

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 3 OCTOBER 1989

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 3 OCTOBER 1989

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. K. R. Lingard, Fassifern) read prayers and took the chair at 10 a.m.

ASSENT TO BILL

Assent to the Central Queensland Coal Associates Agreement Amendment Bill reported by Mr Speaker.

CHIEF REPORTER, PARLIAMENTARY REPORTING STAFF

Appointment of Mr P. B. Rohl

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have to inform the House that Mr Peter Bradshaw Rohl has been appointed to the position of Chief Reporter.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

Resignation of Mr M. J. Ahern

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have to inform the House that I have received from Mr Michael John Ahern his resignation as a member of the Standing Orders Committee.

Appointment of Hon. T. R. Cooper

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Leader of the House) (11.02 a.m.): I move—

“That Theo Russell Cooper, member for the electoral district of Roma, be appointed a member of the Standing Orders Committee to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr Michael John Ahern.”

Motion agreed to.

FORMER MEMBERS LUNCHEON

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have to inform the House that the former members luncheon will be held today from 12.30 p.m. for 1 p.m. in the functions room.

PETITIONS

The Deputy Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

QUT Student Guild

From Mr Beanland (34 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will legislate for an inquiry to investigate the affairs and financial administration of the QUT Student Guild.

Boothville Hospital

From Mr Comben (285 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will provide contingency funding to allow Boothville Hospital to remain open.

Police Force Strength; Police Station, Sunnybank

From **Mr Gygar** (70 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take urgent steps to increase the number of police and establish a police station in the Sunnybank area.

National Park, Fraser Island

From **Ms Warner** (295 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take action to declare all forestry and vacant Crown land on Fraser Island a national park.

A similar petition was received from **Mr Comben** (388 signatories).

Free Public Hospital System

From **Mr Comben** (120 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will protect the free public hospital system by ensuring country services are maintained and that no further charges are made upon the users of the system.

Objection to Feedlot, Goomburra Valley

From **Mr Booth** (37 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take action to increase protection to objectors of the erection of a feedlot in the Goomburra valley.

Bremer River Bridge; Old Toowoomba Road

From **Mr Underwood** (730 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take the necessary steps to fund a replacement bridge across the Bremer River and widen the Old Toowoomba Road between Leichhardt and the RAAF base at Amberley.

Enoggera Road, Alternative Improvement Plans

From **Mr Comben** (490 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will consider alternative plans for road improvements on Enoggera Road near Sedgley Park so as to avoid damage to parkland and protect residents from excessive noise.

Petitions received.

PAPERS

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

Reports—

- Geographic Information for the year ended 30 June 1989
- Valuer-General for the year ended 30 June 1989
- Gladstone Port Authority for the year ended 30 June 1989
- Water Resources Commission for the year ended 30 June 1989
- Queensland Museum for the year ended 30 June 1989
- State Library of Queensland for the year ended 30 June 1989
- Department of Environment and Conservation for the year ended 30 June 1989
- Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation for the year ended 30 June 1989
- Queensland Law Reform Commission for the year ended 30 June 1989
- Disaster Appeals Trust Fund Committee for the year ended 30 June 1989
- Public Defender for the year ended 30 June 1989.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Orders in Council under—

- Explosives Act 1952-1981

Petroleum Act 1923-1988
Harbour Act 1955-1989
Canals Act 1958-1987
Forestry Act 1959-1987
Marine Parks Act 1982-1988
Jury Act 1929-1988
The Supreme Court Act of 1921
Magistrates Courts Act 1921-1988
District Courts Act 1967-1988
Auctioneers and Agents Act 1971-1988
Building Societies Act 1985-1987
Regulations under—
Cremation Act 1913-1988
Food Act 1981-1989
Health Act 1937-1989
Radioactive Substances Act 1958-1978
Mines Regulation Act 1964-1989
Main Roads Act 1920-1988
Mobile Homes Act 1989
Securities Industry (Application of Laws) Act 1981-1987
Futures Industry (Application of Laws) Act 1986
Companies (Application of Laws) Act 1981
Small Claims Tribunals Act 1973-1988
By-laws under the Harbours Act 1955-1988
Rules under the Coal Mining Act 1925-1989
Statement of Receipt and Payments of the Coal Mining Industry Long Service
Leave Trust Fund for the year ended 30 June 1989.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Breast-screening Services for Women

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Health) (10.12 a.m.), by leave: I wish to briefly inform members of this House of a major health initiative which is set to save the lives of hundreds of Queensland women in coming years. Yesterday, Queensland's first mobile mammography unit was launched during the opening of Cancer Action Week in Brisbane's King George Square. The \$260,000 custom-built van represents the latest initiative by the State Health Department and the Queensland Cancer Fund to reduce breast cancer deaths among the Queensland women. It is the first of two mobile units which will be trialled during a pilot program in Queensland. If successful, no doubt they will be followed by another two units.

Each year in Queensland about 325 women die from breast cancer—the largest cancer killer of Queensland women. The introduction of mobile-screening units could slash this death rate by up to one-third. The mobile units will supplement existing hospital-based clinics in the State which have proved enormously successful in detecting breast cancer in the early stages of development. Early detection can prevent unnecessary and traumatic surgery, in addition to saving lives. Over the next year, an estimated 38 000 women over the age of 50 from all parts of Queensland will undergo mammography examinations at public clinics at absolutely no charge.

For the information of honourable members, I point out that in 1985 Queensland was the first State to establish a public breast-screening unit at which unreferred patients could be examined free of charge. The introduction of those mobile units again proves that Queensland remains at the forefront in the development of mammography services for women.

In total, the State Government's investment in breast-screening services in mobile clinics and hospital-based units will total more than \$1m annually. In addition, the Queensland Cancer Fund has contributed \$260,000 for the purchase of one of the mobile clinics. That compares favourably with the Federal Labor Government's recent pledge to provide a total of only \$1.2m funding for all women's cancer-screening programs—breast and cervical cancer screening—plus the development of new birthing centres. That minimal allocation for all of Australia is dressed up in the Federal Government's recently released women's health policy as some great commitment to the women of Australia. Unlike the Federal Labor Government, which is dragging its feet on this issue, the Queensland Government has taken the lead in this area for the women of Queensland.

I also wish to put on public record my appreciation to the State Labor and Liberal Parties for their obvious support of the State Government's programs for breast-screening services for women. Their health policy documents outlining women's cancer-screening policies effectively endorse this Government's work in recent years. The simple fact is that this National Party Government has already delivered on promises that the opposition parties are putting to the people of Queensland for the forthcoming election.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Health-care Services in Regional and Rural Areas of Queensland

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Health) (10.14 a.m.), by leave: Members of this House, particularly those from non-metropolitan electorates, would be well aware of the tremendous challenge of providing quality health-care services for regional and rural areas of the State. It is against this background that the State Health Department has recently established a rural health division to address the health needs of country Queenslanders.

The new rural health division will act as the central policy adviser and co-ordinating body for the department in all health matters affecting rural areas. That initiative will further improve the level of health care in rural areas while striving to attract and retain more doctors in the public health system.

Honourable members would also be aware of the extra \$15m funding provided in this year's Budget for improved conditions and salary rates for resident medical officers in the State's hospitals.

The State Health Department is also providing funding for the establishment of rural health training schemes, with a pilot program operating initially at the QEII Hospital in Brisbane and at the Rockhampton hospital. These hospital-based units will improve the training, skills and knowledge of doctors to enable them to meet the special demands of rural practice. The units will be operated by the post-graduate medical education committee at the University of Queensland as an extension of existing medical education courses offered by that committee.

The final part of the State Government's rural health strategy is the formation of a ministerial advisory committee, comprised of professional, academic and consumer groups with a special interest in rural health. This advisory committee will provide useful feedback and information from people with daily hands-on experience in rural health to ensure the Government remains responsive to their particular needs.

I have no doubt that all honourable members will welcome this latest State Government initiative as part of our commitment to providing free and accessible health care to all Queenslanders.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Victorian Workers' Compensation Scheme

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs—Minister for Police and Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Affairs) (10.19 a.m.), by leave: Mr Speaker—

Mr Milliner: Vroom, vroom!

Mr LESTER: It will be "Vroom, vroom!" when I have finished with the ALP this morning. I will state a few facts in this Parliament today. I will examine workers' compensation in Queensland and workers' compensation in Victoria, which has a Labor Government.

Recently in Victoria the pay-roll levy for workers' compensation rose from 2.4 per cent to 3.3 per cent. That is incredible and incomprehensible. That means that the ALP Government in Victoria is so broke that the compensation paid to workers is being reduced from 80 per cent of the wages paid to 60 per cent of the wages paid. That is what the Labor Government in Victoria thinks of the workers of that State. The Victorian Labor Government wants to cut back the payments to workers. It could not care less about the workers. That Government is deeply in debt.

Many companies in Victoria are considering undertaking their own Workcare schemes with private insurance companies. These companies include Coles-Myer and TNT. Even the State Electricity Commission—a semi-Government authority—cannot afford to support the Government of Victoria. Who is going to pay for workers' compensation? Small businesses are going to have to meet the backlog. Small businesses are going to have to help fund the gap in workers' compensation in Victoria. That will mean that their premiums will rise even more.

In Victoria, under a Labor Government, few methods of accident prevention have been considered and acted upon. There is little provision for rehabilitation. In addition to that, the Labor Government in Victoria is \$5 billion in debt. It has taken away all of the services and put up the premiums. That is in line with the \$30 billion debt that the Labor Government in Victoria seems to have.

Mr Compton of the Australian Chamber of Manufacturers is disgusted with what is happening in Victoria. He has said very clearly that the manufacturing base in Victoria is being lost and that it is going to go to New South Wales and Queensland. That is what is going to happen. Indeed, Mr Compton has indicated that at least 170 textile clothing manufacturers say that jobs will be lost because of high workers' compensation premiums in Victoria which provide very little return.

In contrast to the position in Victoria, under a National Party Government in Queensland the workers' compensation premium per \$100 of wages paid is \$1.45. That is the cheapest rate in Australia and, I am led to believe, the cheapest in the world. The Queensland Government has moved in relation to accident prevention. That is why this Government has joined the workers' compensation and the Division of Occupational Health and Safety areas. Our experts are now going out into the field, finding out where most of the accidents occur and taking action to ensure that fewer accidents will occur in the future in those accident-prone spots.

At South Brisbane the Queensland Government has what is regarded as the best rehabilitation centre in the world. That service will be extended throughout the length and breadth of Queensland. The Government thought that that rehabilitation centre would take nine years to pay for itself. In fact, it has paid for itself in three years. The reason that it has paid for itself in three years is that people are getting back into the work-force sooner. That is what good business is about, and that is why the economy of this State is running so well. It is because the members of the Queensland Cabinet have business experience. They have had to make a profit.

Let me examine what has happened in Victoria. The Victorian Cabinet is composed of people who have not been outside a class room or a legal practice and would not

know what making a profit is all about. As for the Federal Government, all one needs to do is to consider the balance of payments problem. All one needs to do is to consider the debts of the Federal Government. Again, the Federal Cabinet is not composed of people who have had business experience. The National Party Cabinet of Queensland comprises people who have made it in the business world. The Queensland Government has made a profit and employed more and more people. That is why this Government is starting to go so very, very well.

The Queensland Government is ensuring that workers' compensation premiums go to the sick people who are out of work. This Government is progressively giving those workers more remuneration. Everybody knows that. In fact, this Government is keeping abreast of workers' compensation rises in Queensland.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr LESTER: Members of the Opposition did not get me wrong that time. If they want to make fun of that remark, they can.

It is very, very clear that the Government of Queensland is doing the right thing, both by employers and employees. The Queensland Government will continue to do that, and it will continue to point out all of the problems in the Labor States because they are going backwards at a great rate of knots.

The people of Queensland should realise that the National Party is at least providing good government in this State and is providing a return for their dollar. They should realise that any thought of voting for the ALP would mean the demise of this State and financial chaos.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Study of English in Australia by Overseas Students; Statement by Federal Minister for Employment, Education and Training

Hon. B. G. LITTLEPROUD (Condamine—Minister for Education, Youth, Sport and Recreation) (10.22 a.m.), by leave: I draw the attention of honourable members to a press statement made on 30 August 1989 by the Honourable J. S. Dawkins, MHR, Minister for Employment, Education and Training. Mr Dawkins announced new arrangements for private overseas students wishing to study English in Australia. In his statement, Mr Dawkins recognises that a valuable industry has grown in this area from almost nothing a couple of years ago to be worth about \$230m a year, with the potential to rise to about \$500m a year within the next decade.

It is ironic and regrettable that the procedures and criteria announced by Mr Dawkins to control this industry appear likely not only to prevent his projected growth patterns but also to bring about a severe contraction of the industry. It appears inevitable that the severe entry criteria to be imposed by the Commonwealth Government will cause large numbers of potential overseas students to turn to countries other than Australia.

A further impediment imposed by the new Commonwealth policy is the requirement that if students come to Australia to complete a short course, such as an intensive English language course, and then decide to enrol for further studies in Australia, they must first return to their own country to obtain a new visa. The additional costs that this requirement imposes will undoubtedly make Australia seem a far less attractive study destination for overseas students.

Another aspect of the Dawkins policy announcement which will cause great harm to institutions offering short courses is the proposed \$160 visa charge on short-term students. It seems quite clear that the charge will have no impact on current problems being experienced with student overstay in Australia. What it will do is further disadvantage Queensland and Australian institutions against providers from competitor countries, notably New Zealand, which appear to value this industry more.

As the majority of short-course overseas students of all nationalities are young and mobile, they typically combine study and travel while in Australia. This provides an added benefit to the economy as their fees and other expenditure are spread across a number of communities and markets. Risking the loss of the student travelling market at this time, when all sectors of the travel and accommodation industry are under strain through no fault of their own, in the view of the Queensland Government defies logic.

The Queensland Government has made strong representations to the Commonwealth Government on this matter, and I call on members of the Opposition in the Queensland Parliament to also address this matter urgently with their Federal counterparts to avoid the damaging effects that this ill-considered decision could bring.

I table Mr Dawkins' press release and seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

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

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ANNOUNCES NEW ARRANGEMENTS FOR PRIVATE OVERSEAS STUDENTS

The Federal Government has introduced new arrangements for private overseas students wishing to study English in Australia, following an extensive review of entry criteria.

The Minister for Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs, Senator Robert Ray and the Minister for Employment, Education and Training, John Dawkins, today announced new processing arrangements to ensure that bona fide student applicants, with the educational and financial capacity to study in Australia, were processed speedily.

The new arrangements, endorsed by Cabinet, would enhance Australia's multi-million dollar export education industry and would seek to uphold the integrity of Australia's immigration policy.

"Study opportunities will remain available to students who have a sincere desire to study in Australia," Senator Ray and Mr Dawkins said.

Senator Ray said the new measures would be complemented by vigilance on the part of immigration officers in an effort to ensure that overseas students complied with the terms and conditions of their entry to Australia.

Mr Dawkins said the Government introduced the new criteria for the entry of genuine students and decided to tighten compliance monitoring to protect and strengthen Australia's burgeoning export education industry.

"This valuable industry has grown from almost nothing a couple of years ago to be worth about \$230 million a year, with the potential to rise to about \$500 million a year within the next decade," Mr Dawkins said.

As part of the Government's review, new steps would be taken to ensure the speedy processing of a huge backlog of applications to study in Australia lodged by students from the People's Republic of China.

ATTACHMENT 1

PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR PRC ENGLISH LANGUAGE STUDENTS

The backlog of 25,000 applicants in the People's Republic of China wishing to undertake English language courses will be asked to fill in a questionnaire, and these applicants will then be assessed against the following criteria:

- they must have a minimum educational level to the Australian standard Year 10;
- a maximum age of 35 years;
- they must present some form of certification of the relevance of the course to their current employment, or demonstrated relevance to future employment, or evidence of provisional enrolment in appropriate further education.

Applicants from the PRC would be required to acknowledge that no dependants would be permitted to join them in Australia.

NEW FEE

A special application fee of \$160 will be levied on all private overseas students wishing to study English in Australia.

The fee will go towards off-setting the cost of compliance operations conducted by the Department of Immigration.

GUARANTEE FUND

From January 1 next year, all institutions approved to teach English to overseas students will be required to have in place a mechanism to guarantee the provision of services for which students have paid.

The institutions will also have to establish guarantee funds to return fees to students who have enrolled with them, but who are then unable to enter Australia and participate in the course.

REVIEW OF ACCREDITATION

Institutions where more than 20% of students overstay their visas will have their accreditation reviewed by the Department of Education, Employment and Training.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Provision to Public of Computerised Access to Government Information

Hon. H. D. J. FRASER (Springwood—Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology) (10.27 a.m.), by leave: Today I wish to inform the House of a major step forward in giving the public computerised access to Government information. Information which previously could be obtained only at a public counter will be available on a personal computer in an office or home. The new service, known as the public access system, is an extension of the computerisation of Government information, but its introduction has required careful study and planning. On the one hand, there is a concern to offer an effective and easy-to-use facility to the public. On the other, there is a need to secure information from unauthorised access and to prevent accidental or deliberate alteration of data.

The Department of Industry Development, through its Centre for Information Technology and Communications (CITEC), has worked with a number of departments to develop a safe and effective system. All public inquiries are channelled through a dedicated computer which controls access to other Government computer systems. Only normal counter inquiries are allowed through this dedicated machine, and that prevents illegal access or operation. A single entry point also makes access simpler and easier for clients.

Initially, the system will offer simple and easy access for searches and inquiries on behalf of the Department of Freehold Land Titles, as well as valuations and sales inquiries from the Department of the Valuer-General. Within a short period, it is planned to incorporate further land-related information as well as business and company information from the office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs. Additional Government databases will be available through the public access system in the future. Clients throughout the State will be able to access the system on their personal computers through simple telephone dial-up. So as not to disadvantage non-metropolitan users, investigations are under way into alternative means of communication, such as the Telecom Austrpac facility.

Every attempt is being made to keep to a reasonable level the cost of the system to clients while not placing a burden on the tax-payer. Charges may be marginally more than public counter fees, but the public access system will still offer considerable savings in speed and convenience. CITEC will administer the system, and information kits on the system are available from the public access support service at CITEC on 222-2700.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Public Accounts Committee Report on Drought Relief

Hon. M. D. STONEMAN (Burdekin—Minister for Primary Industries) (10.29 a.m.), by leave: Currently, three shires in Queensland are still drought declared, that is, Flinders, McKinlay and Richmond. In addition, there are a number of individually drought-declared properties (IDPs). Acting on a request from the local drought committee, a

recommendation has gone to Cabinet to revoke the drought status of Flinders Shire as from 1 October 1989. In the remaining two drought-declared shires there are still extensive areas which are severely droughted. In contrast, at the end of February this year there were 17 drought-declared shires and an additional 666 IDPs. In total, 19 per cent of the State was drought declared.

It is against this background of a relatively low drought incidence that I welcome the release of the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee's report on the administration of drought relief by the Department of Primary Industries. I express my appreciation to the members of the committee for their efforts in obtaining the views of the primary producers, industry organisations and officers of my department. I hope that the committee's recommendations will be widely and fairly publicised and receive careful scrutiny by all concerned.

Next week, I will visit the western areas of the State to obtain first-hand reactions to the report and to familiarise myself with the current position. I give an assurance that the Queensland Government will consider carefully the recommendations and will take action on their implementation only after full consultation with those affected by them.

I thank the committee for its tribute to the department's stock-inspectors' role in the administration of drought relief. I was pleased with the committee's recommendations on the drought declaration process and the strengthening of the local drought committees. I have asked my department to reconvene its Technical Committee on Drought, which was established in March this year, to determine a program of implementation in this regard. I envisage that the local drought committees will take due account of land-care issues in close association with the land-care committees that are now operating throughout the State.

I have also asked the technical committee of my department to review as a matter of urgency the maximum rates of subsidy for privately owned livestock transport; to examine the introduction of a minimum subsidy payment of \$25 per claim form; to establish procedures for providing part-time or temporary assistance to stock-inspectors during peak drought periods; and to investigate developing a drought warning and prediction system.

A senior officer of my department will liaise with the Railway Department with a view to the drought secretariat administering both rail and road freight subsidies. The committee's recommendations on the freight subsidies will be considered in detail. In general, because the recommendations correspond closely to the recommendations of my department's technical committee as included in its interim report that was submitted in July of this year to my predecessor in office, the Honourable N. J. Harper, MLA, my impression is favourable.

I have some reservations about the effectiveness of setting a \$20,000 limit per property, because that may lead to a general attitude that anything goes up to that limit. Although a \$20,000 limit is more than adequate in the coastal areas, it disregards the high cost of freight and the numbers of stock on properties in the remote areas of the State. Similarly, I will be examining closely the 1 000-kilometre proposal and its impact on a State the size of Queensland. My officers have commenced an examination of the drought secretariat's database to determine the implications of that recommendation for western areas.

Whereas I respect the PAC's recommendation to have neatly defined objectives and aims in drought relief, of equal importance is an administrative system that will respond quickly to a severe deterioration of climatic conditions in the face of changing industry and overall economic circumstances. I have asked my department to take that into account when framing the objectives.

Members will be aware of the Federal Government's Drought Policy Review Task Force, which will publish its final report and recommendations in March 1990. Subject to Cabinet approval, during the next week or two I will forward to the task force a

submission that is based on the interim report of my department's technical committee, which was prepared at the direction of the Honourable N. J. Harper, MLA.

WOLFFDENE DAM

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (10.35 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That this House demands the Government not proceed with the construction or planning of the Wolffdene dam in any way, now or at any time in the future because—

- (1) the social upheaval of 2 000 to 3 000 people who have been allowed to settle in the Albert valley will not be tolerated;
- (2) the environmental and social impact of such a dam far outweighs any technical suitability of the site for dam-building; and
- (3) Queensland has an abundance of land but not excellent arable land so accessible to the metropolitan area such as the Albert valley.”

The Liberal Party's concern in relation to the Wolffdene dam has always centred upon the interests of the people who live in the Albert valley. As to the report that was released last week—what has not been fully understood is that a subcommittee of this Parliament has to address the evidence that is put before the committee.

That engineering-based study found that, on engineering grounds, Wolffdene was a good and suitable economic dam site in terms of building costs and that, in the future, there would be some need for an additional source of water in south-east Queensland.

Mr GATELY: I rise to a point of order. I am sure that I heard the honourable member ask for permission to move a motion, but I did not hear him get permission to do so.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. There is no point of order.

Mr INNES: The clear distinction must be understood that the committee acted upon the evidence that was put before it, and the majority decided——

Mr Campbell interjected.

Mr INNES: I ask the honourable member to let me deal briefly with that.

In an attempt to avoid the implications of the evidence that was put before the committee, the Labor Party is talking about a carefully worded minority report. However, in fairness, the committee had to decide whether the evidence amounted to the need for a dam in the future and whether that site was suitable. The committee did not address—and no study has been done on it—the social impact and environmental impact of that dam on that site.

It is as simple as this: a study could conclude that the city of Brisbane is situated on an excellent dam site; but, because of the competing and alternative land uses and the consequent social upheaval, nobody would build a dam on the site of the city of Brisbane.

Mr Comben interjected.

Mr INNES: No. I refer the honourable member to page 12 of the minority report.

Labor Party members who did not have the guts to say clearly what the evidence was and what they found said that, on the evidence, some new source of water would be needed in the future and that that source would be provided by a dam or by some alternative source. They said also that the Wolffdene dam is the most cost effective at this time and that future dam sites should be preserved from subdivision because of the

prospects of future water-gathering. That minority report did nothing to remove the cloud over the people of the Albert valley.

Mr ARDILL: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member is misleading the House. The report produced by the Labor members of the committee clearly said that, on the evidence before the committee, no dam is needed.

Mr INNES: The committee accepted the engineering evidence in good faith. But that did not conclude the matter. At a meeting, my party reviewed the situation and made the clear decision that, looking at the social upheaval consequences, the matter needs to be made absolutely clear. It is not sufficient to tell people that for the foreseeable future—for 40 or 50 years—no compulsory acquisitions will be made. The people in the area concerned have rightly said that—and this is conceded as being reasonable feedback—in 50 years' time a cloud will be left over their heads; the demand might be there; alternative sources might not be found; and there is still some blot over the peaceable enjoyment of their land. They want that blot removed.

The Liberal Party has determined to follow its original decision in this case on the social impact, irrespective of the suitability of that site as a dam site. Too much settlement has occurred in that area. That settlement has occurred with the approval and agreement of Governments. Subdivisions have been allowed. The local authorities have not been backed in their opposition to subdivision, which opposition would, if successful, have reduced the number of persons to be removed if a dam was built.

The Brisbane and Area Water Board came into being. People who had settled in the valley, or who intended settling there, had written to that board and were assured that no dam would be built in that area. It is perfectly clear that the number of people who have settled in that valley in recent years has increased enormously, to a point at which the Liberal Party believes that, when one looks at the competing land-use interests—and that will always be the balance—and the suitability of the site for a dam as against the number of people to be removed to allow a dam to be built, the Government has to accept the mistakes that it made, perhaps even in 1971. If the site had been frozen, that would be another matter. The Government did not freeze the site. Some 2 000 to 3 000 people live in that valley. They cannot be uprooted.

I see the Premier pointing at Mr Beanland. Let me deal with that. On the evidence before the committee, Mr Beanland did the fair and honest thing. The engineering evidence was that the growth of population would be such that some new source of water would be needed and that at the present moment the Wolffdene dam site is the most cost-effective site for a dam. Denver Beanland did not vote for the building of the Wolffdene dam.

Mr Mackenroth: You said he supported it.

Mr INNES: No. I said that there was no present need for that dam. On the evidence before the committee, there is no need until the year 2050. That is the evidence. The Liberal Party said there should be no compulsory acquisition; that the people should be left to live in peaceable enjoyment on their land in that valley, because no present or urgent need had been demonstrated. But, reasonably, people say, "That doesn't end our agony. Some time in the future, if we live that long, or if we pass the land on to our kids, there could still be a decision to use that land. We can't sell our land; we can't get rid of it. A cloud of uncertainty is left over our peaceable enjoyment and over the values of our land." The Liberal Party accepts that. Therefore the matter needs to be clarified.

As I said last week, there will be no compulsory acquisition. The people wish to know that that will be the position now and in the future. The Liberal Party accepts that. The decision is: ignore the engineering reports. No full environmental and social impact study has been undertaken in that valley. The decision has been arrived at on an engineering basis. The decision whether to convert the engineering suitability into

reality is a political judgment that is made. When one considers making that judgment, one looks at social upheaval and competing land uses.

The Liberal Party wishes it to be clear that it will not support, now or in the future, the building of a dam at Wolffdene.

Mr Hamill: That's not what you said on Friday.

Mr INNES: What I said was that the Liberal Party will support no compulsory acquisition of any land, because no present or imminent need has been disclosed.

For those people in the Wolffdene area who are uncertain, the Liberal Party makes it perfectly clear that it wishes to remove any blots over the peaceable enjoyment of their land now and into the future.

As far as the Liberal Party is concerned—and it assumes also as far as the Labor Party is concerned, despite some fear that Mr McLean has created around south-east Queensland—

Mr McLean: You're gone; they've found you out.

Mr INNES: No. Honourable members should listen. Mr McLean has said that there will be no more big dams; that there will be a lot of little dams. How big the little dams will be, we do not know. He said that subdivision should not be allowed where those little dams are to be sited. I hope that, before the election, Mr McLean and Mr Goss will share with us all those little dam sites in south-east Queensland where subdivision will not be allowed. That was the Labor Party's cop-out. It said, "There will be a need, but we will fill that need with lots of little dams—and no subdivisions will take place—but we won't tell you where they are."

The Liberal Party has listened to the people. Let there be no bones about it: the Liberal Party accepts that an assurance for no compulsory acquisition, now and in the foreseeable future, has not been enough for the people in the Wolffdene area. The Government cannot now go back over history. It cannot remove the fact that it has been responsible for the settlement of the valley. No steps were taken to stop the settlement of the valley. No steps were taken to stop the subdivision of the valley. Therefore, the Government is responsible for the people who have settled on the land in the valley and is responsible for any upheaval.

The Government's decision must be that there are too many people and that they cannot be moved. The Government should decide that the Wolffdene dam will not be built. Let me make it perfectly clear to the Government and the Opposition that the Liberal Party will support the motion that no Wolffdene dam will be built now or in the future; that it will do so now, next week, the week before the election, the week after the election and the months after that. That is the position that members of the Liberal Party took earlier this year and that is the position that we have resolved to maintain today. We do so because of the uncertainty that hangs over the people who live in the Albert valley. It is causing them distress. It was not enough to say nothing for 50 years. They want total assurance and they will get total assurance. Members of the Liberal Party are more than happy to seek to assure them peace of mind—

Mr Ardill: But how are you going to do it?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Salisbury!

Mr INNES: By indicating precisely how Liberal Party members will vote in this House before and after the election.

Mr GOSS (Logan—Leader of the Opposition) (10.48 a.m.): I second the motion.

Mr BEARD: Mr Speaker—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr GOSS: In seconding the motion, let me say that it is a pleasure to stiffen up the jelly of the Liberal Party.

Mr BEARD: I rise to a point of order. I second the motion, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members, I have not been notified of this motion. I call the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr GOSS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It is a pleasure for the Opposition to help stiffen up the jelly of the Liberal Party. The Macbeth to the Lady Macbeth down at King George Square stood on a stage with me at Tamborine Village, Mount Tamborine, earlier this year. When asked by the people of the Albert valley, "Where do you stand, Angus?", he said, "Well, we're prepared to let a committee have a look at it and will abide by the decision of the committee." Obviously there was no respect for that barbed-wire position adopted by the Leader of the Liberal Party after some weeks of pressure applied by angry residents of the valley and by members and supporters of the Liberal Party.

Finally the Leader of the Liberal Party, as you will recall, Mr Speaker, was smoked out and came off the barbed wire. He said, in that firm leadership style of his that we have come to know and love, "This will be a condition of coalition." Do you remember that, Mr Speaker?

Mike Ahern came back from overseas and blasted him, and he went back into the doghouse. Last week the Liberals backflipped again and came out supporting the majority report in favour of the Wolffdene dam. Since then, members and supporters of the Liberal Party have been walking away from the party. In Fassifern and in other areas, they have been deserting it in droves. They are doing so because the Liberal Party has backflipped yet again as the parliamentary members of the Liberal Party attempt to cosy into another sleazy coalition deal and as they try to get the impediments to such a deal out of the way.

Members of the Liberal Party have been hammered for five days. It has taken five or six days for the Leader of the Liberal Party—this refugee from the Campari and soda set—to finally decide that now he is, again, against the Wolffdene dam. Flip-flop, flip-flop; it is no wonder the Liberal Party in this State, particularly in the south-east corner, commands less and less respect.

Let us put on the line the question that tests fairly and squarely the resolve of the Liberal Party. Members of the Liberal Party have not answered it this morning. As I recall, members of the Liberal Party stated on the front page of a daily newspaper that they felt so strongly about the Wolffdene dam issue and it was such a matter of principle to them that it would be a condition—I emphasise the word "condition"—of any prospective coalition agreement. Where was that statement today from the Leader of the Liberal Party? Does anybody think that, if these refugees from the cocktail circuit got a chance to come back as junior partner in another coalition—second fiddle to the biggest fiddlers in the business—the Liberal Party would say, "Look, this is a matter of principle. We're not going into a coalition agreement. We're going to hold on to our principles in relation to such things as electoral reform and the Wolffdene dam", or any other principles that they may have and of which I may not be aware? I do not think that anybody else is aware of them either. Let the Leader of the Liberal Party answer the question: is it a condition of a coalition agreement, or would he, as the leader of a junior partner in the coalition, bow down and cop it sweet from the senior partner, the way the Liberal Party did for 26 out of 32 years?

This is a very symbolic question. It is a very important question to all of us. I know it is a matter in which you have an interest, Mr Speaker. I can assure you that a Goss Government would do all in its power to protect that part of your electorate. This question is important at two levels. It is important to approximately 3 000 people who live in that beautiful valley, to the environment and in terms of sensible and rational planning that the answer to the question of whether the dam will be built be known.

At least it can be said about members of the National Party that we know where they stand. They have taken a firm and consistent stand from the beginning and have said, "Build it." People know where the Labor Party stands because its members have taken a firm and consistent position against the dam. Members of the Labor Party were the first to say, "No dam." The shadow Minister, Mr McLean and I stood on the stage with Mr Innes when the fires of rage were lit. Thousands of people who live in the valley were there. We were asked what our position was. Whereas Mr Innes prevaricated and squirmed uncomfortably on the barbed-wire fence, Mr McLean and I said, "We have a simple policy and that is, 'No dam'."

As I was saying earlier, this issue is important at two levels. It is important in terms of respecting the personal and property rights of people who live in the area. It is also important as a question of fundamental integrity and fundamental credibility to the whole of the electorate of Queensland in this forthcoming election.

Most commentators and Queenslanders realise that there are two choices facing the people of this State at the next election: either a Goss Labor Government or a National Party-dominated coalition. They are the two choices. What would be the quality of a National Party-dominated coalition on important issues, such as Fitzgerald, and symbolic environmental and people issues, such as the Wolffdene dam?

Where does the Liberal Party stand, and what guarantees are the blancmange set prepared to give to the people of the Albert valley and the rest of this State? Are the members of the Liberal Party prepared to hold a public forum next week in the Albert valley and say, "We know we have backflipped again, but this time we are honest; trust us. This time we are not going to backflip."? Will they stand up in the Albert valley and say, "We also reaffirm that our position on the Wolffdene dam, as set out in this motion, is a matter of principle to us. We are so committed to people who support this position and to the people of the Albert valley that this is an unshakeable condition of a coalition."? Will they say that? There is silence from the honourable member for Sherwood.

Yesterday on television I saw Lady Macbeth from City Hall say, "There's all these people in the Liberal Party who want me to play Lady Macbeth and do the job on poor, old Angus." If this is the best Macbeth can do, watch out for Lady Macbeth!

The Opposition is happy to support this motion. It represents the Labor Party's position from the outset. We are pleased that the Liberal Party has flipped back to our position, but the question we ask is: for how long?

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Leader of the House) (10.57 a.m.): I move—
"That the question be put."

Mr LICKISS: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, I refer you to Standing Order 142, under which you have the discretion to decide whether there has been sufficient debate on this issue. There have been speeches by only the mover and a seconder.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have decided that it has been an excellent debate.

Question—That the question be put—agreed to.

Question—That the motion be agreed to—put; and the House divided—

In division—

Mr R. J. Gibbs: interjected.

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

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You can't, during a division.

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

AYES, 39

Ardill	Santoro
Beanland	Schuntner
Beard	Scott
Braddy	Sherlock
Campbell	Smith
Casey	Smyth
Comben	Underwood
D'Arcy	Vaughan
Davis	Warburton
De Lacy	Warner
Eaton	Wells
Gibbs, R. J.	White
Goss	Yewdale
Hamill	
Hayward	
Innes	
Knox	
Lee	
Lickiss	
McElligott	
Mackenroth	
McLean	<i>Tellers:</i>
Milliner	Prest
Palaszczuk	Gygar

NOES, 46

Ahern	Katter
Alison	Lester
Austin	Littleproud
Berghofer	McCauley
Booth	McKechnie
Borbidge	McPhie
Burreket	Menzel
Chapman	Muntz
Clauson	Neal
Cooper	Nelson
Elliott	Newton
FitzGerald	Perrett
Fraser	Randell
Gamin	Row
Gately	Sherrin
Gibbs, I. J.	Simpson
Gilmore	Slack
Glasson	Stoneman
Gunn	Tenni
Harper	Veivers
Harvey	
Henderson	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hinton	Stephan
Hobbs	Hynd

Resolved in the negative.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! As this is a day allotted for the debate on Matters of Public Interest, I now call the honourable member for Cairns.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

World Expo Fun Park; Government Mismanagement

Mr De LACY (Cairns) (11.02 a.m.): I rise today in this debate to outline to honourable members and to the public of Queensland a scandalous waste of \$16.3m of tax-payers' funds. This scandal can only be described as gross financial mismanagement by this National Party Government, or simply a further example of the cronyism and corruption that have strangled Queensland for decades under the stewardship of conservative Governments.

The matter that I wish to raise today will expose this Government's mismanagement and bungling over the property on which World Expo Fun Park is presently situated. New evidence has come to me in recent days that proves beyond a shadow of doubt that, because of this Government's ineptitude or deliberate back-room dealing, Queensland tax-payers have paid out at least \$16m more for this site than was necessary.

When World Expo development tenders were called in 1985, one of the plums was the contract to develop an amusement park on almost five hectares of land next to the world fair. In late 1985, the contract was won by KFL Investments, which was to trade as World Expo Fun Park Pty Ltd. On 19 December 1986, the final contract was signed by the Expo Authority, on behalf of the State Government, and KFL Investments.

The terms of that contract required KFL Investments to purchase the site for a price of \$10m, and \$1m was paid as an initial deposit. A further \$4m was to be paid at the conclusion of World Expo on 31 October 1988. The remaining \$5m was to be paid as royalties during Expo, and the balance of that \$5m was to be paid by 1 January 1991.

The contract prepared by the Expo Authority stated that the site would be zoned Commercial B and that such a zoning plan would come into effect at the conclusion of World Expo on 31 October 1988. In retrospect, it is obvious that the company Pennant Holdings Pty Ltd came into the deal to exploit the land potential after Expo by constructing

twin 40-storey office towers. That company was not even interested in running a fun park—business as usual in Queensland.

I should also point out that, since the initial signing of the contract, the ownership of World Expo Fun Park Pty Ltd in developing the site has changed somewhat. Firstly, World Expo Fun Park was held 50 per cent by KFL Investments and 50 per cent by the Perth-based company Pennant Holdings Pty Ltd. Pennant Holdings also had a 49 per cent subsidiary, John Holland Constructions, which was the project manager. I am certain that we will hear more of John Holland Constructions before this year is out.

After further financial transactions, however, Pennant Holdings subsequently took a 90 per cent stake in World Expo Fun Park Pty Ltd through its subsidiary, Leisure Corp. Therefore, shortly after World Expo had begun, World Expo Park was 90 per cent owned by the Perth-based Pennant Holdings.

The management and operation of the fun park during World Expo were, to say the least, questionable. Despite record attendance at Expo, the fun park was not the success it was expected to be. World Expo Fun Park had, therefore, run into financial difficulties very early. By the time the \$4m instalment was due at the completion of Expo in October 1988, things had become so tight for World Expo Fun Park Pty Ltd that it was unable to pay the \$4m that it owed to the State Government through the Expo Authority.

Under the contract signed by the developers and the Expo Authority in 1986, failure to meet this payment represented action in default of the contract. Under the contract, the Government could have then moved in and done one of three things: charged the operators 24 per cent interest on the moneys owed; taken possession of the site and its buildings; or sold the site. The contract also allowed the Expo Authority to ask for and receive the financial statements of World Expo Fun Park Pty Ltd. The authority, therefore, had the ability to examine and scrutinise closely the financial position of the fun park operators. Honourable members will be shocked to know that the Government, through the Expo Authority, never took up its right to examine the financial records of that beleaguered company. I shall return to that matter later.

World Expo Fun Park continued to operate after the closure of Expo but, owing to poor management by Pennant Holdings, it was unable to recover. By early 1989, because of accumulated debts and apparent bad management, the company was in serious financial trouble. It was at about that time that Sir Llew Edwards was also informed of the company's serious financial position in relation to the operation of the fun park.

In a bid to pay off its increasing debt with its creditors, World Expo Fun Park began negotiations with the National Party Government to buy back the site. On 5 May this year, the National Party Government bought back the fun park site for an initial payment of \$25m, with a further \$8m to be paid on 1 May 1993 and a concessional lease-back arrangement of \$1 per year for four years, which has been estimated to be worth a further \$5m. When the \$8m deferred payment is computed in 1989 terms, that is a grand total of \$34.3m.

It is not a bad deal for a company that had paid only a \$1m deposit and was on its last financial legs. It is not a bad deal for a company that had, in fact, some seven months earlier reneged on its first instalment of \$4m and under the terms of the contract could have been forced to forfeit the site at no cost to the Government. It is not a bad deal, indeed!

But what is the site really worth? I repeat that the State Government was to pay a grand total of \$34.3m for it. Out of that, World Expo Fun Park paid \$1m deposit, \$1m for buildings and \$7m for construction of the car park. The \$9m it still owed was deducted from the sale price. That makes a clear profit of \$16.3m on the land—not a bad deal at all!

Are we to believe that this asset appreciated in value by nearly 100 per cent, from the \$18m that World Expo Fun Park was prepared to outlay for the asset compared with the \$34.3m that the State Government was prepared to pay for it? If anything, the

value of the asset is likely to have depreciated over the period for two very sound reasons. Firstly, fundamental doubt now exists in relation to the zoning conditions of the land which, under the original contract, allowed for high-rise development but which now may not, and probably does not, allow for this development. That would depreciate the value of the land. Secondly, the probable removal of the zoning entitlements for high rise on the land would similarly depreciate the value of the assets such as the car park which, under the original contract plan, was intended as an adjunct to major high-rise development.

Is it any wonder that the contract of sale signed by the Pennant Holdings subsidiary and the State Government included the following secrecy clause—

“This agreement shall remain confidential between the parties hereto and no public statement concerning the same shall be made without the prior agreement of both parties save to the extent any such statement goes no further than stating that resolution of disputes between the parties has been reached to the mutual satisfaction of both parties.”?

Can honourable members remember Sir Llew Edwards saying that there was no secrecy in this deal?

The Government obviously did not want Queensland tax-payers to know the details of that scandalous waste of \$16.3m. Is it any wonder that the National Party Government was evasive and obscure when answering questions on the land deal?

Queensland tax-payers have clearly got the rough end of the pineapple with this deal. Why did the Government waste that \$16.3m? One of the reasons given was a desire of the Government to avoid costly litigation. It would appear that a company unable to meet its own contractual obligations was able to outmanoeuvre a National Party Government racked by indecision and leaping from crisis to crisis.

The possible costly litigation to which I refer apparently stemmed from the Commercial B zoning promise included in the original contract from which Pennant Holdings hoped to make its commercial killing by developing the twin 40-storey office towers. It would appear that there was some doubt and there were some questions about the ability of the National Party Government to deliver on that original promise.

To avoid the political embarrassment that would have flowed from that litigation, the Government was willing to be bought. Its price was \$16.3m. Despite claims to the contrary, that is a preposterous price to pay for that land.

But are there other reasons why the \$16.3m was wasted? Clearly, as a result of this transaction, there are a number of unanswered questions. Why did not the National Party Government immediately step in and resume ownership of the site when Pennant Holdings, through World Expo Fun Park Pty Ltd, failed to pay the \$4m due at the end of Expo?

I call on the Public Accounts Committee to examine the whole issue.

Comments about Mr K. Byrne by Member for Cairns

Mr TENNI (Barron River) (11.16 a.m.): I wish to bring to the attention of the House some deliberate lies, untruths—call them what you like, Mr Speaker—

Sir William Knox: Scurrilous.

Mr TENNI: They were scurrilous remarks that were made in this House by the member for Cairns, Keith De Lacy.

