are amongst the lowest-paid employees in Australia. If employers want to level out the difference between weekdays and week-ends and day work and night work, it is up to them to pay much more attractive rates overall. This has already been done by some of the more-enlightened Queensland employers who have been in the industry for a great many years and are still doing very nicely.

Most employees and unions are realistic and reasonable if approached in a realistic and reasonable manner. Huffing and puffing and bludgeoning will not work; proper negotiation will.

I turn now to national parks, which is a subject that greatly concerns me and has done all my life. A petition that was presented in this Chamber stated—

“It is of the utmost importance that such a site should be reserved, where the sick in mind and body may go to recuperate, where, surrounded by the beauties of nature, they may make themselves fit once more, for the battle of life.”

Those were the words of 521 people in the first half of the year 1915 who petitioned this Assembly to create a national park in the MacPherson Range in the area that came to be called Lamington national park. They struck a responsive chord in the mind of John McEwan Hunter, Lands Minister in the T. J. Ryan Labor Government; and the creation of this magnificent park, which has been of immense benefit to Queensland and its people, became reality. It was the culmination of a campaign of 37 years and was the reason for the existence of a national park movement in this State. Although other parks such as Witches Falls, Bunya Mountains and Cunninghams Gap were created before it, the campaign for Lamington by two outstanding Queenslanders, namely, Robert Collins of Mundoolin and Tamrookum and Romeo Lahey of Canungra, began the national park movement.

In 1872, because of the work of Judge Cornelius Hedges, Yellowstone Park in the USA became the world's first national park. It had a precursor in 1864 in the substantial State parks of California including Yosemite, and in 1878 that great Queensland Robert Collins saw Lamington as a Queensland equivalent to Yosemite, which he visited in that year.

Mr Stoneman: Was he a Labor man?

Mr ARDILL: No, he was not.

In 1896 he was elected to this Assembly and began the parliamentary campaign to have Lamington declared as a national park. On 7 November 1906, 81 years ago, the Lands Minister, the Honourable Joshua Bell, had a National Park Act approved. He was supported by the Honourable R. Philp and the Honourable T. Paget.

Mr Stoneman: Who wrote this?

Mr ARDILL: Look at the writing! The Tamborine Shire Council was the first to avail itself of this opportunity when it proposed 324 acres on the western escarpment of that mountain, which the Lands Department of the day considered to be unfit for any other purpose. That was the reason why Queensland got its first national park.

However, the Lamington proposal was opposed by Liberal Lands Minister, Digby Denham, who supported settlement of the area until he became Premier in 1911. His Lands Minister, E. H. McCartney, had a different outlook and prohibited further alienation. On the death of Collins, the fight was taken up by Romeo Lahey, of the timber family, and it is highly likely that the words of the 1915 petition were his. I hope that that answers the honourable member for Burdekin's question. He spent the six months following his graduation from university stirring up community support for the 20 000 hectare park that a Labor Government in this State then created.

I can liken him only to the wonderful people who are doing the same thing in the conservation movement—stirring to get things done.

I do not believe that the importance of this incredibly beautiful part of Australia in creating a national parks sentiment and climate should be forgotten. It is pleasing to see in the department's report that 17 kilometres of track in the park have been repaired; because when I took interstate visitors through the park at New Year, I was ashamed of the neglect, which reflected not only on the National Party Government but on all Queenslanders. Tracks were severely overgrown, signs were derelict and there was a real danger that strangers could lose their way.

In my opinion, national parks are one of our greatest assets not only to bring tourists to and back to Queensland but, more importantly, for the reasons that are set out in the 1915 petition, which the Labor Government found so persuasive.

In the Moreton region, where over half of Queensland's people reside, only 2 per cent of the land is in national parks and that is not good enough. A similar area around Sydney has 21 per cent of the land in national parks. One of the means that this Government has adopted in an attempt to partially redress the problem is the creation of forest parks. More effort should be made in that regard.

Of urgent need for consideration is the alienated land that projects into Toohey Forest and has been the subject of many legal battles. I urge the Minister to heed the pleas of thousands of petitioners—not 521 as in the case of Lamington—and to provide funds to purchase the 25 hectares that would destroy Toohey Forest park if it were developed. He would receive the grateful thanks of thousands of ordinary Brisbane residents if that land were declared as a national park.

Time expired.

Mr HOBBS (Warrego) (8.10 p.m.): I was amazed at the previous speaker's comments. When one considers what he does not know about tourism, it is rather incredible. Why has the growth in Queensland tourism in the last 12 months exceeded the growth of tourism in the rest of Australia combined? How can that happen?

Mr Ardill: It is because of the assets that we have with the Great Barrier Reef.

Mr HOBBS: Queensland has great assets and it is run by a great National Party with vision.

In Queensland, the five-star accommodation provides a tremendous attraction for international tourists. Queensland also caters for other visitors who will stay at the three and four-star hotels, and accommodation will be available for the back-packers and the trekkers. Those people are all catered for in Queensland. Queensland is being promoted as a family holiday destination.

Mr Ardill: What does this piece of paper say?

Mr HOBBS: It is a blank piece of paper—or almost blank.

Queensland is attempting to cater for everyone and is doing it very well. The figures prove that the tourist trade in Queensland is going ahead in leaps and bounds.

The honourable member for Salisbury should compare the Gold Coast and the Northern Rivers district in New South Wales. There is no comparison. Because it is so tied up with red tape, no development is occurring in the Northern Rivers district. However, the Gold Coast is booming. Why is the Gold Coast booming? Of course, the member for Currumbin and the member for Southport are great representatives of that area. Their constituents are lucky to have such great representatives. If the honourable member for Salisbury examines the facts and figures, he will see that there is more to the matter than meets the eye.

Mr Veivers: Wait till we have Qantas and the open skies policy.

Mr HOBBS: That is right. When we get Qantas and the open skies policy, the tourist industry in Queensland will improve. It will get bigger and bigger, and better for Queensland.

Mr De Lacy: Bigger and bigger, but not better.

Mr HOBBS: It will get better.

I wish to discuss an issue that is important to my area, that is, the National Parks and Wildlife Service aspect of the Minister's portfolio and the kangaroo industry. I am pleased to be able to support the Honourable Minister for Tourism, National Parks and Sport and the Estimates proposed for his portfolio.

I feel that I cannot let this opportunity pass without highlighting the considerable resources of the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service within the Minister's portfolio which have to be wasted in dealing with the duplication, bungling and interference that emanates from Canberra on the control of kangaroo numbers.

As honourable members well know, the Queensland Government has been able to manage the impact of kangaroo numbers in rural areas through a carefully thought-out plan involving controlled harvesting through a commercial industry. That commercial industry is in great danger because of the ineptness of our supposed friends in Canberra. Over the years, controlled harvesting has been most effective in Queensland.