Mr Scott: You never spoke about it as a Minister. Why are you raising it in the House now?

Mr TENNI: If Mr Scott is not careful, I might bring him into this as well. If I were him, I would behave myself.

The honourable member—not the “honourable” member, because he certainly was not honourable in this instance——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member will withdraw the comment.

Mr TENNI: I withdraw the comment.

The Labor Finance spokesman, Mr Keith De Lacy, said that the Northern Development Department was helping fund the campaign of Mr Kevin Byrne in the seat of Leichhardt held by Labor's Mr John Gayler. Mr De Lacy said—

“... Mr Byrne uses State Government funds to buy stamps for use on National Party correspondence.”

He then went on to say—

“In addition, National Party letters are typed in the Office of Northern Development in Cairns.”

Mr De Lacy also said that early this year Mr Byrne booked accommodation at the Sheraton Breakwater Casino-Hotel in Townsville during a State National Party conference and charged the cost to the department.

That is a shocking indictment of a very capable person in Cairns. I do not believe that any member of this House should have the right to denigrate a very honest and hard-working public servant who works for this Government. He may happen to be the candidate for Leichhardt, and without doubt he will be the new member for Leichhardt. However, I do not believe that deliberate untruths should be told in this House. I want to make the record clear for the people of Cairns and the Leichhardt region so that they know that their future member of Parliament is an honest and hard-working person.

The National Party State conference this year was not held in Townsville. As a matter of fact, it was last held in Townsville in 1987. That is lie No. 1. Lie No. 2 is that Mr Byrne shared a holiday unit on the Strand called Yongla with other male representatives at the conference from the Cairns area. If the member wants proof of that, I can give him the names of the people with whom Mr Byrne stayed and he can check with them. That was a shocking statement to make. Mr De Lacy has mixed up the years and the location. He even stated in this Chamber that Mr Byrne had shared the room with his girlfriend. I have never heard such denigration of anyone in all my life. I am ashamed to be a member of this Parliament when such statements are made by members.

I turn to lie No. 3. All campaign and National Party correspondence is typed on a typewriter by Mrs Amanda Byrne, Kevin's wife. Because we knew that the member for Cairns would make that statement about the typing of correspondence, a typewriter was purchased with campaign funds. He has fallen into his own trap. That correspondence is typed at Kevin's house at Yorkeys Knob on a typewriter that was bought with funds from the campaign account. If the member wants proof of that, we are prepared to issue copies of cheque-butts and receipts that will verify that statement so that his deliberate lies are stopped forthwith.

I turn now to lie No. 4. Mr De Lacy says that all the stamps are being bought by the Northern Development Department. I can assure the member that cheque-butts and Australia Post receipts will verify that the stamps are bought with funds from the campaign account. As a matter of fact, the mail is handled by Mr John Power, who happens to be a National Party office-bearer at National Party House in Mulgrave Road. He can attest to the fact that Mr Byrne delivers unstamped mail to him to stamp and actually take to the post office. I repeat that that gentleman is Mr Power in Cairns. He is prepared to sign a statutory declaration to that effect.

I do not know what this House is coming to when a member deliberately rises in this Chamber and denigrates a person who is held in the highest respect in far-north Queensland, a very hard-working person who, while I held the portfolio of Northern

Development for some eight or nine months, worked a lot longer than the required eight hours per day. That man——

Mr Scott interjected.

Mr TENNI: The honourable member is totally wrong.

Now that he has been endorsed as the candidate for Leichhardt, Mr Byrne spends his week-ends all over far-north Queensland, particularly in the Cook electorate. The member for Cook, Mr Scott, has kindly interjected and reminded me of a few things that have happened up there.

Quite frankly, one of the main reasons why Mr Byrne is forced to spend his whole week-end up in far-north Queensland—and it does not matter whether he is campaigning or not; it is his time, his business and he is using his own vehicle and paying his own expenses—is that he has to chase up a lot of the work that the present Labor member for Leichhardt, Mr Gayler, is just not doing. He is forced to take phone calls in the Department of Northern Development office and then ring me or another member of Parliament and ask us to get on to our Federal senators to try to get Federal matters cleaned up in the electorate of Leichhardt because, quite frankly, the member for Leichhardt, Mr Gayler, is very, very hard to locate.

Mr Scott: Who is handling the truth loosely now?

Mr TENNI: The honourable member should just listen.

It may be because of the problems caused by the air pilots dispute, which all honourable members who represent far-northern electorates are experiencing in trying to get to and from their electorates to carry out their jobs. At present, I am finding it practically impossible to get to and from my electorate. The other day I was wait-listed on East-West, Ansett and Australian Airlines. Eventually I obtained a seat on an F28 out of Cairns at 10 past 4 on Sunday afternoon. In order to return home I was wait-listed with everything that moved in the sky. I am now booked on a Thai airline leaving Brisbane at 1.25 p.m. on Friday. By the time I get to my office in Cairns there is only an hour or two of daylight left, so I have to do my work and receive deputations on Saturday. It is impossible to do my work at any other time.

That attack by the member for Cairns was uncalled for. Unfortunately, many of those accusations came from a former member of this Parliament who seems to delight in denigrating Mr Byrne and other people by making all sorts of statements.

Mr De Lacy: All coming from the National Party.

Mr TENNI: Yes, it was a member of the National Party. That is where the member for Cairns got all of his leaks, which were totally wrong. Unfortunately, Mr De Lacy is so weak that he accepted those statements from that person as factual, and then he rose in this Chamber and denigrated Mr Kevin Byrne.

Mr Scott interjected.

Mr TENNI: I do not think that I will bother with Mr Scott. He is like me; he is going out, anyway. He is not worth worrying about. However, I am worried about a young, up-and-coming fellow by the name of Kevin Byrne who, I believe, has a very large role to play in helping to develop north Queensland. If there is anything that is needed in north Queensland right now, it is a strong Federal member, particularly a National Party member, representing us in Canberra so that we can get a fair go. Ever since Gayler has been the Federal member, we have received nothing but a hiding. Gayler does not look after us; he looks after the boys in Canberra.

Mr Speaker, I plead with you to control these fellows who are telling lies in the media and denigrating a very good person and his young wife. Untruths are being told and rumours are being spread maliciously around the State of Queensland by a former member of Parliament.

Use of Ministerial Expenses by Premier; Alleged Defamation of Premier by Member for Murrumba

Mr WELLS (Murrumba) (11.23 a.m.): I seek leave of the House to incorporate in *Hansard* correspondence addressed to me from Chambers McNab Tully and Wilson, who are solicitors acting for the Premier, Mr Russell Cooper.

Leave granted.

8th September, 1989

Mr D. M. Wells M.L.A.,
Suite 6, Professional Centre,
Kippa-Ring Shopping Village,
Boardman Street,
Kippa-Ring Qld., 4020.

Dear Sir,

Re: MR. RUSSELL COOPER, M.L.A.—DEFAMATION

We advise that we act on behalf of Mr. Russell Cooper M.L.A. in connection with certain defamations published by you. Those defamations arise from a statement made by yourself and re-published in "The Courier Mail" newspaper on 14th August, 1989. They involve the allegation that our client is under criminal investigation concerning his use of ministerial expenses.

Your statement lacks any foundation in fact. You will of course be aware that all current Ministers of the Crown and former Ministers who held office since 1980 have received correspondence from the office of the Special Prosecutor seeking assistance in his enquiries concerning ministerial expenses. Those enquires do not relate in particular to our client's use of ministerial expenses. Further, those enquires do not comprise "a criminal investigation".

He has also asked us to point out that our client has dealt with the issue of his ministerial expenses on several occasions in the House. Your defamation was published with knowledge of this and without any supporting foundation in fact. Your statements were made despite the fact that you failed to take advantage of the opportunity afforded by our client to peruse all documentation relating to his ministerial expenditure.

You will now be aware that a statement was made by our client in the House on 7th September, 1989. That statement included reference to an extensive review of our client's ministerial expenditure conducted by the respected accounting firm of Price Waterhouse. That firm found no evidence of any impropriety. Further, they made positive findings that appropriate supporting documentation existed for all items of ministerial expenditure including cash advance expenditure.

Our client reserves his rights in relation to defamations already published. We place you on notice that should you choose to repeat these or related defamations, our client shall place this correspondence before the Court and your actions shall be judged in that light. Any repetition of such defamations shall be regarded as aggravation of damage which our client has already suffered.

Yours, faithfully,
CHAMBERS McNAB TULLY & WILSON

Mr WELLS: I also seek leave to table correspondence from the same gentleman, addressed to Wayne Goss, Leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition, and to his deputy, Tom Burns. I also table a reply by Tom Burns and a copy of section 408C of the Criminal Code.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Is leave granted?

Mr HARPER: Mr Speaker, I ask if you have had an opportunity to see that correspondence?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I advise the Leader of the House that I have seen the material incorporated in *Hansard*; I have not seen the other material that the honourable member has sought leave to table. I will still allow it to be tabled.

Leave granted.

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

Mr WELLS: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The document that has been incorporated is a remarkable document in which the solicitors, acting on instructions from Mr Russell Cooper, MLA, allege that I defamed the Premier by alleging that he was under criminal investigation concerning his use of ministerial expenses. When one prominent Queensland newspaper recently ran the headline "Meet the new Joh" in reference to the Premier, it did not know that he was engaging in the tried and true Bjelke-Petersen tactic of using defamation writs to attempt to silence political opposition.

The letter alleges that, although all then-current Ministers of the Crown and former Ministers who held office since 1980 have received correspondence from the Special Prosecutor concerning his inquiries into ministerial expenses, those inquiries do not constitute a criminal investigation. The letter does not tell us what sort of other investigation it might have been. It is unlikely that it was a medical or scientific investigation. It is equally unlikely that it was merely a social call.

Special Prosecutor Drummond's own letter to Ministers, which contradicts what the Premier's solicitors claim, concluded—

"... Ministers and former Ministers may have conducted their private affairs as a matter of regular practice, at Government expense. Such conduct would, if established, infringe the criminal law and could warrant prosecution."

The Special Prosecutor exists in order to undertake criminal investigations and there is no doubt that the Special Prosecutor would be aware of section 408C of the Criminal Code, which, in part, states—

"... any person who dishonestly applies to his own use or to the use of any person property belonging to another or property belonging to him ... subject to a trust is guilty of the crime of misappropriation of property."

The solicitors' letter goes on to say that I failed to take advantage of the opportunity provided by their client to peruse all the documentation relating to his ministerial expenditure. The reason given was that, when the Minister made this offer, he made it clear that the documentation did not say what he spent the money on. We know from the Fitzgerald inquiry and elsewhere what ministerial reconciliations of cash advances look like. At best, one might get a little list just typed on a piece of paper headed "Reconciliation of \$100"—for example—"cash advances". The list might read, "Reciprocal entertainment, \$60; alcohol, \$20; etc., \$20—total, \$100." This has been regarded for auditing purposes as sufficient accountability.

Such ministerial accounting does not tell one what the "etc." was for; nor does it tell one who drank the alcohol or received the reciprocal entertainment. Alternatively, one might get no more than a receipt saying that \$100 was received and spent. So when the Premier's solicitors advise that his ministerial expenditure was reviewed by the "respected accounting firm of Price Waterhouse", we mean no disrespect to that respected accounting firm when we say that it merely does what auditors do.

Audits do not go behind the justifying documents to find out what the money was spent on. They merely indicate that the figures add up and that they are listed in categories which are recognisable by auditors. The people of Queensland are not interested in being regaled with jargon and professional terminology; they want to know what the Premier spent the money on. This is the fundamental question that he refuses to answer. All we get time and time again is the statement that everything is in order, but we do not get an explanation of how the money was spent.

It has been stated, and not denied by the Premier, that over certain periods he was regularly taking \$150 per week in cash advances—cash on top of his ministerial credit cards and other entitlements. What did he spend it on? If the Premier is prepared to tell us that and if he is prepared to table a statement so that all the people of Queensland can see it, then the people of Queensland will be happier. For my part, that would silence me much more effectively than any threats of a defamation writ. Of course, the

Premier's threatened writ is all the more odious for the terms in which it is couched. His solicitors say—

“We place you on notice that should you choose to repeat these or related defamations”—

they will take me to court. This amounts to a devious and totally improper attempt to get round the principle of parliamentary privilege. Since Tudor times, in Westminster Parliaments, members of Parliament have had the right to speak freely without fear of a defamation writ. This is a corner-stone of democracy because it means that at least in one place there is a capacity for information to be brought to light without fear of a defamation action.

The Premier has attempted to undercut this ancient principle by alleging that I committed a pre-existing defamation and by saying that, if I repeat that pre-existing defamation, he will sue me. His solicitors did not rule out the possibility that he would bring his action against me if I repeated the alleged defamation in Parliament. In other words, there is an implied threat in that solicitors' letter that, if I do what I am now doing and use parliamentary privilege to raise, in the public interest, concerns about the Premier's ministerial cash advances, he will sue me—not, of course, for what I said in the Parliament but for what I am alleged to have said previously.

Mr Harper: Why didn't you accept his invitation to inspect—to peruse?

Mr WELLS: The Leader of the House is several minutes behind the game. I have already adverted to that. I have said that we did not want to enter into any conspiracy with the then Minister so that one of us could go in as his honoured guest and look, one by one, at a piece of paper on his desk; nor did we want to be placing ourselves in a situation whereby the people of Queensland did not have the information. The Labor Party wanted the information tabled. More than that, it did not want any reconciliations, audits or jargon. The Labor Party wanted to know on what the Premier spent the money, but that information will not be found in the sorts of documents that the Premier was offering to produce.

By making that sort of attack on parliamentary privilege, the Premier is undercutting the very institution of which he is at the pinnacle. During one of his several personal explanations to the Parliament on this point, the Premier said that, sure, he took cash advances, but he paid them back. That is irrelevant. If a person works on the check-out of a supermarket and gives himself a cash advance of \$150 in one week with every intention of paying it back during the next week and does, in fact, pay it back during the next week, does that person seriously doubt that he is committing a criminal offence? Does he seriously doubt that the full weight of the law will come down on him? The only kind of person who would doubt that is somebody who would regard himself as being above the law; as being better than the ordinary people whom he is graciously consenting to govern.

I draw the attention of the Premier to section 408C (3)(b), which states—

“a person's application of property may be dishonest notwithstanding that he is willing to pay for the property or that he intends to afterwards restore the property . . .”

I advise the Premier that it does not take a writ to silence me or my colleagues on this subject. All it takes is for the Premier to write out on what he spent the money and then to table that statement in the Parliament.

The Labor Party does not want assurances from auditors. It has seen enough assurances from auditors and various other people who have provided character references to the effect that they are sure that Ministers and former Ministers would not do anything like that. Those character references have been tabled previously in this Parliament. The Labor Party does not want those; it wants a statement in common language that is understood by everybody in Queensland as to what the money was spent on. The Labor Party does not want further offers by the Premier of private viewing of such statements;

it wants the statement to be tabled in Parliament so that it becomes part of the information base of all Queenslanders.

On behalf of my colleagues I say to the Premier, "If you tell us that you will hit us with writs if we continue to do our democratic duty, we will never fall silent; but tell us the truth and you will have our silence and our respect."

Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee; Drought Relief

Mr HOBBS (Warrego) (11.35 a.m.): Today I wish to talk about the political attack on rural producers by some members of the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee, which was set up in a genuine attempt to maintain accountability. However, it appears that some of the members of that committee have breached the spirit and guide-lines of the committee. The release of an inquiry into the administration of drought relief by the Primary Industries Department was nothing other than a political statement by the Liberal and Labor Parties of Queensland. Those two parties have been working in consultation and in harmony with one thing in mind, namely, political point-scoring against the Minister for Primary Industries and the rural producers of Queensland. They have made no genuine attempt to improve the guide-lines that may help the future viability of Queensland and Australia's export items.

The selective leaking of documents relating to unsubstantiated accusations and unfinished inquiries by the committee occurred during the process of the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee hearing. That lack of ethics by members of the committee leaves in no doubt that the result of any future inquiry that might be held by those very same members would lead to another political result.

The chairman of the committee at that time, Mr Gil Alison, requested all members of the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee to provide statutory declarations stating that those members did not disclose documents that were under investigation by the Public Accounts Committee to any outside person or persons. Only three declarations were submitted, and they were from National Party members.

Mr Hayward: Four Nationals.

Mr HOBBS: Four National Party members.

It is quite obvious that members of the Liberal and Labor Parties found that they could not sign the statutory declarations for fear that they would be found out and that they would be disgraced. They are the weasels of accountability. I call for the resignation of the members of the Liberal and Labor Parties on the Public Accounts Committee, namely, Mr Terry White, the member for Redcliffe, Mr Clem Campbell, the member for Bundaberg, and Mr Ken Hayward, the member for Caboolture.

If anyone has any doubt about the political overtones of the announcement one has only to look at the handling of the release of the report on the administration of drought relief and the comments by members of the Liberal and Labor Parties. Those comments were guaranteed headlines by eager members of the media who are ready to run with any story that can denigrate the National Party in Queensland.

The headline in the *Courier-Mail* of "Axe Harper over \$30m drought aid waste" is typical; it is totally wrong, totally unaccepted and without any foundation, even in the report. Members talk about corruption and accountability. I ask: where is the accountability and where is the corruption in this issue? The \$30m referred to in the press report is only a hypothetical figure that was dreamed up and plucked out of the air by the Labor and Liberal Parties in an effort to get a headline at the expense of the rural producers of Queensland.

Mr LICKISS: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the remarks of the honourable member. Is he not in contempt of the Parliament in relation to the Public Accounts Committee?

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

Mr HOBBS: One could say also that, if all single mothers who have more than two children were refused social security, the Federal Government might also save \$30m. One has only to change the rules.

The Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee is supposed to be above corruption and to be totally accountable. However, at the press conference that was held following the release of the committee's report, members of the Liberal and Labor Parties were not accountable. Quite frankly, they can be accused of nothing other than corruption of the parliamentary system.

The rural producers of Queensland do not agree with the Public Accounts Committee report that \$30m could have been saved on drought aid, and neither does the Public Accounts Committee. In many places throughout the report it is stated quite clearly that no direct evidence of malpractice of the drought-aid scheme exists.

I turn now to the response from industry spokesmen such as those from the United Graziers Association which, one would think, would be able to make a responsible comment on the accusations that were laid against its members. However, none of the media outlets was prepared to listen to that industry organisation, let alone run a report on what it had to say about those accusations. As I said, honourable members talk about accountability and corruption, but why was that organisation not allowed the right of reply? Could it be—as has been reported to me—that Mr Murdoch, our very own media baron, has issued the order to his editors to get any story that can denigrate the National Party in Queensland? Could it be that those instructions mean that reporters, for fear of losing their jobs, have no choice other than to write anti-National Party stories such as that? Whatever the reason may be, I urge the media to give the rural producers of Queensland a go and allow them equal time and equal opportunity to fight a fair fight.

Let me refer to some of the issues of the report and the background to it. In 1983, the Queensland producers, through the United Graziers Association and the National Farmers Federation, urged the Federal Government to come up with a set of guide-lines that could be used in the role of drought relief. The committee was set up and guide-lines were drawn. This State went along with that and both the Federal and State Governments chose to use the Natural Disaster Relief Fund as a vehicle to administer drought relief in Queensland. In other words, the State Government was going along with the Federal Government's recommendations for the basis of drought relief. For those who still cannot understand it, I point out that this State is using the Federal Government's guide-lines.

I acknowledge and have respect for the committee and the position it holds. However, I think it unfair if I do not point out that members of the Labor and Liberal Parties have no real knowledge of the vast areas concerned, particularly in view of the freight subsidy and the administration problems associated with drought relief in far-west and northern Queensland.

One of the basic principles of drought assistance is to keep the Australian flock and herds intact so that when a good season comes production can be fully restored in the shortest time possible. This, of course, has a threefold effect. It allows—

- (1) rural producers to get back into income-producing status as soon as possible;
- (2) the local communities within those farming and grazing areas to stay viable and thus keep a decentralisation philosophy, of which we in Queensland are proud; and
- (3) Australia as a nation to quickly build up valuable exportable items that in this day and age are sadly lacking in Australia.

Mr CAMPBELL: I rise to a point of order. Comments have been made by a National Party back-bencher that may have been recorded in *Hansard*. The comment was that it was not a unanimous report. It is a unanimous report by all members of the Public Accounts Committee, and we would welcome any debate on it in this House at any time.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I note the honourable member's comment.

Mr HOBBS: In recent years, drought-relief measures in Australia have vastly improved. In the 1920s some 40 million sheep were lost during droughts, whereas in the 1980s only some 5 million were lost. That in itself means that somewhere near 35 million sheep are producing export income for Australia for the next year.

The principle of drought relief is self-help and incentive. The Federal Government has taken away all incentive to provide for the bad times, with the emasculation of the tax-deductibility incentive for water and forage storage, and also the elimination of the income-equalisation deposits that in recent years have been reinstated in a fashion so unworkable as to be virtually useless. When all the incentives are taken away, the only avenue left for primary producers is to seek assistance in the form of drought relief.

With regard to the 20 recommendations made by the Public Accounts Committee, I point out that some are acceptable and some most certainly are not. One of the most important recommendations that is in error is for the freight subsidy on droughted stock sale movements to be discontinued. This is totally unacceptable. Producers should be encouraged to sell their stock as soon as possible. I am talking only of next year's income stock; I am not referring to normal turn-off stock that would be sold in an average year. I am referring to stock that would normally be held until the following year and that has had to leave the property of origin because of drought.

Many land-holders have to sell stock that would provide next year's income and do not have the financial capacity to restock. Therefore, the following year they would breed up and preserve their country. If they happen to have a very good season following a drought, they may even be able to take on agistment stock, but they still may not be in a financial position to physically buy back stock they have had to sell.

Over the years, methods and priorities change with changing circumstances. In this day and age much more emphasis is placed on land care. It is therefore more appropriate if someone can in fact sell and be rewarded, even though it may be only a handful of silver. People should not be disadvantaged because of some paper-shuffling. There is no doubt in my mind that most producers would prefer to sell in drought times rather than find agistment. However, that is, and should be, the choice of the producer at the time.

Another of the committee's recommendations is to limit the maximum distance to 1 000 kilometres. This is totally unacceptable to the people who live in far-north Queensland, and absolutely crazy to consider.

Time is limited, but I wish to refer to one more case, that is, the limit of \$20,000 per producer. I refer to the case of Mr Stewart Moore, who was unceremoniously named in an ABC program on the week-end as one of those people supposedly rorting the system. Over the last two years, Mr Moore's cost of fodder, freight and agistment has been \$735,000. The subsidy he received over that period was \$166,000. His personal profit over that period was nil, yet his export production for this nation was \$1.481m. Perhaps if Mr Stewart Moore had a different colour skin, or maybe if he was on the dole, he would receive better treatment.

Alleged Involvement of ALP in Electoral Fraud; Stafford ALP Plebiscite

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (11.44 a.m.): The Labor Leader, Mr Goss, would like Queenslanders to believe that the ALP is a united party offering this State honest government. In fact, the ALP is a seething mass of factional hatred which is intimately associated with the most despicable form of dishonesty—electoral fraud.

What Mr Goss does not want the people of Queensland to know is what happened in the Magistrates Court before Mr Page, SM, on 26 July 1989. On that day, Darryl Leonard Cox, a defeated Labor candidate for pre-selection in the State seat of Stafford, pleaded guilty to falsely and knowingly signing an application for a postal vote in respect of a person who was dead.

Mr Cox pleaded guilty to the charge under Commonwealth law and his legal representative admitted that he was acting as a volunteer worker for the Australia Labor Party at the time he committed the offence. Mr Cox was represented in court by Channel and Associates, the well-known firm of Labor lawyers who are, I believe, the ALP's official solicitors. So much for the honesty of the ALP!

Mr COMBEN: I rise to a point of order. I take it as a personal insult when the honourable member says that the ALP is dishonest. The person who is dishonest here today is Mr Gygarr. When Darryl Cox signed a statement to be helpful to an elderly person, he was not aware that the person was dead, and that information was well and truly before the court.

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

Mr GYGAR: As I said, Mr Cox wilfully signed a document in respect of a person who was dead.

Many people are aware of the outrageous electoral frauds which came to light after I defeated the ALP and, as the member for the area, was able to examine the Stafford State electoral rolls. Voters in the cemetery, in creeks, on fences and at non-existent addresses were enrolled. In all, during my first term in this Parliament, about 700 voter registrations were challenged and removed from the Stafford electoral roll.

Mr COMBEN: I rise to a point of order. This speech is tedious repetition. It has been presented by this member on two other occasions.

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

Mr GYGAR: We thought that the ALP electoral fraud had ended in Stafford, but when I learned of the prosecution of Mr Cox—and his admission of guilt—I started a thorough examination of the Stafford electoral roll to try to detect and eliminate any resurgence of ALP electoral fraud in the Stafford electorate.

I must regretfully advise the Parliament that, as a result of that examination, I have today lodged with the Principal Electoral Officer formal objections to 673 voter registrations currently appearing on the Stafford electoral roll. Many of them relate to enrolments, which must raise the gravest suspicion of attempted electoral fraud in the mind of any observer.

There have been a large number of additional enrolments in Stafford over recent months and, as I always do, I wrote a letter to each of my new constituents as soon as they went on the roll, offering them my assistance should they ever need it. I find it hard to believe that it is coincidental that so many of those letters were returned to me by Australia Post and that the real residents at the addresses to which they were sent marked the envelopes "unknown", "not at this address", "wrong address", etc. Those returned envelopes indicated that the people who had lodged enrolment cards had never lived at those addresses and were completely unknown to the residents. Such a fraud can work because, even if the enrolment card sent out to all new voters is returned, it can take the Electoral Office up to four months to remove them from the roll. Four months is quite enough in an election year. Often, of course, the cards will not be returned and the fraud can go on for months or even years.

I lay upon the table of the Parliament photocopies of some examples of those envelopes so that everyone can see for himself what has happened. I have blacked out the details of the addresses that were used in these fake enrolments in order to protect the innocent residents of those homes.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the documents on the table.

Mr GYGAR: In other cases the people who were supposedly living 10 or 12 to a house in Stafford were really living elsewhere. The phone book provides clear evidence of that.

In all, I have objected to 673 persons whose entries on the Stafford electoral roll give rise for concern. No doubt in a few cases that concern will be misplaced, and I apologise in advance to the dozen or so Stafford residents who will receive letters from the State Electoral Office in the next few weeks asking if they are in fact living at the address at which they are enrolled. However, I believe it is better that a few people receive unnecessary letters than that the door be left open once again to massive electoral fraud in Stafford.

I am also still investigating some extraordinary situations where recent enrolments have boosted the number of people allegedly living in small two-bedroom flats to eight, nine or more. Once again, defects in the official procedures for challenging questionable voter registrations could leave those enrolments unchecked by the Electoral Office until after the coming State election. I urge the Minister to take immediate and positive action to check the electoral rolls, not only in Stafford but elsewhere, to ensure that the results of the next State election are not manipulated by organised fraud in marginal seats.

It is not surprising that these problems have resurfaced in Stafford so soon after the Socialist Left faction of the Labor Party—the most ruthless and unprincipled group within any Australian political party—staged a coup in the local branches and installed its choice as candidate in Stafford, despite the objections of the majority of local ALP branch members.

A plebiscite was held to select the Labor candidate for Stafford and the Socialist Left contender was rejected by the local branch. However, in the faction deals done in the trades hall, the seat of Stafford had been traded off to the extreme Left and, in a display of their arrogance and contempt for local opinion and the democratic process, the faceless manipulators in the trades hall overturned the results of the local plebiscite and imposed the Socialist Left candidate on the unwilling members of the Stafford Labor Party branches. Naturally they were outraged—as they should have been—when they saw all the so-called principles of the ALP being thrown out the window as the power-brokers ruthlessly used them as pawns in the factional deals that govern every action and decision in the Queensland ALP.

Many decent members of the Labor Party in Stafford were so appalled by what had happened that they resigned from the ALP in disgust. One of those who decided they could no longer support the ALP was Mr Daryl Beattie, a 16-year Labor Party member and the chairman of the Stafford electoral council—the most senior position in the Stafford ALP branches. He wrote to the members of the local branches explaining why he had resigned, and he described what had happened as “sordid” and a “betrayal”. His letter of resignation is a searing indictment of the reality behind the thin facade of Labor unity and should be read by every Queenslanders who is even contemplating a vote for Labor. I therefore table Mr Beattie’s letter of resignation from the Stafford branch of the ALP and seek leave to incorporate it in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

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

52 Barbical Street,
Stafford, Q. 4053.
6th December, 1988.

Dear

For the past sixteen years, I have been a committed party member and worker. My service includes:

- Vice President, Stafford Branch
- President, Stafford Branch
- Vice President, Stafford E.E.C.
- Secretary, Stafford E.E.C.
- President, Stafford E.E.C.
- Vice President, Lutwyche M.E.C.

- Vice President, Chermside M.E.C.
- Delegate, Brisbane F.D.E.

During this time I have contributed thousands of manhours, thousands of dollars, and even endured harassment by the police during the late Dennis Murphy's successful campaign in Stafford. Now, after having kept faith with the ideals of the Australian Labor Party through all these hard times, it has been made devastatingly clear to me that the Party no longer values the commitment of grassroots branch workers.

One would have thought that the Oxley debacle would have alerted the factional wheeler-dealers to the political perils of riding rough-shod over the wishes of the local membership. Unfortunately, the endorsement of Mr Rod Welford for the seat of Stafford proves that such has not been the case. Once again the Electoral College, motivated purely by politically petty factional concerns, has demonstrated cavalier disregard for the wishes of the majority of grassroots workers.

For years now, workers in Stafford have held together a small, but committed, organization purely because we have accepted the principle of majority rule. Certainly I, as President of the E.E.C., have never experienced any qualms on that score, and nor would I have, had Mr Welford actually earned the support of the majority of the grassroots membership.

In my view, the Welford nomination cannot be justified on any grounds beyond sordid and politically myopic factional intrigue, and, as such, constitutes a betrayal of the majority of the long-suffering Stafford organisation.

For these reasons, I am no longer prepared to contribute time and money to a party which clearly holds me, and people like me, in complete contempt.

I hereby tender my resignation, not merely in sorrow but more particularly in disgust and anger.

Yours faithfully,

(Daryl Beattie, President, Stafford E.E.C.)

Mr GYGAR: The reality behind the Wayne Goss mask of Labor honesty and unity is revealed. Mr Goss tells us that the Labor Party of 1989 would never again commit the electoral outrages for which the ALP was so infamous in the past. The reality is that one of its activists—a defeated candidate for pre-selection—has just had to plead guilty in the Brisbane Magistrates Court to attempted electoral fraud. If he had been charged under parallel provisions of the State Elections Act and found guilty, he would have been guilty of corrupt practices and banned from standing for a State election for five years thereafter. That indicates the seriousness of the offence he committed.

Mr Goss says that Labor is united, but half the ALP branch members in Stafford have just resigned because of the sordid factional deals and trades hall manipulation that saw an extreme Left Wing ALP candidate thrust into Stafford, despite the overwhelming opposition of the local branch members.

Labor in 1989 is the same as Labor has always been in Queensland—dishonest, faction-ridden, brawling and corrupt. On behalf of the people of Stafford, I invite the members of the Labor Party to leave us alone and go somewhere else to have their civil wars and to practise their dirty tricks. We expect, and demand, better of a party that says it is ready to govern this State.

Socialism; Labor in Queensland

Mr GATELY (Currumbin) (11.54 a.m.): I must agree with the matters stated by the honourable member for Stafford because I have been checking the Currumbin roll and have found that the same rorts as described by him are occurring in my electorate. I am not prepared to let the matter lie any longer.

I point out very clearly to all honourable members in this Parliament today that Goss is trapped within the embroidery of Labor Party dogma. That dogma is socialism, which is failing all around the world. No better example of failed socialism can be found than that in East Germany. People are leaving that country in droves. They are travelling via other countries to get to the free world.

I will never forget what happened in Tiananmen Square in Beijing. Since I was a boy I have always wanted to visit China. This year I had the opportunity to go to China as part of a parliamentary delegation, but the visit was cancelled because of the rotten corruption of the socialist Government in China that ordered the students in Tiananmen Square to be shot. Because that Government cannot be trusted, I do not ever want to visit China. The socialists want to take control of Queensland in the same way, and I will not sit back and let it happen.

Goss's shiny, glossy television advertisements cannot remove the taint of total economic mismanagement and cronyism shown by the Labor Government in Canberra. The ACT Labor Government brought down a one billion dollar Budget for 250 000 people, without even taking a vote. Why should 250 000 people in a small area such as Canberra be given a one billion dollar Budget? That is an example of more cronyism and dishonesty. In addition, and again without any debate, that Government decided to discontinue the fluoridation of Canberra's water supply.

The Federal Labor Government has handed over \$200m of tax-payers' money to four banks whose collective profits last year were \$3.7 billion. Those same banks are taking interest rates up through the roof, thereby forcing people out of their homes, off their farms and out of business. The Labor Party in Queensland says that it will govern fairly. I say that that is poppycock; it would not know how. The sum of \$200m was allegedly given to the banks to stop home-loan interest rates increasing. Instead, this week the interest rate has increased again. The Federal Government gave a further \$60m to a multinational company by the name of Kodak to save it from competition. The Labor Party's dishonesty continues. The Federal Government gave \$100m to the airline companies to save them from the predatory pilots union, thereby creating devastation in Australia's tourist industry.

The Queensland Labor Party says that it will govern this State fairly. The people of Queensland are not as stupid as Mr Goss and his mates would think. Mr Goss does not even have the guts to appear in the Labor Party's television advertisements. He says that he does not need Mr Hawke or outside people to help him run his campaign. If that is so, why is Mr Swan swanning around Queensland using slick merchandising and marketing? The women of this State say categorically that they do not like or trust Mr Goss. They will not wear him and, when it comes to the election, they will not vote for him at all. Goss cannot divorce himself from Labor's socialist taint.

Queenslanders must not forget that Goss jumped off a plane from America, raced down to Canberra, saw Mr Hawke and conspired with him to withhold millions of dollars of fuel excise from Queensland which was urgently needed for the construction and maintenance of roads in this State. Mr Goss maintains that he will have all the money he needs because he has struck a little deal with Mr Hawke.

Two thinking people have written to the *Queensland Country Life* about Mr Goss and the Labor Party. A Mr Derek Land of Hall Street, Dalby, wrote—

“I think there is a lesson in the figures I have outlined above if we Queenslanders vote a Goss Labor Government into power, we in the sunshine state could well end up on the scrap heap, along with the cast-offs from the bitter 3-way power struggle I have also mentioned.”

That is the airline dispute. The letter continues—

“Wouldn't it be better to vote for the National Party we know, rather than the ALP we know in Canberra, who like the ALP in Queensland are full of promises. . .”

Queensland cannot afford such excesses. The other night Mr McLean stated how good the unions are, but a second letter to the *Queensland Country Life* states—

“Why did it take his Government some 24 months to expel the BLF from his industrial relations 'club' even after numerous proven court cases of 'thuggery' by the Union. . .”

In this House the supporters and lovers of unionism and socialism tell everyone about dishonesty and corruption. If people look back at history, they will understand what it is all about. If Queenslanders vote the Opposition into power, they will finish up behind an iron curtain and the Labor Party will ruin the State. Before the National Party/Liberal Party coalition took office 32 years ago, this State was bankrupt. That is what Queensland will get if Queenslanders are stupid enough to vote for the Labor Party.

Why is the RAAF being used to break a strike? Many questions need to be answered in relation to Hawke's attitude and approach to the airline pilots dispute as opposed to his attitude towards the Waterside Workers Federation and the Builders Labourers Federation. Industrial thuggery on the part of the unions occurred in New South Wales when a court brought down a ruling that it was right and proper for shearers to use wide combs. During that dispute people on farms were bashed up. The Ford agent in Bourke was told, "If you fix those bludgers' cars, we'll fix you." It was straight-out intimidation. Is that what the people of Australia or the people of Queensland want? I believe that, when election-time comes, Queenslanders will be wise enough to see through the media bias that day after day continues to knock this straight, honest National Party Government and its members. As happened in 1986, the people of Queensland will give their vote to the National Party.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The time for Matters of Public Interest has now expired. I remind honourable members that the House will adjourn today from 12.30 to 2.30 p.m.

At 12 noon,

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

SUPPLY

Estimates—Third and Fourth Allotted Days

Estimates-in-Chief, 1989-90

Tourism and Environment, Conservation and Forestry

Hon. R. E. BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise—Minister for Tourism and Minister for Environment, Conservation and Forestry) (12.01 p.m.): I move—

"That there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1989-90, a sum not exceeding \$622,000—Office of the Minister for Tourism and Minister for Environment, Conservation and Forestry (Consolidated Revenue)."

These are very definitely not the best of times for our State's tourism industry. As each and every one of the honourable members present would be well aware, the industry is facing a series of repeated body blows, not the least of which has been the pilots dispute. Let me say at this point that I am angry with the way that recent efforts by this Government to charter aircraft to ease the burden on our crippled industry have been torpedoed. This is another example of how, as far as the Federal Government is concerned, the world stops at Hornsby just north of Sydney. That Government knows little about how the industry works and, as far as Queensland is concerned, could not care less.

Tourism is the major growth industry for our State. If in the past Queensland rode on the sheep's back, now more than ever before it rides on the jumbo jet and the tourist coach and we must be sure that our priorities recognise the vital role this industry has to play in our State's future. Certainly we cannot become a race of waiters and porters, but the support infrastructure required by a growing and vital tourist industry will provide the key to our future prosperity.

In the past 12 months our industry has suffered from the decline of the Aussie dollar, the almost obscene blow-out in interest rates, a shocking weather pattern with

many months of rain and now the added body-blow of the pilots strike. In spite of all of this, it is a tribute to the many men and women of the industry that it survives and, although slowed down and forced into a position that may take 10 years to climb out of, continues to grow and develop.

Few times have been as opportune as the present to address the subject of Queensland tourism. The current industrial action by pilots, which has starved the nation of regular air services, has not only placed the tourism industry firmly on the public agenda but also emphasised with unprecedented force its importance to Queenslanders and Australians. The community's reliance on the industry as a vital source of income has been hit home with particular strength in Queensland. People whose livelihoods depend on support industries such as retailing, food production and manufacturing, felt the effects of reduced air services in tandem with the people in the front line of the tourism and hospitality industries.

The fact that the State has been affected to such a degree is testimony to the leading position we have assumed as a visitor destination within Australia and as part of the south Pacific region. The position is reflected in the confidence of investors. Forty-nine cents in every dollar of Australian tourism investment is spent in Queensland. The multiplier effect on this investment means a further strengthening of our economy. This, let me say, is an enviable position in which to be, against a background of massive expansion in business and leisure travel throughout the world.

According to a recent survey by American Express, tourism is the world's largest industry. Tourism is the greatest contributor to the credits in our national balance of payments, even though our share of the world tourism market is less than 1 per cent. Queensland is the State others watch and try to emulate. The truth is, though, that none has come close to Queensland's successes in terms of visitation, which has trebled over the past 10 years, and development of infrastructure for sustained expansion.

Queensland's success is directly attributable to the market facilitation policies which set this State apart from all others. There is strong evidence indeed that, when it comes to tourism, Queensland has achieved the right balance between Government support and private-enterprise initiative. In its first 10 years, the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation has been the Government's catalyst for a remarkable period of growth as well as many exciting prospects for the future.

At a time when other States and Territories were grappling with the question of their tourism futures, Queensland was putting in place a growth strategy to take the State into the next century. High growth forecasts were scorned by a handful of the inevitable doubters and knockers, who seem to seize upon all promising new ventures with cynicism. This was certainly the case in 1978 at the time of the Government inquiry into tourism and travel. But these critics were soon silenced when Queensland started exceeding the forecasts.

Even now, there may be prophets of doom in the wings ready to point to adverse conditions for Queensland and Australian tourism, and take a well-rehearsed short-term outlook of negativity. Perhaps they are descended from the cynics who wrote off the Queensland wheat industry after the first bad season. I would like to inform the ill-informed pessimists right now that this State has only just begun to show the world what it can achieve in terms of tourism growth.

The Government will intensify its efforts through the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation to aggressively market our world-class tourism destination both domestically and internationally. We will continue to carry out the research and development activities to ensure that we know just who our customers are, how to keep on attracting them and to ensure that industry has timely information on which to draw in making decisions. We will continue to push for a better deal for the State through official industry representation. And, through our support for institutions such as James Cook University's National Centre for Studies in Travel and Tourism, we will ensure that training and education standards keep on getting better so that our customer service continues at a

high level. In a word, Queensland will keep on doing what has made it the fastest-growing tourism destination in Australia.

Basically, there is a lot of common sense and hard work as the starting ingredients for our success. And there is a bold entrepreneurial approach to tourism which will not only enhance Queensland's prospects in the short term but also enable the State to seize new opportunities well into the future. At the heart of this approach is an unflagging effort to ensure that supply of accommodation facilities and transport infrastructure is sufficient to cater for visitor growth. History has proven that this approach works. By encouraging tourism investment and development, Queensland has more than trebled the annual number of nights spent by domestic and international visitors in Queensland hotels and motels from 1979 to 1989. The number of hotel and motel rooms has more than doubled over the same period. International airlines flying into Queensland now total 15, compared with five in 1979. The 34 international services a week in 1979 have grown to 90 today.

Queensland came early to the realisation that an enviable climate, beautiful natural scenery and rich cultural heritage were not enough to ensure the success of its tourism industry. Our tourism potential was limited by the lack of Statewide co-ordination and an insufficient range of readily saleable packaged products, including accommodation, tours and attractions. However, this situation was rectified promptly when the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation responded to the industry's need for a wholesaler of packaged Queensland holiday programs. As well as becoming a major product, the corporation's wholesale programs have achieved their aim of providing travel agents and the Queensland Government Travel Centre national network with saleable and attractive packages that also provide the marketing advantage of collective promotion.

In the late 1970s research into tourism was scarce and lacked co-ordination. Today, Queensland is in the forefront of tourism research in the Australian and international markets. Research is vital to ensure that the needs of domestic and overseas visitors alike are well catered for. Increasing competition from within Australia and abroad for the tourist dollar means Queensland must stay a step ahead in its understanding of the market. To this end, the State embarked on major new research initiatives in 1988-89, as well as maintaining and enhancing existing ones.

In line with Queensland's market facilitation approach to tourism, the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation maintains strong links with the tourism industry by answering inquiries, embarking on special research projects and introducing new investors to the State. These investors come from all over the world, not just Japan, as some misguided members of our community would have us believe.

Queensland's success in attracting investment is evidenced by impressive development figures. More than \$3.4 billion worth of tourism development was under construction in Queensland at the end of the March quarter, representing close to half of the total Australian tourism investment. A further \$6.4 billion worth of projects had received rezoning approval, indicating a firm commitment to proceed in the next five years. This will mean more jobs and greater prosperity for Queensland.

Included in these projects are accommodation facilities for every market, from budget to international standard. The top world hotel chains, including Hilton, Sheraton, Hyatt and now Radisson, are now firmly established in Queensland. We have also attracted major Australian chains such as Country Comfort and Interwest. It has been necessary for our industry to greatly diversify the range of accommodation available so as to widen the State's appeal to a broad cross-section of markets.

Queensland now has top-of-the-range hotels and resorts to attract the higher-spending business-traveller and international holiday-maker. To compete in an international market, it is necessary to provide world-class facilities. But the rapid growth in the top end of Queensland's accommodation supply has in no way excluded the traveller on a budget. I emphasise that affordable hotels and motels continue to offer the largest proportion of rooms. In the last financial year we saw our ten-thousandth three-star

facility come on line, confirming that the market is keeping in touch with what people can afford.

The need to provide high standards of service to visitors is being met by strong emphasis on tourism training and higher education. The Government's ongoing commitment to excellence in the people of the tourism industry has seen the emergence of new courses for workers in the front line of customer service and in management.

The partnership between Government and industry is taken very seriously in Queensland, which is evidenced by the Government's frequent official representations at conferences and inquiries within Australia and around the world. The voice is not paternalistic, but a strong reflection of industry feeling. Most importantly, though, it is one powerful voice. The benefits of a unified approach extend to the area of marketing, in which highly effective promotion has been achieved both within Australia and overseas. By marketing Queensland as a unique part of the south Pacific region in close co-operation with tourism operators, Queensland has achieved a much stronger domestic and international market presence than would be possible if promotion were undertaken solely on an individual basis. Within Australia, the corporation undertakes extensive promotion of product through consumer advertising, public relations and liaison with the mass media and travel trade.

Overseas, the QTTC has built the State's share of the international visitor market through active assistance to the travel trade and the mass media and joint marketing and promotion exercises with Australian and foreign air carriers. The importance of this offshore promotional role has seen the establishment of nine autonomous officers in key overseas markets. These offices are a guarantee that Queensland is not overlooked in the highly competitive world tourism market.

A strong presence in Australia is ensured by a network of retail travel outlets around the country and the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation's advanced on-line reservations and information system, ATLAS. I point out that ATLAS has been sold to tourism agencies both in Australia and around the world. Continual development ensures Queensland's strong lead in Australian reservations technology is maintained. This saleable technology also provides a valuable source of revenue.

The co-ordination of efforts, which is the hallmark of Queensland tourism, has not been achieved by centralising control in any particular region. In fact, the State has Australia's most decentralised tourism industry. Just as other industries have been encouraged to start up throughout Queensland, rather than cluster around the capital city, tourism growth outside Brisbane and the south-east corner is strongly encouraged. The results are, for example: the revitalised Queensland coastal centres and the rapidly growing inland world-class attractions such as the Australian Stockman's Hall of Fame and the Matilda Highway concept which links outback centres.

The Queensland Tourism and Travel Corporation provides substantial financial support for 17 regional tourist associations around the State. The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation has five of its own regional officers, in Townsville, Mackay, Alexandra Headland, Toowoomba and Longreach, to manage its investment and development initiatives and provide assistance to local community members.

A prime example of the decentralisation policy in action is the successful strategy for the establishment of international airports at Cairns and Townsville. The advent of these international gateways means that overseas visitors are no longer required to detour through a capital city before reaching their destination, as is the case in the other States and Territories of Australia.

The northern gateways have changed from being remote destinations into on-line opportunities on the major international air trunk route structure. Apart from benefiting from the economic impetus of decentralised tourism, people around the State are also enjoying its many social benefits. Regions that once saw the drift of young people away from their families to greater employment opportunities elsewhere are now retaining their young. For the sugar towns feeling the effect of mounting international competition

there is new hope. Prospects for young people in emerging outback areas have never been better. Perhaps the greatest legacy of the tourist industry is its profound ability to create jobs for young people where they live.

As Queensland embarks upon a new decade of tourism growth it is important to remember that this industry is not something that fell from heaven in a suitcase. There are ups and downs. Sometimes there is rain and sometimes there is industrial action.

There is mounting competition as advances in aviation make the world an even smaller place—one with a growing number of challenges for the international tourist dollar. But here is a State with a wealth of natural attractions and, after the past financial year, an even stronger, more vibrant industry with a commitment from Government and industry unmatched in Australia.

The commitment from Government consolidated revenue this financial year is \$20,704m. In addition, the corporation will generate its own funds to the tune of \$17.48m. All up, that is an income and expenditure for 1989-90 in the vicinity of \$38m. With domestic and international competition on the rise, and adverse conditions such as the current pilots strike expected to threaten growth, new initiatives in marketing will be undertaken. For this purpose, a total of \$12.4m has been budgeted for, including \$2.8m to be outlaid on advertising, \$2.2m on brochures and \$1.1m on promotional activities.

Research and regional development initiatives, vital for the short, medium and long-term future of the Queensland tourism industry, will be funded to the tune of \$4.8m. Items requiring supplementary expenditure in 1989-90 include the ongoing major survey research program, which will be broadened to take in daytripping, marine-based accommodation, small regional analysis and forward bookings. Special new research projects into domestic and international markets will facilitate new marketing initiatives.

A budget of \$1.1m for public relations activities will enable the corporation to effectively initiate publicity for Queensland tourism in the Australian and international media and respond to journalists' inquiries. Other activities such as the annual Queensland Tourism Awards will be used to raise the profile of tourism and improve industry standards through recognition of excellence.

A net \$910,000 has been budgeted for the Australian Travel and Leisure Systems computer reservations and information subsidiary in 1989-90. Special initiatives include bringing an overseas computer network on line, enabling the more effective distribution of Queensland tourism product internationally. Reorganisation of resources within ATLAS and the appointment of contractors will bring about an upgraded customer service function.

A budget of \$1.2m for administration will provide the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation with the day-to-day management required for effective and efficient use of resources. The commitment of this Government to the tourist industry remains unchallenged.

There is no doubt that environment and conservation have become the issues of the late 1980s. As we move to the end of this decade it has become a time of change for our nation in many ways, a time when we must examine what has been done in the past and look forward to the ways we are going to handle our growing State into the last decade of this century and the first years of the next. Unlike many, I do not look forward to those years with a sense of doom. I see hope, growth and prosperity for our future, but it must be a future guided by sensible and balanced management and by learning the lessons from mistakes that we have made in the past.

This is a time for change—a time for change in many of our basic attitudes. In particular we must look closely at the way we use the gift that has been bestowed upon us in the form of a beautiful, rich and diverse environment. As a society we must realise that resources are finite, that we cannot exploit and that development at all costs is wrong; yet we must not go hell for leather to lock away our resources at the expense of the life-style, growth and prosperity that future generations demand we leave them.

The key is balanced management. Growth, prosperity and progress can and do go hand in hand with the environment. We must learn to plan within the guide-lines of the environment and take care to make sure that the future is a bright one for our State.

It is a little frightening when environmental issues become distorted through often well-meaning but ill-informed campaigns and, indeed, through obvious and deliberate moves to jump on the bandwagon for political or mercenary ends. There have been many lies told about the environment and there will be many more to come, but hopefully the sense of near-hysteria that has dominated much of the environment debate in this nation of recent months is beginning to wear thin. People are beginning to realise that much of the rhetoric is hollow and that many of the arguments put forward are based on emotion, not common sense or hard scientific fact. We cannot let emotion or fairyland thinking dominate our environmental management. If we do, we will be failing in our duty to our children. By the same token, we cannot afford to take too many risks and we must, in some circumstances, err on the side of the environment, even if the hard, scientific evidence points to another way. Let us face it, scientists make mistakes.

It is for those very reasons that this Government has committed itself to sound and balanced environmental management through the creation of the Department of Environment and Conservation. Its creation saw the bringing together of areas of Government activity which had previously been spread throughout several Government departments.

The department is anticipating expenditure of some \$45.4m in achieving its directions and goals through the environmental management program, conservation management program and corporate management program in the 1989-90 financial year. Details are listed on pages 250 to 257 in the *State Budget for 1989-90 in Program Format*.

Turning firstly to the environmental management program, which is administered by the Division of Environment—members would be aware of the establishment of the State Environment Advisory Committee, which replaced three statutory bodies and provides advice on all aspects of environmental management, including technological advances and environmental planning.

The division has also changed its focus from the policing of pollution control legislation to a broader program for environmental management involving all relevant decision-making agencies. This practice is now well accepted among environmental managers. It allows for management by all sectors of the community whose decisions and activities impinge on the environment, including all levels of government, industry and individuals. Focusing environmental issues through this area of government activity will allow clear environmental quality objectives to be met.

Assistance to industry seeking to practise environmentally sound activities is given, as is education and public awareness. It should be remembered that individuals as well as industry must be responsible for their actions.

Environmental management covers a broad range of issues and, for the information of honourable members, I would like to list some of the new and continuing achievements in this area of the department—

- A waste management program is to be trialled in the south-east corner of the State. The program, when approved, will be available for use by all local authorities.
- A recycling program is being investigated. A booklet, titled *Over and Over*, will be released in approximately two weeks, listing recyclers throughout the State and giving advice to the community on actions that can be taken.
- A recycling poster has just been distributed to all local authorities, schools and libraries to further educate and inform.
- The provision of additional regional offices is being investigated.
- An ozone-depleting protection strategy is being implemented in line with other Australian agencies.

- Further technical guide-lines will be produced. To date, these have been particularly useful in helping industry to plan and work within environmentally acceptable limits.
- An after-hours emergency service will be introduced in the Brisbane area.
- The Moreton Bay strategic plan will be released on Thursday morning. This plan follows months of consultation with the many users of the bay area and aims for balanced use of its resources.

It stresses the need for improved conservation measures, seeks to create and manage recreation opportunities, takes cognisance of development pressures, and provides for development where planning and environmental guide-lines can be met. It is hoped that all areas of the community, including individuals, will provide comment on its contents.

- Finalisation of the relocation of the A. J. Bush processing plant from Murarrie is being pursued.

Total funding for the Division of Environment amounts to \$5,306,976. This is comprised of consolidated revenue funds, \$3,073,000; miscellaneous collections, \$158,000; and fees and licences, \$1,679,000. Expenditure is expected to total \$5,126,000, which will provide for a carry-over in the State Environment Trust Fund to next year of \$180,976. Of necessity, the major cost is in providing a Statewide network of inspectors and monitoring staff who ensure that environmental standards are met by Government, industry and the community.

Turning now to the conservation management program which is administered by the Division of Conservation, Parks and Wildlife—honourable members are aware that the division is charged with the responsibility of managing national parks, marine parks and other nature reserves and conserving wildlife as well as administering recreation areas. To enable the division to fulfil its obligations effectively, it is estimated that a total of \$32,994,809 will be expended. Of this, some \$14m will be expended this financial year on the salaries, wages and related payments of employed staff and rangers across the whole State. Nearly \$7m will be used in general operations such as park maintenance, vessel charter, plant and equipment hire, fuel and oil costs and office supplies.

Of the total divisional base, in excess of 90 per cent of available funds will be directed to regional activities. Some \$3.03m will be provided to assist in the extension of the national parks estate, of which some \$2.4m is anticipated to cover relevant land acquisition costs for a national parks system in the southern Moreton Bay area. The remaining \$630,000 will be expended in acquiring lands to create new national parks and reserves or to extend existing holdings.

The problem of improving road access to national parks and reserves to cope with ever-escalating visitation has been recognised with an allocation of \$405,000 this year. Some 11 shires throughout the State will receive funds, including the Bauhinia Shire Council to complete the upgrading of the Carnarvon Gorge access road to normal shire standard gravel road.

An amount of \$200,000 will be expended in the 1989-90 financial year to stabilise and protect the increasing component of valuable and important cultural resources on national parks and reserves. Initial emphasis will be focused on ongoing projects on Saint Helena Island and Fort Lytton as well as protecting the bora ring in Cooloola national park and other selected Aboriginal art sites.

The Government is conscious of its obligations in the day-to-day management of the Great Barrier Reef marine park. In total, \$4.982m has been provided to ensure the protection and prudent management of this unique wonder of the world.

Sitting suspended from 12.29 to 2.30 p.m.

Mr BORBIDGE: Prior to the luncheon recess I was referring to the day-to-day management of the Great Barrier Reef marine park. Management strategies are custom driven, with the need to provide opportunities for people to enjoy and experience, yet

respect that dynamic and, in places, sensitive environment. Within the funding listed, the Commonwealth Government provides \$520,000 for initial capital works within the marine park, with both the Commonwealth and State Governments providing \$2.231m each for operating costs and post-initial capital works.

In line with Government initiatives, recreation will adopt a higher profile within the divisional program. The Recreation Areas Management Act 1988 allows the creation of declared recreation areas over publicly owned lands that have existing recreation demand, are located in areas with existing management infrastructure and have a significant population catchment. The concept builds on the success of Brisbane forest park and Fraser Island. But let me assure the Committee that it builds on recreation management and does not override any conservation law.

A network of about eight recreation areas will be created at key locations along Queensland's coast and hinterland. They will be the State's premier nature-based recreation locations, providing an expo of Queensland's natural areas. In all cases the planning and management of those areas will be consistent with the environmental sensitivity of the particular site. In many cases the setting up of a recreation area will give added protection to the more fragile areas of parks and reserves. A strategic plan setting out the proposed network is currently being prepared for presentation to Cabinet.

I expect that, in the near future, Moreton Island will become a recreation area. Funds to the extent of \$1,770,000 will be expended in that area of the department. Consolidated revenue funding amounts to \$224,000, with \$1,546,000 being self-generated funds. As the Committee is aware, fees from camping permits and commercial operators' permits on Fraser Island are in place and allow for the continued management of the island, staffing levels and the provision of visitor facilities.

At this point it is important to note that the management of Fraser Island has been recognised worldwide as the blueprint for how to care for a rich and diverse area that has to meet many demands from the community. Fraser Island is unique not only in its geography but also in its position in the hearts and minds of many Queenslanders. That rich island has to be cared for so that it is literally not loved to death. However, no clear-thinking person would ever consider it a reality that the island could be locked away. That is simply neither desirable nor possible. The biggest danger to Fraser Island is people, and through the use of the Recreation Areas Management Act that is now controlled.

As to logging—the record of forest management on Fraser Island speaks for itself. In fact, while providing a valuable resource, sustained selective logging actually enhances some parts of the island. In answer to anyone who criticises the management of Fraser Island I simply say, "Go and have a look." If there is for the world to see a blueprint for the management of a sensitive, yet readily accessible area, that is Fraser Island.

Brisbane forest park on the western edge of Brisbane will complete Walkabout Creek, a fresh-water study centre. Funds totalling \$120,000 are available to complete that project. Redevelopment of existing recreation facilities at Bellbird Grove, Ironbark Gully and Maiala picnic area will also be undertaken. Together with the provision of interpretive boardwalks and facilities at Westridge Outlook, those works will cost approximately \$260,000. The sum of \$500,000 is the proposed expenditure of capital works funding this year, including the completion of the Northbrook Parkway, which connects the park with the upper Brisbane valley and Lake Wivenhoe. Other capital works on national parks and reserves will amount to \$1.781m and will cover activities such as the redevelopment and construction of camping and picnic grounds and appropriate visitor infrastructure, including walking tracks on mainland and island reserves.

Finally, I mention the corporate management program, which is administered by the Division of Corporate Services, and which incorporates financial and staff management, administration, records management, media and information, and sales and marketing. In that area of activity some \$7,344,000 will cover administrative costs, including salaries and wages. Of this, an allocation of \$180,000 will allow further investigation of the Q-Zoo concept.

Of special interest to the Committee would be the promotional activities that are to be undertaken in the next 12 months. Those include the continued presence of departmental staff on television programs such as *Wombat*, which enables an educational message to be conveyed to the younger members of the community. Regular radio talks will be maintained and expanded where possible.

The *Naturally Queensland* magazine, which is distributed through the RACQ's *Road Ahead* to more than 500 000 Queensland households, has drawn the public's attention to the many and varied activities of the department. The public will again be able to see the department on display at city and provincial shows. Staff have been able to inform and educate the public on many issues in that way. The theme *Naturally Queensland* has been adopted as a distinctive marketing identification and slogan for the department.

The *Naturally Queensland* shop at 160 Ann Street has been a definite success in its role of serving the public by providing information on all aspects of the department and the sale of related items. The development of a Statewide concept will be given priority in the coming year, reflecting an increasing departmental commitment to services and quality products.

Further documentaries along the lines of the greenhouse effect and land-degradation features, which were done in association with Channel 7 Brisbane, will be considered. I should mention that both of those programs rated very well on the evening shown, and the second feature, *Rescue the Future: Holding Our Ground*, will be replayed on 7 October at 5 p.m. in the Brisbane viewing area. Arrangements are being made for all regional television stations to broadcast the program in their localities. Department-organised activities such as World Environment Day will be continued as well as the regional seminars and public meetings to explain the department's role in Government.

I now present details of the budgetary requirements of the Department of Forestry. Before I get down to dollar issues and uses, I feel that it is necessary to set the stage by explaining the purpose and structure of the department in a context that is relevant to its financial requirements.

Although the department as a whole is production oriented and supports a major industry, its operating philosophy also embraces other tangible but non-financial benefits for the community. The comprehensive nature of the department's contributions to the economic and social fabric of Queensland is best summed up by the six goals that guide its operations.

The department aims to produce forest products and services in accordance with long-term community requirements; to ensure that State forests are used and managed in an efficient, effective and environmentally responsible manner; to maximise community benefits arising from the management of State forests while ensuring a positive return on any investment funds that are utilised; to encourage and facilitate the long-term economic viability of the Queensland-based forest products sector; to encourage the development and sound management of private forest resources; and to ensure a high level of community awareness of the values and diverse uses of trees and forests.

During 1988-89, Queensland's 4.5 million hectares of State forests and timber reserves supplied more than 1 million cubic metres of log timber for milling and other industrial purposes. The sale of that timber represented about 70 per cent of the annual intake of the State's wood-processing industry, which directly employs some 14 900 people with an estimated annual turn-over of \$1.1 billion.

Thus, the Department of Forestry's stewardship of the Crown forest estate, and sales of forest products from those lands, provides the overwhelming majority of raw materials to a major industry—an industry which, by its very nature, is decentralised and often forms the economic and social backbone of many of our smaller communities. However, it must be remembered that the department supplies those necessary raw materials from an infinitely renewable resource—our forests—and does so in a manner which must be environmentally responsible to ensure continuity of supply.

Because forests must be managed on strict environmental guide-lines, there are also a multitude of benefits flowing to the community at large from all of our State forests. These benefits include the protection of water catchments, extensive areas available for stock-grazing, protection of wildlife habitats, and the availability of extensive areas for nature-based recreation.

The Department of Forestry generated \$32,248,000 in revenue as a result of its sales to various elements of the timber industry in 1988-89. The department expects revenue from timber sales in 1989-90 to be about \$34m. It is within this context, therefore, that the department's budgetary requirements for 1989-90 have been framed.

In concert with other Government departments, the Department of Forestry has presented its forward estimates on a program basis. The summary appears on page 335 of the Budget paper *State Budget for 1989-90 in Program Format*, and explanations of specific allocations by program follow on subsequent pages. As a necessary prelude to the implementation of program management, the department had to develop a new set of operational guide-lines which would reflect and enhance its performance.

Achievements to date under this strategic-planning process have been—

- definition of an outcome-oriented program structure and drafting of relevant goal statements;
- Government endorsement of the major program management initiatives including strategic options for the Queensland Government pine plantations and financial strategies for the Queensland Department of Forestry;
- detailed review of funding arrangements for the organisation with clear separation of social and commercial goals and the full allocation of costs and revenues to programs;
- comprehensive structural review of the organisation to achieve efficiency and effectiveness;
- establishment of financial and non-financial information systems to enable monitoring of program performance; and
- rigorous pursuit of performance indicators for programs and work units, and a personnel performance appraisal system.

With these major elements of an effective program management framework either in place and operational or in an advanced stage of development, the department can look forward with confidence to continuing its major contribution to the economic and social prosperity of the State. The department's commitment to program management has also necessitated a review of its organisational structure to improve efficiency and effectiveness.

The organisational structure has been streamlined from six to four divisions—production, corporate services, technical services and strategic services—with the head of each division, along with the Conservator of Forests, forming the executive. A line of decision-making has been removed, with the abandonment of six divisional director positions, thus making branch managers directly accountable to an executive member.

The amalgamation of 10 districts and 22 subdistricts into 13 district administrative and management units removes a further line of decision-making. Major savings in infrastructure costs will flow from this new arrangement. As a result of the restructure, as at 30 June 1989, 14.6 per cent fewer salaried staff were employed in the department than the department's establishment figure.

Funding

The department's operations are funded from the agriculture, forestry and water resources policy area and from departmental revenues. The department retains all revenues generated from operations. A program-based accounting and budgeting system is fully operational. The result is a sound basis for assessment of the organisation's financial performance and a clear measure of its accountability.

There are four elements of the funding strategy—

- Program-funding must be from the appropriate source.
- The department now retains financial resources at year's end and carries forward balances.
- Income is matched against expenditure for each program.

Sources and application of funds for the 1989-90 financial year are as follows—

A balance carried forward from 1988-89 of \$13,866,000.

Estimated receipts are—

- (i) Consolidated Revenue Fund allocation to finance non-commercial and social programs, \$29,622,000.
- (ii) capital works funding for the plantation production programs and construction of recreation facilities, \$20,000,000; and
- (iii) Internally generated revenue, \$49,220,000, giving total funds available of \$112,708,000.

Estimated expenditure by program is as follows—

Native forest production	\$11,520,000
Plantation production	\$73,839,000
Other resource sales	\$2,088,000
Forest services	\$10,350,000
Consultancies	\$2,100,000

giving total expenditure of \$99,897,000, resulting in a balance carried forward to 1990-91 of \$12,811,000.

It should be noted that the balance carried forward to 1990-91 is to be used as the basis for a reserve fund which will be used to smooth fluctuations in predicted revenues on an annual basis and to provide for loss replacement in the forest estate.

Native forest production

The native forest production program is the vehicle for the management of the State's 4 million hectares of native forest which have been set aside for the sustained production of timber and related products. The commercial goal is for annual revenues to exceed annual costs. However, overriding considerations such as environmental protection and multiple-use management limit opportunity to manage this program on a fully commercial basis.

There are now 92 wood-processing companies in Queensland dependent on the native forest resource of our State forests for milling-timber supplies. To assist in the development and long-term viability of these enterprises, the department has in many cases entered into 20-year guaranteed supply agreements. This year some 433 000 cubic metres of native milling timber was allocated to Queensland sawmills for logging on a sustained-yield basis. Production management of native forests, by its very nature, leads to intangible benefits which cannot be accounted for in a strictly commercial sense. These benefits include fire protection and fire hazard reduction, water catchment and landscape protection, wildlife habitat and complementary nature conservation and decentralisation of industry. Provision of these benefits addresses broader Government social, economic, and developmental objectives and, as such, any deficit of revenues is funded as a subsidy to the commercial production program.

Removals of native forest milling timber during the year were generally higher for most of the 13 forestry districts operated by the department, but a dramatic reduction in rainforest removals in north Queensland effected an overall six per cent reduction in native forest removals. Estimated expenditure in 1989-90 is \$11,520,000, which is funded from an allocation of \$4,760,000 from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and \$6,760,000 from receipts on sales of forest products. As honourable members would be aware, an

issue of major concern for the Government and the Department of Forestry has been the Commonwealth Government's effective banning of rainforest-logging in north Queensland since January 1988.

The Queensland Government has continued its legal challenge to the validity of the Commonwealth regulations that impose a total ban on commercial forestry operations within the World Heritage listed area. Proceedings will commence before Mr Justice Lockhart in the Federal Court on 30 October 1989.

Plantation production program

The goals of the plantation production program relate specifically to establishing and maintaining a plantation resource sufficient to sustain an efficient and viable timber industry in Queensland and to the management of that resource in an environmentally and financially responsible manner. The program has resulted in the establishment of more than 169 910 hectares of plantations since its commencement in the 1920s. Procedures used in establishing and maintaining this substantial resource are based on an ongoing research and development program, for which the Department of Forestry has established an enviable international reputation in tropical and subtropical plantation management.

The department has four tree-breeding programs concentrating on hoop pine, Caribbean pine, slash pine and hybrids. The major thrust of these programs is to continue the improvement of the department's plantation species for factors such as growth performance and wood quality. The basic objective is to grow superior trees quickly, thus maximising returns from invested funds. The financial goal of the program is to maximise the rate of return of investment and, as a minimum, ensure a real rate of return of 3 per cent on funds invested.

This year the concept of plantation valuation will be incorporated into the financial accounts of the department. This recognises that the department's plantations are an extremely valuable asset—an asset which grows both in volume and value over time. The total value of the plantation resource is presently calculated to be in excess of \$900m. A major goal of the program is the development of large, regionally based industries. Substantial progress has been achieved in recent years with the establishment of major timber-processing plants at a number of regional centres. During the last financial year, removals of plantation milling timber from State forests increased by 24 per cent, with revenue to the State increasing concurrently. This increase in timber sales was made possible by an effective increase in the amount of timber available for sale to wood-processing industries, together with an increasing demand fuelled by a buoyant local building industry. The increase in resource availability has resulted in the extensive modernisation of a sawmill in the Caboolture area, as well as the construction of two new high-technology sawmills in the Gympie and Maryborough regions.

Pulpwood removals from Crown softwood plantations increased by around 66 per cent during 1988-89, and they are expected to post major increases in future years as the new \$78m medium-density fibreboard plant in the Gympie region begins to utilise its entitlement of up to 300 000 cubic metres a year. The allocation under this program for 1989-90 is \$73,839,000, which will be funded from the following sources: the Consolidated Revenue Fund will provide \$36,322,000 and from the Forestry Fund a total of \$37,517,000 will be made up of a carry-forward balance of \$3,017,000 and sale of forest products of \$34,500,000.

Other resource sales

The other resource sales program is responsible for the harvesting of forest products from those native forests on Crown land other than State forests. Harvesting must take place in accordance with long-term community requirements and in an efficient, effective and environmentally responsible manner. The program operates with the goal of maximising the excess of annual revenues over annual costs and, as a minimum, ensuring revenue equals costs for each subprogram. The department also manages the sale of quarry

materials from State forests and Crown lands through its other resource sales program. As well as playing a major role in supplying forest products to Queensland's timber industry, the department has become a significant supplier of quarry materials. In 1988-89 approximately 1.6 million cubic metres of quarry materials were removed from operational quarries on Crown lands throughout Queensland.

There are strict requirements for all operations to take place under approved environmental standards. All quarries are required to operate under approved working plans covering both the conduct of quarrying operations and the rehabilitation of the quarry site. Financial goals are also in place requiring a maximisation of net revenues from quarry sales except where such material is provided for public sector projects with a high level of direct community benefit. In this situation the goal is to cover costs on a Statewide basis. Budgetary requirement under this program for 1989-90 is \$2,088,000, the funding for which is more than covered from sales estimated at \$3,900,000.

Forest services program

With the implementation of program budgeting, the forest services program has now adopted, where practicable, the user-pays principle. Full Government funding continues for regulatory services or for those services which the department provides for the public as a matter of Government policy and where it is not practicable to apply the user-pays principle. The forest services program includes four major subprograms—

- recreation,
- forest extension,
- timber utilisation extension, and
- wet tropics non-timber management.

With society spending more and more time in the active pursuit of leisure, there is an increasing demand for nature-based leisure activities. The department's recreation subprogram is endeavouring to meet this demand by continually upgrading and developing forest-based recreational opportunities throughout the State. As honourable members would know, under the Recreation Areas Management Act the Department of Forestry has a joint responsibility with the Department of Environment and Conservation for certain recreation areas established on public lands. The Act ensures a joint commitment to the improvement of the range and quality of nature-based recreation facilities in Queensland. Overall, the Department of Forestry administers more than 60 State forest parks, forest drives and interpretive trails strategically located throughout Queensland. During the 1988-89 reporting period, the department recorded more than 1 200 000 day visits and about 400 000 overnight stays for visitors using its facilities.

Widespread publicity regarding the greenhouse effect and the impact of twentieth century life-styles on the environment has led to a heightened community awareness of the value of trees in protecting soils, maintaining water quality, wildlife habitats and stock shelter and reversing land degradation generally. Healthy forests exchange the greenhouse gas, carbon dioxide, for the environmentally desirable gas, oxygen, through the photosynthesis process. This process is speediest in actively growing forests, which is exactly the type of forest that is favoured for producing future timber supplies. Put simply, good forestry practices help reduce the greenhouse effect. The second major bonus is that carbon—the basis of carbon dioxide gas—is stored in timber products. As long as we can use and maintain timber products, the carbon that is locked up in them will not be released to the atmosphere. Those two points make a powerful argument for the pursuit of good forest management in Queensland and the expanded use of timber products in the community.

One of the primary functions of the forest extension subprogram is to ensure this awareness is maintained through a technical advisory service to the public on the value of trees and forests. Another is to encourage the development and sound management of private forest resources. A commitment to achieve both these objectives has established the department as a primary source of land-care information in Queensland. For example, the Government has allocated \$1m to encourage tree-planting on private land in

Queensland. This money will be allocated to a new project, entitled "Caring For Our Countryside", which will be implemented by the Department of Forestry. The project promotes tree care on rural properties through the three Rs—retention of trees, regeneration of trees and replanting of trees. The major focus of the project is to help ameliorate land degradation and other environmental problems on rural properties and to enhance future timber supplies, thus providing a future source of income for rural land-holders. Other benefits of the project will include protection of wildlife, less pollution in watersheds and a more scenic rural environment. The implementation of the Caring For Our Countryside project will be co-ordinated through the ministerial land care task force and the interdepartmental liaison committees so that all relevant Government agencies can assist.

While a large part of the department's effort is directed at growing trees to help meet the State's increasing timber needs, the business of growing trees cannot be separated from the use of timber. In this regard it is important timber-purchasers continue to regard wood as a cost-effective, reliable and versatile material. To this end, the department provides a large range of after-sales services to ensure the community receives the maximum benefit from the State's timber resources. These services have been combined to form the timber utilisation extension subprogram. These services include timber identification, pest and disease identification, tree-root identification, research and advice on wood-processing, seasoning and timber mechanics, a regulatory role to review timber specifications and standards, and the administration of the Timber Utilization and Marketing Act and the Diseases in Timber Act. More than 6 000 requests for after-sales service and advice were processed by the department last year. Budgetary requirement for the forest services program for 1989-90 is \$10,350,000, which is funded from Consolidated Revenue Fund to the extent of \$8,540,000, and from internally generated funds of \$1,810,000 within the forestry fund.

Consultancies program

The professional skills and expertise of many Department of Forestry officers are acknowledged as being amongst the best in the world. Together they form an excellent source of consultancy expertise capable of satisfying a potentially significant demand from outside the organisation. An essential goal of the program is to promote the department as a skilled and professional consultant in a variety of forestry and forest product areas in both tropical and subtropical environments.

As part of its consultancies program during the past year, the department continued as managing agent for the Australian International Development Assistance Bureau's (AIDAB) Dongmen State forest farm eucalypt afforestation project in the People's Republic of China. Short-term overseas consultancies were also carried out for AIDAB, the World Bank and the Shell company in China, Indonesia, Zimbabwe and the Solomon Islands. A new consultancy is currently under way in Vanuatu. The financial goal of the program is for revenue to exceed costs by at least 10 per cent on an individual project basis. Budgetary requirements under this program for 1989-90 are \$2,100,000, and receipts are estimated at \$2,300,000.

Conclusion

I have given honourable members the essential reasoning behind the five goal-oriented programs to be implemented by the Department of Forestry. I commend the department for the thoroughness of the strategic planning process that went into the formulation of those programs, and I commend my department's 1989-90 Estimates to the Committee for consideration.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I desire to inform the Committee 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).

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 COMBEN (Windsor) (3 p.m.): It is appropriate, in these last Estimates debates before Parliament rises for the election campaign, that I examine the environmental record of Russell Cooper's National Party Government and compare it with the positive policies that the Goss Labor Government will give to the people of Queensland in the future.

The new National Party Minister for Environment has outlined the directions in which he believes we should be moving. He has acknowledged that the world has turned green, and many of the initiatives that he has talked about are simply steps in the right direction. But he has not detailed the strategy for the future. Vague suggestions, hopes and inquiries have been the hallmarks of the Minister's statement today and in the recently tabled annual report of the Department of Environment and Conservation.

Twenty-six years of National/Liberal Party rule and six years of National Party rule have resulted in the worst system of environmental protection in Australia now obtaining in Queensland. Less of this State is national park than in any other State. Only 2 per cent of Queensland is national park, whereas the Australian State average is some 5 per cent. Only 50 per cent of the plant communities of our State are protected in national parks or similar reserves. Our Fauna Conservation Act allows the destruction of habitat that can wipe out an entire species with impunity; yet if a person shoots one koala he can go to gaol. We allow our faunal emblem to be sold. Where else in the world can a person go round flogging the cute little animal that is the faunal emblem?

We have no pollution-control strategy outside Brisbane. The dumping grounds for toxic and hazardous wastes in Queensland are our local creeks, rivers, disused mine-shafts and quarries.

The Recreation Areas Management Act, as it applies to development proposals, overrides the national parks legislation. The coastline of Cape York is up for grabs to the highest bidder who is close to the National Party. The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Act is a great piece of legislation which is being used in other parts of the world as a model, but the islands of the Great Barrier Reef are still not really managed and we do not put sufficient resources into managing those areas. The sorry tale of legal challenges to World Heritage listing of the wet tropics is well known. Millions of dollars have been spent so that the Minister and the former Minister could stay at five-star hotels across the world. Those millions of dollars should have been spent on managing those wet tropics areas.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Just so they can view the girl from Ipanema.

Mr COMBEN: I would not know who the girl from Ipanema is, but I am quite sure that, with his knowledge of tourism, the present Minister could probably tell us what it is all about. I am a simple Queenslanders concerned for the Queensland environment. Certainly I would not have travelled as far as Brazilia and spent the amount of money that was apparently spent by the former Minister.

The national park service has the lowest morale that it has had for years. People are leaving in droves. There is a totally top-heavy administration. One of the people who recently resigned from that service gave, among other reasons, a list of his dissatisfactions. This person was dissatisfied with the restructuring of the award in both gradings and wages. After 21 years of service, being graded down to a Ranger 2 after having held an Overseer Division 3 position for many years was insulting. He had provided the same service as an overseer on numerous occasions. The necessity to reapply for a job was not acceptable to him. The loss of \$30 a week following his downgrading was not acceptable. He is concerned about what is in his opinion the overall downgrading of the service, but it is an opinion that is shared by people right across the State. We have effectively lost our National Parks and Wildlife Service. He was also concerned about the way that personnel with short periods of service were acquiring high gradings. There was also the feeling that the service, as such, was not being protected at ministerial level. Suddenly there was a loss of direction and no-one knew where the service was going.

It is significant that, for the last 15 years, the National Parks and Wildlife Service had, as its cardinal principle, section 25 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act. That section reads—

“The cardinal principle of management of national parks is ‘the permanent preservation, to the greatest possible extent, of their natural condition’.”

That statement has been contained in every annual report for the last 15 years but, suddenly, this year it does not appear in the report.

The report contains a whole lot of corporate goals and interesting waffle, and that is about all there is. The following appears on page 12 of this year’s report—

“The planned means towards these aims include:

- by 1992 having management strategies for protection and balanced use of all present reserves.”

What does “balanced use” mean when there is a Recreation Areas Management Act which allows the Government to override the national parks legislation and when it is said in other places that there is to be development of the park system? We must start questioning where we are going with this service.

Further down on that page, another planned means is—

- increasing the community’s appreciation of conservation and cultural heritage.”

With due respect, the community knows about the appreciation of conservation and cultural heritage; it is the National Party Government that needs to be told.

Another means is—

- providing additional protection of native fauna and flora in their habitats through revised policies and more resources.”

What has the Government done to upgrade the Fauna Conservation Act? We had an upgrading some months ago. On that occasion power was given to flog koalas off to the highest bidder from anywhere to whom the Government wanted to sell; yet the Government did not think to make the changes that would have allowed the Queensland conservation groups to take Queensland Cement and Lime to court for the destruction of the habitat of the little bent-wing bats and ghost bats at Mount Etna, so the system is still in place.

An Opposition member: They are bats.

Mr COMBEN: Yes. We are very concerned about the little furry things that fly around of a night-time, but the Minister is quite prepared to let them fly off because he thinks that they will find another habitat somewhere. There is a need for State legislation to protect not just the living species but also their habitat. The world has now moved towards knowing that habitat preservation legislation is where we should be going. It is no good attempting to preserve a single species in isolation. A single species is part of an ecosystem which must work. We must have a system in which endangered fauna and flora and their habitats are preserved.

I turn to the other conservative party in this Chamber. This year, finally, the Liberal Party has decided that it has some conservation and environment policies. We see on 100 per cent recycled paper—

Mr Beanland: You’re asleep. You missed the last policies. We’ve had them all along. We’ve had them for ages.

Mr COMBEN: I am glad to know that the Liberal Party in the Windsor electorate is so good that I was asleep during the last election campaign and it still could not beat me.

The Liberal Party’s flimsy policy document, which is half the length of that produced by Mr Gibbs for the Labor Party at the previous State election, covers most of the areas

that the Labor Party dealt with at the State election three years ago which, in terms of environmental thinking these days, are a long way past. However, one of the most fascinating aspects about it, especially in view of the release of the Liberal Party's tax policy last week which was going to abolish land tax, reduce pay-roll tax and do a whole range of important things to let the people of Queensland get on with spending their own money, is that under "3.12 World Heritage" we find—

"The implementation of this policy will be costly. The Liberal Government will therefore ask the conservation movement to support it in seeking Commonwealth funding for the initiative. Should this fail the movement will be asked to support the introduction of a special conservation tax to provide funding."

I would be very interested to hear from Mr Beanland, who is so concerned about the environment, what form the conservation tax would take. It will be 10 per cent on what?

Mr Beanland: You will have to pay the most, by the look of it.

Mr COMBEN: I do not mind paying the most, because my money already goes towards conservation. I am wondering about the Liberal Party's "great" taxation policy which was released last week. It did not mention a special conservation tax.

I move on to other areas of the Liberal Party's environmental policy. The pollution control commission that the Liberal Party would establish would impose on identified potentially dangerous sites or establishments an annual inspection levy to cover the high level of inspection made necessary by the activity. That is a hidden tax. We now have two additional taxes.

The average house-holder in Queensland will also be hit. I thought that the task of government was to be creative, doing what the community wants, and that taxes are to pay for the programs that the community wants. One of those community needs is recycling. Every party makes a commitment to recycling. Some of the commitments are hollow and some of them are meaningful. However, the Liberal Party policy states—

"A specific innovation which a Liberal Government will test for a selected area of Brisbane will be a self sort multiple bin recycling program."

That is great. I have no problem with that. The Labor Party will be doing the same sort of thing. The only problem is that the Liberal Party is a little behind the times. Its policy states further—

"Participatory households will invest \$100.00 in the program . . ."

That \$100 is a hidden tax on every house-holder. Every pensioner who wants to do the right thing to keep the earth as a decent place for our young people and future generations will have to pay \$100 to achieve that. This is the same Liberal Party that says, "We'll abolish land tax. We'll abolish land tax on those people who have got enough land to have to worry about land tax, but the pensioner living in a pensioner unit—100 bucks up front, mate. You can afford it. You can live on cat food for the rest of the week." That is the type of policy produced by the Liberal Party.

Mr Hayward: A penalty for environmental awareness.

Mr COMBEN: What my colleague says is quite true. Anyone who is environmentally aware and who wants to participate in the program will have a penalty imposed upon him—a hidden tax.

We need to know from the Liberal Party, which is grovelling on its belly like a snake, what it will do in terms of a coalition.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Lower than a snake.

Mr COMBEN: Yes, lower than a black snake's duodenum.

Will the Liberal Party make the commitment that it is claiming with Wolffdene dam, the Redbank radioactive waste dump, Diamond Street, World Heritage, repeal of the Recreation Areas Management Act and the reinstatement of section 25 of the National

Parks and Wildlife Act as the cardinal principle of conservation in this State? Will it make those issues conditions of a coalition? Will it sign a piece of paper to be put before the people of Queensland saying, "Yes, we care. We produce nice documents and they will be upheld. We will not go into coalition unless we get a commitment about those."? This morning, there was a back-flip on Wolffdene dam, as was well demonstrated by my leader. We have on the back bench political hermaphrodites who do not know whether they are coming or going.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: The word is that there was a terrific brawl in the party room meeting this morning and Mr Beanland got absolutely slaughtered.

Mr COMBEN: I understand that Mr Beanland got slaughtered, because the reality of his signing the Public Works Committee report was that he was asleep, he was too lazy to prepare a separate report himself or he was following the policy of the Liberal Party, which this morning did a back-flip and hoped that no-one would notice. The future Premier of Queensland was on to them fairly quickly.

This State needs a decent set of environmental principles such as will be implemented by the Labor Party after the State election. We need legal and administrative changes to the environmental system in this State. Firstly, we need a land and environment court to which environmental issues can be taken. Secondly, we need as a matter of course environmental impact statements on all major developments. Thirdly, we need to give conservation groups in this State the ability to stand before the courts, to be given *locus standi*, so that their views can be heard. Fourthly, the conservation groups should be funded from the public purse, because they do a public service. If anyone challenged me and asked, "Are you going to fund all those greenies out there?" I would proudly stand here and say "Yes" with no trouble at all. That is where the people of Queensland expect their money to be going, not for subsidisation of the white-shoe brigade.

There is a need for a decent coastal protection strategy. In spite of the recent interest in coastal resource management, the recent coastal management strategy produced by the Government was one in which it can be shown that there was more of a commitment to having a coastal grab by land-developers than anything else.

There are four problems associated with the Government's coastal management policy. The first is that the existing arrangements for coastal management in Queensland are not satisfactory to any of the major interest groups concerned with coastal management in Queensland. Secondly, the proposals contained in the Green Paper do not address key coastal management issues in Queensland. Rather, they seem to be more concerned with protecting the authority and prestige of existing State Government agencies. Thirdly, the proposed local board structure would be dominated by State Government bureaucrats, with poorly defined roles for local government and poorly defined procedures for community participation in decision-making. Fourthly, approvals for both area management plans and specific development applications appear to be restricted to ministerial and Executive Council approvals, with no defined appeal provisions; yet, once approved, they would have the force of law, overruling town-planning powers even in areas above the high-water mark traditionally under the control of local authorities.

Those are the sorts of problems easily identifiable with the Government's coastal management plan. The Opposition will implement the type of plan that has a series of guide-lines which will be relevant to the entire coast, which will be administered by local authorities and which will have a major input from local communities and conservation groups. The Opposition is not afraid to go to the people and ask, "What are your views? What are your opinions?" That is what coastal management and coastal protection should be about.

An overall pollution strategy is needed in this State. A disposal site for toxic and hazardous waste is needed somewhere in the south-east corner—somewhere appropriate, somewhere away from residential areas on non-flood-prone land, that is geologically

stable. Similar sites are needed outside Gladstone and Townsville. At present there are no such sites and the toxic and hazardous waste goes anywhere.