Kangaroo numbers have been kept in check to ensure that they cause minimal damage, yet the species have been assured of continuing survival. This is common sense when we consider the market forces of a commercial industry. After all, there is no mileage in the commercial kangaroo industry completely eliminating its livelihood.

The commercial industry arrangements managed by the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service ensure that kangaroos are harvested from the areas where they are most prolific; species are monitored to ensure their survival and rare species are totally protected.

Since 1974 Labor Governments in Canberra have sought to delay, ban or duplicate various aspects of the Queensland Government's kangaroo management program with disastrous results for rural industry. Through a totally illegitimate use of foreign affairs powers exercised under the Wildlife Protection Act, the Commonwealth Government has sought to extend its powers to cover the control of the harvesting of kangaroos. This Act is totally unnecessary and is a duplication of legitimate State powers and responsibilities.

It has enabled the Commonwealth bureaucracy in Canberra to grow and keep growing, and become involved in areas which have traditionally been efficiently managed by the Queensland Government. The Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service, armed with the Fauna Conservation Act, has all the experience and legislative powers necessary to adequately manage the kangaroo industry in Queensland—and with the highest motives, namely, the protection of the various macropod species and the protection of the livelihood of Queensland farmers and graziers. I question whether the Hawke Government aspires to act from such motives.

Since 1985, the people of Queensland have witnessed a further insidious development, which has been encouraged by the activities of the Canberra Government. Radical greenie organisations have now entered the scene and are mounting legal challenges against the approved management program. They are generally creating further delays and costs that have to be borne by Queensland. That type of action on the part of people who seem to be intent only on blocking and stopping the Queensland Government all the way, without looking further ahead to make sure that the species are managed and harvested on a professional basis, is totally irresponsible. For example, in June 1985, the Fund for Animals Limited challenged the 1985 Queensland Government management program—or, more correctly, the Commonwealth Minister's decision to approve the plan. This is the point that really has to be understood.

An appeal was lodged in the Federal Administrative Appeals Tribunal after much use was made of the Commonwealth Freedom of Information Act. The matter was heard in early November 1985 after a number of Commonwealth blunders. In June 1986, the Administrative Appeals Tribunal finally handed down its decision in favour of the Fund for Animals and against the Federal Minister.

As a result, in June 1986 the Federal Minister, Mr Cohen, ceased all exports of kangaroo products from Australia for a period of five weeks, which affected both the 1985 and 1986 seasons. That caused considerable disruption within the industry and resulted in a large number of permits being issued for farmers and graziers to control pest kangaroos. This is the aspect of conservation that is probably not really understood. The point about the need for control has to be put across. The net result was that the same number of kangaroos was culled, but the kangaroo industry was forced to cease operations for a year. A viable and sensible means of dealing with a serious rural problem was effectively halted. What a waste! The industry should be stable. All because the Federal Labor Government allowed these irresponsible, radical greenie groups to ride roughshod over it, the kangaroo industry ceased to operate.

I understand that in 1986, the subject of what was a reasonable quota was again negotiated with the Canberra Government. It was proposed that an independent scientific committee should review the Queensland quota application. That was readily agreed to by the State Government. It is indicative of the hypocrisy of the Federal Labor Government that it has not seen fit to accept the recommendations made by the committee that it established.

In 1986, the Fund for Animals again challenged the Queensland Government's program. That challenge was dismissed by the Administrative Appeals Tribunal. In 1987, a further appeal was lodged. It makes one wonder where the funds for such expensive legal challenges are coming from. I understand that the hearing is expected to take place this month.

Honourable members will be pleased to know that the Queensland Government has wisely decided to protect its interests at that hearing. The fact that the Queensland Government has to do that is a darn shame, because a great deal of money has to be spent to make the Government's part in that appeal effective. What a waste! The Fund for Animals really has not got a case at all. It is playing with numbers and with rulings, and to what end? I think it is scandalous that those people are prepared to impose all these costs on a State Government which is trying to do the right thing and look after its fauna.

In 1987 the scientific advisers in the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service sought a quota of 2.24 million. The Commonwealth set the quota at 1.755 million. Anyone who lives and works in rural areas will say that there is no danger to those species of kangaroos that are culled. Rather, the opposite is true. The kangaroo numbers are building up all the time. In the western areas of Queensland there is no way in the world that the kangaroo will be culled right out. The country has been fully developed, the timber has been cleared and grasses have been introduced. There is more grass and more water out there now than has been seen for many, many years. No doubt, because people are developing their land, the country will improve.

Mrs Chapman: Some of the people who go there and make decisions have never seen the kangaroos.

Mr HOBBS: That is right. Some of them have not been out there at all. If they do go out there, they travel in a motor car, stay in a motel, get up at 8 or 9 o'clock in the morning and go for a drive. By that time of day the kangaroo is under a tree having a camp, like quite a few of the people down in Canberra, and probably like a few of the fellows on the other side of the Chamber.

Our viable rural industry is under grave threat from the ever-increasing kangaroo numbers. The industry can be viable if it is managed properly. I believe that the right thing is being done. I certainly hope that the Federal Government will realise that and hunt away those other fellows who are trying to disrupt the industry.

Experiments have been carried out by the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service that confirm that competition occurs between kangaroos and other grazing animals. That aspect has to be considered very carefully. It is important to know the ratio of feed which a beast, a sheep and a kangaroo will eat. As the beast and the sheep have been the traditional stock, the effect that kangaroos have on them needs to be known. Experiments have been done and I believe we know what the effect is. However, we are prepared to allow the investigation to be done scientifically and we will go along with the result of those findings. If our best scientists are satisfied with the Queensland Government management program, it is hoped that the Commonwealth Government as well will accept that advice, as we are prepared to.

For some unfathomable reason the Commonwealth Government seems committed to pandering to the whims of a handful of radical greenie groups. That is certainly disgraceful and disgusting.

The bottom line is that Queensland has a very good management program. Methods to update and upgrade it are constantly being considered. Because of a shortage of funding, the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service is no different to any other Government department. However, because of the present difficult economic times, further funding to that service is not possible and it has to live within its means.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. They do a terrific job. I have always found them to be very helpful, right from the director, Graham Saunders, down to the other staff. Lately Graham Saunders has been ill, but it is great to see him back in action now. I wish him all the best and I hope that he has good health in the future. I have also found the deputy director, Herb Bonney, particularly co-operative. When the director has been ill, Herb has taken over the reins. I thank him for his co-operation and his interest, particularly the kangaroo industry.

I thank also the service's staff at Charleville, which is the centre for the kangaroo program in that area. It is also the computer headquarters. The staff do a great job. At present tags that were previously posted from Brisbane are now being posted from Charleville. The shooters certainly appreciate the faster service that is being provided. That has been really great and I thank Herb Bonney for giving consideration to that. Improvements can be made in other ways and hopefully those will be announced in due course.