Even the goodies out there who want to do the right thing take toxic and hazardous waste to the local dump, from which it leaches all over the place. If it is dumped at Emerald, it gets into the drinking water supply. If it is dumped at Warwick, it goes into the biggest rubbish dump anywhere in Australia. Because the Warwick dump is on the banks of the Condamine, the waste ends up in the Coorong in South Australia. If waste is dumped in the Hervey Bay rubbish tip, it goes out into Hervey Bay because the rubbish tip is located right on the bay.

There is a need for a pollution strategy. Real money needs to be put into a recycling program right across the State. There are big pilot programs in the major cities. However, the Government has to get involved and it has to consider the options, including perhaps beverage container deposit legislation.

It will be interesting to see the specifics of a plan relating to Moreton Bay to be launched by the Minister on Thursday morning. It involves the creation of islands to improve Moreton Bay, which is something that no environmentalist will take on. It is really very strange to see the Government building on the Spit at Southport and at other places and then have it say, "We are going to improve Moreton Bay."

The area of Queensland national parks will have to be increased in size to the Australian State average of 5 per cent of each State's land area. A number of proposals can be put into place by the stroke of a pen if the political will is there. Some of the proposals have been around for 12 years. They were identified by Standard and Webb and Co. in the mid 1970s. Those proposals will be put into place.

What is happening to Idalia, out in the west, and Thrushton? Suddenly, they are on hold. The new group, the "loonies", are in charge and suddenly those great proposals are not there.

Mr Borbidge: There's been no change.

Mr COMBEN: Is the Minister going to declare them?

Mr Borbidge: There's been no change.

Mr COMBEN: There has been no change. That means that they will not be declared.

Endangered species/habitat legislation is needed. The Fauna Conservation Act has to be upgraded so that the habitat as well as the fauna can be properly protected. An urban wildlife program needs to be implemented. Last night many people watched on television a program about Cape York. It revealed land deals involving 2 million hectares, the freeholding of land by non-Queenslanders and blatant trafficking in wildlife.

Approximately two years ago I was up in Cape York. While I was there the nests of palm cockatoos, eclectus parrots and rufous owls were all raided by nest-robbers, who came in one night and then left. It is quite amazing how quickly they got in there. The national parks officers were at the other end of the park. Those officers do a sterling job, but they have insufficient support. The Fauna Protection Squad needs to be upgraded so that there are at least five officers across the State. At present there are only two. Police officers, like nuns, always seem to travel in pairs, so there is only one squad for the whole State. That is insufficient.

There is also a need for a sound policy on the greenhouse effect. The Government needs to ensure that our wet tropics are properly preserved. The Queensland Government must enter into a management plan with the Federal Government. With those sorts of policies in place, Queensland can look forward to being the nature State of Australia. Brisbane could be the nature capital of Australia. There is a marvellous opportunity ahead of us.

The present Minister is a young man. It is a pity that he is not going to be able to implement the sorts of policies that a Labor Government will implement and will look

forward to implementing over the next 10 years, knowing that Labor's place in history will be secure as the party that really put conservation in Queensland on the drawing-board and gave this State a decent framework within which to work and a decent national parks system that is the envy of the rest of the world.

Mr BEANLAND (Toowong) (3.23 p.m.): This Government's record on conservation, environment and heritage matters does leave a great deal to be desired. I had hoped that today the new Minister might tell honourable members some more of his plans for the future. It is disappointing that honourable members did not hear more of his plans on these very important matters.

The tourist industry does have a very impressive record in this State because of the climatic conditions. Unfortunately, these days it is rather hamstrung by the current problems foisted upon it by the Labor Party. It is struggling for air and it is certainly under attack from all sides. It is under attack by the Hawke Labor Government and it is also under attack by the Goss Labor Opposition in this State because of its support for Federal Labor policies. Over a number of days in this place, honourable members have heard members of the Opposition expound those Labor policies.

Queensland tourism certainly has a very impressive record. However, in recent times it has been crippled, and it is still being crippled. The effect of the crippling airline dispute is not going to be washed away overnight, as we have been led to believe. It will be around for a decade. The same applies to the effects of the high interest rates, which will be around for several years to come.

One only has to read the recent report by the Geneva-based International Foundation of Airline Passengers Association, which was mentioned in one of the newspapers today. It says that tourism operators must realise that tourism is a global industry and is becoming extremely competitive. That report was commissioned by the Australian Tourism Industry Association.

Countries such as Spain receive 32 million tourist visitors a year compared with 2 million visitors to Australia.

Mr Hayward: Because they are closer to Europe.

Mr BEANLAND: As the honourable member said, they might be closer to Europe, but that is begging the question.

The point is that Australia is close to other parts of the world, such as Asia, which has a population larger than that of Europe. As time goes by, the people of Asia are becoming wealthier. They are in a position to travel to other countries, and many of them are now doing that. However, Australia, and Queensland in particular, are not attracting as many Asian tourists as they might like. The same can be said about American, Japanese and European tourists who want to travel to somewhere different. The people in those countries can travel to Europe at any time during the year. A visit to Australia is something special because Australia has unique flora and fauna. Today, Australia's tourist industry is hamstrung because of the policies that have been enunciated by the Federal Government.

Mr Hawke declared war on the airline pilots. Of course, the only people on whom he has declared war are those in the tourist industry. They are the people who are in the trenches, suffering and fighting, not Mr Hawke; he is on cloud nine, foisting his policies onto the tourist industry. One only has to look at the effect that tourism has on Queensland cities and towns to realise that during 1988-89 the industry continued to grow strongly. The total number of nights spent by visitors in Queensland each year has increased by 55 per cent, from 56 million visitor-nights in 1983-84 to 87 million visitor-nights in 1987-88. That represents an impressive annual average growth rate of 15.8 per cent. An examination of the tourist industry in this State shows that the growth of the tourism industry in Queensland, particularly the number of international visitors, is increasing at a faster rate than it is in New South Wales and Victoria. The number of international visitors to Australia by State of intended stay shows an increase from

1985-86 to 1986-87 for New South Wales of 29.6 per cent; for Victoria, 22.9 per cent; and for Queensland, 42.5 per cent. Queensland will be unable to maintain that significant increase if high interest rates prevail and the airline pilots dispute continues. The figures show that in 1986-87 Queensland, with approximately 271 000 international visitors, passed Victoria, with 262 000. It is clear that Queensland has become the State that attracts the second-highest number of international visitors. Queensland should try to build on that figure, but it will not be able to do so if the airline dispute continues. Because Queensland is a decentralised State, it will suffer the most.

One has only to look at the effect that the tourist industry has on many of Queensland's small towns and cities. I know that members of the Opposition are not very interested in this, but I point out to them that milkmen, butchers, greengrocers and farmers are all affected by the pilots dispute. Owners of small motels are also affected by it.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: What have you suggested to fix it up?

Mr BEANLAND: A number of solutions have been put forward, and I will deal with them in a moment. Clearly, Hawke is not prepared to entertain those solutions.

Honourable members are aware of the Prime Minister's change in attitude towards contract employment. For the first time the Labor Party has had a change and said, "We are going to embrace contract employment for the airline pilots." For some time members of the Liberal Party and members of the Federal National Party have been talking about contract employment in various areas of the labour market. Members of the Labor Party, including those in this Chamber, have indicated that they are against deregulation of the labour market. It makes one wonder whether they will adopt this change of face across the board or whether it is purely for the airline pilots. Unless the labour market is deregulated, the tourist industry will continue to experience problems with work practices that it ought not have to experience. Without deregulation of the labour market, it cannot achieve the necessary work practices that are so desirable in an industry that must provide service. The tourist industry has only one thing going for it—service to the community.

Mr Veivers: That's what you've got to do—bring them in by seaplane and land on the Wolffdene dam.

Mr BEANLAND: I am sure that the honourable member will be right there. That is right up his alley.

Providing service to the community cannot be achieved without a break-down of regulation in the labour market. The current arrangement has continued for quite some time, although there has been enormous pressure for change from the tourist industry. Because of the great expansion that has been going on, the industry has tried to introduce employment contracts. However, the Labor Party has clearly indicated that after the next State election it will say, "To hell with the tourist industry; to hell with Queensland growth and development; employment contracts are out. The tourist industry will have to continue with its current inflexible, outdated, outmoded work practices."

Without changes in the labour market, Queensland will not be able to take the great strides in the tourist industry that it ought to be taking. All the hoo-ha about sweatshops and that type of thing that is thrown up time and time again is outdated thinking. Everyone in the industrial relations scene acknowledges that. It is more important for the tourist industry than any other industry to move with the changes that are occurring in the market-place.

The Goss Labor Party has indicated that, if it is elected to Government in this State, it will insist on compulsory unionism. Young people in particular have massively rejected trade-unionism. Only 32 per cent of those under 25 years of age hold union tickets. That is a decrease from 43 per cent in 1976. Recently, the Bureau of Statistics released figures showing that, in 1989, only 42 per cent of the work-force now belong to trade unions, compared with 51 per cent in 1976. It is little wonder that the Labor

Party is talking about the repeal of the essential services legislation. A Goss Labor Party has indicated that, if it is elected to power, it will scrap that legislation. If that were done, Queensland would end up with more strikes than it now experiences. The effect on the most important industry in this State will flow right through to many of Queensland's cities and country towns. The Labor Party is most decisive that it will scrap the essential services legislation.

As to other problems that are crucifying the tourist industry—I have already mentioned the current spate of high interest rates. As from 15 July 1990, there will be a new tax slug, which will fall particularly hard on the tourist industry. The Hawke Labor Government has stated that for the quarters ended December, March and June companies will pay the usual tax, but on 15 July 1990 they will be slugged 85 per cent of the 1989-90 tax in one horrendous payment. Effectively, for seven months some businesses will generate no cash flow. In fact, they will go into debt because they will have to find additional funds to pay their taxation. That will create a huge reduction in the development and services that can be provided by the tourism industry as a whole. On 15 July 1990, companies will have to cough up a huge slab of taxation. Clearly, the tourism industry as a whole, and small business in particular will be hit by that taxation slug.

It is worth while noting the Labor Party's point of view on interest rates. On 30 July 1989 on the *Sunday* program Mr Goss stated—

“... the fact of high interest rates is that it is a very minor aspect of the Queensland political scene ... The interest rate question is a very minor figure. On advice I received this week it may be as much as 1 per cent.”

Honourable members are aware that the Federal Labor Party will not cut its own expenditure. For example, it will not tackle the deregulation of the labour market and it will not privatise at a Federal level. The Federal Labor Party is content to lock into the economy the current system of work practices through the Accord, which does away with productivity and ties salary increases to the current inflation rate. None of that comes to grips with interest rates, nor will it do so unless a totally different view is adopted by the Federal Labor Government, which is no doubt hoping that the airlines dispute will do enough to dampen the economy. If the strike continues for a few more months, more and more people will become insolvent. They will go broke.

The airlines dispute is having a disastrous effect on Queensland's tourist industry. Honourable members hear all about the big tourist operators, hotel chains and so forth, but they do not hear about the smaller people in the community—the ordinary, everyday citizens—whom the strike is affecting. It is all very well for the Labor Party to give \$100m to the airlines, but why does it not provide funds to those small operators who are paying the penalty?

The Federal Labor Government should entertain payment for productivity increases. After all, the airline pilots have indicated that they are prepared to accept them and have made it clear that they are quite happy for people within the industry to be sacked. If they are happy for 300 or 400 fewer pilots to be employed within the industry and to accept payment for productivity increases, so be it. The Labor Government does not want payment for productivity increases, because that would break its precious Accord, which has done so much damage to this country's balance of payments and foreign debt. Because Australia remains tied to the outdated and outmoded thinking of years gone by, the standard of living in places such as south-east Asia will surpass that of Australia.

Mr Burreket: What sort of Government would subsidise the airlines so that the strike could continue?

Mr BEANLAND: One must realise the relationship between the Federal Government and some of the key players in the airlines.

Honourable members would be aware that Sir Peter Abeles is a good friend of Robert Hawke. He seems to be making a number of statements on Mr Hawke's behalf, while Mr Murdoch seems to be staying in the background.

Mr Hayward: You've got six minutes to give us the solution.

Mr BEANLAND: It would not be too difficult to solve the dispute.

If the honourable member and his party had half a brain and the ability to update their thinking they would get on with the job of introducing payment for productivity increases and accepting contracts, which the Liberal Party has mentioned over and over again. I want to know whether the Labor Party intends to accept voluntary employment agreements or contracts right across the board or whether it intends to stick by its current policy.

Mr DAVIS: I rise to a point of order. I hate to use my vast experience in this Chamber against a new member, but we are debating the Tourism Estimates. The gentleman from Toowong is debating labour and industry Estimates, which are a completely separate issue. Mr Temporary Chairman, you should pull him into gear.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Booth): Order! The honourable member for Toowong said earlier that he was talking about voluntary agreements. It is in the best interests of the Committee that he comes back to tourism.

Mr BEANLAND: Voluntary employment agreements should be introduced across the board in the tourist industry. Until that happens, the problems within the tourist industry will continue.

The Hawke Labor Government needs to assist the tourist industry through the development of roads, which are so important for tourists. After all, 80 per cent of tourist travel in this State and in this nation is undertaken by road. Clearly the Labor Party is not very concerned about that. It is much more interested in ripping off the community through the fuel-tax levy. For every litre of fuel that is purchased, 30c goes towards fuel tax, but 4.95c is returned to the States, which is inadequate for proper road-funding.

Whether it be on the Gold Coast, in the Whitsunday area or at Cairns, the same problems exist within the tourist industry. The road structure is inadequate. The roads are breaking up. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr Burns, who no doubt sees himself as Treasurer in a future Labor Government, appeared on television one night recently holding up a slab of asphalt and saying, "Dear, dear, look at this. Isn't this hole in the road terrible?" The holes in the road exist because the Federal Labor Party has short-changed and ripped off the motorists and has not put adequate funding back into the road infrastructure of this nation.

Since 1983-84, fuel-tax revenue has increased by more than 100 per cent, yet in real terms the Federal Government's road-funding to Queensland has declined by \$90m. In fact, the roads are the life-blood of the tourist industry. Although the Federal Government imposes a tax of 30 per cent on luxury goods that may be bought by tourists, motorists pay a fuel tax of more than 120 per cent. That is something all of us should keep in mind. I am sure that the Minister also has that in mind.

Last financial year Australians paid \$6,500m in fuel taxes, but only \$1,215m was returned to the States in road-funding. Clearly, less than 17 per cent is returned to the States, the remaining 83 per cent is being ripped off by the Federal Government. If that huge rip-off is to continue, I am afraid the tourist industry will suffer and the types of development that have occurred over recent years will not continue. It is clear that, if the Federal Government were to increase the fuel tax returned to the States by only 3c from 5c a litre to 8c a litre, some \$400m would be returned to Queensland, or \$150m more than the \$250m that it presently receives. That would go an enormous way to developing this State's road network that is so precious and so important to its tourist industry. As I said, roads are a fundamental feature of the tourist industry.

In conclusion, I want to refer to noise control. I notice that the Minister's portfolio covers this subject. Recently, I was pleased to learn that new guide-lines were introduced by the noise control authority. Although they are only guide-lines, I trust that the

Government will keep in mind that down the track legislative action might be needed to implement them.

In many residential areas of Brisbane—and, I am sure, elsewhere in the State—developers who undertake building activity at all hours of the day and night have become a major problem. Quite often, subcontractors are the culprits. They will go out at 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning and start building, grinding away and making all sorts of other noises, waking the neighbourhood. Although the construction industry must be allowed to get on with its job, there are times of the day when people must also have their peace and quiet. Although the guide-lines stipulate the times at which the building industry can carry out its work so that the neighbourhood has its peace and quiet, I stress that at this stage they are only guide-lines. I hope that they are the subject of legislative action.

Time expired.

Mr HYND (Nerang) (3.43 p.m.): I take pleasure in joining the Estimates debate today to support the Queensland Government's continuing commitment to environment, conservation and forestry issues. Too often the sins of the father are visited on the sons, and I must say that in recent times this has become the case with environmental issues. During much of the past 200 years, our forebears have raped and destroyed the environment. However, the Queensland National Party Government, with its responsible policies, is continuing to educate people to make them aware that this is not our world or our State but that we are simply its custodians for a short time and that we must hand on a well-preserved world to future generations.

In the past, through either ignorance or lack of foresight, many actions have been taken which have caused immeasurable damage to the environment. It is important that we now follow the State Government's strategic management plan without falling prey to environmental hysteria which could damage many of the things that we as a nation have developed over the past 200 years.

It is fair to say that environmental and conservation issues have taken the spotlight; but a society can survive only if it continues to grow. If we intend to pass on to future generations the happy and prosperous life-style we currently enjoy, we do not have the right to stifle development and progress. It is our responsibility to continue to develop and progress, but with the firm understanding that the environment must have the utmost protection. It has always been a philosophy of mine that, although blind progress must be opposed, there must never be blind opposition to necessary progress.

During the time that I have been a member of the Conservation, Environment and Forestry committee, it has taken the hard stand that will eventually lead to a greater Queensland as far as the environment is concerned—that, of course, being our recreational area management plan, under which the user pays. It is essential that this user-pays system be implemented throughout Queensland to ensure that the Government always has the funding to continue area management.

The National Party Government recognises that in a growing State all development cannot be stopped, but rather that the demands of a growing population and also the demands of a society that takes for granted easy and cheap electricity and many other essentials in today's life-style be met.

If we wanted to return to the good old days, we could; but I venture to say that it would be at the expense of the environment as we now know it, and I wonder whether anybody really wants to forego the luxuries that we take for granted today and return to a time when such luxuries simply did not exist, or to a time when people died of the simplest of illnesses.

With its many publications on environmental information, the National Party Government has led the way in educating the public towards a better understanding of our environment. The Departments of Environment, Conservation and Forestry are run by a group of dedicated men and women which comprises many technical experts, scientists, inspectors and rangers who have pledged themselves to the continued well-

being of the environment by their overseeing of the development of national parks, environmental and marine parks, nature reserves, wildlife and recreational areas and, most importantly, environmental planning. To ensure the best possible control across the State, offices have been opened in Cairns, Townsville, Gladstone and Brisbane.

The department has established a strategic plan to provide for the balanced use of Moreton Bay. This plan stresses the need for improved conservation measures over the bay's resources and will monitor the developmental pressures that are placed upon the bay's environment.

A major initiative in the south-east corner is the scenic rim strategic management plan, which takes in an area of 100 000 hectares stretching 250 kilometres from Currumbin Creek to Cunningham's Gap at Warwick. It takes in popular mountain resorts such as Lamington national park, Binna Burra and other resorts. This scenic rim follows the border and mountain ranges through some of the most beautiful forests in Queensland. As a result of 10 years of continual planning, various Government bodies will be consolidated under one control. This area—known as the green behind the gold—comprises forests, national parks, local government land and private land. It requires careful and considered management. The area includes some of the most diverse landscapes and flora and fauna in south-east Queensland. It is an ideal area for recreation and tourism.

Currently, the parks in this area are catering for in excess of one million visitors each year. The National Party Government and the Departments of Environment, Conservation and Forestry have gone to great lengths with scenic rim management to provide orderly development of the area, including adequate protection and promotion of the regions's natural, cultural and recreational resources. The department, through its officers, provides an enormous amount of educational material and imposes the minimum regimentation necessary to ensure the protection required to preserve Queensland's heritage.

The integration and co-ordination of nature-based recreational activities requires a high degree of resource management, which is provided by the various administrators and rangers. Where possible, boardwalks and other facilities have been provided to protect nature from overly enthusiastic observers and those people who do not understand the delicate balance of nature. One of the best examples of the use of boardwalks can be seen at Fleay's Fauna Centre, which has no cages—only boundary fences for birds and animals—and boardwalk-barriers for people. The wildlife is separated naturally by the type of habitat within the centre. Examples of rainforest wetlands and eucalypt forest easily separate the fauna. The former Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service believed this was the best way to display and protect exhibits while showing various species to the public. As at July 1989, the nature conservation estate included 330 national parks covering in excess of 3.5 million hectares and a further 171 environmental parks covering 48 314 hectares. I am proud to say that during 1987, soon after I entered this Parliament, I had an environmental park declared in the Nerang electorate. Successive State Governments have provided eight scientific purpose reserves totalling 64 854 hectares and four fauna reserves totalling 6 444 hectares.

The Departments of Environment, Conservation and Forestry have played a major role in contributing to the Queensland Government's planning for the wet tropical rainforest region. It must be acknowledged that forest conservation did not begin in Queensland till 1873, when the first group of concerned citizens met to protest over excessive clearing of forests by settlers and the excessive waste of timber that resulted. Unfortunately, in many cases cedar-cutters were among the first settlers to the newly explored areas. These people proved to be excessively wasteful and raped much of Queensland's eastern coast lands in search of fine quality cabinet timbers for use in southern States. In those early days, fortunately, concerned sawmillers joined with the first protesters to ensure they could safeguard future timber supplies. During the next 25 years, the sawmillers established that there was a need for forest management and that some of the beautiful rainforests with high conservation significance should be

preserved for ever. Several reports commissioned by the Queensland Government supported the system known as the "wise use" forest conservation policy, which in 1900 led to the creation of the forestry branch within the Department of Public Lands.

By 1906, the then State Government had legislated to permanently preserve State forests and national parks. Full credit should be given to its members. By the end of World War II, the forestry branch had established 448 000 hectares of State forest. The much-prized hoop pine was being felled at such a rate that the Government was prompted to adopt two further forest management principles. The first would be that the annual harvest from State forests would be based on the forest's ability to grow timber rather than to supply the demands imposed by industry. The second was that forest regeneration would be encouraged on a scale that would guarantee the maintenance of the State's forest resources for all time.

Fortunately for us all, those two basic principles still guide the department, which now oversees 4.5 million hectares of State forest for the benefit of all Queenslanders. Naturally, I have taken the time to fully acquaint myself with the Nerang State forests, with the assistance of the chief forester for that region and other members of his staff. I have every confidence in their dedication and ability to protect and preserve these forests for future generations. Queensland foresters started the establishment of hoop pine forests in the 1920s, and these forests are now being harvested.

The honourable member for Glass House advised Parliament last year that a plantation in his electorate was being harvested. I personally took great pride in inspecting both hoop pine and kauri pines, which were planted in the late 1920s, growing at Central Station on Fraser Island.

Thanks to the foresight of those early foresters, Queensland now has about 44 000 hectares of hoop pine plantations, and almost all the hoop pine currently being harvested in Queensland comes from these maturing plantations which have now replaced the vast quantities of this species which previously were taken from native forests. Fortunately, hoop pine is a pioneer species and regenerates much more quickly than other rain forest species. Those early foresters discovered shortly after they started plantations that there would not be enough land of the right quality to continue to establish hoop pine plantations. This caused the early foresters to seek a different type of fast-growing pine to fulfil the State's continuing needs. This was the beginning of experimentation with imported species of softwoods which would grow quickly in ground unsuitable for agriculture. It was found that Queensland's coastal plains could, given the right fertilisers, support the growth of imported pines such as slash pine and Carribbean pine, which originated in the southern regions of North America. Currently the Forestry Department oversees around 120 000 hectares of these exotic pines which can be seen from the Bruce Highway when travelling to the Sunshine Coast. These exotic pines now provide a large part of our requirements for softwood framing for houses, and furniture such as barbecue settings.

While the Queensland Department of Forestry is aware of the conservation aspects of good forestry and the sustainable production of timber. The department also oversees all areas of forestry from sparsely vegetated sand-dunes to tropical rainforest. The Department of Environment and Conservation and the Department of Forestry do all in their power to protect and manage the State's environment and the Queensland National Party Government continues to provide the appropriate funding for its continued development.

I have pleasure in supporting the Minister in the presentation of his Estimates.

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (3.58 p.m.): This afternoon in this Parliament the paranoia of the Liberal Party has emerged once again. I have never witnessed a more disgusting performance from the Liberal Party than the pathetic offering made by the honourable member for Toowong. Recently I was in north Queensland. A group of tourist operators told me that a couple of weeks ago Mr Beanland visited them and it was a very unpleasant experience. One operator said that they thought he was a dope,

and immediately another operator retorted that he thought that that was what the honourable member for Toowong had been puffing. That was the impression that Mr Beanland made on the tourist operators of north Queensland.

This afternoon he showed his total ignorance when speaking about the airline pilots dispute. He said that the Labor Party has done absolutely nothing about the dispute. The honourable member cannot have it both ways. He constantly kicks the trade union movement and criticises it; yet, in a dispute of this nature, he protects people such as these greedy, unscrupulous pilots, who are out to destroy the wage structure and system in this country and who are not prepared to abide by what everyone else in the community and what every other trade union has to abide by, that is, the umpire's decision and the settlement of the dispute in the place where it should be settled, that is, the arbitration commission.

This morning I noticed with a great deal of satisfaction that the Minister for Tourism, Mr Borbidge, finally made an announcement that he and the Queensland Government would not abolish or waive pay-roll tax, but would temporarily hold over charging pay-roll tax and liquor fees to those tourist operators who are in trouble. I can prove beyond any shadow of a doubt that the Labor Party has been to the fore on this issue, because I made that call on 1 September. I called on the Government, not to simply hold over pay-roll tax, electricity charges, land tax, vehicle registration fees, liquor fees and casino taxes on a temporary basis, but to totally waive those charges for the duration of this dispute in order to help out those operators in this State who are feeling its financial effects. This Government could be doing much more. It could provide handsome bonus incentives by underwriting the cost of some holiday expenses for Queenslanders who have made interstate or overseas bookings and who are prepared to holiday in Queensland's tourist resorts during this dispute. Today the Queensland Government could be encouraging people to travel throughout Queensland, thereby assisting the tourist industry.

I will briefly address another problem which was also raised by Mr Beanland, that is, the problem of labour within the tourist industry. His statements show his sycophantic ignorance. He is not even aware of the negotiation processes that take place with the trade unions operating within the industry. For example, he would not know that as long as 15 years ago the Miscellaneous Workers Union in this State negotiated a private employment agreement with Binna Burra Lodge. That agreement is no longer in operation. Ultimately, by mutual consent, because of the turn-over in staff, it was ended. That agreement worked very successfully. The majority of those unions within the industry have never objected to sitting down and talking to the tourist operators. All that the parties want is simply that the case go before the commission, and that the commission decide on the merits put before it whether there should be an industry agreement or industry award. There are such awards at present and the majority of tourist operators are quite happy to accept them. The lies that are perpetrated in this Chamber by the former Deputy Mayor of Brisbane—and what a disaster he was in that position—just do not stand up to argument.

He spoke of the need to attract overseas visitors to Australia. Nobody disputes that, but the simple fact is that, today, Australia gets less than 1 per cent—I repeat that Australia gets less than 1 per cent—of the international tourists and, of course, a smaller number come to Queensland. The reason is twofold: there is a horrific and acknowledged problem in this country with the level of airline fares. I recognise that quite readily. The way in which the two airline system in this country has got away with bleeding the public for years is a disgrace. I am the first to say that, for a number of reasons, I do not support deregulation of the airline system. My prime concern is the safety of people carried on the aircraft. I certainly do support the establishment of further airlines in this country. Make no mistake about that. I welcome the support, for example, that John Bannon, the Premier of South Australia, has given in trying to attract to South Australia the new Queensland company that wants to establish an airline system here. He is offering that company \$50m to establish in South Australia. With a change of Government later this year, the same offer will be made by the Queensland State Labor Government

to encourage that company to establish its head office in Queensland and to compete in the market-place and slash air fares so that Queensland can become greater in the tourist industry.

I will now prove my claim about the value of domestic tourism to this State. Between 1 July 1986 and 30 June 1987 the money spent by tourists staying in commercial accommodation increased by 35 per cent to \$1,915m. The role of interstate and overseas visitors is fuelling the Queensland economy. That is evident from the figures. Approximately 69 per cent of the direct expenditure by tourists in Queensland is by interstate and international visitors. This means that commercial accommodation-based tourism pulled approximately \$1,325m from outside the State and put it into the Queensland economy. That can be equated to a Queensland manufacturing industry selling \$1,325m of its products interstate and overseas and providing jobs in Queensland. The estimated \$590m spent by Queenslanders touring the State is equivalent to spending \$590m on a Queensland manufactured product rather than one manufactured overseas or interstate. It is money kept in Queensland and in the Queensland economy—and it keeps Queenslanders in jobs—rather than spent on holidays interstate or overseas.

This is where I am and have been critical of the role of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. I do not believe that it has paid enough attention to promoting Queensland. It seems to be hell-bent on racing off overseas and promoting this country to the detriment of Queenslanders who want to travel and the tourist attractions in Queensland.

Mr Borbidge: The biggest travel wholesaler in Queensland.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I know that the corporation is the biggest travel wholesaler in Queensland, and there are reasons for that. The tourist operators in the market-place are resentful of this quasi Queensland Government organisation intruding into the market-place and taking dollars away from these operators who have put their livelihoods on the line and have risked their financial security. They find themselves fighting this incredible quango sourced by unlimited dollars.

The second fact is that, in direct expenditure for the year ended 30 June 1987, domestic tourism in Queensland was worth \$3,355m, international tourism was worth \$620m and daytrippers spent \$1,325m, making a total of approximately \$5,300m. Using the QTTC multiplier of 2.1, in this financial year, if it had not been for the pilots dispute, this State should have been looking at revenue of \$13 billion from, for instance, the creation of additional jobs, and the increased supply of electricity. The Queensland Government has an absolute responsibility to start doing something constructive to make sure that this industry, which is being hurt at present by the dispute, is helped in a far more substantial manner.

Successful promotion means more jobs for Queenslanders. The teaming of money and manpower in promoting tourism would be one sure way of providing more jobs in the State of Queensland. Domestic tourist promotion is recognised as being equally as important as overseas promotion. Within Queensland, locals should be encouraged to spend their tourist dollars at home. When Queenslanders spend their money outside the State, their dollars are exported and jobs go with them. An increased level of tourism is reflected quickly in employment growth, because that industry is labour intensive. Increased tourism fairly quickly results in additional employment in motels, hotels, the entertainment industry, restaurants, and tourist attractions, and by the bodies that provide recreation and personal services. The tourism industry also has the ability to use casual and part-time labour.

Recently, as a representative of the Parliament, I had the pleasure of making an overseas trip to Japan and Korea, among other countries. We are often told that Japan is a lucrative market for this State. Nobody would deny that it is a lucrative market. As I said at a luncheon that I addressed today, I do not share the hysteria that some people in the community deliberately create about Japanese tourists who visit Australia. However, upon visiting the office of the Agent-General in Tokyo, I had the pleasure of

meeting Mr Loxton, who is doing an excellent job in representing Queensland overseas. Japan is an incredible market-place to which we are supposed to be geared, yet Mr Loxton works out of a very small office located inside the main office of the Agent-General.

Mr Borbidge: It is being extended.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I know that it has been extended. That was explained to me when we were there. However, I still do not believe that the small resource that he has befits the State of Queensland. It further appalled me to find the number of staff who were available to assist Mr Loxton—

Mr Borbidge: His name is Luxton.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: Yes, Mr Luxton. I offer my apologies. He had access to a general typing pool to assist him in his work. That position must be improved.

Mr Luxton has responsibility also for Korea. Improvements are needed there as well. The Korean market is exciting and in the next five years will be a great source of tourists for Queensland. Korea is undergoing an incredible economic resurgence. Because of new attitudes, many of the ways and customs of the old Koreans are being lost. The people are receiving more money and they are keen to spend it by travelling overseas.

My colleague Mr Fraser, who was on the trip with me, is sitting at the back of the Chamber. I do not ask him to agree with me, but when we arrived in Korea we were met by staff of the Australian Embassy. We were given a briefing on a Saturday morning. I forget the person's name—he can be thankful for that—but on the Saturday morning that whisky-sodden fool showed up to our room. He was obviously well hung-over from the night before. It was obvious to us that he was resentful of the fact that he had to get off his fairly ample backside on a Saturday morning and come to speak to a group of Queensland parliamentarians. Quite frankly, it is his job to do that. He is in Korea as part of the Australian Trade Commission. If we are keen to bolster our international image abroad and to bring tourists to this State as a result of visits to Korea by parliamentary delegations, the best thing that can happen is that that gentleman is pulled out of Korea pronto. He did not do too much for the image of Australia or Queensland. I have been saving that complaint. During that trip, he was the only person who was not co-operative. He appeared to be not interested in his job at all.

Queensland has a most exciting future in tourism; only a fool would say otherwise. Great as tourism has been for Queensland, it can be far better. The Labor Party has given a commitment to establish in Queensland a proper and professional tourism and hospitality college. At present, courses are conducted at the Gatton college and at South Brisbane. I acknowledge that the young people who complete the courses at those colleges certainly reach a particular standard. However, when I speak to people in the tourist industry, they inform me that they are finding that the people who graduate from both those colleges are inadequate; they are not happy with them. Many people in the industry to whom I speak now adopt the attitude that they would rather take a person who has had very limited experience and train him themselves, because they believe that they can get a far more efficient person than those who have graduated from both of those colleges.

That is an indictment of the industry. There is no doubt that there is a mentality in this State and this country that work in the service industry—perhaps it is to do with the fact that much of it is part-time work—is demeaning. We should be facing reality and designing courses that will be attractive to young people. The course curriculums should be prepared by local, interstate and overseas experts so that they emphasise to the members of the community who want to enter our great tourist industry that it is a career industry and an industry of the future.

The airline dispute has highlighted dramatically the absolute inadequacy of Queensland Railways as a modern, efficient people-mover. I welcomed the announcement recently by Doug Ryan of the Crest Hotel on behalf of a large number of people

prominent in the tourist industry about putting together a package that should be considered. I undertake that this year a Labor Government will consider that package. I asked my colleague the member for Ipswich, Mr Hamill, who is the Labor Party's Transport spokesman, to instigate an immediate investigation into the financial viability of extending the VFT—the very fast train—from the Gold Coast, when it eventually reaches there, to Cairns. I believe that it is a financially viable proposition which needs to be investigated. It is very appealing to think that one could board a train at Brisbane and travel to Cairns in three to four hours. In Tokyo, Mr Fraser and I were able to enjoy an incredible experience in one of that country's trains. It is a popular mode of transport that people would gladly use. If that mode of transport were introduced, the tourism industry would not be at the mercy of the airline system.

In the last minute remaining to me, I mention that on behalf of the Labor Party I also announced today that a Labor Government will introduce poker machines in Queensland. Over the last three weeks I have had discussions with a number of manufacturers. My committee and I had discussions last week. I am satisfied that there is now a device available that will make the industry accountable. It can be kept crime free. It will be scrupulously honest. It will be under the auspices of a Government-controlled body.

Mr McPhie: Especially with you fellows running it.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: The Government would not want to let the member for Toowoomba North near poker machines because he is notorious for stealing the silver from the officers' mess in Toowoomba.

Time expired.

Mr McPHIE (Toowoomba North) (4.18 p.m.): I think the Minister would agree with me that, except for the end, that was one of the better and more rational contributions by the honourable member for Wolston. However, he made quite a few points and drew some conclusions with which members of the Government could not agree. The one that comes to mind is when he said that the Opposition will become the Government of Queensland. I do not think I will live long enough to see that.

An Opposition member: Why not? What's wrong with you?

Mr McPHIE: I do not think that I am middle-aged yet. I think that I have got a long way to go.

It is my pleasure today to speak in this Estimates debate. First of all, I pay a tribute to the member for Whitsunday, Mr Muntz, who was the Minister's predecessor in this portfolio for quite a number of years. As a member of his committee for the greater part of the six years that I have been a member of this Parliament, I witnessed the dedication, enthusiasm and determination of Mr Muntz as a Minister and, in every instance, his ability to fully understand the problems facing his portfolio and to get on top of them.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr McPHIE: There are quite a number of achievements of which the Government can be proud. Of course, the member for Wolston and the other members on the Opposition side will never acknowledge that, because they never acknowledge anything that is done well.

I also acknowledge the contribution in the area of environment, conservation and forestry of the member for Gregory, Mr Bill Glasson, who will be retiring at the end of this Parliament. For six years I was a member of his committee on land management. I was also a member of his committee on forestry, which, of course, has become part of another Minister's portfolio. Mr Glasson's contribution will be remembered. He will be missed in this Parliament. Along with so many others, I join in wishing him well in his retirement. It was a privilege for me to serve on the committees of both Ministers

during the six years that I have been a member of this Parliament. I am sure that through their leadership I have learned and understood quite a lot about this portfolio.

I want to speak today about certain aspects of the Department of Environment and Conservation. This department was formed as a separate department only two years ago when eight separate public service organisations were brought together because of the need to create a higher profile in the area of conservation, to produce increased efficiency and to expand the services that are available to the people of Queensland. It is interesting to note that funding has been increased significantly in this area in the Budget, and rightly so. It is a good move, just as two years ago creating a separate Department of Environment and Conservation was a wise move.

I want to examine briefly a couple of the areas that have resulted from the creation of this separate Department of Environment and Conservation and look at the role of environmental co-ordination, particularly the Client Support Unit. The Division of Environment has a special unit that is designed to provide technical comment and review proposals for a number of large developments in Queensland which affect the environment.

I will cite the example of the north Queensland proposals, which include the Collingwood tin prospect, the Disraeli gold mine in the Dalrymple Shire, the Mount Coolon gold mine in the Bowen Shire, the long-distance sulphuric acid pipeline in the Mount Isa area, the bagasse pulp-mill in the Innisfail area and the wet-blue process tannery. All of those big developments, which are, in the main, private enterprise and Government sponsored, needed contributions and input in their planning stages and that has been given by the Division of Environment, and rightly so, by way of the Client Support Unit.

Assistance is also given at the industry association level to help industry to meet acceptable standards for pollution and waste control. That is something that needs greater attention in the modern society in which we live. Specific assistance is given to the department's regional officers by the Client Support Unit and also to local authorities when required. I could cite quite a number of examples of that, too. I am sure all honourable members have them in their own electorates. I will mention a few. There was a reduction of styrene emissions in the fibreglass industry; the recovery of CFCs for the refrigeration industry; manufacture and design assistance for the pathology incinerator; assistance in waste water discharge in the aquaculture industry; the reduction of sawmill noise in the areas controlled by the Queensland Timber Board; the establishment of construction noise guide-lines for the Queensland Master Builders Association and, of course, the whole industry; the introduction of noise assessment courses and investigations into swimming-pool noise and other matters for local authorities throughout the State for the benefit of the people of Queensland and the environment in which we live. The success that has been achieved in that regard is to the credit of the Minister and his departmental officers.

In the presentation of his Estimates, the Minister mentioned that greater attention will be given to recycling and waste minimisation. Of course, that is something that very definitely needs to be addressed. I think all honourable members are aware of the wonderful job being done with the collection of aluminium cans and bottles for recycling. However, I do wonder why in Toowoomba and, no doubt, in many other cities and towns in Queensland, waste paper collection has ceased. I think that is wrong.

I know that in many instances waste paper was collected and resold to people who would reprocess it. If it is not economical or a cost-effective proposition to recycle waste paper and it is cheaper to go out and buy it, surely processes must be able to be established so that waste paper can be collected for free and recycled. There is a mass of it out there. I know how much waste paper goes out of my office and I am sure that the same quantity goes out of the offices of most of my parliamentary colleagues.

There are other areas in which recycling needs to be considered. I have been interested to see in television documentaries the work that is being done to recycle oil and motor car tyres. The areas in which recycling programs can be undertaken are

almost limitless. I congratulate the Minister and I assure him of my support in any areas in which he can further expand recycling programs throughout the State.

I turn now to the introduction of the rural nature conservation program. The RNC program is primarily concerned with the protection of flora, fauna and wildlife habitat throughout all of Queensland. Program activities include monitoring and regulating the harvest of open-season species, enforcing fauna conservation regulations and, most importantly, encouraging the public to adopt practices that enhance wildlife conservation as part of rural property management. All members would be in favour of that. There is no problem there. It is desirable that the Government, particularly this Minister and his department, should become increasingly involved in that issue.

The RNC program is essentially a co-operative effort involving both the rural and urban communities and the Department of Environment and Conservation. The program came about owing to the efforts of concerned land-holders approaching the department seeking co-operation in conserving wildlife on rural lands to the mutual benefit of all members of the community. It would have been far better if we had heard a few compliments from the member for Windsor instead of the diatribe to which honourable members have become accustomed from the Opposition spokesman on environmental matters. He would not know which end of environment was which. In fact, his name "Ally Oop" pretty well sums up his attitude to the handling of the environment. He is back in the Stone Age and he does not understand it.

The identification of local target wildlife species is another major feature of the program. By focusing the attention of the local community on a target species, both the rural and the urban community can better appreciate the need for habitat retention in their own region. For instance, in south-western Queensland the yellow-footed rock wallaby was chosen, whereas in the south-east Queensland area from which I come—up on the downs—the koala is the chosen target species. In north Queensland, the cassowary is the target species, and so it should be. It is the bird symbol of the northern Queensland coastal lowland rainforests. Local community concern and interest in those target species are high and provide a useful means of establishing a willingness to participate in local habitat conservation efforts.

The RNC program produces a wide range of educational and support materials such as the *Living with Wildlife* brochure series distributed widely to provide information on native plants and animals to assist land-holders wishing to adopt nature conservation principles as part of their land-management practices. It is available throughout the whole community, particularly to schoolchildren so that they can be brought face to face with Queensland's wonderful flora and fauna and with the need for their conservation.

The main difference between the Queensland rural nature conservation program and those operating in other States is that this program is wholly voluntary and no financial assistance is provided. The program is founded on a commitment to education and community consultation rather than based on adherence to a strict regulatory approach, which, in many instances, could be counter-productive to the achievement of widespread nature conservation practices. Nature conservation in Queensland is not a simple task. The often conflicting objectives of nature conservation and some land usage practices present many challenges. Those challenges have been met successfully by the Minister's department.

More than 70 per cent of Queensland is under some form of Crown leasehold tenure, principally as pastoral leases, so that habitat conservation is very much dependent upon the conservation practices of rural land-holders. The encouragement of this complementary habitat conservation program in parallel with the national parks program and other Government programs is to be commended.

The Government's land-care program was introduced recently. It runs in parallel with many other Government programs and is part of the Government's overall commitment to better manage and preserve the natural environment in Queensland. The land-care strategy, which comes from the land-care program, provides a framework for the development of an integrated land-care program within the State. It contains

mechanisms to enable community participation in land-care activities, and for co-ordinating action within Government and between Government, the community and individual land-holders. The strategy addresses the threat to the stability and sustained productivity of rural land posed by land degradation. It complements the broad directions and strategies for the continuing economic development of the State contained in *Quality Queensland*, particularly those relating to natural resource management and the environment.

Individual land-holders must ultimately be responsible for the adoption of land-use and land-management practices that protect the land against degradation and conserve other natural resources. Nevertheless, the wider community, including Governments at all levels, has a responsibility to foster conservation management practices and to assist and support individual land-holders in caring for the land.

By and large, the people on the land do an excellent job. However, there are some baddies out there. The Government should consider means of dealing with those people who do not care two hoots for the land they hold. They are the ones who are giving the rural environment a bad name because of their land-management and conservation attitudes.

I turn now to the management of the Great Barrier Reef. Although I come from a Darling Downs electorate, I have visited the Great Barrier Reef since my boyhood days and I know the wonderful place it is. It is the largest complex of reefs and islands in the world. It is over 345 000 square kilometres in area. It has 2 900 reefs and more than 300 islands. It is the breeding ground for a number of rare and endangered species, as well as the multitude of fish that are caught. It supports an important commercial and recreational fishing industry and, despite the airlines strike—which hopefully will not go on for ever—it is rapidly becoming the premier world tourist destination. Balancing the demands in that area is essential to ensure conservation and protection of some of the most outstanding marine environments in the world for the enjoyment of future generations.

This conservation program is all about conserving, looking after and managing the environment for future generations while maintaining logical, sensible and managed development for the present generation and contributing to the greatness of the State.

No other State in the Commonwealth has as great a responsibility for the protection and stewardship of significant marine and estuarine areas as does Queensland. In fact, more than 94 per cent of all marine and estuarine protected areas that are listed in Australia are found within or adjacent to Queensland. Two of the earliest marine parks that were established in the world were declared by the Queensland Government, encompassing the reefs surrounding Green Island and Heron Island. Those reef-island complexes, which are two of the most heavily visited locations on the Great Barrier Reef, are excellently managed by the Government and its departments that are dedicated to the protection of our environment.

In response to the challenge of managing the environment, the State and Commonwealth Governments implemented complementary legislative and administrative arrangements for the management of the Great Barrier Reef which are designed to ensure the balanced use of reef resources based on a multiple-use management approach. The establishment of the Great Barrier Reef marine park, or GBRMP as the authority is generally known, anticipated the principles of the 1981 world conservation strategy and could well be unique in the world in terms of providing specifically for the conservation and reasonable use or sustained development of a large area of recognised conservation significance. Permitted uses of the GBRMP include the establishment of offshore structures and educational facilities, commercial and recreational fishing, tourism, boating and diving.

It is a matter of pride that, when I was the air force air traffic control boss, I had input into the regulations that were devised for the GBRMP to manage the use of air space over the marine park area. The time that has elapsed since then has shown that

all of the regulations in relation to the GBRMP and its operations have been eminently successful.

Queensland marine parks extend over much of the Great Barrier Reef and have been established also on the same multiple-use management principle as the GBRMP. Within each marine park there may be separate areas of Queensland and Commonwealth legislative responsibility as well as areas of overlapping administrative responsibility. Yet because they have a common goal, those two spheres can work together. Thus, complementary zoning plans have been prepared for marine parks in the Great Barrier Reef region to provide for co-ordinated and integrated management arrangements.

A zoning plan provides for reasonable use of the resources of a marine park by prescribing a number of use and entry provisions for a particular zone within the park. Zoning plans are prepared following extensive investigation of existing patterns of usage and a thorough consideration of submissions that are invited from the public and other Government agencies. They provide for the specific details to be set out for management and administrative practices in environmentally sensitive areas. Zoning plans have been tremendously successful and have demonstrated the success of this Government's conservation program and the work that is done by the Department of Environment and Conservation. They are a record of a job well done, which is not receiving the acknowledgement that it deserves either from the media or from this Government's political opponents. If the Labor Party ever came to office in this State—and, God help us if it ever does—I would challenge it to try and produce a better and more successful program. Wherever one looks one sees the Government addressing this problem.

Today in this Chamber I have already mentioned the land-care program, which is an integral part of what is occurring in primary industries and is a development from the soil-conservation committees that were set up long ago. That land-care program has been implemented in the reclamation of mining and forestry areas. I pay due acknowledgement to Tom Ryan, the Conservator of Forests, and to his predecessor, Mr John Kelly, for the wonderful job that they have done with conservation and preserving the environment for the benefit of all Queenslanders, the future of this State and the people who will be coming after us. That has been achieved through managed and progressive programs for the development of an overall program for Queensland. I compliment the Minister and I support his Estimates whole-heartedly.

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (4.38 p.m.): The honourable member for Toowoomba North made a statement to the effect that, when the Labor Party gains office, "God help us." I say to him: it will not be a matter of "God help us"; it will be a matter of "The devil take you."

Unquestionably, soil erosion is this State's and this nation's greatest environmental problem. The honourable member for Toowoomba North might be surprised that I agree with some of his comments about soil erosion. Our greatest need is a very big increase in land-care projects in this State. Unquestionably, insufficient attention has been paid to that aspect in the past and more attention must be paid to it in the future.

Mr Elliott: A lot of it is being put together.

Mr CASEY: It is starting to be put together only because the Federal Government has made funds available for land-care programs and the States have had to follow suit. The Federal Government has taken the initiative.

Recently a great row has developed over drought relief. As you would be aware, Mr Temporary Chairman, during 1978 and the days of the big drought in the Brisbane valley area, many of the problems that occurred on properties were brought about because of overstocking. I say that directly and bluntly.

The real solution to drought relief comes back to farm management. The natural environment, particularly grassland areas, must be managed, replaced or regenerated. Many of our natural grassland areas are in diabolical trouble. The problem has developed

over a long period. The elements such as rain, wind, fire and drought and other natural occurrences gradually erode the soil.

All of Australia's natural fauna are soft padded. The introduced fauna are hoofed, many of them being cloven hoofed. They have created many problems in regard to our soil, our grasslands and our natural herbage. Together with overstocking, overclearing and, in some areas, overploughing, that is one of the main causes of Australia's erosion problems. Some scientists who for a long time have been engaged in studying this subject have estimated that those practices have caused erosion which is between 25 and 50 times the rate of natural erosion. In other words, many areas of Queensland are rushing towards disaster and catastrophe.

The United States experienced similar problems in the nineteenth century, and parts of Africa are now also experiencing them. In some cases, man-made acceleration of natural erosion has caused an irreversible disaster. Australia has an opportunity to reverse the pattern. I know that it is difficult.

Erosion can occur when a wrong drainage practice is employed on a person's property as a result of which there is a wash, then a gully and then a stream, with a complete break-down of the land structure in the area. On the other hand, problems have also been created by siltation in streams, which in turn results in additional flooding and other problems on the flood plains. That accelerates the problems for the communities downstream. The problems were created in the first instance, perhaps, by some careless work being done by a land-holder constructing a drainage system on his property.

They are the visible signs. However, enormous damage that is not readily visible has been caused by the loss of plant nutrients, salinity and reduced ground cover. Consequently, because of the increased stocking problems on some properties, the grazing industry has suffered decreased profit margins. At the moment, treatments to overcome those problems are being identified. They have been identified as high and low stocking rates and the need for more tree coverage in some areas. The trees are the pumps for the water-table. Trees help to protect the water-table and to prevent salinity occurring. Although a land-holder may clear trees from his property and salinity will not occur on it, because of the configuration of the soils and the underground layers of the salts, salinity may occur on his neighbour's property or on a property further down the road. Nevertheless, the whole balance of the soil in the area concerned is upset.

The spraying of huge quantities of land with the chemical Graslan in order to kill trees in a clearing program is outright dangerous. It is dangerous because of the way in which the tree cover is destroyed and also because nobody who has carried out such clearing has properly considered replacement land cover. It is all very well to move in, clear the trees and grow more grass. But on many occasions, that does not really happen. The natural grasses do not grow in the manner in which they should.

It has been identified that on grazing land high and low stocking rates have to be set for certain weather conditions and certain periods of the year. As I said, some tree coverage should remain on the land. It not only provides shade but also protects the water-table, which in most areas of the State is a major part of the environment. There is a need to maintain it as such.

Another consideration is the fertilisation of properties and the distribution of legumes. Quite recently, I was fortunate to inspect a property called Cardigan, which is 44 kilometres south-west of Charters Towers. On that property a land-care program, under the auspices of a local committee, has been adopted in conjunction with work that has been done by the CSIRO over a number of years. An excellent work program has been carried out. It has involved experimentation with the natural grasses that can be regenerated and the legumes that can be mixed in with them to provide ground cover when trees are cleared. That research work has to be extended on to larger properties, where an assessment can be made of what percentage of real cover can be obtained under all sorts of conditions and soil types. That is very, very important.

The amazing thing is that in the two hundred and second year of settlement in this nation, these things are really only starting to be considered. As I said before, once upon a time the natural vegetation was relied upon entirely. In the Burdekin basin, even much of the old spear grass country is starting to disappear. The cloven-hoofed animals have been replaced by other clearing programs. A pattern of replacement programs is needed.

As I said at the outset, it is very, very important that the major environmental problems associated with land care are overcome. I refer to land erosion, whether it be caused by wind or rain. The stage has to be reached at which help is given not only to the land but also to the industries on the land. After all, that is really what land management is all about. That is really why land experimentation is undertaken. It is important to find out what type of cover can be planted to sustain a profitable beef industry for the good of the economy of this State. I am talking about environmental impact programs. People say that the Government has stopped doing things for the sake of stopping to do things, and is allowing the land to revert to its natural condition. However, it will never come back to its natural condition in the grazing areas of Queensland. The Government must take steps to develop appropriate land cover in the form of herbage that will sustain the appropriate beef population and, with proper management techniques, sustain an industry under all types of conditions. Along with management techniques, constant monitoring programs are also required.

Many younger people who are now involved in the grazing industry recognise that land care and monitoring are important. The way that their grandfathers looked after the property is entirely different from the techniques that must presently be applied. Although their grandfathers were very successful and handed on the properties, because of erosion and the depredation that has occurred over the years the land can support only reduced quantities of plant nutrients. Today's grazier has to work very much harder to restore the land. Because of changing weather conditions, monitoring cannot be carried out on a spasmodic basis and must be carried on continuously.

Many pastoralists are prepared to co-operate, but some have to be educated. Unfortunately, insufficient co-operation exists at the top level of the department between DPI and the CSIRO. It is important for DPI to be involved in research work instead of sitting back, waiting for it to be done and moving in when the extension programs have to be implemented. The more the department is involved at the research level, the better will be its understanding and practical knowledge at the implementation stage. The department needs to be involved in a combination of research and implementation to bring about proper land-care programs in this State. Although it could be said that this is really a matter for the Minister for Primary Industries rather than the Minister for the Environment, I can assure the Minister for Environment, Conservation and Forestry that the type of activity I have suggested is the most important environmental program in the State. Unless the Government can sustain those industries, more and more people will leave country towns and move to city areas, thereby causing crowding and other problems.

I turn now to tourism as it affects my electorate. All who know the State well and the Mackay area in particular would acknowledge that my electorate is one of the most important tourism areas in Queensland. Off shore from Mackay in the beautiful waters that lie relatively calmly inside the Great Barrier Reef, more islands can be found in the area 100 miles to the north and 100 miles to the south of Mackay than in any other coastal area of Australia. People who are interested in sailing think the area is very beautiful, but the coastal and offshore attractions are really only a part of the tourism features of the area.

The sugar industry provides lush green growth throughout the whole of the Pioneer valley and is an attraction in itself. The hinterland mines of the Bowen Basin absolutely boggle the eyes of visitors when they realise the vast extent of mining that has been developed. It is incomparable with other areas of Australia. Even the Hunter valley cannot produce coal in the same quantity as that mined in the Bowen Basin. The coal is exported through the twin ports of Hay Point and Dalrymple Bay, which are visible

day and night from the back windows of my own home. Other tourism areas include Eungella, which is also a very beautiful rainforest area. The area contains a natural blend of beautiful attractions and, of course, I am very familiar with local landmarks and tourist attractions.

Prior to the 1986 election, a great deal was said about a project that was to be developed at the mouth of the Pioneer River. It was to be one of the QTTC's four development projects throughout the State. Immediately prior to the election, an announcement was made with much fanfare about the launching of the project. A Cabinet meeting was held in Mackay and the members of the Government set up marquees in the sandhills near the mouth of the river as though they were Arab sheiks. They scoffed the chicken and quaffed the champagne. The Cabinet meeting was held and then the great announcement was made.

The Government boasted that it would knock off the member for Mackay, Edmund Casey, over this project. I was saying that it would not work at that time because there were too many problems associated with it. Subsequently, the hole dug by former Premier Bjelke-Petersen was filled with salt water and to date the project has not proceeded any further. Presently I am engaging in discussions with the Minister in an effort to develop the project. However, I wish to discuss the role played by the former Minister for Tourism, the member for Whitsunday, Mr Muntz. Recently he was dropped from Cabinet. In the early stages of the project's development, Mr Muntz altered the program and had one of the marina proposals shifted to a site known as Coral Sea Haven, which was being looked at by the Mackay Port Authority. It is located just north of the Mackay harbour.

The Mackay Port Authority joined with the Land Administration Commission in a development program. The planning stage took place over a number of years and a great deal of work was carried out. Part of the project included the use of excavated spoil to build up harbour lands and land that could be used for other purposes. At the behest of Mr Muntz, Cabinet took the project out of their control. Mr Muntz decided that tenders would be called for the project.

In February this year, the Land Administration Commission called tenders from developers who were interested in the project. Tenders closed in May and no more was heard until it was finally revealed that two tenderers were being considered. One was named Seymour Land. The member for Woodridge would know that Mr Seymour is a National Party white-shoe brigade stooge from the Gold Coast. He is a great friend of the former Minister for Local Government, Russell Hinze. The other tenderer was Leighton Contractors. That company is a major contractor and was really only looking for project work.

Initially the design provided for 200 marina berths, eventually to be increased to 625. With much fanfare, the former Minister announced that the two companies would be closely investigated. He said that he would soon be in a position to make an announcement about a project that would bring great benefit to Mackay. Four months after tenders closed, nothing had been said. Suddenly in September an announcement was made indicating that neither tenderer was satisfactory. I can inform this Committee that neither tenderer was satisfactory because the project was being handled as a set-up. The process of tendering should never have been carried out in the manner in which the former Minister handled the matter. The Mackay Port Authority should have been allowed to carry on with what it was doing. The then Minister for Tourism, the current member for Whitsunday—and he will not hold that seat for much longer—wanted to gain kudos from the whole project.

Mr Elliott interjected.

Mr CASEY: I will answer the honourable member for Cunningham. The environment up there is changing and there will be an altogether different result. I am told that the honourable member is worried about his 80 per cent figure in Cunningham because things are turning so bad for the National Party. That is the reason why he was involved

in the move to change the Premier. He thought he would gain another couple of per cent which would put him back over the line.

Mr D'Arcy: Is there any truth in the rumour around the House today that Mr Muntz is another one of those rats deserting the sinking ship?

Mr CASEY: I do not know. There is a story floating around that he is getting ready to resign. If he does, the greatest beneficiaries will be the people of Whitsunday and the Mackay district generally.

The handling of this project by Mr Muntz is typical of everything that he was involved in as Minister. After he was first promoted by Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen into Cabinet, he was transferred from the Family Services portfolio when things went amiss and from the Corrective Services portfolio when he could not contain the prison riots. He was sacked by Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen from Cabinet in the backlash after the first dead National Party coup on Sir Joh and he was subsequently downgraded by Mr Ahern to the Tourism portfolio.

Mr BORBIDGE: I rise to a point of order. It is not very relevant to the Estimates that are currently under debate for a sustained personal attack to be made on another honourable member.

Mr CASEY: I will come back to the point, because my attack relates to the former Minister's work when he held the Tourism portfolio during the period of this Parliament. Mr Muntz was downgraded from that portfolio and a better Minister for Tourism was appointed in his stead. I do not think that the Minister would deny that.

There then followed the great fiasco of the north Queensland rainforests. The former Minister and his huge entourage floated all around the world, like a travelling clown with his circus, at tax-payers' expense. All he achieved was to provide comic relief for the whole universe.

The latest project mucked up by the former Minister was the important marina north of the Mackay harbour. The responsibility for this project should be returned to the Mackay Port Authority and the Land Administration Commission which, if it had been allowed to proceed, would have had the project under way. The sooner the responsibility for the project is returned to it, and the Government's developer friends are forgotten about, the better.

One final point I wish to make is a criticism of the current rail services to north Queensland. A better service must be provided for the rail-travelling tourists in this State if the railways are to pay.

Time expired.

Mr ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (4.58 p.m.): In speaking on these Estimates, I do not propose to launch into vitriolic attacks such as the one embarked upon by the previous speaker. I am surprised by his comments, because I thought he had some vision for this State.

Mr Borbidge: He was making a pretty good contribution.

Mr ELLIOTT: He made a few reasonable points earlier, but his old nature came out towards the end of his speech.

The subject of tourism is of great importance to this State. Tourism was this nation's major export-earner before the Opposition's Federal colleagues—plus a few other people—became unable to handle the pilots strike. I have been involved in tourism for a number of years and I am disappointed that this has happened. Before the pilots strike, Australia—this State in particular—was on the verge of an explosion in the tourist industry. Forty-six per cent of international tourists to Australia visited Queensland and, without the chaos at Sydney's airport facilities, over the years that percentage would have increased. When the pilots finally return to work, the problem of restoring people's confidence in Australia as a tourist destination must be addressed.

If one looks back, one finds that a large number of people have done a great deal of work to bring the tourist industry in Queensland to its present position. It began over a decade ago with the inception of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation under the chairmanship of Sir Frank Moore. He has done a fantastic job and he eats, sleeps and breathes tourism. Over the years the present Minister, the Honourable Rob Borbidge, and I have both worked very closely with Sir Frank Moore. I pay tribute to him for the job that he has done. A decade ago the industry experienced a number of problems because of the facilities offered to interstate and international tourists in Queensland. There was a shortage of five-star hotels and up-market resorts on the islands. Some of the island resorts were very good, but needed more professionalism and upgrading. Those facilities have since been upgraded. There was a real need to train young people in the industry in the right attitudes and approaches to visitors.

By nature Australians are very friendly, but some people have the quaint idea that there is something servile about waiting on tables or working behind a bar, and serving, assisting and helping tourists in other ways. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is a very honourable profession. Young Americans working on the Hawaiian islands and on the American mainland have a different attitude to their jobs. Theirs is an exemplary attitude towards their profession and under no circumstances could anyone suggest that there is anything servile about their attitude towards tourists.

That concept must be communicated to some of our own young people. It has been conveyed to those who have taken part in the training programs offered by the TAFE colleges, the facility in South Brisbane and the private-enterprise operations. The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation and private enterprise have combined to give young people practical, on-the-job training, and I instance what is being done at the Adobe Motel in Cairns.

Great improvements have been made in the standard of accommodation, with a consequent increase in the number of five-star hotels. The resorts on the islands off the Queensland coast now have world-class accommodation. In addition, three-star and four-star accommodation has been brought up to scratch. This sort of improvement has taken place in all types of accommodation, including that provided in caravan parks and the facilities provided for back-packers in national parks. Queensland now has a variety of accommodation available to overseas, interstate and domestic travellers.

One aspect of tourism that needs attention is inland travel. Of course, it will not be possible to attract the same number of tourists to inland areas as are attracted to the coastal areas, which have so many attractions and facilities. Whenever tourists are surveyed they say that they do not travel to look at high-rise buildings or cities; they travel to Queensland to see its natural beauty.

Mr D'Arcy: You didn't do much about it.

Mr ELLIOTT: I pushed that line for three years while I was Minister. I tried to convince people to build to less than tree-top level and not to build high-rise buildings all the way up the coast.

Mr D'Arcy: You were a fast-track developer.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is a joke.

As I was saying, assistance must be given to the people who are trying to attract tourists to the inland. I again take my hat off to people such as Mr R. M. Williams, Sir Frank Moore, Mr Randall Chandler and the many others who were involved with the Australian Stockman's Hall of Fame at Longreach, which is an absolutely fantastic facility. It is of importance to our heritage, our history and our background, and it is of great importance to the tourism industry. It is similar to the wild west in America. The people who see it are absolutely amazed. They find it tremendously interesting. Because of it, many of them stay in Longreach longer than anticipated.

I was delighted at the initiative taken by the Minister and the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation in declaring the Matilda Highway. To the travelling public, there is nothing more romantic than the legend of Waltzing Matilda and the Combo water hole. They capture the imagination of the touring public.

Why do people travel, how do they travel and where do they travel? Some people make their own arrangements, but most tourists book package holidays, so it is important that we approach the people who arrange package holidays and give them examples of tours that will be both good value and interesting.

People should not be required to travel great distances between interesting tourist attractions. For instance, in a relatively small area close to the south-east corner of the State, tourists can see the Jondaryan Woolshed, the Acland Coal Mine Museum, the new one at Mount Tyson, Adora Downs with its colonial buildings, where people can stay and experience farm life, Brookvale Park for people who are interested in nature and conservation and like to talk to botanists, and the Bernborough statue at Oakey. Of course, Toowoomba is world renowned as one of the great garden cities and it attracts a large number of tourists.

A person travelling to Ayers Rock or Kakadu can look at the Miles Historical Village and the Chinchilla Steam Museum on the way; but there is a need to provide more places of interest along the highway for travellers to look at. If it is possible to hold tourists in an area for two or three nights instead of one, everyone in the area, including the hotel and motel entrepreneurs, will immediately benefit from the increased revenue. It is quite a challenge, but I think it is achievable.

Other attractions in that general area are Lake Broadwater at Dalby and the national parks at the Bunya Mountains. All of these attractions must be packaged and private enterprise must be encouraged to develop other attractions so that more of them are available on the long distances that people travel when going, for example, to the Australian Stockman's Hall of Fame. If we do that, we will be on the right track. Over the next decade, I hope to see the tremendous effort and enthusiasm that have been put into tourism along the coast and on the islands directed into inland tourism.

For the first time in the Budget—it is not a new initiative; I took it to Cabinet in 1981—provision has been made for the Q-Zoo proposal. Over the years, many members of this Chamber have been involved with that concept. That initiative will enhance inland tourism and encourage people to visit inland Queensland.

Many people do not understand the Q-Zoo concept. They think of animals behind bars in cages. That is not what the Q-Zoo concept is about. Modern zoos, such as the San Pasquale open range zoo near San Diego in California, have lions and tigers. However, in Australia, we have our own natural fauna and flora. Every year, in America, more people visit zoos than attend all the sporting events in the United States of America. That is a mind-boggling number of people. More people visit zoos than sporting events such as gridiron, basketball and baseball. Previously, if someone had told me that, I would have said, "Pull the other leg." However, when I was in America visiting zoos and looking at the technology involved, I saw the statistics. The interest in zoos is part and parcel of the tremendous resurgence of interest in our heritage and our environment.

In the past 20 years, children have been educated about the environment and animals. They are keen to see Australian animals such as kangaroos. Many people think that there are grey kangaroos, red kangaroos and a few wallabies. However, the macropod species contains 58 different kinds of kangaroos. Some of them are absolutely fascinating. People who have not had an opportunity to see them are amazed by them.

Rather than the Government establishing State zoos, private enterprise will run a destination resort in conjunction with a Q-Zoo. That will provide an attraction for people to come and see the animals in their natural environment. No-one wants to see animals brought to the city and put in cages. It is old hat and has gone by the board. One might call it a Victorian menagerie. The Q-Zoo concept opens up a new ball game.

The zoo directors in America are fascinated by it. They have said to me that it is a marvellous opportunity to be able to develop something from scratch without having old buildings that are falling down, gunite—artificial rock—everywhere, elephants standing on concrete enclosed by moats—all of those dreadful problems posed by a conventional zoo. We are lucky to be able to start from scratch in the natural environment and put together a facility at which people can witness how animals live in the wild.

The concept is to obtain a large area of land and manage the animals so that people can watch them in their natural state whilst being moved on a people-transport system which does not damage the environment. However, it has to be managed properly, as has a grazing property. When it is dry in Dubbo, because the zoo has more difficult animals to manage, it looks rather flogged out.

As I have more points to touch on, I will move on to another subject. Inland tourism will not only assist the people involved directly in the infrastructure; it will also create for young people jobs in the area in which they live. If an area has some type of natural phenomenon—a national park or an historic group of buildings—an interesting project could be developed so that people would visit and spend money.

At the Jondaryan Woolshed, loads of Japanese tourists descend on the station store like grasshoppers in a 5 000 acre paddock that contains about five square yards of green pasture. The store stocks toy koalas and sheep made with natural wool, all of which are beautifully packaged. The Japanese tourists come in and virtually buy the shop out. It is incredible to see how much money they spend.

We have an opportunity to develop inland Queensland. When the weather is dry and the wheat is not doing well, as it is at present, inland people are hard pressed to make ends meet. They need the diversity that tourism presents.

I am delighted to support the Minister in the presentation of his Estimates. He is doing a great job. He understands tourism. He has a modern, active approach to tourism and does not have a closed mind to new ideas. I congratulate him on the presentation of his Estimates.

Mr D'ARCY (Woodridge) (5.17 p.m.): It was interesting to hear the last couple of speakers on the Government side, particularly Mr McPhie. It sounded very much like his swan-song. Mr Elliott is, as he said, a former Minister for Tourism. Although he partially denied it today, he is one who has advocated many times in this Chamber the fast-track treatment for this State's tourist operators and developers of ugly projects, who have been largely responsible for the disasters to the environment.

Mr Elliott: That's not true. I have never advocated fast tracking.

Mr D'ARCY: I have heard the honourable member attempt in this Chamber on many occasions to——

Mr Elliott: I challenge you to find one speech that I have ever made in this place that could be remotely construed as my saying that. If you can, I'll go and buy you a drink immediately.

Mr D'ARCY: I am a bit busy at the moment, but I will find one, all right. The member for Cunningham has been very much involved with the fast-track developers, as has this Government. It is a tragedy that that has occurred. He also preys on people in the tourist industry.

The Frank Moores and the Jim Kennedys have had a lot to offer Queensland. I do not think any member of the Opposition has ever denied that. However, the way in which they have been allowed to operate in Queensland is a tragedy. On many occasions I have advocated the American system. If people in private enterprise are prepared to offer Governments their help and expertise for a year, two years or three years in a particular job, that is admirable. It works very well in America. However, it works only when those people divorce themselves from the business enterprises with which they are currently connected. That does not happen in this State.

The fact is that I know some very good things that Sir Frank Moore has done—and some very bad things that he has done—in the period during which he has worked for the Queensland Government. The good things might outweigh the bad. However, the fact of life is that one gets stale in a job. This Government is stale and needs replacing. One cannot have people continuing in these types of jobs indefinitely.

The Government should consider introducing some new blood, particularly into the Minister's portfolio—people who have the expertise and are prepared to give a year of their business lives or perhaps give a year during or just before retirement. If such people are prepared to put in the work, they can be of tremendous advantage to the State. However, people should not be engaged for long periods.

Mr Borbidge: Are you offering your services?

Mr D'ARCY: I think I will be a bit busy in Government for the next few years. As a former motel-proprietor, the Minister might be able to find something to do.

It is important that the Government gets people such as the Kennedys and the Moores into the job, people who are prepared to genuinely give their expertise to the State. However, during that period they must not be involved in business enterprises such as those that Sir Frank involved himself in. I cite the example of the River City 2000 operation proposal for the Expo site.

The Expo site has been mentioned several times today. It could have been a tremendous development, but what a disaster it has been for Queensland! Despite all the hype about Expo, the sails are not down and the site is vacant. The Government has virtually sent to the wall a hotel-operator on that site. The fact is that nothing happened after Expo. What about Sir Llew's promises? He was here today. What about the great promises of Sir Llew? The Libs used to call him "Lying Louie". He was a great promiser. He made many promises—often conflicting ones—to many people.

It is now almost 12 months since Expo finished. It was a tremendous tourist boon for this State. No-one denies that. However, the fact of life is that that site is still not developed. I believe that eventually the boardwalk will reopen on the south bank. That deal has only just been concluded in the last few weeks and it is supposed to open in November. Evidently an American has been given a concession to operate food-stores on the site. I have not even seen reference to it in the media. I presume it has been mentioned somewhere. That American operator is supposed to open on the south bank in a few months' time.

When one looks at some of the buildings that are left on the Expo site, one realises that some of them should never have been built in the first place. That is a disaster, and it is a disaster that is typical of this Government, which is not able to make a decision and is not able to plan properly for development. Queenslanders have been badly let down. Today the Government had to endure the embarrassment of the Leader of the Opposition and other members of the Opposition going into the costs of World Expo Fun Park, which was a financial disaster for this State. It is a tragedy that the people of Queensland have to put up with such an incompetent Government.

There was a lot of criticism when it was found that, all of a sudden, conservation, the ecology, the environment and tourism were to be put together in one portfolio. I believe that for once that is a fairly smart move by this Government—for a reason that the National Party has never recognised in the past, that is, that it is quite acceptable that those facets of Government work in harmony. The born-again greenie who has just left the Chamber, the former Minister for Tourism, the member for Cunningham, surprised everyone.

However, the fact is that Queenslanders are demanding that the Queensland Government finally accept the responsibility of having tourist resorts built in concert and in harmony with the environment. It is something that members of the Opposition have been pushing for a long time. We are sick of the type of resorts that destroy the natural environment, that fail to consider the environment. That has been enshrined in

Government departments and in legislation over the period of office of this National Party Government. That is a tragedy.

When one visits the Mirage resorts on the Spit or at Port Douglas, one might as well be in the Bahamas or in Hawaii, because those resorts are the same as the resorts in those places. One has to get out of the complex in order to see the environment. The resorts in this State should have been built with the environment in mind. The types of resorts that have been allowed to be built up and down the coast—and there are hundreds of them—are a tragedy for the environment.

I put on record again the failure of this Government to look after the environment and the fact that it has conned Queenslanders into allowing land to be used for resorts. However, more importantly, at no time did the Government ever really go into the economic viability of the people involved in building those resorts. I have heard the former Minister for Land Management—thank goodness he is no longer in the job after his performance on *Four Corners* last night—and other Ministers say, “Look, it is not our responsibility to look at this company or that company and find out whether it can do the job. If we give approval to a two-bob company and they flog it to the Japs or someone else, that is not our worry. We don’t want to know about that. Their plans are okay.” It is a load of rubbish—codswallop—and should not happen.

The Government does not have environmental control or financial control; it does not understand, and has never understood, those issues. Developments worth \$80 billion are planned for the Queensland coast—the complete and utter destruction of the coastline from Cape York to Tweed Heads. The plans that have been put forward by the developers in this State have been accepted by this Government and forced through umpteen departments. The Department of Environment, Conservation and Tourism, the Department of Land Management, the Department of Local Government and the Department of Harbours and Marine act in concert in dealing with particular development applications. I have said in this Chamber before that each department writes back and says, “My Minister is responsible only for X. He does not want to know about Y or Z.” In none of those departments is there any consideration of the environment.

Recently, a judge in the Local Government Court said, “I cannot consider the environment, but I realise that in this instance the environment would be wrecked by this development. I have no say in the matter. Therefore, I must grant the approval.” It was just a town-planning matter for a local authority. Everyone says that the Acts in this State do not contain any provision for an EIS—an environmental impact study—of any of those proposals. Sometimes EIS reports are asked for by councils. Some departments have said, “I will get an engineer to write one for us.” I have read some of the reports that have been written. It is a tragedy that the persons who have prepared them have not had any background in conservation.

What has happened with tourist resorts in this State? Honourable members have heard about the Government’s marvellous announcements, but they are phantom projects. Project after project has been announced. One matter that always intrigued me was the announcement about the floating hotel. I point out that, over a long period, as a result of hotel management I have gained a great deal of expertise in the tourist industry and developed entrepreneurial skills. To think that the floating-hotel concept could have worked in Queensland under those conditions was a joke. Now they are trying to flog off the floating hotel in Hong Kong. It is in Hanoi, I think.

Mr Borbidge: It’s there.

Mr D’ARCY: It is there?

Mr Borbidge: It’s in the middle of Ho Chi Minh city.

Mr D’ARCY: It is in the middle of Ho Chi Minh city—they sent it off to the communists. That is about their speed at the moment—get rid of anything that they cannot make a go of.

It is a fact of life that the Queensland Government has bent over backwards to help developers. Companies have been floated. People have been sent broke. What does the Government say? It says, "We do not want to know about the economic feasibility. We do not want to know about the environment." Mr Temporary Chairman, you represent the electorate of Townsville. When the floating hotel was located off Townsville on the fringe of the Great Barrier Reef marine park, tourist operators regularly fed the fish in the area. One day I saw a sweetlip, which had come up from the bottom of the reef, being fed by the tourists. I understand that after the floating hotel began operations, the professional fishermen came in and caught all the fish. Mr Temporary Chairman, although you are shaking your head, I believe that that story is true. It is amazing that that could even happen. If that did happen—you are nodding that it did, Mr Temporary Chairman—what a mishmash of regulations exist in this State. The Government cannot even protect its own tourist industry when something good does happen. I made the point that the departmental activities are so diverse that one hand does not know what the other is doing. No-one in those departments has the expertise or potential to deal with tourism and environmental issues.

What disasters have occurred at Nelly Bay, at Trinity Bay and at the Southport Spit. My good friend and colleague the member for Southport is trying to protect the Southport Spit. I remember when he handed out cards for me.

Mr Veivers: The greatest mistake of my life.

Mr D'ARCY: I remember that time, too. At that time we were trying to save the Southport Spit. The honourable member is still trying to do that today. Slowly but surely this Government has chipped away at the Southport Spit and at every other piece of useful marine land.

At one stage the Government had a marina-led recovery. All sorts of "led" recoveries have occurred in Queensland in recent times. Although I shall run out of time, I wish to refer to previous Premiers—it is difficult to keep up with them—and to the casino-led recovery and the former Premier's big announcement a few weeks ago. It is a fact that at one stage the Government had a marina-led recovery. Marinas are like golf-courses. One of the biggest builders of marinas, Bob McKay, is a very good friend of mine. Any time the Minister wants to sit down and listen, Bob will tell him that there is no money in building only marinas. Large areas are destroyed by allowing developers to grab land from the Department of Land Management. They are allowed to freehold that land, build houses on it and sell it, as Keith Williams and other people have done. I am not blaming them for doing that, because the Government lets them do it. It is the Government's fault because of the way it handles the people's assets. Profit is made from the sale of the units, the freehold land, the building blocks and the canal development; it is not made from the marina. There is talk of filling in a marina at Runaway Bay.

Tremendously bad management exists in this State. For decades the Queensland Government has had a policy of not having a need for an environmental impact study anywhere in Queensland. On 21 October, at 6.30 p.m. on Channel 7, my very good friend Ben Cropp's special will be seen on *The World Around Us*. I have given Ben a plug. The program deals with the secrets of the mangrove. I am about to see the film. I believe it is one of the most spectacular films on the mangrove in Queensland. Ben Cropp did a lot of work on the Queensland coast. The program has also been produced in conjunction with the Australian Institute of Marine Science, which is a very good organisation.

It is a fact of life that that type of program will make Queenslanders aware of the tragic damage that the Queensland Government has done to the mangrove and to the coastal wetlands of Queensland. Honourable members would have seen the space station proposal on *Four Corners*, to which I referred. Obviously, economically, the spaceport could be a great asset to Queensland, provided that it does not fall into the category of being an environmental nightmare. Today, a lot of work has been done by the company

involved in the project. I understand that, to date, nothing has been demanded from it. I know Malcolm Edwards very well; he is another good friend of mine.

Mr Borbidge: It's not been definite that the project will be proceeding.

Mr D'ARCY: No, but it is fairly definite now, as I understand it. As the Minister would be aware, only one operator is left.

The point that was made last night, even by Don Henry, was that balanced management of the northern area is needed. I do not believe that any member of the Opposition would knock the space station project, provided it is constructed within the necessary environmental conditions.

Four Corners probably was slightly dishonest—and the Minister would probably agree with this one—because it mentioned the Farndale project. Anybody who knows anything about business in this State or who occasionally reads the *Australian Financial Review* would realise that Farndale has had liquidators in for the past nine months. That company had the Lloyd Bay project, which is virtually in abeyance. Why were Farndale and its principal, David Howe, not investigated? Why did the Government not know that the land that was freeholded for \$200,000-odd was to be sold for \$14m?

The very same thing has happened on the Gold Coast and throughout the rest of Queensland. Economic factors have not been considered. What Bernie Lewis is doing on the Gold Coast with the seabeds of Sovereign Islands is a tragedy. He started with Andys Island and Griffin Island and I believe that he has now developed 13 islands.

Since 1970 I have been mentioning this issue in the Chamber. When Bernie Lewis first bought that land he paid \$50 an acre. A building block there is now worth half a million dollars, and Mr Lewis is still developing the islands. The Minister for Environment, Conservation and Forestry cannot tell me that he is totally in favour of that project. I would be horrified if he was in favour of what has happened in his electorate. I can state with a clear conscience that every year since 1972 I have opposed that project. Writs were issued against me by a former member, Sir Wally Rae, who attended the former members luncheon today. The fact is that those things were wrong then and they are still wrong. The long-term development of Queensland will not be achieved while Governments such as this are in power.

I turn now to planning and the Moreton Bay plan that was supposed to have been made available today. Why has there been such terrible secrecy surrounding that plan? I have had only a quick look at the plan, but it is a tragedy.

Mr Comben: Thursday morning it's coming out.

Mr D'ARCY: I understand that the plan is not yet available. The information has been leaked to the newspapers. Why was there such a build-up to the plan and so much secrecy surrounding it? I have not had time to study the newspaper reports.

Mr Borbidge: You'll have three months.

Mr D'ARCY: That is great, but why was the Labor Party not allowed a proper input?

I turn now to the top-heaviness within the Department of Environment and Conservation and the fees that it charges. If the Minister is to remain the Minister for the next three weeks or so, he must do something about those fees. The department has a top-heavy administration. All of its officers are complaining about the way in which fees are collected on Fraser Island and Moreton Bay islands. I do not believe that there is anything wrong with those fees and I have never opposed them, but that revenue must go into the resorts and the tourist facilities that are situated in those areas.

The department is getting bogged down with administration. Wildlife officers throughout the State are complaining about the way in which they have to collect fees, which are becoming revenue-raisers in many areas. That fee collection could be compared with the way in which police fine people who drive at 110 kilometres per hour on roads

that have a speed limit of 100 kilometres per hour. Surely a better system can be developed so that borrowings do not create future debt and those fees are put to proper use in our resorts.

I wanted to mention the greenhouse effect, but I will not have time to do so. As to the pilots strike, which has been mentioned on several occasions today in this Chamber—it is a tragedy that this State will take a long time to recover from the dispute. The malaise in the tourist industry is not being addressed; I have already outlined some of the environmental reasons for that. No real, long-term plans are being made to overcome the long-term effects of the pilots strike and the cumulative or multiplier effect that it will have on industry. I was pleased to hear the shadow Minister mention that poker machines will be introduced, which might stop some of the tourist drain to northern New South Wales.

Time expired.

Mr SIMPSON (Cooroora) (5.37 p.m.): I am pleased to support the Estimates before the Committee. It is interesting to reflect on this Government's track record, which is proved in these Estimates in terms of why people come to Queensland not only as tourists but also as permanent residents.

People are attracted to Queensland because of this Government's husbandry of the natural environment, which is the basis of our tourism. Many people have a growing awareness of the environment and realise that they must look after the place in which they live or it will not be the better for their having been here.

Tourism, which is very important in my electorate, is going through a very difficult time because the infrastructure was built up in the expectation of further fostering Queensland's wonderful resources. The major factor that is killing tourism at the moment is the high interest rates that have been imposed by Keating and that have rearranged the family budget so that many people cannot afford a holiday.

Mr Borbidge: No-one on the other side has mentioned that.

Mr SIMPSON: That is very obvious, because the blame can be sheeted home to the Labor Party.

The absolute mismanagement of this country is ruining the tourist industry in Queensland. Many people cannot afford a holiday and their priorities are such that some of them cannot even afford clothing for their children. The prime consideration of many people with young families is to pay off their homes. With the present high interest rates, how the devil can they do that, be able to feed and clothe their children and still find extra money? To many people a holiday is a luxury.

Mr Eaton: And then take them to a five-star hotel.

Mr SIMPSON: No, not all of them go to a five-star hotel. The honourable member knows that they do not. In fact, if the honourable member was keeping up with the tourism trend he would know that many of them have a holiday on a shoe-string budget and go to areas of natural beauty. But wait a minute! Here is the catch. Many families from Melbourne and Sydney are into the newfangled practice of camping. They save their money, borrow some from the bank, buy a four-wheel-drive vehicle and visit Kakadu and Fraser Island. Thousands upon thousands of people are now doing that.

But what has Keating done? He has upped the interest rates. In trying to keep up the payments, people are being bled dry. What will they have to do? They will have to sell their four-wheel-drive vehicles and forgo their holidays. To many people a holiday is of major importance.

The tourism industry provides many spin-offs to small businesses in my electorate. People cannot now afford to make those trips and have those holidays.

Mr Vaughan: The other day I heard that the north coast wasn't affected.

Mr SIMPSON: Yes, it is. It has been affected by the honourable member's mate Keating. His actions are absolutely killing the tourist industry in Australia.

Of the tourists who visit my area, 90 per cent come by road. As a result, the pilots dispute has not had as severe an impact on the tourist industry in my electorate as it has in other parts of the State. But how do those tourists get slugged? Every time they fill up their cars they have to pay that additional fuel tax, which is indexed by Keating every six months. He is of the same ilk as those members on the other side of the Chamber who will in the near future dare to put their names forward on ballot-papers as the next financial managers of this State. With their high interest rates, they would ruin more businesses and more families. It is a shame.

The natural resources in my electorate have made it one of the Meccas of the tourist industry. The national park at Noosa is the most visited national park in Australia. To keep up that high level of visitation, careful management is required. Problems have occurred with that. Management skills are available to train people to deal with those problems. That is being done not hypothetically in a class room but on the spot at Noosa. With the hundreds of thousands of people who visit the national park, wear and tear has been caused to the walking tracks. What can be done to overcome that? Does the department put down that wretched asphalt, which is hardly what is found in nature? Does it lay clay pavers and compact them in an endeavour to keep the area natural at the same time as maintaining a base on which the tourists can walk without wearing a track six feet deep?

The national park at Cooloola is a tremendous attraction. My electorate shares it with the electorate of my colleague Len Stephan of Gympie. I am pleased that extensions have been made to that park. Extensions have also been made to the national park at Noosa. Consideration is being given to the construction of a car park there which will be built so that it blends in with its scenery and provides parking that will allow the present parking area to be used as a natural area overlooking Laguna Bay, which is one of the most frequently visited areas.

Consideration is also being given to the provision of a tourist venture in an old quarry which, in years past, was worked by the Noosa Shire Council. That was a mistake. That development may not eventuate. Some problems have occurred. Because of the pressure that is being brought to bear these days, if those concerned with the approval of that development muck around much longer, it may never go ahead at all.

People often pass the remark that land is a prime resource because no more of it is being made. Of course, that is not quite right. If land is pumped up out of the sea, more is made. The Dutch would be experts at that. A bit of that had to be done at Noosa to protect the canal development at the mouth of the Noosa River, which was constructed in the days when it was thought that canal development was the bee's knees. But we at Noosa now know better and we do not want any more of that. In order to protect that area, the Noosa spit was pumped up. I think that consideration is being given to making greater recreational use of the Noosa spit. Consideration of that will have to proceed through the various processes. If that means that all the traffic will go down Hastings Street, that will detract from the very attractive village atmosphere. Either another access or a more low-key recreation area has to be provided.