The financial statement in the annual report of the service shows that collections from the issuing of open season fauna permits have increased from \$117,000 in 1985-86 to \$123,000 in 1986-87, an increase of \$6,000, which is not large. For the same years the collections from the sale of kangaroo tags increased from \$238,000 to \$253,000, an increase of \$15,000. The bottom line of the financial statement shows that revenue for the service in one year is only \$1.1m, but obviously it takes much more than that to run. A lot of money has to come from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to keep the service going.

That is why it is so disappointing that funds have to be used to fight groups who want to disrupt the kangaroo industry when the people in it are trying to do the best they possibly can. I believe that they are doing their best. Valuable research is being done on kangaroo species. I hope that shortly a national park will be declared in my area to protect the yellow-footed rock wallaby, which is very, very hard to find but quite a lovely animal. Its protection will be of benefit to all Queenslanders and all Australians.

Officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service are in the field all the time. They are doing a lot of research, studying the changing areas of kangaroo habitats and studying the types of terrain that the kangaroo likes best. The service is looking for areas that may be declared national parks to best benefit those animals.

Charleville has a fairly important role to play in the kangaroo industry. Being in western Queensland—

Mr Beard: It is only just in the west.

Mr HOBBS: Although it is not as far west as Mount Isa, it is far enough west. My point is that decentralisation of departments is a good thing.

Mr De Lacy: I wish they would decentralise the tourist industry and get some of it out your way.

Mr HOBBS: The area that I represent does want some more tourists. The honourable member is quite right. If he were to come out, I could show him around. I think that one of these days the member for Brisbane Central is coming out.

I wish to pay a tribute to the work of the Honourable Geoff Muntz, under whose portfolio this issue rests. On this issue the Minister has fought long and hard for the rights of Queenslanders and the legitimate rights of the Queensland Government. He and his staff have had to contend with ever-increasing interference from those who seem to have far more extensive financial resources than this State. The Minister has recognised his role of listening to sound, scientific advice, which has been the corner-stone of Queensland's policy on the kangaroo industry for many years, and seeks only that such advice be accepted by all parties. I congratulate him on his handling of this matter and offer him every support.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Prest): Order! I call the member for Inala—I am sorry, I think it is Archerfield.

Mr PALASZCZUK (Archerfield) (8.29 p.m.): Mr Temporary Chairman, although Inala does form the bulk of the area I represent, the electorate is Archerfield.

I have great pleasure in taking part in the debate on the Tourism Estimates. I wish to congratulate my good friend the member for Salisbury on the capable manner in which he delivered his speech and also on the excellent research that he undertook. I intend to use most of my time in this debate on three tourist industry issues that I consider to be of great importance to the people of Queensland.

The first point is one that I have raised on previous occasions, that is, the tourism industry's preoccupation with wealthy overseas tourists at the expense of the local family man. With the proliferation of five-star accommodation throughout Queensland, it seems to me that it is no use encouraging the family man to take a holiday in this State.

Mr FitzGerald: They're likely to get more jobs.

Mr PALASZCZUK: I would say that the reverse would be the case. The proliferation of five-star accommodation has placed holiday accommodation out of the reach of the ordinary family man.

Mr FitzGerald: What about the jobs? The workers get more jobs.

Mr PALASZCZUK: The point I am trying to make is that what is needed is the availability of reasonably priced apartments or similar accommodation, with the usual holiday amenities such as a swimming-pool, in close proximity to the beach and to shops. More importantly, apartments are needed that are close to ground level. A unit on the 16th, 19th or 25th floor is all very well, but it becomes a nightmare for the parents of small children.

Caravan parks, although very popular, are not everyone's cup of tea. The holiday village concept is more suited to families and should be receiving more support from the Government.

Recently, on a sweep of the north coast hinterland, I came across the Mapleton Holiday Centre run by the Baptist Church. I was most impressed by that centre. It has self-contained cabins, caravans and camp sites at very reasonable rates. The other facilities were just as good. There were swimming-pools, walking tracks, a canoeing lake and tennis and horse-riding facilities. That is the type of concept that the Government should be encouraging private enterprise to move into. I understand that many other religious denominations are leading the field in supplying tourist accommodation for the ordinary battler of Queensland.

I encourage the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation to mount an aggressive campaign for Queenslanders to see Queensland first, particularly the Queensland outback. The Minister did allude to this in the presentation of his Estimates. However, I will go a bit further and make some suggestions as to what can be done.

Recently I accompanied a number of my colleagues on a primary industries tour of outback Queensland. We started at Winton and worked our way back to Brisbane through Longreach, Charleville, Barcaldine, Mitchell, Roma and Toowoomba. I must tell honourable members——

Mr FitzGerald: Did you win any seats there?

Mr PALASZCZUK: The honourable member for Lockyer would be surprised at the warm and friendly manner in which members of the ALP were received by the country people. If the honourable member wants me to go further, I can tell him that members of the Government are on the nose in country Queensland

I was impressed at the manner in which western towns have been spruced up and also with the quality and quantity of accommodation available. I am sure that no-one could complain about the price of a comfortable room in pleasant surroundings. A price tag of \$35 a night for a double room is a modest price, and it is worth considering.

Western Queensland has an enormous amount to offer the tourist industry. Unfortunately, the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation has been a little slow in biting the bullet. All honourable members would acknowledge that for a number of years a fair amount of criticism was levelled at the lack of tourist facilities in many parts of Queensland outside the south-east corner, and much of that criticism was valid. The New South Wales Government has entered into an aggressive marketing campaign——

Mr FitzGerald: Why have we got such a high percentage of the market?

Mr PALASZCZUK: The New South Wales Government has entered into an aggressive marketing campaign to make the New South Wales outback a new holiday destination for Australians and also for international visitors. In answer to the honourable member's intjection——part of the strategy is that 70 per cent of all tourists who come to Australia come via Sydney.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

The **TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr Prest): Order! If honourable members wish to interject they must do so from their own seats.

Mr PALASZCZUK: They do not have to travel outside New South Wales to have a real Australian holiday. To this end the New South Wales Government, through its tourist commission, has made available a brochure entitled *Discover New South Wales Outback Experience Holidays*. This brochure is available in Brisbane and it details a range of options for visitors such as motels, hotels, outback pubs, river cruises, houseboats, hire car services, day tours and extended tour packages. A key to this promotion is the use of Broken Hill as the gateway to the outback. I wish to draw the Minister's attention to what could be done in Queensland by use of the same concept. In my opinion Longreach is the gateway to the outback and it could be developed further. The Longreach airport could be upgraded to allow larger planes to land. I suggest that a park-and-ride terminal could be established at Roma for package bus tours of outback Queensland and that the Government could call for registrations of interest for the development of outback resorts in towns such as Longreach, Winton and Barcaldine.