I thank Mike Ahern for obtaining a commitment from the Queensland Government for the provision of a national park at Lake Weyba, which is an important recreation area for the growing population of Noosa. Recently, much has been said about Stage 2 of the motorway and whether it should go to the east or west of Lake Weyba, which is a shallow and fragile lake. The interesting thing is that only the waters from the western side of the lake flow into it, except for the waters of Murdering Creek on the south. The high dunes on the east between the sea and Lake Weyba cause water to drain into the sea. If the future motorway is to do its job, it is essential that it should be built to the east of Lake Weyba.

Roads are very important in any tourist scheme. I said that 90 per cent of that area's tourists come by road. Better roads are needed for proper commercialisation and

so that tourists do not experience the congested road conditions that exist in Germany, Italy or France, where tourists spend half their holiday week-ends stuck in traffic on the autobahn. Efficient road systems are absolutely essential. Steps should be taken to ensure that road projects go ahead, even if they are constructed in stages.

The Government should take environmental impact studies into account. If delicate wetland areas have to be traversed and they are too important to be destroyed, consideration should be given to minimising the impact of the roadway by selecting an alternative route. I believe that it is usually possible to select an alternative, and I also believe that it is desirable to move motorways away from residential areas so that people do not have to put up with unbearably high levels of noise. I say that in spite of the fact that for a period of 16 years or more most people have known only too well that motorways would eventually be constructed.

Mount Coolum national park is a very prominent landmark in the Maroochy area. The mountain is monolithic and juts up from the coastal plain. People who use Maroochy Airport or drive in the Sunshine Coast area would certainly know Mount Coolum. The Mount Coolum national park is a fine example of the importance that this Government places on environmental matters. The Government appreciates that the natural beauty of an area cannot be enhanced by installing the chair-lifts and cable-cars associated with tourist attractions in mountainous areas.

Although the whole concept of combining tourism with the preservation of Queensland's natural heritage is important, if tourism is to prosper it is nevertheless essential to provide a high standard of service. The interesting factor in striking a balance between the environment and providing an efficient motorway is that the Liberal Party and the Labor Party would do away with toll-roads in Queensland. Instead, Labor would impose a fuel tax that would slug everybody. The only way in which the Labor Party could recoup the \$370m that would otherwise be collected on toll-roads would be to apply the formula that is used in South Australia and continually raise the level of tax. The Labor Opposition is committed to the imposition of a fuel tax in any proposal to establish an efficient road system. The Liberal Party may not impose a fuel tax, but it would probably impose a bed tax. Sallyanne Atkinson is in favour of that proposal. A fuel tax or a bed tax would be a no-no for the tourism industry. The National Party will not introduce either and it will not introduce any tax that would disadvantage the tourism industry. Those factors are important and should be borne in mind.

State forests are a natural attraction and bring visitors to scenic areas. Cooloola in my electorate is a good example of the combination of a national park and forestry areas providing a recreational facility. The important fact about Cooloola is that the national park is visited by fishermen who are more interested in fishing on the beaches than they are in visiting the park. It is interesting that fishermen are counted in the statistics as visitors to the park simply because they drive through a small part which provides access to the beaches. Fishing is a most important part of the tourism industry. In common with other waterways throughout this State, the Noosa River is renowned for its good fishing. Fishing is the greatest participation sport in Australia. It should be fostered and promoted by Governments.

Many people advocate that planting trees is the only way to overcome the greenhouse effect and to reduce levels of carbon dioxide. I point out, however, that a mature rainforest converts very little carbon dioxide to oxygen. It produces only one-tenth of the amount of oxygen converted by a sugar-cane plantation. People should keep these issues in perspective. When I mentioned that fact at a seminar conducted by the Federal Government at Queensland's Parliament House, I was told that the difference was that a rainforest oxygenates soil by virtue of its root system, which provides a great deal of benefit for the earth. I pointed out that that was not of much assistance in providing human beings with a higher level of oxygen in the atmosphere. Fortunately, nature tends to strike a balance. It must be remembered that high levels of carbon dioxide produce a more vigorous growth in vegetation.

A great deal of concern has been expressed about a rise in sea-level resulting from the greenhouse effect. It is interesting to note that 10 000 years ago sea-levels were a metre higher than they are presently. The point I make is that 10 000 years ago no-one had CFC pressure-pack products, simply because they were not available.

Mr Vaughan: No!

Mr SIMPSON: That is true.

Mr Vaughan: That is right.

Mr SIMPSON: Yes, it is true. Those factors have to be borne in mind when these issues are being considered.

Basically, I am in favour of conservation and I urge people not to waste resources. A Government that endeavours to eradicate pollution is heading in the right direction and is well on the way to establishing a good conservation policy. Every Australian citizen should play his part in conserving natural resources.

I am sure that the Minister will join with me in expressing concern about a matter that came to my attention recently. People by the name of Baumann live in the Cooloolabin forestry area west of Yandina. Their only access to the outside world is via a forestry road. Recently they received a notice indicating that a car rally will take place along that road on 13, 14 and 15 October. They are very unhappy about that. If a need for emergency services arises, there would be no way that they could get to the outside world. Although in the past they have been assured that there is adequate radio contact and that the rally would be stopped in the case of an emergency, I believe that these people should be given special consideration. Although I am in favour of rallies being held on forestry roads—provided they are well managed and safeguards are in place—it should be remembered that for some people, forestry access roads are the only means of communication with service centres. I would like the Minister to investigate this matter. The Brisbane Sporting Car Club Limited wrote a contradictory letter to Mr and Mrs Baumann stating—

“Please advise if you have no objection to the rally . . . If no reply is received . . . we can take that as a non-objection.”

This sort of recreational use in the forests is good if it is properly managed and the rallies are conducted safely. The feelings of the people living in the area must be considered before these rallies are undertaken.

Areas such as Noosa rely very heavily on the tourist industry and I ask the Government to consider the establishment of a hospitality-training facility in the region to provide local students and young people with special training in the tourist industry. This matter is of growing importance. Young people living in the Sunshine Coast area could also be trained in a variety of forestry skills. For example, a centre could be provided in the new Lake Weyba national park to train rangers and other personnel. The importance of maintaining greenery should be emphasised in the study of landscaping skills. Landscape advisers with these skills can work throughout Australia and in other parts of the world. That is another must for this Government.

It is with much pleasure that I support the Minister's presentation of his Estimates.

Sitting suspended from 5.57 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (7.30 p.m.): It is not often that we on this side of the Chamber agree with anything said by those on the Government side. However, I agree with what the honourable member for Cooroola said about the slump in the tourist industry and the fact that the tourist industry does not cater for families. Figures show that most of the tourists travelling in Queensland and Australia are Australians. When I was in Western Australia, the manager of the tourist board told me that 90 per cent of the tourists in his State were Western Australians. As I said, the tourist industry is not catering for the needs of Australians and Queenslanders. No-one seems to worry about the family man. The tourist industry has run away from its responsibilities by

catering for the rich and greedy, who are in the minority. It could well appear that there are quite a few of them but there are not in fact. They can afford to pay for whatever they desire, and they always stay at the five-star accommodation.

Later I shall elaborate on how certain people have been using the State Government to obtain land, which should be properly developed to cater for the needs of Australians and Queenslanders. Today, the average working Australian is trying to pay off his home and car and provide the necessities for his family. Such people can afford to travel only a certain distance and are forced to stay at caravan parks or lower-priced accommodation. However, because of the recent boom in Queensland and particularly in far-north Queensland, a lot of money, some of it from overseas, is put into building five-star motels and hotels.

I have attended functions at five-star hotels. There is no doubt that they have high-class facilities and cater for the rich. The average tourist does not look for that. He and his family want to see a bit of our country in the time that they have available and depending on their bank balance. So the Government must start looking at catering for the needs of Queenslanders and Australians. While we have millionaires who fly around and stay at the high-priced accommodation and are able to leave large tips, the average Australian is not used to that sort of accommodation, cannot afford it and does not want it.

Some Australians do want to mix it and rub shoulders with the big-wigs but the average Australian simply wants to cater for himself and his family. This Government should make provision, in the future development of this State, for caravan parks and cheaper accommodation with the necessities required by Queenslanders who wish to take their families to see what this State has to offer.

I shall now deal with where the Government has let the State down, and I refer particularly to far-north Queensland, including Cape York Peninsula. The accommodation and facilities in north Queensland are equal to any in the world. In many cases, various excuses are given to obtain leasehold or vacant Crown land to build big resorts. One of the big failures was the Oyster Point development at Cardwell. The land has been cleared of all the trees and all that remains are puddle holes and heaps of dirt that have been left hell, west and crooked. What was proposed was a \$280m resort development on private, freehold land, and an area of vacant Crown land was obtained from the Government with the intention of converting it to freehold. These people now have a very valuable piece of land.

What has happened in the past can easily happen again. These people can say that they no longer have the finance to proceed with the development and that, to honour their commitments and debts, they will have to sell the land. They can then cut the area up into small acreages or residential lots and sell them off for a fortune.

What this Government has done in the past, which will continue to injure the tourist industry, is to allow this sort of thing to take place. I know that the people connected with the Oyster Point development were trying to obtain, for a golf course, an extra 100 acres of waterfront land along the Hinchinbrook Channel. If it had not been for the objections that we raised with the Lands Department, it would have been allowed to go ahead. These people were told, "Complete the other section of the resort and then we will look at it." Anybody can see how far these people have gone when left on their own.

I raised this issue with the former Minister for Forestry, Conservation and Environment a few weeks ago in this Assembly and he said that the reason they could not pay their men and could not continue with the development was that the Federal Government allowed interest rates to go so high. That is a lot of hogwash. A good State Government that was managing the State properly would apply a condition to all developers in Queensland, whether they be local or overseas, that they have their finance sewn up and the money guaranteed. Because this man could not pay his workers or his contractors, they walked off the job. The land has been lying idle for many months and, no doubt, it will be many more months before any activity takes place.

Last year, on a trip to the Cape York Peninsula we learnt that a Japanese developer had put a proposal to the Cowal Creek Aboriginal community—I think it was Cowal Creek; it was either that or one close by—that he would build a \$250m resort and give them a half-share if he could build it on their land. We all know that, under the Community Services Act, all such land is under the control of the Aborigines and cannot be sold off without their permission. It is a beautiful site. There are on Cape York Peninsula literally hundreds of beautiful sites for whatever a developer wants to do. There are miles and miles of beautiful beaches, rainforests, ranges and mountains that anybody with money could use for development. However, in the process of development, they would destroy part of the environment. All they have is dollar signs before their eyes.

The Government can play a role by ceasing the freeholding of all land on Cape York. Last night on *Four Corners*, honourable members would have seen that a large number of people who have bought leasehold grazing properties are applying to freehold them, because they realise the future of development in Cape York. The Government must be very careful in administering those applications. It is most important that, in future, the Minister for Tourism and Minister for Environment, Conservation and Forestry will have to have discussions with the Minister for Land Management and the Minister for Finance and be careful about the decisions that he makes.

Cape York is a beautiful natural asset. If the Government does not maintain it, it will lose value and be destroyed. It will take many years to return to its natural state. I sound a note of warning to the Government about that matter.

When the Labor Party is in Government at the end of this year, it will put a moratorium on the freeholding of all land other than residential blocks for the first 12 months until it can investigate many of the large areas of land that are being converted to freehold.

Over 80 per cent of Australia's self-made millionaires started off as land-developers. They got in the good books of the Government and had access to Crown land or had access to cheap land. Alan Bond and Christopher Skase are examples of such entrepreneurs. I am led to believe that three months ago Christopher Skase was on Cape York talking with people in the Aboriginal community to see if he could obtain an area of land which was close to the proposed space base for development. Because of the space base, many people are moving into the cape. When the space base is commenced, the roads will have to be upgraded and a proper airport will be needed. As well, either a small city or a very large town will be built. When the road is opened, Cape York will be inundated with not only tourists but also more local people who will be fishing and sightseeing. Cape York is one of the worst areas in Australia for the construction of roads. At present, caravans are travelling to Weipa and further north. Should the road be improved, one can imagine the traffic that will flow to Cape York.

Many people believe that Cape York is all rainforest. It also contains some very desolate places. Previous speakers have mentioned the wildlife on Cape York. Many people would not appreciate looking at and handling pythons and being set upon by leeches in the wet. However, the tourist entrepreneurs promote only the good side of Cape York.

I turn now to forestry. For some time I have been concerned by the large debt that the Forestry Department is accruing. Each year it has increased. Over the past few years, the debt has been increasing at the rate of approximately \$30m a year. This year is no different from other years. The Forestry Department is going through a transition period. I hope that the changes that have occurred will be beneficial not only to the Forestry Department but also to Queensland as a whole.

Earlier in the year, many forestry workers were asked to reapply for their jobs because of the restructuring of the Forestry Department. That caused much concern amongst the workers. Through my association over the years with the Forestry Department at all levels, I have had nothing but praise for the officers involved. However, I feel that

the Government has been giving directions to those Forestry Department officers, which is where the whole thing has fallen down.

I will turn to problems that have occurred previously. I will not accuse the present Minister, because he has just taken over the portfolio. I wish him success in his job. However, I point out that the problems are caused by the lack of initiative and the lack of proper management by previous Forestry Ministers.

The sale of sandalwood has presented a problem. The previous Minister negotiated with a company that had a question mark over it. Shortly, I hope to receive information from Fiji about that company. However, in attempting to keep up to date in my shadow Forestry Ministry, I move round the State speaking to people to gain information. I have learnt that, when I tell people that I am a politician, they either do not want to talk to me or do not want to give me any information in case I am a blabbermouth and name them in Parliament. That makes it difficult to obtain information. However, if one enters hotels and asks a few questions—a few silly questions at times—and listens they will soon put one right. That is the way to obtain information.

The Government has failed with sandalwood. It is on the verge of destroying an industry that would have resulted in the granting of a franchise to Unex Industries (Australia), which is at present made up of a couple of men based in Sydney but who were previously from overseas. They made a deal with the Queensland Government to obtain 1 000 tonnes of sandalwood from Crown land in Queensland for \$1,500,000. However, the annual report of the Forestry Department reveals that \$453,000, which is not even one-third of what that company promised the Government, has been paid. The company has broken its agreement. When the Government attempted to pull the company into gear, it threatened to sue for breach of contract.

The Government should have shown some initiative by trying not only to protect an industry but also to promote it and bring income into Queensland by cutting that industry into zones. People in the sandalwood industry were bringing a good income into Queensland. Not only were those people bringing a good income into Queensland but also they were creating employment.

When the Unex company was awarded the contract and the franchise by the Queensland Government for all sandalwood on Crown land in Queensland, those people who had been involved in the industry had to pay off their cutters. They had no access to it at all.

A bit of a furore arose amongst graziers, who felt that they should have had a right to that sandalwood because it was a stock feed. That is another argument. However, when the controversy arose, this company turned round and offered to buy that sandalwood direct from the grazier himself and by-pass the State Government, which would have done Queenslanders out of a royalty that was fairly low. Had that gone ahead, that money would not have gone into the coffers of the State.

There are a lot of grey areas in relation to this matter. The price of sandalwood has now dropped from \$5,000-odd a tonne to \$3,400 a tonne, all because everybody wanted to jump on the bandwagon. People were taking sandalwood off Crown land, but saying that it had come off freehold land and therefore not having to pay any royalties on it. Honourable members would be aware that it is very difficult to police something like that. I do not believe anyone can be expected to police it properly without sufficient men to do the job.

If one drives onto some of those grazing blocks to see the boss and one is told, "He is down the horse paddock. Just follow the track.", one can drive through the first gate and drive around in paddocks that are 10 or 15 miles square, or even more, and one would be lucky to even find the boss. How can people be expected to go onto grazing blocks to find the stumps of trees? This is something that has to be policed properly for the benefit of the whole State. The Government is going to have to re-examine the agreement that it signed with the Unex company. I believe that the State should be divided into zones. Sandalwood used to be gathered in certain areas of

Queensland by some companies that had a good market and the Queensland Government was getting a good royalty from it.

That brings me to the fact that something should be done about the wild pigs and the vermin in our forests. One cannot carry firearms in national parks or State forests. However, a great deal of damage is being done by the wild pigs that harbour and breed in these protected areas. They are destroying the cassowary because it is a ground-nesting bird. The wild pig is probably as good a hunter and forager as is the dingo. I have observed them in the bush. They can sniff and track. They are survivors and they are breeding quickly.

When I was up at Cape York I met some conservationists who were also concerned about the wild pigs. They have ruined turtle rookeries. They have learned to survive by going down to the beach and rooting up the turtles' eggs. The year that I was up at Cape York no turtles came in. I was told that they had been there but there were no eggs. It is not known whether that is because the year before the pigs had rooted the eggs up and the turtles went to find another rookery. Although the turtles may not become extinct, their number has been reduced. There are turtle rookeries all along the coast. If the wild pigs can destroy the rookeries up at Cape York, they can also destroy them elsewhere.

Another cause for concern was that these people used to show visitors the platypus, which nest in the pannikin grass that grows on the edges of the banks in swampy areas. People could go down through the rainforest and observe the platypus without it seeing them. However, the whole area was rooted up by wild pigs. There were no platypus there at all, young or old. It is not known whether any platypuses will return. It is not known whether the pigs destroyed them or whether they just found another area in which to live. That is something that has to be investigated. Honourable members are aware of the destruction that rabbits have caused in other States. The Government has to consider controlling the vermin in these protected areas.

I want to say something about nurseries. As both the Federal Government and the State Government are promising to encourage the planting of trees, I believe that the Forestry Department should establish a nursery on the Atherton Tableland. I have received several requests and approaches about this matter. I believe that there is a nursery at Ingham. Until I discovered that, I was referring people to private nurseries. However, I believe that the Forestry officers are the people best equipped to handle and sell all tree products. I have a lot of faith in the Forestry Department. On many occasions over the years I have approached officers of that department for advice. I have always had a good relationship with the various Forestry officers who have been stationed in my area.

I would like to see this Government open a nursery on the Atherton Tableland. I believe that Atherton has all the necessary facilities for a nursery. The population in the north is increasing and there is an active interest in forestry. The Government talks about encouraging private nurseries to grow forestry trees. I can remember when World Heritage listing was an issue and people were clearing land——

Time expired.

Mrs GAMIN (South Coast) (7.52 p.m.): I have pleasure in joining this Estimates debate, with particular reference to tourism and the tourist industry.

I am pleased that the State Government is committed to encouraging the growth of the Queensland tourist industry, in the interests of greater prosperity and employment prospects for people throughout the State. As a representative of the Gold Coast area—the tourism capital of this State—I welcome that commitment.

It has been estimated that in 1989 tourism will generate more than \$12 billion of the State's gross domestic product, with \$6 billion in direct expenditure by tourists. Approximately 145 000 people are employed in the Queensland tourist industry and, including support industries, more than 300 000 people depend on tourism for their livelihood. Future growth will depend not only upon servicing the Australian tourist

market but also offering internationally competitive products that will encourage Australians to holiday at home rather than go overseas and allow the Queensland industry to compete for opportunities in the burgeoning world tourist industry.

Studies conducted by the national centre for studies in travel and tourism at James Cook University in Townsville show that the proportion of total visitor expenditure by international tourists will increase from the present 27 per cent to approximately 40 per cent at the turn of the century. The increasing number of international visitors will arrive predominantly by air. This necessitates a policy of stimulating the development of new accommodation facilities and transport infrastructure across the State. I will touch on the effects of the pilots dispute later in my speech.

Tangible successes in the effort to achieve these policy goals include the high rate of growth in room stock. The number of hotel and motel rooms in Queensland has more than doubled in the last 10 years. In the same period, Queensland has more than trebled the number of nights spent by domestic and international visitors in its hotels and motels.

Queensland now boasts three international airports, allowing for the decentralisation of international tourist visitation. The State's leading position as a visitor destination within Australia, and as part of the south Pacific region, is reflected in the confidence shown by investors. At the end of the March quarter, 49c in every dollar of Australian tourism investment was invested in this State. The multiplier effect of this investment means a further strengthening of our economy.

More than \$3.4 billion worth of tourism development is under construction in Queensland, representing close to half of the total Australian tourism investment. A further \$6.4 billion worth of projects had received rezoning approval, indicating a firm commitment to proceed in the next five years. For Queensland, this means more jobs and greater prosperity for this State. Included in these projects are accommodation facilities for every market from budget and family accommodation right up to international standard.

It is a fact that this State has Australia's most decentralised tourism industry. Just as other industries have been encouraged to start up throughout Queensland rather than cluster around the capital city, tourism growth outside Brisbane and the south-east corner is strongly and actively encouraged. The results are, for example, seen in the revitalised coastal centres, which once relied primarily on sugar, and the rapidly growing inland with its world-class attractions such as the Australian Stockman's Hall of Fame.

The Minister recently opened the Matilda Highway from Karumba to Charleville. I pay tribute to the bicentennial efforts of the people of Cloncurry and the surrounding districts with the completion of John Flynn Place in Cloncurry—a worthy community facility for the people of that town, a marvellous memorial to the work of the Royal Flying Doctor Service and a great tourist attraction.

The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation provides substantial financial support for 17 regional tourist associations around the State, as well as operating five of its own regional offices in Townsville, Mackay, Alexandra Headland, Toowoomba and Longreach, to manage its investment and development initiatives and provide assistance to local community members. The Government addresses tourism-related issues which impact upon the development of the Queensland tourism industry. These include inadequate Federal spending on roads compared with the excise imposed on fuels.

As a representative of the tourist industry, the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation maintains an ongoing campaign for a more equitable share of tax revenue to be spent on managing and upgrading road assets, which form the corner-stone of Australian domestic tourism. I specifically mention the Pacific Highway, which needs to be four lanes from Nerang to the New South Wales border, and the Nerang-Murwillumbah road through Numinbah Valley, which is not only a major tourist road but also the alternative route from Queensland into New South Wales.

Efforts by the corporation have resulted in tourism investment from sources around the world. Major international hotel chains have been attracted to the State. In addition, smaller operators, or intending operators, benefit from advice and consultation with the QTTC as to future prospects. The QTTC looks after not only the big guys but also the little ones.

Queensland activity bids for major conventions, sporting events, fairs, international events and major worldwide conferences as a means of presenting Queensland consistently to an international audience. It is recognised internationally that these factors not only aid tourism but increase awareness of Queensland in terms of business and cultural development. Successful international events such as the 1982 Commonwealth Games and World Expo 88 have done just that for Queensland. However, I must sound a note of warning. These statistics—these projections—will not hold up if the crippling airline dispute goes on much longer.

The pilots strike is having a disastrous effect on the tourist industry. I speak particularly on behalf of the Gold Coast, but other tourist areas are equally affected. It is true that some of the big groups—international chains and so on—are holding up their room occupancies by heavy discounting. Some pockets are doing reasonably well during the southern holidays—for instance, some motels on major highways. Some of the big groups can tailor their marketing expertise to provide special attractions. Sanctuary Cove is a good example of that. But there are small operators within the industry and many other small businesses on the Gold Coast that rely directly or indirectly on the tourist industry. Many of them are looking down the barrel of insolvency if the pilots strike is not ended soon. Small business failures will occur in other tourist areas of this State.

We will see the failure of tourist-orientated businesses—small travel agencies, minibus operators, out-of-the-way motels and so on—that have had to put off staff, just as the big hotels have done, and have had their cash flow diminished to nothing. In many instances, they have had to make refunds as well. This will flow through to other small business enterprises, because on the Gold Coast everyone depends on tourism. A good tourist season is good for everyone; a bad season is eventually bad for everyone.

Makers of screens and blinds, curtain-manufacturers, people who make resort furniture, cane blinds and surf skis, right through to the many little enterprises, depend on local residents spending money in their shops. The pilots dispute comes on top of last year's problem caused by Expo. Lots of restaurants and other small businesses on the Gold Coast did not, in fact, cash in on Expo. In the early part of the year, terrible weather conditions were experienced, with Victorian travel agents saying, "Don't go to Queensland. It rains all the time."

The pilots dispute is now causing untold damage to the tourism industry. I welcome the initiative announced today by the Minister for Tourism that major tax and fees relief will be given to tourism industry operators who are suffering because of the airlines dispute.

Mr Borbidge: The only Government in Australia that has made that move.

Mrs GAMIN: The Minister is right. Thank goodness that he has done so. It is a great initiative for those members of the tourism industry who are suffering so badly.

In instances of proven hardship, liquor licence fees and pay-roll tax can be reduced on application. The State Government's decision demonstrates its support for the Queensland tourist industry during a time of great hardship. The only thing that the Federal Government can do is to prop up the two big airlines. It has made no moves to help the tourist industry or to consider tax relief for the thousands of small operators who are so badly affected.

The State Opposition can only act like Brer Rabbit—lie low and say nothing. Thank goodness that this Minister has initiated some assistance for a beleaguered industry. This Assembly should commend him for that and wish the Minister success in his further

efforts to negotiate charter aircraft and crews to service the State's tourist areas. On the last occasion, those efforts were stymied by the Federal Government. I wish the Minister better luck on this occasion,

Mr BURNS (Lytton—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (8.03 p.m.): I intend to speak about two matters, namely, western tourism and Moreton Bay. Because Moreton Bay encompasses part of my electorate, I am very keen on it.

In recent months there has been a very strong and very important move by the Labor Party, the trade union movement, the United Graziers Association and all sorts of people in tourism in western Queensland to build in 1991 in Barcaldine a heritage centre to recognise not only the 1891 shearers strike but also to pay tribute to the contribution that workers have made to this nation of ours.

Mr Borbidge: The QTTC, too.

Mr BURNS: I will be making that point, too.

The United Graziers Association was established during the great shearers strike of 1891, which started the Labor movement.

Mr FitzGerald: The airlines strike will end them.

Mr BURNS: I am not too sure about that.

According to today's public opinion poll figures, Andrew Peacock's popularity rating is at the lowest level of an Opposition Leader in years and the Labor Party is in front. Despite the airlines strike, the Labor Party can still beat Peacock with both hands tied behind its back. The Minister should be doing something about stabbing another leader in the back, just like he did to Mike Ahern; he can do it to Peacock next—if he wants to talk politics—but I want to talk about western tourism and Moreton Bay.

In May 1991 the heritage centre in Barcaldine will be open and the structure used for the travelling Bicentenary Exhibition will be incorporated in that complex. The structure has been made available to the committee by the Federal Government, which in itself is a marvellous thing. I understand that a private-enterprise organisation will transport the structure to Barcaldine and that the grounds for the complex—which I think are an old State school yard—have been made available by the State Government.

The Barcaldine Shire Council and the QTTC have made money available to employ consultants to draw up the plans. The Labor Party has made available \$100,000 to employ staff and to provide office accommodation in Brisbane so that the whole complex can be organised properly. Everybody is involved in trying to promote what I regard as a second major step in western tourism.

The same thing needs to be done in Charleville as was done with the Stockman's Hall of Fame and now the Barcaldine Tree of Knowledge project. It needs to be part of a western route. Retired people from all over Australia do not want to go to a Mirage resort, the Gold Coast or one of those five-star international Japanese hotels that are scattered along the coast. They want to have a look at a little bit of Australia. Tourists from all over the world would like to look at the west.

Charleville is one of the nicest little towns in western Queensland. In 1959, when I started work as a union organiser I spent a lot of time going through the western towns. It is a great pity that, in recent years, those towns have gone backwards because roads and better transport have reduced the necessity for some of their facilities.

Mr Hobbs: How come the change-about?

Mr BURNS: In the history of this Assembly, the fellow who is making all the noise is the poorest representative that Charleville has ever had.

Charleville has had some great members over the years—Bowman and others—who represented the area very well. It is a great pity that that fellow who does not come

from Charleville is out of touch with everybody out there. Fortunately, when I visit his electorate in the near future I will be able to give him a lecture about his area.

If some major attraction can be provided in each western town people will travel those roads to get to them.

Mr Hobbs: You just about can't travel those roads because of the Federal Government's fuel tax.

Mr BURNS: The fellows who make all the noise when they are handed a brief do nothing for their electorates. Charleville would be better with new representation. After the next election when Harding becomes the member things will start to happen out there.

The Labor Party is involved in the proposal at Barcaldine. I have always supported the Stockman's Hall of Fame, the organisation responsible for which I am a life member. When that project commenced I put my money up in cash because I believe that western tourism is the way to go.

Approximately 120 years ago Charleville had a brewery and a number of industries, and approximately 100 years ago it was a 10-pub town, but it has gone backwards. Something is needed to keep young people there, to ensure that they do not need to leave Charleville and go to the coast to get jobs. A major project is one way of doing that.

The Labor Party is proud to be part of the whole plan to do something in the west. Barcaldine will be a major step in the right direction. I will be visiting Longreach next week or the week after. People who are involved in the motel and hotel industries there have told me that tourism in Longreach has boomed out of sight since the Stockman's Hall of Fame was completed. The same thing will happen to Barcaldine, Charleville and other towns down the line as reasons are found for making tourists visit towns and stay overnight.

Today the Government announced a new plan for Moreton Bay, which will be launched on Thursday morning at the yacht club at Manly. It is fitting that that is the location. To be quite truthful, I do not think anything has done less for Moreton Bay than Manly Boat Harbour.

Many boat harbours and marinas generate very little local tourism. The story is that in Manly those who use the boat harbour come with a dollar and a clean shirt and they do not change either. As far as the larger boaties are concerned, that is quite true. They live on the other side of town. They buy their groceries and their gear in town, they hop on their boats and sail out of Manly. All they do is pay 500 or 600 bucks a year, or a little bit more, in marina dues. Those who live aboard their boats pass their excreta into the bay. They paint the bottoms of their boats with a material that causes a lot of trouble in the harbour, which can become a foul, polluted area. Manly Boat Harbour is not a great tourism success. Under this plan, its problems will be doubled.

For the sake of the people of Brisbane and south-east Queensland, it is time we said, "No more alienation of the foreshores." I prefer the old family-style holidays when people can walk with their kids along the beach, paddle in the water, pick up a few crabs under the rocks and enjoy themselves sitting in the sun on the foreshores. If people go to Wynnum and Manly or Sandgate and Shorncliffe they will see that happening again. Every fellow who has a quick-quick mentality will go to those areas and say, "Let's put a marina out here. Let's put a canal development in there."

This morning, as far as Wynnum is concerned, it was said, "Preserve and reserve, but put a marina at the mouth of Wynnum Creek." Manly has a marina. One is proposed for Tingalpa Creek. An artificial beach will be able to be built on the little piece of land in between the three marinas so that people can walk there and see what it used to be like. Some 30 years ago sand castle competitions used to be conducted at Wynnum and Manly and special excursion trains ran from Brisbane. That sort of activity is coming back, and it will come back again at Sandgate.

Not everybody wants to drive to the Gold Coast or the Sunshine Coast for the week-end. Some waterfront space needs to be left for those who want to spend an hour or two with their kids on a Sunday afternoon. It is time that we said straight out, "No more alienation of the foreshores of the bay. Let the people go there." There should be no more Raby Bays. The bloke who wants to own a boat and who has to have his own special ramp in his own back yard is not really interested in the bay. In fact, he is not interested in people. In his own way, he is a recluse. He wants it all to himself.

It should be ensured that there are esplanades and that there are grass and trees under which families can sit and enjoy themselves. The Lord Mayor is always talking about the year of the bay. I would like to see a bit of money spent on the bay. For example, from Wynnum North through the mangrove areas of Fisherman Islands there should be a mangrove boardwalk. I have written to the Minister for the Environment—or one of the previous Ministers for the Environment; I am not too sure which—and he said that that would be a great idea and that help would be given with the planning but that no dough would be provided. I do not think a lot of cash is needed.

Some of the people who are placed on community service could play a part in this. One such person comes to me every Sunday and I take him to the foreshores at Wynnum where he picks up broken glass, plastic bottles and packets. But the following week there are again more plastic bottles, broken glass and packets there, and I do not achieve much.

However, if I was given a dozen of those fellows and a supervisor, and the Government, through the Forestry Department, gave us the timber, we could build that boardwalk. I am sure that good Australian companies such as Ampol would be prepared to sponsor it and put their name to it. A boardwalk would be constructed through the mangroves so that people could see the life and the vitality of a mangrove area when the flood tide is coming in. When people saw that and realised how valuable a resource it was, there would be no trouble with people cutting down mangroves and destroying them. No-one would accept the idea that the mudflats at Wynnum should be destroyed because it would be better to have a dredge dig it out and have someone's \$100,000 boat anchored there.

People really need to be convinced how lively that mangrove and mudflat area is. A walk through the mangrove area on any day of the week, right beside the dumps, where the rubbish, the plastic and the paper are spreading through the mangrove trees, into the clearer water will reveal life that city people would never believe. It is most interesting and exciting to see. I go to those areas just to pick up a bit of green weed for my luderick, or black bream, fishing. A visitor walking through those areas would be amazed at that burst of life as the tide rises.

If that boardwalk could be constructed so that people could go through to the boat passage, out near the Fisherman Islands area, they could visit Fort Lytton by bus, walk the boardwalk back along the front and then go by boat to St Helena. It could become part of an enjoyable heritage and environmental trail within 14 miles of the city. People do not have to travel 100 miles to the sea; those places are available to be seen now, right on our doorstep.

The Government plans to put a marina at Wynnum. That is crazy. It proposes an artificial concrete jungle to replace a natural resource. At low tide the flats in front of Wynnum are alive with birds, crabs, and people.

Mr Borbidge: The plan is a draft document. It is open for public comment.

Mr BURNS: It will get some public criticism; I can guarantee that.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Next year as Minister for Tourism I am going to open it as Burns' Way.

Mr BURNS: I thank the honourable member.

Mr Borbidge: When you read it you will be a lot more relaxed about it.

Mr BURNS: I hope I am much more relaxed about it. My friend here is going to open it next year as Burns' Way.

It is my belief that we ought to be doing something to invite people back to those bayside areas. When I was a kid, Manly had an old English-style pier with a fun parlour at the end. Why can that not be done again? Why do 20-storey high-rise hotels and marinas have to be built? There are piers down there that no-one is using. They are monuments to the folly of the past because they have been built out of concrete and a person cannot get a boat near them. The piers could be used as I have suggested. If that was done, family visitors would be brought back to the foreshore. In many of the bayside areas there is nothing for young people. If young people want to make a noise, they can do it out there and not cause a great problem.

Some of the areas that could be properly used are St Helena, Fort Lytton and places like Nudgee Beach. If the schoolkids undertake environmental excursions from their schools to those places while they go on historical excursions to Fort Lytton and St Helena, then I believe they will be taught to respect our heritage and environment and look after it. That will create jobs in the future because those children, after they go home to mum and dad and say what they have seen, will convince them that they ought to go down there themselves and enjoy the bay.

It is important to look very closely at what can be done to promote tourism on our own doorstep. Delegations from Wynnum, Sandgate or Nudgee who approach the Government about promoting individual areas in Brisbane are told that the approach should be made to the Brisbane Visitors and Convention Bureau. The bureau treats those approaches in a collective manner. Redcliffe operates independently and is presently carrying out its own promotion. The people of Brisbane would like to be able to promote individual areas. We need help to promote Wynnum and Manly. Why can't people have a Moreton Bay museum? Think of the history of Moreton Bay, the whaling and the numbers of lives that were lost when ships were wrecked off the coast of Queensland; think of the numbers of people who journeyed to Australia in ships riddled with plague; think of those great grave sites and headstones at Dunwich. All of those features are historical relics to remind us of people who died providing service to this colony. That history needs to be recognised and represented in a humane way. The Government should start to spend money on those types of projects instead of spending money on Sallyanne Atkinson's year of the bay. The people of Queensland do not need more alienation of the bay's foreshores for private use.

What was done in the thirties is what should be done now for the benefit of future generations. If the Minister were to visit the flat areas around Sandgate or Wynnum, he would see dozens of families riding push-bikes and walking together, enjoying themselves and taking in fresh air. It is important that not all efforts in tourism be focused on the Gold Coast, Cairns or the Sunshine Coast. Some attention should be given to the two areas I have mentioned. They are two areas that really need support.

I am pleased that Barcaldine and Longreach are now well on the way to being tourist centres. Mount Isa is a major mining centre. Charleville can be promoted as a tourist centre and other smaller centres can be promoted in exactly the same way. Fishing in the gulf country could be promoted as a major tourist attraction. Surely with the co-operation of Aboriginal communities, decent fishing lodges could be established. People would come from all over the world to catch a barramundi or get among the jungle perch. In co-operation with Aboriginal communities and local authorities, the Government should promote northern and remote areas of this State. The Minister should get out and work with other levels of Government to promote areas that have tourism potential.

I do not know if anyone promotes yellow-belly fishing, but there could be nothing better. Someone should promote yellow-belly fishing trips because they are part and parcel of the heritage of the south west. It is great fun to be on the banks of a billabong, a creek or the Barcoo, trying to catch a yellow-belly with a frog, a line and a bottle of rum.

Mr Vaughan: What about the poor frog?

Mr BURNS: The frog is put on the hook. He goes into the water but then scrambles out and climbs up a tree. The point is that nobody catches a fish but they drink a lot of rum and have a great day.

People talk about Moreton Bay and western Queensland. I do not think that enough money is spent on those areas. Right now, I am making a submission in support of both of them.

Mr SLACK (Burnett) (8.20 p.m.): Mr Temporary Chairman——

Mr R. J. Gibbs: This will be a smash.

Mr SLACK: I thank the honourable member.

I join with other members who have complimented the Minister on his handling of the Tourism portfolio and, of course, on his handling of the portfolio of Environment, Conservation and Forestry. I wish to refer to the work of his departments, particularly to the role played by the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation in tourism. I join with the member for Cunningham in conveying my compliments to Sir Frank Moore whose experience, entrepreneurial flair and obvious business skills have been invaluable to tourism in Queensland. Sir Frank Moore's high profile in the airline strike has been particularly noticeable.

Much has been said about the damaging effects of the airline strike in terms of loss of confidence. I make the point that both large and small-scale entrepreneurs in the tourist industry put their livelihood on the line. Their businesses are difficult enough without the added problems caused by the airline strike. The tourism industry should not be taken for granted. With your permission, Mr Temporary Chairman, I wish to make some observations.

Queensland offers sun, surf, clean air and the unique features of the outback. Queensland is not overly polluted, and people can eat the food and drink the water. On top of that, Queensland is fortunate to have some really genuine Australian characters living in this State. Over the years, Australian characters have been part of the unique attractions that have drawn overseas visitors to Queensland, particularly to western and country areas. However, Queensland has some disadvantages. I wish to mention some of them, such as long distances and associated travel costs. In addition, many Queenslanders have a take it or leave it attitude and can be downright rude or arrogant. Queenslanders do not like working on week-ends, but want to be paid irrespective.

Regrettably the custom of tipping is gradually creeping in. I urge the Minister to discourage this practice. Honourable members who have visited overseas countries would realise that tipping is a way of life in America and other overseas countries and part of the wage structure. I am informed that some people actually pay to be employed at a hotel so that they can earn their income from receiving tips. In Australia, the wage structure is completely different and, consequently, tipping is not necessary. I ask the Minister to bear in mind that tipping is increasing and should not be encouraged.

Another problem that is emerging is that tourist accommodation is beginning to cost too much.

Mr Veivers: If people want to park your car, you have to tip them.

Mr SLACK: Perhaps the honourable member will have to park the car himself.

Prior to the airline strike, the message came through loud and clear that many of the larger hotels in Sydney and in Queensland are beginning to charge a price for accommodation that is not acceptable to many tourists. Overseas tourists can go elsewhere. They are finding that accommodation in some other overseas destinations is cheaper than that available in Australia, particularly accommodation of an equal or higher standard.

It is to be hoped that the voluntary work agreements introduced by this Government will go a long way towards overcoming some of the problems associated with week-end work in the tourist industry. If these agreements are genuinely entered into and approached in a proper fashion, the agreements will do just that. One thing that must be realised is that tourists do not have to come here; there are many other attractive destinations in the world. If overseas tourists are not given the best of hospitality and courtesy in Australia, they will go elsewhere. This country desperately needs tourists, particularly in light of its balance of payments situation.

The multiplier effect is felt by local communities. Tourists in the local community buoy that community's economy, and help development up and down the coast and throughout the State. There is a very dynamic tourist and development board in my region. As honourable member for Bundaberg, Mr Temporary Chairman, you will appreciate my mentioning this board. It promotes the Bundaberg and Coral Isles, the Burnett country and the pathway to the Great Barrier Reef. This is one of 17 regions in the State that is working well. Although it is recognised that the Government has increased the subsidy to these regions from the previous \$70,000 to \$85,000, it is to be hoped that the commitment given by Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen before the last election that those regions would receive an increase up to \$100,000 will be honoured by this present Government before the next election, which is not too far away.

The airline pilots strike has had a major effect in Queensland, but my electorate has not suffered the same effect simply because it is an area through which tourists travel by motor car. For example, in Gin Gin, which is in the centre of my electorate, the business people have recorded an increase in business since the strike.

Greater pressure should be put on the Federal Government for the establishment of priority roads for tourism. For instance, the Agnes Waters-Seventeen Seventy connection road to Bundaberg, which goes through my electorate and that of the honourable member for Callide, is desperately in need of funds. If the Government waits for an increase in population in the region the road will not be completed for decades. It should be recognised that this will be a major tourist road and that much of the traffic on that road will come from the Bundaberg area. Eighty-five per cent of the land and homes at Agnes Waters are sold through Bundaberg agents and 60 per cent of the buildings and land in that area are owned by people living in the Bundaberg area. Another road that is in need of attention is the Monto-Langley Flat-Mount Perry road, because much of the tourist traffic returning from the Australian Stockman's Hall of Fame is hampered by poor roads to the coast. This road would receive more usage if it was upgraded. I ask the Minister to press the Commonwealth Government to provide additional funds for these and other roads so that the tourist industry can be fostered and developed throughout country areas. These roads are particularly important in wet seasons when the southern half of the State offers an alternative tourist destination to the Great Barrier Reef and gulf country because those areas cannot be reached as a result of the weather conditions during the wet season.

I turn now to Expo. I realise that it was held a long time ago, but it should be remembered that the Bundaberg/Burnett region had a very strong presence at Expo. That is reflected in the tourism figures for the area, which have shown a consistent upward trend since that event. Many businesses showed the effects of Expo, but the tourism industry within the region did not show the marked down-turn which was evident in other parts of the State. There is no doubt that tourism in the region will continue to expand. Many people in the country are looking to tourism to cushion the adverse effects of years of droughts, low commodity prices, high costs and high interest rates which have devastated the region's farmers. No-one is suggesting that tourism will substitute or take-over from primary industries, but every extra person coming through the town who stops the night and buys a soft drink, petrol or anything else is a help to many small businesses. As I stated before, tourists are stopping overnight in Gin Gin, which is good for the town. Unfortunately, one man's loss is another man's gain.