I wish to turn my attention now to the question of overseas tourists arriving in Australia. The first point that must be emphasised is that Australia is a low-cost tourist destination. One only has to listen to the tales of \$300-a-night accommodation, \$90 laundry bills for two people and \$200 in overseas telephone calls from Australians coming back into this country to gauge the comparison. Tourism does contribute a great deal to the GDP in Australia, and the Minister alluded to that fact. As a matter of fact, the tourism industry creates as much employment as the textile, clothing, footwear and motor vehicle industries combined.

In order to increase that figure tourist operators must act now and provide more motels, restaurants and other facilities that appeal directly to Japanese and Asian tourists. If Japanese needs are not accommodated, the Japanese will travel around Australia in a pre-packaged protective bubble and little money will go into Australia pockets.

Mr Beard: We've got to teach our kids Japanese, too.

Mr PALASZCZUK: Yes, I totally agree with that. This industry must continue to ready itself to meet the needs of people whose cultural backgrounds are different from those of Australians and who cannot expect to adapt to local habits and customs overnight.

I move now specifically to Japanese tourists and deal with the manner in which they spend their yen. Most Japanese tourists visiting Australia come on a package tour that lasts a week and costs approximately \$10,000 per couple. The package deal of two air fares and accommodation cost approximately \$5,000, leaving \$5,000 spending money. Many couples are in Australia on their honeymoon, and 75 per cent of Japanese newly-weds travel overseas for their honeymoon. Australia is the third most popular destination after Hawaii and Europe. I am convinced that with the right type of promotion, Cairns and its surrounds could become the accepted alternative to Hawaii for Japanese honeymoon couples.

I will detail to the Chamber the increase in the number of Japanese tourists visiting Australia over the past 13 years. In 1974, there were 23 872; in 1975, the figure increased by 1 per cent; in 1985, the figure was 107 590; in 1986, it was 145 500; in 1987, the figure is expected to be 170 000—which is an increase of 23 per cent; but for 1988, the forecast is 265 000, which will be an increase of 55 per cent. Nearly 170 000 Japanese tourists will visit Australia this year and approximately 265 000 will visit Australia next year, and the figures will continue to rise.

At this point I would like to detail to the Committee the break-up of spending of an ordinary Japanese couple on a holiday in Australia. A honeymooning couple could start their holiday on the Gold Coast. Their expenditure included \$1,000 on food and drinks and \$400 on casino gambling. In Sydney, their expenditure included: matching jumpers, \$160; dinner, \$230; drinks \$100; a cruise, \$44; shopping, 26 key-rings with

Australian map motifs, \$60; T-shirts, \$40; other costs, quality Australiana, \$2000; dinner and drinks, \$130; tours, \$88; duty-free opal ring, \$2,000; and travel and accommodation, \$5,000. That gives a total of around \$10,000.

I draw the attention of all members to the fact that \$2,000 was set aside for quality Australiana or souvenirs and \$2,000 for an opal ring. The couple to whom I referred were not madly keen on tourist sites such as the Opera House, the Sydney Harbour Bridge or Bondi Beach; all they wanted to do was to spend most of their money—in fact, 20 per cent—on presents for acquaintances and close relatives. They were not interested in koalas, as there are enough koala motifs in Tokyo. They were not bothered with lines such as those produced by Ken Done, as Ken Done goods are readily available in Japan. They were more intent on searching for quality Australian souvenirs.

I make the point that just three years ago in this Chamber I mentioned that one group of businessmen, namely the operators of souvenir shops, do a great deal of damage to the tourist industry. Most of the souvenirs are plain rubbish and are produced in the labour sweat-shops of south-east Asia. They are bought at a very low cost and sold at a very high price. It is about time that Australian souvenir-importers were made accountable for their actions. Australian souvenir-manufacturers should be encouraged to move into the quality end of the tourist market.

Japanese tourists do not want the run-of-the-mill tea-towels, spoons, stubby-holders and other such mass-produced articles from the labour sweat-shops of south-east Asia. If they wanted to buy cheap rubbish, they would go to south-east Asia to buy it.

Mr Muntz: Have you been reading my press releases?

Mr PALASZCZUK: No. As a matter of fact, I raised this point in 1984. At that time the Minister for Health plagiarised my speech and moved on the point that I am again bringing to the attention of the Committee. Mr Ahern plagiarised my speech, and I take it that the Minister for Tourism, National Parks and Sport has done the same thing.

Australia's souvenir industry should be looking at offering overseas visitors quality items that relate directly to this country. If it is to make souvenirs with an Australian theme, let us make sure that they are made of Australian precious stones and gold or silver. Let us make clothing such as jumpers not only from Australian wool but also from Australian cotton.

Mr Austin: Is that suit you've got on made in Australia?

Mr PALASZCZUK: It is made in Australia. Would the Minister like to check the label? It is made in Australia.

We should also make sure that the Australian souvenirs are made in Australia, and preferably in Queensland, creating jobs for Australians. With the boom in the tourist industry, the time is ripe for Australian manufacturers to use this as an opportunity to rebuild the manufacturing sector. Especially in Queensland, which has a narrow manufacturing base, the tourist industry should be the springboard to future prosperity.

Mr HYND (Nerang) (8.44 p.m.): In speaking to the Estimates of the Minister responsible for the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service, it is my intention to localise my comments to the south-east region of the State, and specifically to the Gold Coast and hinterland areas.

It bears mentioning that in the short 12-year history of the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service it has become the largest authority within the Tourism, National Parks and Sport portfolio. This growth is due to the enthusiasm of the Minister and both the director and assistant director of that department, all of whom have placed great emphasis on the recognition of the natural talents, loyalty and dedication of their staff.

The Queensland Government recognises the need to set aside and manage areas of scenic, scientific and historic interest as national parks. It is significant that we recognise

that the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service, by applying its limited resources to the best possible advantage, has been able to acquire significant areas throughout the year and has added to the national park estate. The estate now totals 3 506 015 hectares, or just over 2 per cent of the State.

To ensure the survival of natural flora and fauna, the department has embarked on a massive marketing program to foster harmony between mankind and our environment—considering our past, enjoying our present and ensuring our future.

When I think of the Tourism, National Parks and Sport portfolio, I realise just how closely National Parks and Tourism are linked—not only on the Gold Coast but throughout the State. I wonder how many honourable members in this Chamber appreciate the contribution that has been made to tourism by our native animal the koala. It was decided in 1982 that the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service would implement an appropriate official gift of koalas to the people of Japan. That gift was to be in three parts, each comprising two males and four females. The source of those animals was the Lone Pine Koala Sanctuary in Brisbane. Of course, that meant that they were carefully selected and reared in captivity. Prior to that official gift being presented, cultivation of eucalypts in Japan had been taking place for a number of years to ensure an abundant supply of the appropriate eucalypt for our Australian koalas, and since their arrival in Japan four koalas have been born.

Tourism to Australia has been the largest single beneficiary to date of our koala project. The interest in the koalas is generally accepted as the overwhelming reason why Japanese people have been attracted to Queensland. The Qantas manager in Tokyo attributes more than half of the Japanese tourists increase to Australia to the koala project. Since 1984, the Japanese tourist volume to Lone Pine has increased sixfold. With the current high level of interest in koalas by the Japanese tourists, there has been considerable pressure on the National Parks and Wildlife Service to provide koalas for display, and for this reason the service is examining procedures that would meet the escalating requests from tourist complexes without jeopardising our viable wild populations.

The mainland estate management program encompasses environmental parks, fauna reserves and fauna refuges. One such program is Fleay's Fauna Centre and the Tallebudgera Greenspace project, which was recently completed after three years' work. The National Parks and Wildlife Service is to be congratulated on taking the initiative to convert what was mangrove swampland into a study in wetland development. The previous bogs, marshes and swamps have been cleaned out and are now host to masses of native birdlife and animals.

Wetlands mean different things to different people—fascination and beauty to some, a wasteland for drainage and a rubbish dump to others. The National Parks and Wildlife Service has been more than considerate with its provision of boardwalks throughout the entire complex, and consideration has been directed towards those people who are incapable of walking and are confined to wheelchairs, so that they, too, may enjoy what the National Parks and Wildlife Service has to offer. The first stage of Fleay's Fauna Centre features a major display of Queensland native plants and animals in four distinct habitats, namely, wetlands, rainforests, eucalypt forest and rocky slopes. Each area contains a variety of habitats supporting a range of Queensland native animals and plants. The wetlands support flocks of ducks, ibis, egrets, herons and brolgas as well as fresh-water crocodiles, swamp wallabies and short-nosed bandicoots. The eucalypt forest has emus, kangaroos, wallabies and echidnas roaming free, while cassowaries, pademelons, scrub turkeys and potoroos are at home in the rainforest. An agile group of rock wallabies abound on the rocky slopes.

The rainforest has been totally man-made, with plants natural to the Gold Coast region replacing cleared land. Full credit should be given to the service for achieving an almost perfect rainforest environment. It should be mentioned that a tourist in an afternoon can virtually journey on a simulated walk from the top of the Great Dividing Range to the Queensland coast.

The Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service acquired the West Burleigh fauna reserve in November 1983 following extensive negotiations between David Fleay and the Queensland Government which featured a shared concern for the genuine protection of the Tallebudgera Creek estuary and the environs. The reserve was renamed Fleays Fauna Centre and the service undertook its redevelopment in a nature conservation concept called Tallebudgera Greenspace.

Not only are there Queensland native fauna on display in their natural habitats spread over 7 hectares of land adjoining Tallebudgera Creek, but also there is the opportunity to hear and understand why these animals need particular habitats and, therefore, why it is so important for the National Parks and Wildlife Service to acquire representative samples of land throughout the State in all biogeographic regions. This rational and planned approach to conservation sets Queensland apart from the "grab it all at whatever cost" attitude of some greenie elements and the Federal Labor Government. Fleays Fauna Centre is managed by the service on a self-funding basis from admission charges.

The hinterland resorts have always been able to attract tourists in droves, and it only takes a little shower of rain to encourage the visitors to the many waterfalls of the hinterland, all of which are only a few kilometres from the heart of the Gold Coast tourist strip.

The National Parks and Wildlife Service, by providing walking tracks, has established the best way to explore the magnificent scenery, the wildlife and the vegetation. Most of the parks in the Gold Coast hinterland are covered with dense tropical rainforest surrounded by open eucalypt forest. Within the parks themselves the easily accessible fringe areas present an excellent opportunity for tourists to explore rainforests at first hand and to see the trees crowding in on each other. The members of the National Parks and Wildlife Service take pride in explaining the different types of trees, scrub and even nettles. High in the branches are the orchids, bird-nest ferns, elkhorns and staghorns.

I feel it is most fortunate that large areas of these parks are too steep and too dense for tourists to move from the watchful eye of the park rangers, who keep tourists on the man-made walking tracks.

The facilities within the national parks have been designed to blend into the landscape by the use of brown and olive colour schemes on the buildings so necessary to continue to service the areas.

Barbecue areas are provided so that the whole family or groups of tourists can safely prepare their meals without the risk of fire getting out of control. Toilet facilities are clean and hygienic and built from natural stone and timber, again blending into the environment.

The National Parks and Wildlife ranger information centres are well-manned and maps, pictures and tourist information are readily available to all. Because of the increase in popularity of our national parks, the tourist industry is booming in many fields perhaps not recognised at first.

A number of minibuses take day-trippers to the hinterland resorts. These buses increase our tourist traffic and have given a great boost to our private-enterprise entrepreneurs, who are always quick to see the chance to set up a new and viable business, which is clearly evident by the establishment of many places where tourists can purchase meals, Devonshire teas or just a light refreshment.

Cottage industries are also booming with the sale of cottage goods, pottery, leather goods and souvenirs in general.

Visitation to our national parks throughout Queensland is increasing rapidly and is challenging the resources available to the National Parks and Wildlife Service to manage those precious areas. It must be accepted that those people enjoying the facilities and natural beauty of our national parks should be asked to contribute to their upkeep.

Only with this type of scheme in place can our caretakers of this natural environment in Queensland properly administer their responsibilities.

I would strongly encourage the honourable Minister, Geoff Muntz, to pursue this course of action, which will serve to reinforce this Government's commitment to the introduction of the user-pays principle. Many major tourist developments have been established throughout Queensland during the past few years. It is pleasing to see the way in which private enterprise operations are co-operating and working with Government authorities, particularly the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

The Minister responsible for national parks, the Honourable Geoff Muntz, must be congratulated on fostering this relationship. Of course, the tourism industry is second nature the honourable Minister, coming as he does from the Whitsunday area and previously the Gold Coast. I guess that is why he is handling this most valuable portfolio so very competently.

Queensland's National Parks and Wildlife centres, therefore, provide a valuable educational package regarding the Queensland Government's role in conservation.

At 8.57 p.m.,

Under Standing Order No. 307 and the Sessional Order, progress was reported.

EXPO '88 ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 15 October (see p. 3312).

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (8.58 p.m.): Members of the Opposition will be supporting the amendments to the Expo '88 Act.

The main provisions of this amending Bill are designed to provide for an agreement with the Trades and Labor Council which will permit uniform conditions to apply throughout the Expo 88 site, no matter whether the people concerned are employees of the Expo authority, employees of other countries or employees of other operators on the site.

Members of the Opposition agree that, in principle, the agreement provided for is a very good idea. It is surprising that the Expo authority would negotiate an agreement with the Trades and Labor Council and have the Government bring amending legislation before this House to give effect to that agreement when it is considered that the next piece of legislation listed for debate in this House will effectively cut trade unions out of making agreements with employers. When it suits this Government, and when it knows that it can make an agreement with the trade union movement that will be for the betterment of Expo 88, the Government is prepared to allow the trade union movement to make agreements.