Having spoken briefly on tourism and its effects on the State and my electorate, I turn now to some aspects of the Forestry Department. I make particular reference to the extension to rural land-holders. The \$1m allocated by the Government to encourage tree-planting on private land will allow the Department of Forestry to implement a new project called Caring For Our Countryside. The major focus of the project is to promote the wise use of trees to help decrease land degradation and other environmental problems. The essential elements of the project include the expansion of TREDAT, which is a computer-aided system to provide land-holders with the best advice on how to match trees to specific site requirements. Honourable members will be aware of the different requirements for different soil types and climatic conditions within the countryside. The project will include the implementation of the Emerald tree-buffer project to protect that township from possible drift from agricultural sprays applied to nearby farmland. That is very commendable. There will be a public education and extension program directed at land-holders, land-care groups and tree-care groups. A tree-research program covering studies on the natural regeneration and restoration of trees on degraded land will be established, and over three years there will be the provision of one million free tree seedlings to individual land-holders and land-care groups where appropriate farm plans are developed. The Department of Forestry will co-ordinate this commendable project through the ministerial land care task force and the interdepartmental liaison committee so that relevant Government agencies can assist.

I turn now to public education. Queensland high schools, both public and private, have an award-winning forest education package in their libraries. It is a three-volume teacher resource kit called ForEd, produced by the Department of Forestry, the Department of Education and the Queensland timber industry. In its quest for better understanding of the dynamics and purpose of good forest management, the department is making every effort to ensure widespread use of this valuable teaching resource.

In a similar vein and not forgetting primary schoolchildren, the department has recently produced a set of easy-to-follow information sheets called *Forest Facts*. They are very simple, are in a small folder, and are available throughout the schools. I have no doubt that they would be made available to honourable members if they wished to avail themselves of them. The *Forest Facts* series, although designed for primary schoolchildren, is also popular with the general public. It is regularly supplemented with new material as the occasion warrants, and a new greenhouse-effect issue is in preparation.

The department has always been characterised by a deep concern for community acceptance and understanding of the forces and issues that affect modern forest management. The Queensland Government as a whole is also concerned that the members of the public understand and have access to information concerning our environment.

Some time ago the Minister's predecessor and the Minister for Education approached me and asked me whether I would chair a committee of representatives of their departments and the present Minister's Department of Environment, Conservation and Forestry to ensure that there was an ongoing and close working relationship with officers from those departments. We have been successful. We have met several times and have come up with a set of guide-lines. As the Minister would be aware, with the co-operation of those departments we have embarked on a trial area in the education region of the near north coast.

At this point in time, the Education Department, with the assistance of the other departments, is compiling a little booklet to be distributed to teachers throughout the region so that they will be aware of the facilities available to them, from the other departments within the region, as to points of contact and personnel available to help out in the schools. It is hoped that, further down the line, there will be co-operation and the departments have indicated that there will be co-operation as to input to curriculums for children. I am pleased to report that the committee did work well and co-operated well. We have some positive runs on the board.

The brochure that is being developed will be available shortly. It will outline what is available and will promote a very close working relationship in the region on a

personal basis between the people from the departments. This happened before to a limited degree—I stress “limited degree”—and we will see how it will work on a broader scale in that pilot region and whether it is acceptable to the rest of the State. I pay tribute to the members of that committee and repeat that the brochure should be available shortly.

I have spoken to the Minister for Primary Industries because Primary Industry officers and offices can be seen within this area as well—and I refer to officers as in personnel and offices as in buildings established in representative areas to be included in the brochure. The Minister has agreed to forward material to the Education Department so that it can be incorporated and made available to schools so that the people in the schools will have a ready contact.

I again compliment the Minister on the image that he brings to tourism and the departments that he has just taken over. I pay tribute to the former Minister and the Department of Conservation, Environment and Forestry. The Minister has visited my area several times and I know that he has had a very close working relationship with his committee and also with the people in his department.

I am pleased to have been able to take part in this debate on these Estimates.

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (8.35 p.m.): The Minister’s responsibilities in this State are of great importance. They include two of the areas that are crucial to the future of this State. The first is tourism, which is the big growth industry in Queensland and the one upon which our prosperity into the next century will be largely dependent, and the second is the environment, which is the one upon which the quality of life that this State offers to its citizens and children is dependent and which will also be decided not just in the next few years but well into the future. The Minister has crucial decisions to make and his departments will be those which, perhaps more than any others, set the standards and the background for this State for the next generation.

Tourism is the most important industry in this State and it would be remiss of anyone speaking in a debate on that subject not to raise the matter of the current airline dispute which is crippling our tourist industry, particularly in northern areas. Let everyone clearly understand that this is not a strike; it is a lock-out, because the pilots have said quite clearly that they would have the planes flying tomorrow if they were allowed to negotiate. But that does not suit the interests of the Prime Minister; nor does it suit the interests of his big business mates or the ACTU. When the triumvirate which runs this country today—big government, big business and big unions—does not like you, it proceeds to kick you to death, as it has kicked to death the pilots and the pilots union in the current lock-out.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: It is not a union.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable gentleman is saying that it is not a union. This is the excuse that he and his socialist mates use to justify those fine old Labor principles of bringing in the troops to act as strike-breakers, of importing scabs from overseas to fly the aeroplanes, and of locking out workers who want to work. There is only one reason why this dispute is being allowed by the Prime Minister and his mate Sir Peter to persist. It suits the business interests of Abeles and his mates over airline deregulation. It has not a lot to do with pilots asking for wage rises. The contracts that Sir Peter Abeles is currently offering to the pilots who fly the 707 freighters offer an 80 per cent pay rise over the current rate paid to the pilots.

Why is it that the only workers who have been stood down without pay are the airline hostesses and flight attendants? All the other mates of the ACTU are sitting back feather-bedded by the Australian tax-payer. They are paid by Bob Hawke and Mr Kelty from the pockets of Australians to sit down and cop it sweet while Bob organises things so that Sir Peter and his mates have an inside run when airline deregulation comes in next year. It is not a strike; it is a lock-out. For the political interests of the ALP and for the business interests of Bob Hawke’s mates, the Labor Party in this State is prepared

to sacrifice the northern tourist industry. Where have Wayne Goss and his mates been during this dispute? Deaf, dumb and blind! Not a word!

Mr Burreket: They are also stupid.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member said that they are also stupid. I disagree with him. By saying nothing about this dispute, they are not being stupid. There is nothing that they can say.

What will Mr Goss do? Will he tell the people of Queensland that he supports strike-breaking with troops and the importation of scab labour? Will he tell the people of Queensland that he supports the idea of paying off the ACTU with tax-payers' funds? Will he tell the people of Queensland that he will sit idly by while his friends in Canberra destroy the tourist industry in north Queensland?

Perhaps Mr Goss might go one step further and tell us why the Federal Government deliberately blocked a Queensland Government proposal to bring two DC-8 aircraft into this country to run tourists to north Queensland? If the Federal Government was interested in ensuring that tourists moved in this country and airline services were restored, why did it block attempts by the Government of this State to put two DC-8 airliners in the air shuttling tourists to north Queensland destinations? Perhaps Mr Goss would like to talk about that? But there is a stunned silence from the Opposition Labor benches on the matter. We can rely on one thing: as long as the airline dispute continues, Mr Goss will continue to say nothing—not one word in defence of the Queensland tourist industry.

Mr Borbidge: There were a few phone calls made when they heard we had the DC-8s.

Mr GYGAR: I have no doubt there were. It was probably Mr Goss panicking and trying to find an excuse that he could plausibly use. What excuse did he use? The excuse of silence. Not a word did Mr Goss say about Canberra's plans, Canberra's intent or Canberra's action in blocking off the tourist resorts of north Queensland from the tourists who wanted to get there.

It is a good, cosy, old union deal. I invite Mr Gibbs, as one of the bastions of the Socialist Left, to tell me whether he supports the use of scab labour to break strikes. Does he support the use of troops to take over the operations of workers? I hope that he will say that he does, because it will open whole new vistas for conservative Governments to react to industrial disputes in future years—and don't they know it! That is why the union movement in Canberra is deserting the Labor Party over its inaction on the resolution of the current airline dispute.

While the Labor Party sits on its hands, the tourist industry in Queensland is receiving an enormous set-back that will take it years to recover from; and not a word from the ALP. It simply has no solutions to the problem, just as it has no solution to the other problems that face this State. This bunch of no-hopers, union hacks and passed-over academics who have never held a decent job in their lives now seek to impose their strictured ideological viewpoint on the people of Queensland.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Where were you for five months, out of your electorate?

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member asked me where I was last year. I am happy to tell him, as I have told the people of Stafford and the people of Queensland, and as was published in many newspapers. I went overseas to the London School of Economics. I would have thought that a member of the Socialist Left would have been delighted that a conservative member of Parliament went to the London School of Economics on a scholarship from the British Government and——

Mr R. J. Gibbs: What an absolute disgrace!

Mr GYGAR: Wait for it, Mr Gibbs. I was on a scholarship from the British Government under its future leaders' scheme.

A Government member interjected.

Mr GYGAR: As the honourable member interjected, unlike Opposition Labor members, I have never been to Russia on a scholarship provided by that Government. Obviously, Mr Gibbs is upset that the streets of Moscow were not as attractive to him as the streets of London would have been if only he had received a similar scholarship. Regrettably, he is ineligible for post-graduate scholarships and for admission to the London School of Economics, just like most of his colleagues are.

However, I turn to tourism. Once again, despite invitations, Opposition Labor members have said not a word about tourism. In the development of the tourist industry in Queensland, we must remember that the domestic market is, and will remain, the most important sector. Eighty per cent of the tourist bed-nights sold in Queensland are sold to people from the southern States of Australia and to intrastate tourists. In the management of tourism, there is always a great danger of being bedazzled by the multimillion-dollar five-star bring them in from overseas type resorts. However, they are not the bread and butter of our industry. I do not say that they are not important; they are crucially important. Those sorts of developments and attractions act as focal points for tourist industries. We have seen that on the Gold Coast, in the Whitsundays and at Cairns. These five-star international resorts are essential. However, the bread and butter will continue to come from mum, dad and the kids from the western suburbs of Sydney and Melbourne. As long as our domestic market does not receive from the Government the priority that it should, a grave risk is being taken in relation to the future development of tourism in this State.

One brief example will suffice to demonstrate that point. We hear a lot about airports but we do not hear much about roads. Yet I understand from the Mackay tourist board, for example, that it believes that more than 80 per cent of the tourists who pass through the Mackay area are road-travellers. The Government simply must recognise the importance of infrastructural development to the continued progress of our tourist industry.

Tourists, whether they are travelling in their own private cars, in hire vehicles—which are becoming increasingly popular—or by coach, simply will not travel on bad roads. The road network of this State is a crucial element in our tourist mix and must receive a higher priority. Perhaps the road north of Sarina, which is nothing short of appalling, would be the best example of our bad roads. Not only the Queensland Government but also the Federal Government should be examining the state of our roads.

Recently I had occasion to drive some overseas visitors along that stretch of road and they simply would not believe that the signs at the side of the road saying “This is a national highway” were not some sort of an Australian joke. The few hundred kilometres of Highway 1 north of Sarina are a national disgrace. That is a failure even more of the Federal Government than of the Queensland Government. However, the Queensland Government must recognise that if there are failings by the socialists in Canberra—and lord knows there are many of them—it might have to take up the slack occasionally, and roadworks is one area in which it will have to do so.

I want to draw the attention of the Minister to another problem. I have received complaints from one resort that its on-line reservations system keeps falling over because the quality of the power supply in the local area is not reliable. The number of cycles fall out, the voltage drops and the whole computer system closes down. One simply cannot run a resort if the reservations computer keeps falling over because of inadequate power supplies. That is another basic infrastructural problem that should be taken care of by the Government.

As I wish to speak about conservation, I must deal quickly with the QTTC which, regrettably, is becoming part of the problem and not part of the solution. Sir Frank Moore has outlived his usefulness. His extravagant political involvement and his close identification with this National Party Government has left him in a position in which

when he talks to people they do not know whether he is speaking for the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation or for the Government of Queensland.

Sir Frank has made extravagant political statements and has been involved in activities—partisan political activities—to the extent that his credibility is now such that he cannot be used by this Government as an apolitical leader of a Government department, which is virtually what the QTTC is.

Mr Hobbs: That is unreasonable.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member says that that is unreasonable. I merely refer him to Sir Frank Moore's statements about the Mackay river mouth project, which has at last been acknowledged by the Government as having fallen over and being no longer operative. The statements that Sir Frank Moore made were blatantly deceptive. When members of this Parliament asked questions about the viability of that project, Sir Frank's statements and responses were, frankly, partisan political.

I do not mind the Government engaging people who have political backgrounds. That should be done; it must be done. Frankly, the high-fliers in business will almost inevitably have had some involvement in politics, because politics is where the action is. However, people have to realise that once they accept positions with the Government, their partisan political roles must end. Regrettably, Sir Francis has not been able to see that distinction and, therefore, he must pay the price, because the credibility of the QTTC is now starting to suffer.

I turn to conservation and the environment. I urge the Government to greater heights in this area because, frankly, there has been too much neglect of the environment and of conservation issues in this State. The Government should be attracted towards those issues not simply because environment and conservation are the flavour of the month but because the future of this State depends crucially upon them.

We have had the development mentality, and thank heavens we have, because it has put Queensland in the forefront of economic development. However, there comes a time when the Government has to start considering the social consequences of this growth and the cost that this growth extracts from our environment. Now is the time to step back and take a look at what is happening and what ought to happen in the future.

The Liberal Party totally rejects the notion that environmental concerns are incompatible with growth, progress and continued development. Australia's future economic well-being and Queensland's continued future critically depend upon sustainable development of our natural resources to maintain our quality of life and standard of living. This recognition demands policies that aim to preserve for future generations. The preservation of the natural beauty of our lands, landscapes, flora and fauna and the need for extensive consultation, planning and a balanced approach to all activities that impact on the environment are paramount.

Conservation is not about building fences around things and keeping people out. It is about management of the human use of our planet so that it yields the greatest sustainable benefit to the present generation while maintaining its potential to meet the needs and aspirations of future generations.

Developers do not consider "conservation" to be a dirty word. Conservation is an essential element in all adequate, properly planned developmental projects and must be acknowledged as such.

Mr Hayward: You never said that when the World Heritage debate was on.

Mr GYGAR: If the honourable member wants to talk about World Heritage listing, I would be happy to do so. Would he like to tell the Committee the Queensland Labor Party's policy on Fraser Island? I have read its platform, which is the one that it really wants to adopt; I have read its policy, which is the one that it wants people to read; and I have read its local candidate's statement in the newspaper, which is the one that

it hopes people will look at just before they vote. So the Labor Party has three policies on Fraser Island, depending on who the audience is and what it is seeking to achieve at the time. The honourable member wants to talk about World Heritage. Let him rise next and tell us about World Heritage and Fraser Island, because nobody on Fraser Island or in other parts of Queensland can figure out what Opposition members are on about. They keep shuffling policies to suit the audience of the moment.

Rural land management and rural land degradation is a crucial issue for the future of this State and one which must be tackled head on by the Government. It is the issue of the next generation. Unless we manage our lands better in the next 50 years than we have in the last 50 years, this country is headed for total, unmitigated disaster.

We need to come to grips with the problem of pollution, and there really is only one solution—to legislate for a pollution control commission to take charge of all of the effluents and discharges in this State. We have to change our whole attitude towards the way in which we deal with wastes discharged by our society, be they chemicals, sewage or local garbage.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member wants to talk about garbage. Perhaps he can stand up again and tell us why members of the Labor Party came out 100 per cent in support of the radioactive waste dump and then a few days later stood on their heads and did a backflip. What is the Labor Party's policy on radioactive waste dumps this week? We have heard two already; let us try for a hat trick.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: We have been consistent.

Mr GYGAR: As the honourable member says, the Labor Party has been consistent. It was consistent on the first day when it said that it supported a radioactive-waste dump; then it was consistent during the second week when it said that it was opposed to it. The trouble is: which sort of consistency are we to believe?

Like everything else, the Labor Party's policy on conservation and the environment are a farrago of mixed stories for mixed audiences. I urge all Queenslanders to read the platform of the Australian Labor Party to find out how it will destroy rural lands by reintroducing the soldier settlers scheme and to look behind the nonsense of this environmental ombudsman.

Talk about feel-good, back-scratching politics. Why not come to grips with pollution by instituting a pollution control commission and giving it the powers and authority that are needed to do such things as making sure that sewage waste is properly managed and that the urban waste-stream is recycled and redirected for the sake of future generations?

On the environment alone one could speak for hours, but I direct the Minister's attention to the two major thrusts that he faces: firstly, the industrial development and progress of this State in tourism; and, secondly, the social welfare and quality of life that depend totally upon the environment that we leave to our children.

Time expired.

Mr HOBBS (Warrego) (8.57 p.m.): It is certainly my pleasure to rise in this debate and to support the Honourable the Minister, Rob Borbidge, in the presentation of his Tourism Estimates. Earlier tonight, I was very interested to hear the rubbish from the member for Lytton. He referred to the need to promote the west and that type of thing.

Mr Borbidge: He is about 18 months behind the times.

Mr HOBBS: He is. As a matter of fact, I was going to mention that members of the Labor Party usually conduct a triennial visit to the west. They make a pilgrimage to the west every three years and usually get lost. I suppose that we can excuse the honourable member for Lytton for the mistake that he made today.

Members of the Labor Party knock the west all the time. In the last few days they have certainly been knocking drought relief. Fuel taxes are affecting the west and hurting everyone in rural communities. Members of the Opposition refer continually to electoral representation. A great deal of support cannot be derived from what Mr Burns said earlier. He would find it difficult to travel out west by train because he would get off the rails very quickly.

The Government is promoting the west. The member for Lytton said that the Government could promote a track out to the west. The Commonwealth Government imposes a fuel tax of 25c on every litre of fuel that is purchased by the motorist. However, only 5c is returned for road-funding. Perhaps Mr Burns was right when he referred to a track to the west. The Minister and the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation have done a great deal of work in the promotion of the Matilda Highway, which begins at Charleville and extends right up to the gulf. It was opened on 14 September. It will be a great attraction and prove to be a great asset to all the western areas.

Tourist activity is on the move in the west. The increase in tourist activity has been achieved without the help of the Federal Labor Government in any manner or form.

Mr Davis: You told me the other day it was the Labor Government in Canberra that was helping them out.

Mr HOBBS: I am not sure about that. The member for Brisbane Central must have heard a rumour. The honourable member and I have had a serious discussion about the open spaces.

In the town of Charleville in the last two years, tourism has increased by 200 per cent. That reflects the great work of the National Party Government's free-enterprise philosophy.

Mr Hayward: I don't believe this.

Mr HOBBS: It is about time that the honourable member learnt something.

Mr Hayward: Are you going to explain to us what the National Party free-enterprise philosophy is?

Mr HOBBS: I am pleased that the honourable member has come into the Chamber to learn these facts. For a long time Government members have been trying to educate Opposition members. Eventually we will be able to convince them.

The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation is of great importance to the tourism industry. The honourable member for Stafford criticised Sir Frank Moore. Contrary to what the honourable member said, the Queensland Government pays a tribute to Sir Frank Moore for the work that he has put into the tourist industry throughout Queensland. A very important group is the Outback Queensland Tourism Association, which operates from Blackall and covers a large area. It has been very positive in the promotion of tourism in the west. Local tourist community groups in western towns are very active. Most importantly of all, they have a local member who is very keen and very interested in tourism and will promote it for ever and a day.

Mr Davis: There is a good Labor candidate out there.

Mr HOBBS: I do not think that what the honourable member says is correct. I point out to him that I, not the Labor candidate, will be elected. There is no doubt about that.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr HOBBS: We will see what happens in that area. Many new projects are being undertaken. The wool scour at Blackall is the only steam-powered wool scour in the eastern States.

Mr Elliott: It will make a tremendous tourist attraction.

Mr HOBBS: That is quite correct; it will.

The Government has been working very hard to put that project together. As well, it is working on the Cobb and Co. factory in Charleville and is using a replica coach in the promotion of that project.

Mr Davis: I am doing a tour out that way in a couple of weeks' time.

Mr HOBBS: I would love the honourable member for Brisbane Central to visit my electorate. I will show him around and he can have a look at those places that are often spoken about.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: I am just reading the history of Charleville and I have discovered that my great, great grandfather built the Catholic school out there.

Mr HOBBS: That is very commendable. I would like to take the honourable member there and show him that school.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Do you feel it may cleanse my soul?

Mr HOBBS: I believe that it would. As well, I would love to feel part of that process. As a matter of fact, it would be rather amazing.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You may want to lay on the hands.

Mr HOBBS: I do not think so.

The Government is doing a lot of promotion throughout the Charleville area and is undertaking promotion programs for local associations.

I turn now to Fraser Island and World Heritage matters. As most honourable members would be aware, Fraser Island is on the Australian Conservation Foundation's hit-list for World Heritage listing, together with the channel country, Cape York, the Simpson Desert, the Lamington national park, the Conondale Ranges and the Riversleigh fossil area. Mr John Sinclair has been lobbying for inclusion of Fraser Island on the World Heritage List and the banning of logging on Fraser Island. Senator Richardson, who is the numbers man in Canberra and who is often known as the toe-cutter, has said that Fraser Island will not be listed. But can he be believed? Perhaps not. I believe that he will do anything for votes and to get more control over Queensland land.

Perhaps there is a ray of hope or a crack in the Labor armour. In the *Maryborough-Hervey Bay Chronicle* of 19 September 1989, Mr Bob Dollin, the ALP candidate for Maryborough, was quoted as saying that there is no need for the banning of timber-harvesting on the island. He said—

“I know in my heart of hearts that the logging is doing no damage. Why should we throw away a couple of hundred jobs in Maryborough connected with the timber industry when we are actually helping the island by controlled logging?”

That fellow might know a little bit about the local area.

Extreme conservationists have a lock-it-up mentality. The Queensland Government favours the balanced development of our national assets. As usual, the Queensland Liberals have no policy. Angus Innes is reported in the *Maryborough-Hervey Bay Chronicle* as visiting Fraser Island on 19 September to formulate his party's policy for the island. On the other hand, Senator Puplick, the Federal Liberal spokesman on the environment, is attempting to woo John Sinclair by discussing with him the proposed inclusion of Fraser Island on the World Heritage List in Australia. It is obvious that the Liberal Party is having two bob each way. Perhaps that barbed wire is making a few deep marks on the Liberal Leader.

The 900 000 hectares of north Queensland rainforests that are listed on the World Heritage List are almost totally Queensland Crown land—mainly national parks, forestry

land and timber reserves. Since that area was listed in December 1988, Queensland Government agencies have continued to manage it with the expertise that has characterised management in the past. There is no need for Commonwealth interference; Queensland is quite capable of managing its own land.

The Commonwealth's involvement is another example of its desire to duplicate State responsibilities and is indicative of the arrogance of the Commonwealth Government which believes that all expertise resides in Canberra. However, Canberra is not behind the door in asking for Queensland's help when it wants to provide forestry-management expertise to overseas countries. Queensland Forestry Department officers have undertaken or are presently undertaking consultancy work in many countries including China, Thailand, the Philippines, Malaysia and Nepal.

The Queensland Government is now formalising a management plan for the north Queensland rainforest area which will be completed shortly. That plan, which was produced following a public consultation process that lasted for over six months, will be something of which all Queenslanders will be proud.

The Commonwealth Government is now in a state of panic over the Queensland Government's challenge to the validity of the regulations banning selective timber-harvesting in north Queensland rainforests. The Commonwealth Government is on the run.

Mr De Lacy: How would you know what rainforests look like?

Mr HOBBS: I have been to the rainforests in north Queensland. How would the honourable member know what the west of the State looks like?

Mr De Lacy: I am not talking about the west.

Mr Gygar: Don't talk about things you know nothing about and we will congratulate you on that.

Mr HOBBS: That is about all the honourable member needs.

The Commonwealth Government is trying every legal avenue to avoid having that case heard. On 22 September it made an application to a judge of the High Court to have the matter settled by the Full Bench of the High Court without any factual inquiry. The Commonwealth's application was thrown out by the single High Court judge. It is very interesting that that was not reported in the press and is yet another example of anti-Queensland bias. Had Queensland lost, there would have been headlines to that effect.

It is important to note that Queensland's forthcoming challenge will be fought on technical and scientific evidence, not on the validity of the Commonwealth's use of the external affairs powers. It will be interesting to see where that scientific expertise rests. I am confident that Queensland's scientists will outperform anything that the Commonwealth can produce.

Australia cannot afford to have more areas locked up through World Heritage listing. The Cape York space station will be endangered if the extreme conservationists get their way. One has only to look at tonight's television news to see what those people can do. The Queensland grazing industry will be in trouble if the channel country is listed.

Because of the policies of the Federal Government, Australia is facing economic ruin. Every available export dollar is needed. We do not want to live in the prettiest banana republic in the world. Balanced development is the key to Australia's future.

Our future can be assured by the implementation of sensible, middle-of-the-road policies, not policies of the loony extremists, and certainly not policies dictated by the Governments of foreign countries that are represented on the World Heritage Committee.

Mr De LACY (Cairns) (9.10 p.m.): Mr Temporary Chairman, it is nice to see you gracing that chair. You certainly do it with dignity.

I was very interested to hear the previous speaker, the member for Warrego, talking about loony extremists. Last week our attention was drawn to the front page of the *Gold Coast Bulletin*, which referred to the loonies being back in control in Queensland. Queensland has loony extremists, all right, but they do not belong to the conservation lobby or to the Labor Party; they are all on the Government side. The worst thing about it is that they happen to be running the Government.

It is my pleasure to speak in this debate on the Tourism and Environment portfolios. Because it is relevant to both tourism and conservation, I particularly want to speak about Cape York Peninsula. Honourable members will know that last night's *Four Corners* program on the ABC has generated a great deal of interest and talk throughout Queensland. If one message came through crystal clear in that program it was the immense tourism potential of Cape York Peninsula and the way in which that potential can be threatened, and is being threatened, by the kind of development-at-any-cost mentality, which regrettably still prevails in the National Party and which was articulated once again by the member for Warrego in his most recent speech.

The *Four Corners* program articulated the concept of a wilderness. It seems impossible for members of the National Party to comprehend that wilderness concept. It would take a quantum leap in understanding for them to comprehend what a wilderness was about. The viewpoint that is still current in the National Party is: if it is there, it must be developed. Last night Mr Glasson said—and he has said it a hundred times before—that if people are not given concessions to go into the remote areas, they will not go there; they will not develop them. What needs to be understood is that every square kilometre of land in Queensland does not need to be developed. If the land simply remains in its pristine state—its original state—it will be an asset for all Queenslanders and it will remain so for future Queensland. Bulldozers do not have to be sent in. Resorts and buildings do not have to be developed and built. Development does not have to be carried out for the sake of development. That is an attitude that will do more in the long term to destroy the tourism industry in Queensland than the quick-quid mentality that prevails in the National Party.

The other factor that was highlighted in the program was the way in which leasehold land is being freeholded and then sold off to developers for enormous profits. It is my view—and that of the Labor Party—that if profits are to be made from the sale of Crown land, the Crown should then distribute those profits among all tax-payers. The sale of Crown land should not be used to benefit single individuals. It should be remembered that I am talking about Crown land, not freehold land. It belongs to the Government; in other words, it belongs to all the people. Therefore, it should benefit all the people. It should not benefit individuals.

This is a matter on which I have been crusading for some time. This is happening right throughout Queensland not only with grazing leases but also with special leases on industrial estates, and with perpetual leases. The quick-quid merchants have worked out ways of manipulating the system to their own ends. They have moved into Cape York and they are capitalising and exploiting. Last night's program made that crystal clear.

Mr Borbidge: The program was riddled with inaccuracies.

Mr De LACY: It is being called the Cape York land grab; it is being called the rape of the cape. Yes, there may have been some inaccuracies in the program. However, I accept its general thrust.

Unless a move is made to implement a management plan for Cape York instead of just opening it up for unbridled development, the last bit of extensive wilderness that exists in Queensland and, for that matter, virtually in Australia, will be lost.

There are now any number of examples of the freeholding of leasehold land. I refer to the Quaid example on Starcke station, where land was sold for something like \$10 a hectare. There was also the Richard Rand example at Silver Plains. Last night Mr Glasson said that Mr Rand does not want to freehold the land for a tourist resort; he is freeholding it to develop a cattle-grazing enterprise. What a joke! Cattle are not being

put on the land. The only part that Mr Rand wants to freehold is the coastal part comprising the river estuary and the sand dunes. Cattle are not running there. The leasehold conditions are not being met. Yet Mr Glasson could stand there, look the interviewer in the eye and say that the land is being freeholded so that it can be developed as a cattle property. What a joke! I do not think Mr Glasson really understands what he is saying; he is so far behind on these kinds of issues. Maybe he does not understand the mentality of these kinds of people.

What about Line Hill station on Princess Charlotte Bay? The land was freeholded in November 1986 for \$2,186 and sold in January 1987—within three months—for \$14m. Again, this person was presumably freeholding it for cattle-grazing purposes. What a joke! He was given freehold title for \$2,186. If it were not so disastrous for Queenslanders and for the tax-payers who have missed out on \$14m, it would be a joke. Unfortunately, although it may be a joke, nobody is laughing any more—except the owner of the place, who is laughing all the way to the bank. Aubrey Behn from Farndale proposed to establish a \$300m tourism development on that freehold land. The project may now be on the back burner because I understand that Farndale is in receivership.

Mr Jim Kennedy owns some leases on Cape York. I understand that he has made application to freehold some land. Another application has been made by a friend of the Premier who owns three leases at Walsh Bay, south of Cooktown. He owns 1 821 hectares on special lease No. 14/37018. This friend of the Premier has made an application to freehold portion 4 of the leasehold land that he currently owns. At this stage I do not want to mention any more details. The question I wish to address to the Minister for Land Management through the Minister for Tourism is whether or not this person is meeting the lease conditions.

Mr Gately: You should name the person.

Mr De LACY: By mentioning the number of the lease and stating where the land is situated, I think I have provided enough information.

Mr Gately: Name him so that the Minister can chase it up for you.

Mr De LACY: I will give the name to the Minister privately. The honourable member need not worry about that.

I challenge the Government to table the lease conditions in Parliament. I can bet honourable members now that the person involved is not meeting the terms of the lease conditions because not one of the property-holders has done so.

Mr Eaton: The Minister said during one debate that the country was no good.

Mr De LACY: That is right, but a week later it was sold for \$14m. It may not be good country, but some developers want it.

The other question I want to ask is whether the freehold will be subject to open tendering. If it is not, that indicates to me that the person involved is obviously looking for favours. If he has not met the lease conditions and if the land is not put up for open tender, how can the Government grant freehold status at concessional rates unless it is granting a favour? In relation to the question I have put, I am prepared to advise the Minister of the name of the person involved.

In conclusion, I mention what I believe the Labor Party would do to save Cape York. I inform the Committee that the Labor Party has a strategy to save Cape York from the rape and pillage that is being carried on by the white-shoe brigade and the quick-quit merchants. Three steps should be taken immediately. The first is that a land-use study should be carried out. I understand that one had been carried out by the State Government, but it will probably never see the light of day because such studies seldom do. A management plan should be adopted for Cape York taking into account all the conflicting land uses that exist.

The second step is that proposals for national parks should be processed quickly. Currently 13 proposals are before the Government. Two have been granted and some

have been in existence for as long as 15 years. The Labor Party would guarantee that significant environmental areas would be protected and, further, that land of great significance to Aboriginal people—the original land-holders—will also be protected. The third step that the Labor Party would take is to impose an immediate moratorium on the freeholding of leasehold land. That ought to be done immediately so that people cannot destroy the whole future of Cape York.

Mr Eaton: When we win Government, that is the first thing we will do.

Mr De LACY: When it attains office, that is the first thing that the Labor Party will do, as the shadow Minister for Land Management has said.

In conclusion I mention the rally that was held in Cairns on Sunday. Honourable members would no doubt be aware from reading newspapers and watching television that the rally was attended by approximately 8 000 people who arrived at the Cairns esplanade to protest against the proposed Trinity Point development. In anybody's language, that is a large protest. The people of Cairns have made a statement. They do not want the project. The Mayor of Cairns, Alderman Keith Goodwin, said that the people of Cairns did not want the project; that they do not want it, they did not ask for it, and they do not need it. More than 20 000 people signed a petition to oppose it. During a poll carried out by a local radio station approximately 80 per cent of the listeners who phoned in opposed the project. There is even the spectre of National Party members and candidates opposing it. In fact, there are more political somersaults being turned in the Cairns region on the Trinity Point development issue than are occurring within the Liberal Party on the Wolffdene dam issue.

Mr Eaton: That's bad.

Mr De LACY: Very bad. I now call on the Government to respect the voice of the people of Cairns. It should make a statement and it should can the project. I am not overstating the position when I say that the future of the National Party in north Queensland depends on the Government's making a definitive response. If the National Party is tardy in doing so, or if it responds in the wrong way, it will be relegated to the scrap-heap of history in north Queensland. It may well be anyway, but this is the National Party's only chance to save itself. I am not usually in the habit of giving advice to members of the National Party on how to save themselves. However, I feel so strongly on this issue that I give this matter first priority. I am calling on the Government to indicate that the project cannot go ahead so that the developer can be put out of his misery and the people of Cairns will get a bit of peace. Never again should projects that have enormous, dramatic environmental, social and economic consequences in an area be contemplated without consulting local people to ensure that the consequences that are likely to arise in relation to Trinity Point do not eventuate.

Mr VEIVERS (Southport) (9.24 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to speak in support of the Minister's Estimates.

Speakers from the benches on the other side of the Chamber have knocked everything. Mr Comben referred to the recycling of paper to help the environment. He terrified pensioners by saying that \$100 would be taken from them and that they would have to live on cat food. He made other horrendous statements. Mr Comben also said that the police in the north are like nuns; they travel around in pairs. He said that they are not doing their duty by catching people who are poaching owls, cockatoos and other wildlife at night.

Today Mr McPhie paid tribute to the former Minister. I also pay a tribute to Geoff Muntz, the honourable member for Whitsunday, who presided over the building of a proper Department of Environment and Conservation in Queensland. Mr Muntz took the challenge on board and, with the help of his departmental officers and the advice of scientists, set up an organisation of which Queenslanders can be very proud. The organisation needs a bit of rounding-off, but Queenslanders can still be proud of it. Other Australian States have expressed amazement at how quickly the department has

come together and how efficiently it runs. I also wish to pay a tribute to the wife of the former Minister, Jeanie Muntz, who supported him through thick and thin. I was proud to be the chairman of Mr Muntz' committee. His conscientiousness and application to his portfolio were exemplary at all times.

Mr McElligott: Why did you get rid of him?

Mr VEIVERS: That had nothing to do with me.

The new Minister, Rob Borbidge, is a man of decision and one who cares deeply for the environment and will certainly provide the strong and stable hand on the tiller that this sensitive and often controversial portfolio demands. At times he will have to make decisions that will not be popular with the radical and more vocal sections of the conservation movement. Those decisions will be made in the interests of all Queenslanders as well as in the interests of the environment. I pay a tribute to the man sitting in the lobby, Mr Stan Wilcox, who supports not only the environment, but also sport, surf life-saving movements and anything else that is good for Queensland.

Mr Burreket: He's a good man.

Mr VEIVERS: Yes, he is a really good man and I am sure that the honourable member knows him.

Mr McLean: Does he owe you a quid?

Mr VEIVERS: He would not bet on the Sydney Rugby League grand final, but it is illegal, anyway.

I wish to take this opportunity to make a few points concerning a very significant area of this State in my electorate with which I have a very close affinity, the Gold Coast Broadwater. This area is one that will continue to benefit from the State Environment Act 1988 which has gathered together the responsibility for pollution control in major areas such as the Broadwater. The legislation has enabled initiation of a program of environmental management so that economic growth can occur whilst natural resources are protected. On the Gold Coast the protection of the quality of our waters has been and always will be a top priority. The importance of the Broadwater to me and my electorate is immeasurable. It is a focal point of recreation, fishing and natural beauty. It is no accident that property with a view of the Broadwater commands premium prices. No-one can deny that the demand for access to the Broadwater for recreation and other uses has placed increasing pressure on this resource, and that activities which have the potential to affect the water quality must be planned and managed intelligently.

The Division of Environment plays a co-ordinating and management role which it has carried out efficiently and effectively. For instance, the Department of Environment and Conservation closely monitors the level of pollution of the waterway relating to the sewage effluent discharge into the Gold Coast Seaway. In its most recent report, the department has found that this discharge is having no significant impact on the Broadwater. People can even swim in it. Having regard to the impact of development and other activities, the report clearly states that the water quality in the Gold Coast Broadwater is generally good. This does not mean that we can sit back complacently and pat ourselves on the back for a job well done. A constant and careful watch must be continued. For instance, although the report has shown that there is little evidence that sewage pump-outs from boats cause problems, the question of extending the Clean Water Act to control these discharges is under review.

At the moment it concerns me that there appears to be a concerted campaign by certain political hopefuls on the Gold Coast to discredit the positive approach by the State Government and by its authorities in monitoring and controlling pollution in the Broadwater. For instance, recently one critic of the State Government was directly responsible for the spillage of raw sewage into the Nerang River near the Southport school. After lengthy assurances from this person that this would not happen again, it did happen again. This same would-be-if-he-could-be political hopeful from the Liberal

Party has the gall to criticise this State Government on environmental issues. Another idiot in my electorate was recently quoted as saying that he would not drink water from the Broadwater because it is polluted. What a dill!

Mr Vaughan: It's too salty.

Mr VEIVERS: It is salt water. This is amazing stuff coming from another Liberal hopeful. Perhaps one day someone will tell him that it is salt water.

I object to the fact that these people are using their present positions to make outrageous, unfounded statements for political expediency. The audacity and temerity of such people!

Today we heard the honourable member for Toowong sell out the Liberal people on the Gold Coast. He joined the members of the Opposition in condoning the abandonment of the Wolffdene dam scheme, which is the only future additional water supply for the Gold Coast. He sold out the Liberals. Recently the Hinze Dam was about five days from being dry. We were about five days from total chaos and that idiot Beanland joined with Angus Innes in abandoning the only future additional water supply for the Gold Coast. How disgusting!

I am personally fed up with their nonsense and so are all of the people in my electorate. Liberals are running in my electorate. If the people there support dills like them, they are welcome to them.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (9.31 p.m.): First of all I should like to comment on some of the remarks passed by the honourable member for Southport. It was interesting to hear him say that he is very concerned for his constituents because they may not have any water. He said they needed the Wolffdene dam. The interesting point is that he expects the people of Bundaberg—the people of Brisbane to pay for it.

Mr FitzGerald: Bundaberg?

Mr CAMPBELL: Well, we will be paying for it, too, and I will come to why I say that. It is the Brisbane and Area Water Board that is supposed to pay for the Wolffdene dam. The honourable member for Southport expects the residents of his electorate to get it for nothing. If they want it, they should pay for it; they should not expect the people of Brisbane to pay for it.

The Gold Coast expects everything for nothing. When mistakes are made there, the people of Queensland are expected to pay for them. The Gold Coast Seaway cost \$50m. It was constructed to allow millionaires to enter the Nerang River and moor their yachts. But who is paying for it? About \$7m is being paid every year by all tax-payers in Queensland. If the people on the Gold Coast want it, all right, they should pay for it; but, when it comes to dredging the Burnett River, will those people help to pay for it? No. They say, "Do it yourself." If the Government wants the user-pays system, it should apply it all the way. If the people on the Gold Coast want the seaway and want us to pay for it, they should pay for the dredging of the Burnett River.

When mistakes are made on the Gold Coast that result in the beaches being mucked up, the Queensland tax-payers have to pay. They will pay \$8m this year for sand replenishment. It is not the Gold Coast residents who are paying for it; it is the tax-payers throughout Queensland. As I said, if the user-pays principle is to be applied, it must be applied all the time. Two mistakes have been made on the Gold Coast and all Queenslanders are expected to pay.

Let me now deal with stamp duties. Why is it that the Government made an ex gratia payment in the form of a refund of part of the stamp duty payable by the Mirage Resorts Trust? Why was this supposedly large company helped in that way? Everybody should pay his fair share.

Mr Veivers: How much stamp duty does your electorate pay?

Mr CAMPBELL: The honourable member asks about stamp duty. I have answered him. All we are asking for is a fair go. Why was Iwasaki given special concessions? When he did not fulfil the conditions, the Government said, "We will forget about the whole agreement and tear it up. We have given you 10 years' start on everybody else and we will not worry about anything any more." The honourable member for Cairns referred to special leases. If the people involved are not fulfilling the special requirements, why does the Government allow them to retain the leases and why does it allow them to freehold the land and make all the profits? If the Government wants to be fair, it should be fair to everyone.

The honourable member for Lytton made a major point about tourism in the west. We in the Labor Party had a special policy for rural tourism in 1986, so Government members should not claim that we are trying to get on the bandwagon. There are too many cases, especially in tourism, when the costs are socialised and the gains are capitalised. It happens all the time. The Government allowed it with Iwasaki and the Gold Coast Seaway. It allowed it with the sand replenishment at the Gold Coast. It socialises all the costs and allows the profits to be capitalised. It also happened when the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation sold out its interest in the Mirage resort at Port Douglas. It sold its holding for \$2.70 a unit. Subsequently the holding was resold to the Japanese for \$9 a unit. The purchasers were able to buy cheaply and sell at a large profit. The profit did not come back to the people of Queensland. All the time, people are being subsidised through the costs being socialised, while the profits go to others. It has been happening with industrial estates all the time.

Mr Borbidge: The QTTC has made a very substantial profit.

Mr CAMPBELL: They had 5 million units at \$2, which were sold for \$2.70, and Mr Skase sold his 49 per cent to the Japanese for \$9.

I do not mind developers taking a fair profit. However, I am concerned with a proposed development at Theodolite Creek in the Bundaberg region. If that area is rezoned and becomes an integrated resort development, the infrastructure costs will be borne by the tax-payers as usual, and the developer will develop the area and sell out at a profit. The environment will suffer as a result of that development.

The Bundaberg region has tremendous potential for international and domestic tourism with Fraser Island, whale-watching and fishing in Hervey Bay and a proposed wilderness area—the Kinkuna national park—which will be a great asset to tourism. It also has the beaches of Bargara, the turtles and the Barrier Reef islands. It offers a marvellous package of facilities and activities for international tourists to visit and take advantage of.

I am concerned that, with integrated resort development, the Government will allow Hervey Bay to be wrecked. The tourism and wilderness resort development at Bundaberg proposes to change and move significantly the mouth of One Mile Creek. It is proposed to form a harbour by building groynes out into Hervey Bay. Those groynes will devastate the picturesque aspect of the bay.

Mr Gately: Who's going to do that?

Mr CAMPBELL: The developers for the wilderness resort at Bundaberg.

The developing company planned so poorly that it was told to redesign the groynes. Initially they were to face the south-east winds and the waves would have been hitting them straight on. The developers said that, because of the problem that will be caused by the groynes, sand replenishment would be required. If the sand is not replenished, it will not be washed south and Woodgate Beach may be wrecked. When projects are commenced, concern should be shown for other areas that could be affected.