The Government should seriously consider what the legislation that is presently before the House means. If the Government is fair dinkum, if it trusts the Trades and Labor Council—and apparently it does—and if this Government trusts the workers, it should throw out the contract legislation. The reality is that that kind of legislation is not needed if the Government's Expo authority can make an agreement that will apply to all workers on the site.

The Trades and Labor Council has informed the Opposition that it is happy with the agreement that has been struck with the Expo authority. On that basis, the Opposition will support the legislation. However, I am concerned about the amendment that will allow the Expo authority to have control over airspace. To me it seems a little open to say merely that the authority will be given control over airspace. I ask the Minister: why is that necessary? What exactly is meant? To what height will control be given? If there is a need to amend the original legislation to give the Expo authority control over airspace, something must have occurred for the Government to consider it necessary to

do that. If the simple reason is that the authority wants to stop news helicopters from flying over the site and so forth, perhaps one could see the dangers involved if that were to happen.

When the Minister replies, I would like him to explain exactly what the legislation entails. As I said, if the Government could come to an amicable agreement with the Trades and Labor Council, which it has on this occasion, the Opposition would support the legislation.

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (9.01 p.m.): The Liberal Party also supports the legislation. As the Opposition spokesman said, and as the Minister's second-reading speech laid out, it is basically an innocuous Bill. It attempts to tidy up some aspects which were perhaps overlooked or not thought of initially.

It is quite appropriate that the Expo authority, because of the difference in the working conditions and in its hours of opening, should need to discuss directly with its employees special arrangements for employment and to enter into contracts which sometimes may be at variance with normally accepted award conditions. If a seven-day-a-week, twelve-hour-a-day exposition is being conducted over a period of months, the amendments are only natural and legislative support should be given to them.

The power to make by-laws in various aspects is also appropriate, and this Bill makes provision for that, as it does also in relation to the power to extend the areas. I note that there are in the new schedule to the Bill, which has been published in the Minister's amendments, still some, what one might call, discrepancies. I refer to the fact that the area of Musgrave Park is still included, even though statements have been made to the effect that it will not be resumed and actively utilised by the Expo authority. Perhaps the Minister might care to comment on the Government's current thinking with regard to the uses of Musgrave Park and the need for this extensive power over the park by Expo. I ask the Minister: has Expo any current plans for redevelopment? Just what is the position with regard to Musgrave Park?

When one looks at the physical layout of the site, one realises that it is appropriate that the extensions in the vicinity of the Performing Arts Complex ought to be made so that degrees of control around the entry and exit ways can be properly performed there as well as at the other area and on the river. I expect that there will be a great deal of activity associated with the river and with the air space above the site associated with Expo. That area will certainly be a magnet for people, boats and aircraft. It is appropriate for the safety of the site and for the good management of traffic in its area that these increased powers over the water, over the air and over some of the adjoining land areas ought to be given to the Expo authority. Therefore, the Liberal Party supports the Government's intentions and would welcome from the Minister, if he is able to give them at this stage, some minor explanations in regard to Musgrave Park.

However, this debate also gives members an opportunity to say a little in general terms about the Expo project itself, where it stands and what should happen in the future. One of the great questions that this Government faces—in fact, I suggest that this Parliament will face—over the next 12 months is: what will happen to the south bank site once Expo is over? It is a question which, one can say without exaggeration, is of historic importance to the people of Brisbane and to the State of Queensland. The site represents a unique opportunity to reclaim the centre of the city for the people of Brisbane; to reclaim the centre of the capital for the people of Queensland.

There was a time when the south bank site was in fact the centre of town. That was when Brisbane was a port and the schooners used to come up the river. At that time the main wharfage for Brisbane was on that site, because that side of the river was the side on which the deep channel ran. The wharves that were used to hold the major vessels were all along that site. It has not been many years since that site lost its importance to the town.

I can remember as a boy going on trams across the Victoria Bridge and looking down to see the extensive wharves still there. I can also recall the unforgettable odour

of the Fish Board, which used to sit on the site, too. I must admit that I was not sorry to see that go. However, that is just another point of emphasis to show the importance of that site. In the war years and afterwards the area went into decline, but it is still a magnificent site—an area of vast, one could almost say “unlimited”, potential.

The Government has made an excellent start by placing the Queensland Cultural Centre, comprising the Queensland Art Gallery, the Museum and the Performing Arts Complex, on that site. What the Government must do in the interests of the history and the future of this State is to not stop there—not for the sake of a few dollars or, even if it becomes necessary, for a few million or a few tens of millions of dollars—and allow that site to fall into the hands of developers who want to throw up high-rise apartments or other flash deals in order to make a quick dollar. The Government has shown great forethought in the expenditure of enormous amounts of money on the Queensland Cultural Centre, the Museum and other complexes. Let it not stop half way. I emphasise to the Minister that, after discussions on these matters, I speak here on behalf of the Liberal Party. What could be worse than to spoil that whole effect of a unique approach to architecture in the form of very low-rise buildings clinging to the riverbank, so that the visual effect runs up to the mountains in the distance, than to throw up next to them some high-rise monstrosity so that a real estate developer can make a quick dollar.

Queensland has a unique and historic opportunity to retain that site for the people of Brisbane and to develop it in the same way as the Cultural Centre complexes have been developed: with sympathetic, low-rise buildings that have a great deal of public open space surrounding them. This is a chance that will not come again. With the development of the river, with real estate prices being what they are and with the tendency that will almost certainly be seen to split up the titles on that site into some sort of strata title arrangement in order to gain maximum return for whichever investor takes it over, the people of this State will never again be able to claim that riverbank as they will be able to in this coming 12 months. The Liberal Party urges the Government not to fail that test.

I think it is pretty clear to everyone that, despite the gloom and doom merchants, Expo will not be a financial disaster. In fact, it will do quite well. At this stage one would not like to project a profit. In fact, I would hope that the Expo authority is not looking to make massive profits but is looking to make sure that its revenues are ploughed back into the project to ensure that it reaches its fullest potential.

The Government will not be, as was said at the start, stuck with a huge bill. What will occur is that the land will be left with a debt over it. That debt may very well be significant in dollar terms—as I said, it could be tens of millions of dollars—but it must be recognised as a great, historic, once-only opportunity to hand back the centre of town to the citizens of this city. As a party, we urge the Government not to look for a short-term expedient and not to think only of next year's Budget and how it would be good to pull in 10, 20, 30 or more millions of dollars to help balance the books, but to think of the future, to preserve that area for the people of Queensland and for the people of Brisbane and to enforce a sympathetic development of low-rise architecture and public open space so that when Expo is remembered in the years ahead it is remembered not as a fond thing that drifted away—a nice thing when it happened but look at what is over there now—but as a lasting legacy for the future generations of this State.

The Government should know that it will be well remembered if it takes that course of action and roundly condemned by future generations if it fails the test. If, in facing that test, it needs to produce the money, it will have the Liberal Party's support. We ask the Government and we ask the people in this State to recognise the opportunity that presents itself and to unite in a bipartisan, or tripartisan, effort, if that is what is required, to show future generations that we in this place at least could think ahead when we had to redevelop the site that has now been given back to the people of Queensland by virtue of Expo 88. The Liberal Party supports the Bill.

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate—Leader of the Opposition) (9.10 p.m.): Obviously the main purpose of the Bill is to ensure that all employees on the Expo site during its period of operation are in fact covered by the provisions of the industrial agreement agreed to by the Expo authority and those unions that will have members employed on site. Those people who have a good understanding of what this Bill is all about and who have examined it closely understand that that is the position.

The industrial agreement to which I refer is very separate and distinct from the agreement that has applied to the construction work that has been carried out on the site to date. In other words, this is an industrial agreement that covers the operations of the Expo site.

The construction work agreement has, of course, been an outstanding success. I have had the pleasure of visiting the Expo site and seeing what has occurred. To the best of my knowledge, not one day has been lost owing to industrial disputation. There can be no doubt that the very sensible and productive negotiations that took place between the Expo authority's representatives and the unions of employees led to a work agreement that has been seen by all sides as fair and reasonable.

I have no intimate knowledge of the provisions contained in the new industrial agreement that is designed to cover the operations of Expo and which, incidentally, is duly registered with the State Industrial Commission. However, it is reasonable to assume that if the same commonsense attitude prevails during the negotiations, we should be able to look forward to yet another very extensive period of dispute-free employment at the Expo site. I know that all honourable members would agree that that will be very, very important to the success of Expo and will help very significantly indeed in ensuring that favourable lasting impressions will be gained by the thousands of visitors to this State and to the capital city of Brisbane in 1988.

As the Metal Trades Industry Association, representing the Expo authority, has quite properly said, it was always the intention of the parties to the Expo 88 industrial agreement that agreements be made pursuant to the Expo '88 Act. Although it had been felt that the Expo authority could enforce the industrial agreements by use of its general by-law power, legal advice has evidently been received that to resolve any uncertainty concerning the responsibilities of the authority in this regard, suitable amendments such as those under consideration tonight should be made to the Act.

The amendments are designed to ensure that the Expo authority can enforce the industrial agreements, and I emphasise that. These amendments are designed to ensure that the Expo authority can enforce the industrial agreements reached between the parties to the agreements, and the Opposition is told that there is no intention on the part of the authority to utilise any industrial agreements other than those negotiated under the auspices of the Queensland Trades and Labor Council. Would any honourable member believe that?

Therefore, to me it is somewhat extraordinary to find that today the Queensland National Party Government is giving its support to a system of negotiation and a system of agreement to terms and conditions of employment at the very same time as that Government is trying to push down the throats of Queensland workers a system of contract labour that has the potential to blow industrial relations in this State clean out the window.

From my point of view, it is even more extraordinary that the Bill has been introduced by the Premier of this State. At this moment Mr Gunn is in charge of the legislation, but it was introduced by the Premier, who openly detests the arbitration system, is a strong opponent of organised labour and is the strongest opponent of this type of negotiated industrial agreement. The contract labour legislation that is currently before the House is designed to destroy the very type of industrial agreement that this legislation will ensure is able to be enforced. What a hypocritical Government and what a hypocritical situation we have here this evening! This hypocrisy is coming from a Government whose right hand truly does not know what its left hand is doing and a

Government with a Minister for Employment whose reputation and credibility is, and has been for some time, in absolute tatters.

I shall repeat the point I have made because contract labour legislation is currently before this House. Every Government member who spoke on this legislation said that it is essential to the well-being of employment in this State. I simply put to the Government that this piece of legislation, which this Government is pushing through and which the Opposition is supporting, is designed to ensure that a proper industrial agreement drawn up or agreed to by the parties—that is, the Trades and Labor Council of Queensland, on behalf of all of the unions of employees and employees who will work on the site, and the Metal Trades Industry Association, acting on behalf of the Expo authority—will be enforced.

It is encouraging to see that the Expo authority—not the Government, but certainly the Expo authority—recognises the need to embrace a traditional and time-tested method of achieving industrial harmony, despite having the Queensland National Party Government looking over the Expo authority's shoulder in its pursuit of the most objectionable and confrontationalist industrial policies and objectives.

Expo 88 is a very vital component of Queensland's participation in this nation's Bicentenary celebrations. Despite the understandable reluctance on the part of other Australian States to take their place at Expo, it is pleasing from my point of view, and from the point of view of most honourable members, to see that to date both the major States of New South Wales and Victoria have agreed to participate. As a result of discussions that I have had with both the Western Australian and South Australian Governments, those two States are very seriously looking at their ability to participate also. They are naturally having to take into consideration their tight fiscal situations and the financial problems faced by all States at the present time.

Over a period I have been very proud to be the chairman of the sport and recreation committee of the Bicentennial Authority in Queensland. Its members are unsung and unheralded people who, together with some of my colleagues and some members of the Government, have participated to ensure that in 1988 the celebrations in Queensland will be something to remember.

As I have indicated, Expo is one of the integral parts of the overall celebrations that will take place. I know that my colleague Ken Vaughan has been a member of the authority in Queensland for some time and has participated in the activities on that committee. I do not know of one member of that committee who has gone to the extent of endeavouring to publicise his position in the interests of himself or his political party. It is very pleasing that unsung and unheralded workers carried out that task.

I repeat that it amazes me to find that tonight the National Party Government is pursuing vigorously a proposition to ensure the enforcement of an industrial agreement entered into by the Expo authority and the Trades and Labor Council. Although I support the proposition whole-heartedly, I repeat that it is most hypocritical for the Government to allow that situation to occur. At the same time, before the House at present, with the debate yet to be completed, is contract labour legislation that is designed to override that type of sensible arrangement which obviously, from my point of view, will ensure the successful operation of Expo. It will ensure a dispute-free environment during the operation of Expo, just as has occurred during the construction on the Expo site. That is tremendously important to the future of Expo and to those thousands of people who will visit Expo. Although the Government has adopted a hypocritical attitude, the Opposition supports the legislation.

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police) (9.22 p.m.), in reply: The proposed amendments are necessary for the efficient planning and administration of Expo. There is no doubt that Expo will be the major event of our Bicentenary year and that it will be the most successful event ever held by this nation. The main thrust of the Bill is to create by-laws that are absolutely necessary.

Control over airspace is essentially a function of the Commonwealth. Provision has been made for by-law control in the event of the Commonwealth's finding itself unable to exercise control over light aircraft, balloons and other advertising objects operating at a very low level. The Government is very conscious of the need for planning after Expo. I feel certain that the Expo grounds will be used to the best advantage after the staging of Expo. No exhibits are to be erected in Musgrave Park. The park is to be landscaped and enhanced as a facility for use by the public both during and after that famous event.

As to post-Expo development—an evaluation committee comprising the Co-ordinator-General, the Under Treasurer, the chairman of Expo and the Town Clerk are reporting on four short-listed proposals. Assessment will be subject to planning guidelines agreed between the organisations that I have mentioned.

The construction work agreement has been registered in the Industrial Commission. The World Expo 88 Agreement is not registered in the Industrial Commission because both parties opted for by-law control. Both parties appreciate the special nature of Expo and agreed to take the negotiations outside of the everyday jurisdiction. Like the Leader of the Opposition, I have received a copy of the agreement from the Metal Trades Industry Association. The second paragraph of a letter from the MTIA states—

“As you will recall it was always the intention of the parties to the Expo '88 Industrial Agreements that the agreements be made pursuant to the Expo '88 Act.”

I thank honourable members for their contributions.

Motion agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 6, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

JURISDICTION OF COURTS (CROSS-VESTING) BILL

Hon. P. J. CLAUSON (Redlands—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (9.26 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to provide for the cross-vesting of certain jurisdiction.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Clauson, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. P. J. CLAUSON (Redlands—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (9.27 p.m.): I move—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

The purpose of the Jurisdiction of Courts (Cross-vesting) Bill 1987 is to establish a system of cross-vesting of jurisdiction between Federal, State and Territory courts. The Bill is the result of extensive consultations between the Commonwealth and the States in the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General and is an attempt to resolve difficulties that presently exist in determining the jurisdictional limits of Federal, State and Territory courts. The Bill will not detract from the existing jurisdictions of those courts. The Bill will be complemented by the enactment in the Commonwealth, each State and the Northern Territory of reciprocal legislation.

The essence of the cross-vesting scheme, as provided for in the Bill and proposed complementary Commonwealth and State legislation, is that State and Territory Supreme Courts will be vested with all the civil jurisdiction, except certain industrial and trade practices jurisdiction, of the Federal courts, at present the Federal Court of Australia and the Family Court of Australia, and the Federal courts will be vested with the full jurisdiction of the State and Territory Supreme Courts.

The reasons for the proposed scheme are that litigants have occasionally experienced inconvenience and have been put to unnecessary expense as a result of, firstly, uncertainties as to the jurisdictional limits of Federal, State and Territory courts, particularly in the areas of trade practices and family law and, secondly, the lack of power in those courts to ensure that proceedings that are instituted in different courts but which ought to be tried together are tried in the one court.

Jurisdictional difficulties do the law and the community no good. They result in litigants with genuine disputes that require judicial determination being faced with the anguish, delay and additional expense that flow from the sterile and pointless need to search for a court or courts with jurisdiction to resolve those disputes. The seriousness of those jurisdictional difficulties to the community is all the more pressing because they occur in areas such as family law and trade practices, which touch the everyday activities of so many people and corporations in Australia. We are thus confronted with growing frustration in the community and the legal profession with a system of courts with geographic and other jurisdictional limitations that get in the way of the efficient resolution of the disputes of litigants.

Despite efforts by the High Court of Australia to resolve many of the jurisdictional problems that have arisen, problems that require legislative action for a solution still exist.

Governments and Parliaments have a responsibility on behalf of the community to find solutions to those problems, which at present impede the efficient administration of justice.

The cross-vesting scheme, as contained in the Bill and the proposed Commonwealth and State complementary legislation, seeks to overcome these problems by vesting the Federal courts with State jurisdiction and by vesting State courts with Federal jurisdiction so that no action will fail in a court through lack of jurisdiction, and will ensure that no court will have to determine the boundaries between Federal, State and Territory jurisdictions. The scheme, although simple in concept, amounts to a radical change in the Australian judicial system.

The Bill seeks to cross-vest jurisdiction in such a way that Federal and State courts will, by and large, keep within their proper jurisdictional fields. To achieve this, the Bill and the proposed Commonwealth and State legislation make detailed and comprehensive provision for transfers between courts, which should ensure that proceedings begun in an inappropriate court, or related proceedings, begun in separate courts, will be transferred to an appropriate court.

The provisions relating to cross-vesting will need to be applied only in those exceptional cases in which there are jurisdictional uncertainties and in which there is a real need to have matters tried together in the one court. The successful operation of the cross-vesting scheme will depend very much upon courts approaching the legislation in accordance with its general purpose and intention as indicated in the preamble to the Bill.

Courts will need to be ruthless in the exercise of their transferral powers to ensure that litigants do not engage in forum shopping by commencing proceedings in inappropriate courts or resort to other tactical manoeuvres that would otherwise be available to them by reason of the fact that State courts would have all the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, and vice versa. The courts themselves would also be expected not to take advantage of the legislation to aggregate business to their own courts in matters that would not otherwise have been within their respective jurisdiction.

It is considered that the courts will approach the legislation in accordance with its spirit and purpose. Under the cross-vesting scheme, no court will need to decide whether any particular matter is truly within Federal or State jurisdiction since in either event the court will have the same powers and duties. That is because, in any particular proceedings, in so far as the matters involved are within Federal or Territory jurisdiction, the powers and duties will be conferred and imposed by the Commonwealth Act, and in so far as the matters are not within Federal or Territory jurisdiction, the powers and duties will be conferred by complementary State legislation.

In particular, the Bill provides for the compulsory transfer by the State Supreme Court of any special Federal matter unless it appears to the Supreme Court that, by reason of the particular circumstances of the case, it is both inappropriate for the matter to be transferred to the Federal Court and appropriate for the Supreme Court to determine the proceedings. The expression "special Federal matter" refers to matters of special Commonwealth concern, being matters that at present are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Court.

Two examples of special Federal matters are matters arising under the Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Act 1977 and matters within the original jurisdiction of the Federal Court by virtue of section 39B of the Judiciary Act 1903, this being jurisdiction with respect to any matter in which a writ of mandamus or prohibition or an injunction is sought against certain Commonwealth officers.

The special role of the Federal Court is also recognised in relation to appeal matters which presently lie within the exclusive appellate jurisdiction of the Federal Court. Appeals in matters under certain Commonwealth Acts will remain within the exclusive appellate jurisdiction of the full Federal Court.

An important factor of the scheme is that a committee of Chief Justices of State and Territory Supreme Courts and the Chief Justices of the Federal Court of Australia and the Family Court of Australia will be established for the purpose of monitoring the operation of the scheme and to report regularly to the standing committee.

After a trial period of three years, each party to the scheme will have the right to withdraw from the scheme upon the giving of notice to the other parties.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Prest, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 9.36 p.m.