Theodolite Creek could be changed drastically. The mouth of the creek is very fragile. If groynes are built and sand replenishment is required, in 10 years' time who will pay for the sand replenishment? We will have a similar problem to that which occurred at the Gold Coast. The tax-payers of Queensland will pay for it. No-one has

given an ironclad guarantee to pay for future sand replenishment. It is important to ensure that the people of Woodgate and the people near Theodolite Creek do not have to pay, instead of the developers who, on past history, will come in, obtain a rezoning and flog the project off overseas to a foreign investor.

Mr Borbidge: Are you debating the Estimates before the Committee?

Mr CAMPBELL: I am talking about the Estimates. In decades to come, the cost to the tax-payers will be massive.

When the development at Theodolite Creek is discussed by the Government, I warn the Minister to be careful. We will get only one chance.

Earlier, members spoke about the wilderness areas of Cape York. The Bundaberg region has much potential with its whale-watching, its beautiful coastline and its hinterland. If it is mucked up, we will not get another chance. The Minister should be very careful in this case. The development has problems with sewage, water supply and access roads. It is a fragile, low-lying area. Before any work is carried out, a full environmental impact study should be carried out, for which the developers should pay the full cost.

It is important that the Minister consider the matter seriously. We get only one chance to develop the region properly. For the sake of our children, I hope that we do not make a mistake.

Mr BURREKET (Townsville) (9.44 p.m.): The tourist industry in north Queensland is in an absolute mess. The effect of the pilots strike has been so disastrous that many small tourist operators are going broke and closing their doors. I condemn the Prime Minister of Australia, Mr Hawke, for his action in subsidising the domestic airlines, because all he has effectively done is to pay the airlines to have the planes sitting on the tarmac while thousands of tourist operators, particularly in north Queensland, are folding up. As well, it is inconvenient for the 30 000-odd people who travel every day with domestic airlines.

I remember that, some years ago, the Labor Party used to represent the workers and the little people of Australia. However, in the last few years in Canberra we have seen a dramatic change. No longer does the Australian Labor Party represent the people of Australia; it represents big business. The incident with the domestic airlines epitomises the change that we are seeing and it will spell the end of the ALP in the Federal scene—and there are not many State economies left that the ALP can bring down.

I also condemn the leader of the ALP in Queensland, who has been up in the north so many times recently big-noting himself and waffling on but saying nothing. He is aware of what is happening. People have spoken to him about what is happening in the tourist industry. What has he done? Nothing! He has done nothing to help those tourist operators. He goes up there and pontificates about what the Labor Party will do for Queensland. I am disgusted and ashamed of the Leader of the ALP in Queensland.

Mr Vaughan: What's your solution?

Mr McElligott: Tell us what you would do.

Mr BURREKET: My solution is simple, and it should have happened many weeks ago: let the pilots and the airlines negotiate with each other. So what if it hurts the Accord? So what if it hurts the damned unions? In the last 10 years in this country the union movement has done nothing.

Right now the tourist industry in north Queensland is bleeding to death. Sixty-four per cent of visitors to Cairns arrive by plane. Incidentally, that figure amazed me. Average occupancy for the last three weeks in Cairns has been 24 per cent. Quicksilver Cruises is operating at 27 per cent. Great Adventure Cruises—that is the old Hayles Cruises—is operating at 25 per cent and I believe that it laid off 80 people last weekend. Of 600 scheduled tour seats for the Tablelands, for the past three weeks custom

has averaged 57 seats per day. Of the 17 four-wheel-drive adventure tours to the cape and so on, average business is only six weeks for the entire year.

The Chamber of Commerce in Cairns has reported a 40 per cent decrease in retail trade. Real estate has hit a brick wall. Banks in general are not renegotiating overdraft facilities. The Cairns Port Authority has borrowed \$80m for its new airport extensions based on projections of a 40 per cent increase in international traffic and a 10 per cent increase in domestic traffic. For the first six months of this year, Cairns Airport usage was 4 per cent less than last year. It is currently losing \$58,000 per day.

Mr Casey interjected.

Mr BURREKET: The member for Mackay can laugh. This is what his Labor Government is doing to the people of Queensland, to the tourist industry and to the future of this country. He might think it is funny, but I can assure him that a lot of people do not.

The Sheraton Mirage was about to close its doors last week. If ever there was an example of how industry is being hurt and how it is bleeding to death, that is it. I repeat that the Sheraton Mirage was going to close its doors last week. However, a temporary reprieve came in the form of a Digital Corporation conference, which has put off the inevitable. There is no doubt that that business and many other businesses are going down the chute.

At a meeting in Cairns last week two operators from the Whitsundays stood up and tearfully explained that last year they were millionaires and now, because of this airline strike, they face bankruptcy. The air at the meeting was extremely tense. I understand that the QTTC general manager, Ken McGill, was visibly shaken by the reports to that meeting. The general feeling was that, in about four weeks' time, the doors would quite literally close on many tourist and retail operations in north Queensland.

Revenue is down 80 per cent for some of the cruise-operators, with no hope of recouping the funds. Various retailers in the major blocks such as the Park Royal have not made one sale for two weeks. Three shop-proprietors have simply walked away. This is in Cairns. The member for Cairns has spoken today in this Chamber. He does not even know that these things are happening in his own electorate.

Vehicle sales are down to virtually nil compared with more than 300 for the same period last year. All media houses reported an appalling position. Accounts are not being paid and no advertising is being booked. Coca Cola advertising has not reached anywhere near budget forecasts. It is predicted that real estate in that area will collapse before the end of November.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr BURREKET: The member for Brisbane Central asked about Townsville. So far the effect on Townsville is less significant because it has a very strong industrial and commercial base. The bookings of the Sheraton are down 10 per cent on last year to 63 per cent. The motels are operating at an occupancy rate of approximately 68, 70 or 75 per cent. As far as I can ascertain, retailing in Townsville is down by approximately 8 per cent. In fact, two new boat operations are starting up—Pure Pleasure Cruises' 2001 to the outer reef and Westmark's new cruise to Orpheus Island.

As you would be aware, Mr Temporary Chairman, Townsville is very fortunate because 35 per cent of its population comprises public servants and it has a large industrial/commercial base. Townsville is the centre of north Queensland. The policies of the ALP council over the years have ensured that very little tourist development occurs in Townsville.

Only 14 per cent of Townsville's visitors arrive by plane. It is well recognised that Townsville is a very strong motor vehicle service centre. I am surprised that more people are not continuing on to Cairns. However, we are very pleased that they do stop off in Townsville. Townsville is fortunate to have a very strong and diverse economy. I

understand that it was accepted at the meeting in Cairns that, so far, Townsville is doing fairly well, despite the tourist industry debacle.

The position in the Whitsundays is about the same as that in Cairns. I am amazed that people can still invest fortunes during a super high such as Cairns has been on for the last few years. People keep saying that Cairns has reached its peak. They say the same about the Whitsundays. However, the money that normally would have been going to places such as Townsville, for example, has been going to these other areas and the tourist industry has been growing very quickly. Unfortunately, it has all come to one shuddering halt as a result of the stupid decision made in Canberra to try to help Mr Abeles prepare for deregulation of the airline industry, which is what it is all about. It is not about the airline pilots; it is about what is going to happen to Australia soon. It is about deregulation and where Mr Abeles stands in regard to his aeroplanes.

The only part of the region known as Magnetic North to be affected has been Mission Beach, where the traditional holiday market, namely Townsvilleans, has been lured further north to places such as Cairns by the cheaper rates that are being offered. A 50 per cent reduction on normal tariffs has been offered to the people of Townsville to go to Cairns, and many people are taking advantage of that. I feel very sorry for Cairns. I think it will take many years before the tourist operators in that city recover. Worst of all, they will be unable to sell any goodwill; their businesses will no longer exist.

Reference has been made in the media to the fact that companies should be helping out the tourist operators and trying to support them. Today I received from Mr Geoff Orpin, one of my constituents, a letter that was passed to him by solicitors acting for Esanda. It states—

“You will by now be in receipt of our client’s Notices of Default and Notices of Exercise of Power of Sale. We confirm that our client”—

that is, Esanda—

“does not propose to extend to you any further credit or to consent to your sale of any of its security until all outstanding arrears are paid or satisfactory arrangements made for the payment out of the total debt.

If you are not in a position to pay all arrears then outstanding by 25 October, 1989, please ensure that you have vacated the premises by that time.”

That is a response by a financial institution to the plight of the people in the north and those affected by the down-turn in the tourist industry.

Today, Mr Orpin sent me a letter, which states—

“Due (to) a general down turn as a follow on from expo the pilot strike is the last straw. With virtually total loss of all school holiday bookings and now the withdrawal of the apex and discount fares I can look forward to and am already experiencing further cancellation of bookings, including Xmas and New Year.”

The next paragraph is very interesting. It states—

“Mercantile Credits had been prepared to assist until their takeover by Esanda. The attitude of Esanda is ‘stiff luck’ pay your interest or get out.”

Mr Casey: Aren’t they the ANZ Bank?

Mr BURREKET: I understand that they are.

The letter continues—

“We have had numerous meetings and phone calls with their Townsville office.”

This is very important. This poor man is seeing his whole life and all of his earnings disappear. He is finished. He is trying to plead with a finance company to help him. This is the support he receives from the finance company. Mr Orpin states—

“We have had numerous meetings and phone calls with their Townsville office. Their manager would give no indications, or commitments and referred all matters to Brisbane.

We asked Esanda to assist in interest payments or allow us time to sell off properties.”

Mr Vaughan: What sort of business is it?

Mr BURREKET: It is a business consisting of eight units on Magnetic Island.

Mr Davis: A motel?

Mr BURREKET: No, holiday units, which are booked for holiday lettings. They are located on the waterline on Magnetic Island.

Mr Orpin further states in his letter—

“Richard Ellis our valuers and also Esanda’s recommended that we place the properties on the market for sale in December, for sale in probably February.

Esanda have security over some \$1.9 million dollars worth of property, with a total mortgage of approx \$880,000, however as you can see by their solicitors letter their attitude is they don’t give a damn.”

So Esanda has security over tenure; it has the guy tied up. It has an equity of \$1.9m in assets. The letter continues—

“Esanda’s Townsville office pays lip service to their Brisbane Office. They don’t want to know about us.

I would appreciate any assistance you can give in this matter and gladly offer the use of this information in parliament if it can be of use to show the nature of companies like Esanda.”

I have passed a copy of that letter to the Minister. I do not know what we can do to help. I do not know whether the QIDC can help. However, I understand that the Minister will take the matter up.

I listened to the debate on the environment. I strongly support a properly balanced protection of the environment. I spent some time on the Gold Coast and I walked along all of the beaches looking for effects on the environment. Without doubt, there has been some bad planning by councils on the Gold Coast, but at least they have learned by their experience. The erosion that has occurred on the beaches is criminal. However, we cannot stop the forces of nature. By the same token, future planning on the Gold Coast and in other places along the Queensland coast indicates that parkland and roadways will be set a fair distance back from the beach so that the effects of erosion that are being experienced on the Gold Coast will not be repeated. Although the erosion that had occurred was unfortunate, I must say how exciting it was to see what in just a few years the Queensland Government has been able to do with the Gold Coast from just a number of sand dunes to the magnificent city that now exists. It is exciting. Nobody can knock that sort of progress.

Mr McElligott interjected.

Mr BURREKET: The honourable member is right. Mr McElligott, the member for Thuringowa, used to be the member for Townsville. He was a member of the Townsville City Council. He is one of those responsible for the most negative direction of development in north Queensland, which unfortunately affects my city of Townsville. The council has done nothing. It has been the most backward, repressive operator.

Mr McElligott: You just said Townsville was faring very, very well.

Mr BURREKET: I was referring to its industrial and commercial base. It has nothing to do with the Labor Party, although it takes all the credit. Members of the Labor Party say that they provided the mall and the civic theatre and that they brought the army to the area. In fact, in the 13 years that the Labor Party has been in Townsville, not one major industry has been established there. The army, the university, the teachers college, Queensland Nickel, the marine institute and all of the major industries in

Townsville were established before the Labor Party came to office. Since that time Townsville has gone backwards.

Mr Beard: Didn't they bring in full-time public relations officers, deputy mayors on full salaries and that sort of thing?

Mr BURREKET: Mr McElligott would know all about that because he instituted the position of a fully paid deputy mayor on the Townsville council—but I did not want to say too much about Mr McElligott.

I believe that the Queensland Government has learned a lot from the environmental mistakes of the past. I cannot but be cynical when I watch programs such as last night's *Four Corners* on the ABC. One would think that the whole of north Queensland is engulfed in massive tourist developments. That program showed big flags covering a little bit of north Queensland. It is a pity that some of the people who appeared on the program have not flown over that area.

The developments that have occurred in north Queensland are a mere speck in the total area that is available for development. I cannot help being a little bemused when I read about people who get uptight about the desecration of forests in north Queensland. One can fly for hours over north Queensland and see nothing but a carpet of millions of trees in pristine condition. One could go around with a tomahawk for a million years without knocking over all of the trees.

The ABC and the greenie movement are trying to create the impression that the trees are like the Gold Coast six-pack—knock one off and there are only five to go. It is a cynical exercise. North Queensland has millions of beautiful trees that we could never get rid of even if we wanted to. I am a little sad that so much misinformation is disseminated about the north. Unfortunately, people in cities such as Brisbane do not get an opportunity to see the real situation in north Queensland.

Mr PREST (Port Curtis) (10.04 p.m.): I am pleased to join in this debate on the Estimates. Firstly, I support Tom Burns' remarks about tourism attractions in central and western Queensland. I was very impressed when he spoke about the heritage centre that will be built in Barcaldine and opened in May 1991. Not only will that centre be a major attraction for the tourist industry in central Queensland but also it will contribute greatly to tourism overall.

The heritage centre committee comprises 27 people from all walks of life, including local authorities, interested people from Queensland's tourism and travel industries and people from all political parties. It is wonderful that the Federal Labor Government donated to that committee the Bicentenary Exhibition structure, which was one of the major attractions during our bicentennial year. Those people who were fortunate enough to see that exhibition, which was financially supported by BHP, when it visited a limited number of major centres not only in Queensland but throughout Australia made some very glowing comments about it. The structure will be set up in a permanent home as part of the Barcaldine heritage centre, and the State Government has made that land available. A mall from the heritage centre will supplement an existing attraction, namely, the Tree of Knowledge. As R. M. Williams said, that attraction will contribute greatly to the continued success of the Stockman's Hall of Fame in Longreach and will be another supporting tourist attraction that will attract more tourists to the central part of Queensland.

In the past, shearing was one of the major industries of towns in central Queensland. The central west was the heart of the golden fleece and people rode on the sheep's back. Because the numbers of people who visit those centres have dwindled, those towns need some assistance. Magnificent tourist attractions such as the heritage centre will create employment and job opportunities for those young people who still live in the central-western part of this great State.

My electorate has a major tourist attraction, namely, Heron Island. Because that island is situated right on the reef, it provides a real reef holiday. People from interstate

and overseas who wish to go snorkelling can do so right at their doorstep on Heron Island. Unlike other islands along the Queensland coast that could be accused of fraudulently advertising reef holidays, Heron Island imposes no added expenses. Some tourists say that when they go to the other holiday resorts it costs them almost an arm and a leg to travel out some 100 kilometres or more to the reef to go snorkelling and to enjoy the reef itself.

I am quite certain that Mr Borbidge realises that some of the holiday resorts are not built on the reef at all, although they are advertised as such. Heron Island, off the central coastal city of Gladstone, is a major island resort attraction that is enjoyed by people who want to go snorkelling and diving on the reef.

I want to talk about Gladstone, which has been spoken of as being chosen as the major centre—or a great centre—for industrial development and which has great potential. To a degree, that will be the case. No doubt, that development could help to alleviate unemployment and create job opportunities, and that is welcomed by the people of Gladstone. However, they do not want industrial development at any cost. They will accept industrial development provided the company, the State Government and local authorities ensure that proper pollution and environmental controls are built into the industries and that off-site monitoring is carried out. If that takes place, I am quite certain that the people of Gladstone will welcome industry to their city.

Unfortunately, in the past this Government's record on pollution and environmental controls has not been good. In fact, its record is terrible. As Minister for the Environment, Mr Muntz was the greatest disaster Queensland has had. The people of Gladstone look forward to the present Minister being more caring and considerate about environmental matters.

Mr Ahern came to Gladstone just one week before he was removed as Premier. In response to the welcoming address at a lunch given in his honour by the Gladstone City Council and the Gladstone Port Authority, Mr Ahern said it was pleasing that his Government knew that any industry not wanted by any other local authority was always welcome in Gladstone.

Mr Hinton: You don't want the industry in Gladstone. You don't want the pipeline. Mr Goss said he didn't want the pipeline.

Mr PREST: They were the words of the idiot from Broadsound. The honourable member comes from a tourist area but he does not have the ability to stand up in this Chamber today and make a 20-minute speech on the tourist potential of the great Capricorn Coast, an area that he represents. He does not have a clue, yet he foolishly interjects on someone who knows that area of Queensland like the back of his hand. I have not been eating with the pigs, as Mr Hinton has. In fact, after the election it will be found that Mr Hinton will be back with his pigs; I am quite certain that the pigs may have a little more pride and not eat with him.

Mr Casey: Is that why they call him the prodigal son?

Mr PREST: That is one of the reasons.

In his address, Mr Ahern said that he was pleased that Gladstone was one area that would always take industry when it was not welcome in any other local authority in the State. Let me assure this Government—in particular, the Premier, irrespective of whom it may be at the time—that we, the people of Gladstone, will not accept any industry unless a satisfactory environmental impact study has been completed to our satisfaction and we are assured that the industry is pollution free and will not harm the environment.

Gladstone and its residents have put up with pollution for far too long. That is because the National Party State Government has been in office for far too long. The legislation that it has introduced in relation to environmental control has been a toothless tiger.

I will now deal with some of the problems that Gladstone has had to tolerate over the past 35 years. Large quantities of coal began to be exported in the early 1950s. A newspaper article of 27 October 1988 headed "Coal dust problems" states—

"Gladstone City Council"—

through its wisdom now—

"will caution Barney Point coal facility operators about clouds of coal dust which have blown across Gladstone this week.

The dust clouds, whipped up by strong onshore winds, caused consternation among nearby residents and complaints were lodged with the city council."

It continues—

"... under council by-laws, the company was required to dampen its coal stacks with water to stop dust blowing across the city.

'The health surveyor will take it up with them about not having the coal stacks watered down,' ..."

The article then deals with the Air Pollution Control Division, which is a paper tiger in this State, and it states—

"Air Pollution Control Division regional engineer Mr Chris Wood said it would be difficult to prevent coal dust clouds during strong winds."

Mr Wood has been a resident of Gladstone for quite a number of years, and he is something like the wind—he changes from day to day—but he is never one to give any support to or make any representation for the complaints about pollution in the area. He said—

"If people find they are getting a high dose of coal dust we'll take complaints."

The article continues—

"An Oaka Lane resident yesterday said her house was covered in coal dust every time Gladstone had windy weather.

'You just get through with the housework, cleaning everything down and half an hour later it's covered with dust again,' ..."

The article states further—

"Ald Brown"—

who is the mayor—

"said he witnessed coal dust clouds blowing across the city ... and would complain to the company."

He said that he could see it clearly from the window of his city office. He also stated—

"If they have used twice as much coal, then they want to put on twice as much water."

In my opinion, that is quite a logical conclusion.

Residents living near Auckland Point said that they accepted the coal-dust problem as part of everyday life. Why should people have to put up with coal-dust and accept it as part of life? Surely the Government should instruct officers of the department to implement existing legislation to provide relief.

As I said earlier, coal-dust has been a problem in Gladstone for 35 years. Even after that period, the residents are still being promised anti-pollution systems that will be installed in coal stacks. Perhaps it has taken a number of years to reach the conclusion that water would alleviate some coal-dust problems, but is it asking too much to have the problems eradicated?

For the last 13 years people have been told that the Gladstone Power Station did not cause pollution problems. When the former Premier, Mike Ahern, announced prematurely that Comalco would buy the Gladstone Power Station, it was revealed that

the first task that Comalco would undertake, if and when the purchase was completed, was the improvement and upgrading of its pollution-control mechanisms. Throughout an extensive period, members of this Government and Ministers who were responsible for pollution control and the environment did not recognise problems associated with the power station; yet, when Comalco makes the purchase, it will have to undertake to upgrade the anti-pollution system as a condition of the sale.

Local people are deeply concerned about environmental issues associated with new industries and are interested in the conditions upon which approval to establish the plants is being given. Companies such as ICI, Minproc and Equity Energy proposed to set up plants in the Gladstone area. A report in the *Gladstone Observer* of 8 September reads as follows—

“Gladstone area environmentally concerned groups yesterday claimed ICI and Minproc had failed to convince local residents of the safety of chemical plants.

Concerned Citizens for Industrial Control and the Harbour Protection Committee based this claim on a survey released this week which showed that more than 60 per cent of Gladstone residents were concerned about the safety and environmental effects of the plants.

However, ICI and Minproc spokesmen yesterday reiterated the stringent safety requirements placed on chemical plant construction and operation.

The survey, by Queensland University post-graduate student Dr Phillip Guerney, showed most Gladstone residents welcomed chemical plants to the area but were concerned about safety and the environment.

About 140 people responded to the postal survey, about half the number who received questionnaires.

CCIC chairman . . . said the survey vindicated the CCIC's attempts to have air monitoring equipment installed at Yarwun, as many people were wary of the hazards of industry.

The survey shows that a lot of people are worried about the chemical plants which means that the massive media campaign by ICI and Minproc to convince people that they are safe and environmentally sound has failed.”

Let us remember that, prior to agreement being reached to build the plants, the committee met with both companies, ICI and Minproc. The companies agreed that they would provide portion of the funds required to install both on-plant and off-site monitoring to the satisfaction of fruit-growers in the Yarwun and Targinnie areas.

In his wisdom, the former Minister, Mr Muntz, informed the people who live in those areas that they should not honour the conditions that had been agreed between them and the company. However, his statement was made some months after the fruit-growers had withdrawn their objections to the plant. The objections were withdrawn because the people believed that the companies had agreed to provide monitoring equipment. After the time for appeal had elapsed, Mr Muntz visited the Yarwun area with Mrs McCauley. He informed the fruit-growers that he did not believe that the monitoring was necessary. Both companies were only too happy to accept the recommendations made by him.

As a result, I am quite certain that in future the fruit-growers of Yarwun and Targinnie will take no notice of any Minister of the National Party Government. I am certain that they will insist upon conditions agreed with the companies being fulfilled. I am sure that they will insist on monitoring at the plant and in nearby areas to ensure that damage caused by pollution will not destroy their industry. After all, Yarwun produces many papaws, which bring in a great deal of income for the district. Although ICI employs 80 people, the plant could severely damage the environment to the extent that 300 farmers may be put out of business. If that happened, it would be a tragedy for fruit-growers in this State and for the economy of the Yarwun district.

Mr NEWTON (Glass House) (10.24 p.m.): I have pleasure in joining in this debate this evening. My electorate covers the Imbil, Kenilworth and Beerburrum State forests and much of my speech will relate to forestry and the production of timber in my electorate.

Mr Burreket: And Bribie Island.

Mr NEWTON: The tourism industry is also being debated this evening and some lovely ladies who were involved in the Bribie Island festival a fortnight ago are present in the gallery. It is my pleasure to welcome them.

Mr Hinton: I thought they were all your daughters.

Mr NEWTON: No. These lovely ladies are here to listen to this debate.

Mr Burreket: Are all the girls on Bribie Island as beautiful as that?

Mr NEWTON: Yes, all the girls on Bribie Island are beautiful.

The Minister's portfolio covers Tourism, Environment, Conservation and Forestry. The budget of the Department of Forestry for 1989-90 reflects a new direction that is required by the Government following its adoption of the Savage report recommendations on program budgeting. Through dedication and diligence the department has assumed a leading role in implementing new directions in public administration. It has developed a corporate management style, simplified its regulatory procedures and developed a leaner and more efficient administrative structure. The department has also intensified its emphasis on financial performance and is moving towards commercial accounting methods. It is now costing expenditures on a program basis so that it is easier than ever before to see where the dollars are going. The department has also separated its funded activities into financial and non-financial categories and is establishing relative performance indicators. It is important to remember that commercially the department's activities are essential to Queensland's wood-processing industry.

Mr Vaughan: This is awful. It's straight out of the annual report.

Mr NEWTON: Yes, and I will come to that. A total of 15 000 people are employed in the industry, which has an annual turn-over of \$1.1 billion. I will put these figures into *Hansard* to show what the industry is achieving for the benefit of Queensland.

Mr Vaughan: Why don't you incorporate the annual report? It would be easier.

Mr NEWTON: Yes, I could do that.

Whilst Queensland's native forests continue to play an important role in the provision of forest products to meet domestic demand, conifer plantations are providing an increasing proportion for progressively increasing demand. This year saw the establishment of a \$78m medium-density fibreboard plant near Gympie, which brought the value of industry development based on the Tuan-Toolara exotic pine resource to about \$150m, with the import replacement value of processed-wood products being of the order of \$120m. Often members of the Opposition have stated that money raised through forestry activities is not reflected in industry establishment costs.

Today, forests are being clear-felled in my electorate and much timber production comes out of the Imbil State forest from the kauri pine forests that were established 57 years ago. These areas produce an enormous amount of timber per hectare. Areas in the Beerburrum State forest are also being clear-felled and are a credit to those who started the project 35 or 50 years ago. The CSR mill at Caboolture is gearing up to become the largest mill in Australia. This mill is totally supplied with timber from forests planted years before. In addition, a hardwood mill at Woodford processes hardwood grown in the region. This area has been thinned for many years and has a 20-year turn-round. A large amount of timber is coming out of the Bellthorpe region and other top forestry areas. This proves how timber management can succeed.

Although many people maintain that forests cannot be harvested, timber is a renewable product. In years to come new plantations will be established. Since the 1920s, 170 000 hectares of forest have been established which are now paying big dividends. A total of 170 million trees per year will be planted from forest nurseries. More people are becoming involved in the industry and overused land can be rehabilitated by utilising reforestation.

The total value of the plantation resource is now calculated to be in excess of \$900m, which is something to be proud of. A large number of very dedicated people have put a great deal of work into the forestry industry. I have been involved with Tom Ryan, the Conservator of Forests, and I appreciate his efforts in matters concerning my electorate. I also pay tribute to the involvement in my electorate of the former Minister, Mr Muntz, and the present Minister. The timber industry will prove to the people of Queensland and Australia that it is looking ahead and preparing for the future. As a result of the large amount of timber being produced in the area, everyone will have a job, there will be increased sales and the production of timber for the construction of homes in Queensland will be improved.

Hon. R. E. BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise—Minister for Tourism and Minister for Environment, Conservation and Forestry) (10.30 p.m.): I thank all honourable members for their largely positive contributions to the debate this afternoon and this evening. It is not my intention to waste the time of the Committee by making a lengthy and detailed reply. However, some matters require clarification.

May I say that, while some members made very positive contributions to the debate, others did not. Clearly, some are seeking to politicise the environmental issues for their own ends. It is very easy for people to sit back and make broad and sweeping motherhood statements and to jump onto the trendy environmental issues, but the considerations of a Government must be broad and wide and must serve a growing and prosperous community as well as the needs of sound environment care and conservation.

The community is beginning to see this kind of emotional rhetoric for what it is and to realise that the key is sound and balanced decision-making. Once again, let me stress that the keys to sound environment care are balanced decision-making and the education of the community at large. The key is not to jump on certain trendy and emotional issues, ignoring the real issues that face us as a community. That is transparent political nonsense and it is exactly the type of nonsense that we expect and have heard from some members, although not all, during this debate.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: I will exclude the honourable member. I was referring to the rather inane contributions of the honourable member for Woodridge and some others. I shall deal later with some of the points raised by my honourable friend opposite.

I urge some members of the Opposition to stop trying to make political points on the environment and to look at the hard scientific facts before buying into an essentially complex argument that requires more than emotional rhetoric and high ideals that do not stand up to scrutiny.

It is on the precept of balanced decision-making and on the education of the community that my department has put the highest priority. We must face the fact that the worst polluters are people and the greatest danger to our planet is humanity. However, to suggest the wholesale abandonment of many of the good things that our advanced society has given us, in the name of environmental care, is both idiotic and impractical, and it is ultimately undesirable.

Can we afford to give away the advances of medicine and sanitation because they do not dovetail with the aspirations of some of the more lunatic fringe conservation groups? I think not and, should we do so, we would be failing in our duty.

Long before environmental issues suddenly became the flavour of the month, this Government moved to set up and consolidate the Department of Environment and

Conservation. We began the process to put in place sensible planning to protect and conserve Queensland's environment. I pay particular tribute to the efforts of my predecessor the honourable member for Whitsunday, Geoff Muntz, who was the first Minister for the new portfolio of Environment and Conservation.

We have moved to streamline the department's operations to have in place not some sort of quasi police force, as is suggested from time to time by our political opponents, but a department that goes out and, through advice and forward planning, stops the pollution and the environmental disasters before they occur. It is a department that, through education and planning, helps the community to help itself in caring for the environment. Certainly, in recent months, we have acted to find polluters. Our rangers are vigilant in their work to ensure that regulations to safeguard national parks are policed, but we believe that the way to go is not to discipline after the fact but to educate beforehand.

The honourable member for Windsor made certain comments, based on the resignation of one disgruntled employee, that the morale within the Division of Conservation, Parks and Wildlife was at an all-time low. Let me assure honourable members that the restructuring that has occurred will produce a more efficient and workable organisation. We recognise the fact that there will be some grumbles, that it is a by-product of change in any organisation, but the end result will be far superior care for our environment. If the honourable member, or for that matter any honourable member, wishes to speak to the vast majority of the other 699 employees of the department in 75 centres round Queensland, perhaps he will put that whinge of one man into some perspective.

There are good and bad in any community and in business we believe that most people want to do the right thing environmentally. Already business is realising that if it takes the forefront in environmental care, dollars are to be made. We have also recognised that we cannot, as some would demand, build electric fences around beauty spots and lock them away. In the Recreation Areas Management Act we have moved to ensure that areas are not loved to death yet remain accessible for people to visit and enjoy. Early criticism of that Act recycled today by the honourable member for Windsor is a prime example of how certain vested interest groups will seize on semantics to twist words in their favour.

Again I say that the Recreation Areas Management Act will not—I repeat “not”—override conservation legislation. I am pleased to say now that most sensible sections of the conservation movement accept and appreciate the terms of the Act and that only those who do not want to listen still voice criticism.

The working model is Fraser Island. I repeat my comments earlier today: if anyone has any doubts, go and visit. This is an example to the world of how it should be done—balancing the needs of a community with the needs of environment and conservation to wind up with a result where everyone wins and the environment does not lose.

Again, the many management plans for areas such as Moreton Island and Moreton Bay, to name but two, are steps in the right direction to give us the clear guide-lines and perspective we need if we are to fulfil our obligations to the future. We will not be distracted by the trendy issues of the moment; we will not be involved in the emotional nonsense. At the same time, we accept our responsibilities to the community.

The one further point raised by the honourable member for Windsor which I could not allow to slide past was his comment about the cardinal principle of the National Parks and Wildlife Act. May I refer him to the department's estate register document which, out of courtesy, I have sent to his office. I refer him to page 3 where it reads—

“The Act states that the Cardinal Principle to be observed in the management of national parks shall be the permanent preservation, to the greatest possible extent of their natural condition.”

We must be aware that, on environmental issues, there is no quick-fix solution. If an individual, group or Government says that there are easy answers to matters such as

pollution, the greenhouse effect and balancing development and preservation, they can bet their bottom dollar that what they will get will be a simplistic, naive or simply misguided solution.

The signs and information tell us that the way through the environmental maze will require effort and co-operation from Government at all levels, industry, the media and the people of Queensland themselves. All of us must realise the responsibility, that we share our land with other creatures and that it is not the preserve of any one group. It belongs to us all to share and keep for future generations. It is our aim to pass on our State to the Queenslanders of the future as a prosperous, happy and healthy place to live and raise a family, and a place with all the beauties nature has provided preserved and the delicate balance of a fragile ecosystem in place.

It was pleasing to hear the contribution of the member for Wolston acknowledging the spectacular growth in Queensland's tourism industry. However, he criticised some of the very fundamentals that contributed to that growth over the past decade.

The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation is the largest packager of holidays in this country. I assure the Committee that if that were not the case, there would be hundreds of small operators in Queensland who would have no co-ordinated marketing outlet for their products, because the simple fact of the matter is that no organisation in this country, including the airlines, is prepared to pick up a diverse range of products to the extent that the QTTC does and then go out and market them across Australia and throughout the world.

In respect of his concerns at the resources available to Tony Luxton at the Tokyo office of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, I can assure the honourable member for Wolston that we are boosting staff resources and have employed a prominent PR firm respected by all members of the travel trade in Japan.

I also note the honourable member for Wolston's comments, which were a recital of his leader's criticism of the QTTC's deployment of expenditure relative to international and domestic promotion. To ensure that Queensland maintains the largest percentage growth in visitation, the QTTC will devote 68 per cent of its promotional funds to domestic marketing relative to 32 per cent of funds allocated to international promotion. Such proportions have always been part of the QTTC's marketing position.

Several members made comment on the airline dispute. It is a simple fact of life that international arrivals into Australia have now dropped by 30 per cent. One hundred and fifty conventions have been cancelled. We know that our industry is haemorrhaging. Also, I express grave concern at the immoral continuing subsidisation of the two airlines to deliberately extend the dispute at the expense of the Australian community, in particular the tourism industry and the small businesses that make up the industry that is Australia's greatest export earner. To do that, as the Federal Government has done, is a blinkered attempt to preserve its sacred Accord. I ask the question: what will the preservation of the Accord cost the country, the tourism industry and small business on the road to bankruptcy? That is the Labor Party's attitude towards the tourist industry; that is the future that it is plotting for the one great growth industry that Australia has.

I ask the question: is this the ideal future for our economy? Is this the ideal Government for our nation? Is this in fact the ideal party that aspires to the Treasury benches in Queensland? Is this the future that this party holds for the kids of this State? The handling of the pilots dispute by the Federal Government has been totally inept at best.

The member for Mackay expressed the view that protection against soil erosion is this State's greatest environmental need. He also quite rightly pointed out the important role of trees in the prevention of soil erosion. In responding to that point, I draw the attention of the Committee to the ongoing work of the Department of Forestry in that area.

Although that department is more widely known for its activities in our State forests, it also plays a major role in the collection and dissemination of information to

assist land-holders in the selection and care of trees in land rehabilitation situations. Through funding initiatives of the Government as far back as 1984, the Department of Forestry has been able to pioneer the establishment of an internationally recognised computer-based tree advisory service called TREDAT. That project complements the department's other long-standing programs of support and encouragement for tree-planting as a means of land rehabilitation and protection. Over the years, the Department of Forestry has planted more than 170 000 000 trees in its State forests.

I put it to you, Mr Chairman, that rather than waiting for hand-outs from a Canberra Government, this State has been actively pursuing a program of tree replacement and land rehabilitation for many years. The Government has a deep commitment to sustainable land-management practices and encourages the growing enthusiasm of Queensland land-holders for improvement of their land-management practices.

The growing appreciation of the role of trees in balanced land-use planning is significant. The Government, through its land-care strategy and with support from a number of departments, is promoting greater attention to good land-use planning, and to land rehabilitation where appropriate.

In that respect the Department of Forestry is extending its support to the land-care strategy on several fronts. Additional extension officers are being appointed to extend the tree planting advisory service to land-holders. The TREDAT project is being extended and enhanced to provide a better advisory service to land-holders. The databank is being made more user-friendly and more easily accessible to land-holders. At the same time, nursery production is being increased to assist in the supply of suitable seedlings for rural plantings.

I stress that those very worthwhile initiatives of the Department of Forestry are not being undertaken in response to the recent upsurge in public concern about environmental matters, but are part of the ongoing and long-standing efforts of the department to service the interests of the State.

The member for Mourilyan raised the question of the sale of sandalwood from Queensland Crown lands. During the past decade, sandalwood prices on the world market have progressively increased to the stage at which that wood is more than 20 times as valuable as the next highest valued wood product of our forests. That has led both to increased competition for resources and to increased unauthorised removals.

To regularise sandalwood operations, public propositions were called for the operation of resources from Queensland's Crown lands. Of the proposals received, one was more favourable than the others, and that highest bid was accepted.

During the first year of operation, the rate of removals was less than proposed, in part owing to a prolonged wet season in many areas. As mentioned by the honourable member for Mourilyan, policing of sandalwood operations is a difficult task. It is clear that unauthorised operations are a continuing problem. However, I assure the honourable member that legal actions are in train and that close supervision of operations will continue.

Mention was also made of the indebtedness of the Department of Forestry. Although it is true that some \$400m has been spent on the development of Queensland's forest resources, the department's softwood plantations alone were valued at more than \$900m on 1 July this year. The resource has an even greater value to the State when the benefits accruing from its large, dependent wood-processing industries are taken into consideration. In addition to providing substantial employment opportunities at regional centres throughout the State, these industries produce export and import replacement products worth in excess of \$300m each year, and I suggest that that is not a bad investment.

The Department of Forestry in Queensland has achieved a worldwide reputation for efficiency and technical innovation in the management of its softwood plantations. It is also leading the way in this State in the adoption of commercially oriented management procedures. Having contributed to the development of these plantations, the State is now in a position to reap the rewards in the form of regional industry

development and employment. At the same time, the plantations are poised to contribute positively to the State's revenue flows. I am confident that these valuable assets are being managed on a sound commercial basis, and I commend the Department of Forestry for its efforts in this area on behalf of the people of this State.

Several members touched upon the question of Cape York land matters and the Cape York spaceport. I mention in particular the member for Cairns, who tonight demonstrated beyond all doubt that he is a raving Left Wing extremist. I might say that I was extremely disappointed at the systematic way in which misinformation was peddled about Cape York on Monday night's *Four Corners* program. In any case, although many of the accusations made do not enter into my area of responsibility, I feel that I must draw the attention of the Parliament to some important facts which were overlooked or deliberately deleted from the *Four Corners* program.

Although the program actually portrayed the beauties of much of Cape York and its unique and rare flora and fauna, it did so in a manner which suggests that the Departments of Environment, Conservation and Forestry were ignoring their responsibilities and were delinquent in their efforts to achieve national park status for areas of significant conservation value.

The fact of the matter is that 12.2 per cent of Cape York—almost 2 million hectares—is already declared as national park. When one considers that world conservation authorities recommend that 5 per cent of lands be set aside for conservation in national parks and that the Queensland Government has already set aside more than double that amount, one can see quite clearly how seriously this Government has taken and continues to take its responsibilities in protecting this unique and beautiful wilderness area.

Any member of the public can call at my department to collect a map which shows the gazetted national parks in Cape York at the present time. I express disappointment that the *Four Corners* team decided not so to do. This would have corrected the program's sloppy presentation, which did not make it clear that 1 898 587 hectares of Cape York is in fact national park. There were other technical inaccuracies about national park proposals and gazettals, as well as dubious references to flora and fauna, which ignored the fact that all native species in Queensland are totally protected.

The program also aired the tired and somewhat discredited views of the honourable member for Sherwood, who gave credence to vicious rumours that there is some clandestine proposal to log hoop pine in the McIlwraith Range area. For the benefit of the honourable member for Sherwood, I will repeat the answer given on my behalf to a parliamentary question on Thursday, 28 September. The answer was—

“(a) An approach was recently made to the Department of Forestry to allow logging of timber on the McIlwraith Range.

This approach was rejected by the Department of Forestry on both conservation and economic grounds.

- (b) Yes. There has been no logging.
- (c) Logging has never been considered.
- (d) Yes. Hoop pine seed was last gathered from this area in 1982.
- (e) Further collection of hoop pine seed is being considered for 1990.
- (f) Any benefits which would accrue to the Government would have to follow the assessment of all factors relating to the cost of logging.
- (g) A national park proposal was considered over an area to the north of the hoop pine timber stand.”

Finally, I can only agree with Don Henry's plea during the program in which he called for sensible, balanced development of the cape and ended with the cry, “Cape York needs a plan.” The program omitted to state that this is what the Queensland Government is doing right now through the agency of the Premier's Department—the senior department of Government in this State.

In regard to the reference by the member for Stafford to the importance of roads to the tourist industry—I advise the Parliament that the QTTC has in fact completed a priority tourism road study which identifies key tourist road networks within the State and has prioritised the development of those networks.

As a result of the rapid growth in the tourist industry there is an increasing pressure on roads from tourist traffic, which accounts for in excess of 80 per cent of the State's tourism visitation. As the industry grows, not only in this State but also across the nation, there is an overwhelming need for a substantial increase in Federal road-funding. The tourist industry highlights the inadequacies of Federal road-funding and in particular the paltry percentage of the Federal fuel levy that is allocated to road-funding in this country. The State Government, however, is dedicated to ensuring the development of the tourism road networks within the State to improve the facilitation of tourist traffic around the State and, in particular, those more remote areas that are fast becoming an essential part of our tourism product.

I commend all honourable members for what I believe was largely a very valuable contribution to the debate. I will comment briefly on the contribution of the honourable member for Townsville, who I believe showed incredible sensitivity to the plight of the tourist industry, not only in his own electorate but also in Cairns. I believe that it was a reflection on the standard of parliamentary representation in this place when the National Party member for Townsville had to rise in his place and tell the Parliament about the plight of the tourist industry and the workers in that industry in the electorate of the honourable member for Cairns, who seemed pre-occupied with other matters.

In this time of crisis for the tourism industry, I assure the Committee that the Government will continue to do what it can. Today, initiatives were announced in respect of the deferment of certain State Government taxes and charges. That matter will be kept under review, despite the difficulties being thrown in the Government's path by certain vested interests to inhibit the Government's search worldwide to obtain suitable aircraft and aircrew to service the tourist industry in this State and those resorts and areas in this State that are haemorrhaging very badly because of a dispute to which they were not a party, in which they had no say and for which they are now facing bankruptcy and economic annihilation. This Government stands firmly committed to the tourism industry in this State in a way unmatched by any other Government in Australia.

The Queensland Government will certainly be keeping open its options to try to locate suitable aircraft for charter work in the State of Queensland and to provide other assistance that may be deemed appropriate during the pilots dispute.

At 10.54 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Under the provisions of the Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 26 September, I shall now put the questions for the Vote under consideration and the balance remaining unvoted for Conservation, Recreation and Culture, Department of Environment and Conservation, Agriculture, Forestry and Water Resources, Department of Forestry, Economic Services, Department of Environment and Conservation (Consolidated Revenue and Trust and Special Funds).

The questions for the following Votes were put, and agreed to—

\$

Office of the Minister for Tourism and Minister for Environment, Conservation and Forestry (Consolidated Revenue)	622,000
Conservation, Recreation and Culture, Department of Environment and Conservation (Consolidated Revenue Fund and Trust and Special Funds)	52,052,000
Agriculture, Forestry and Water Resources, Department of Forestry (Consolidated Revenue and Trust and Special Funds)	149,519,000

Economic Services, Department of Environment and Conservation
(Consolidated Revenue) 20,704,000

Progress reported.

SURVEYORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Land Management) (10.59 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Surveyors Act 1977-1987 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Harper, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Land Management) (11 p.m.): I move—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

The principal Act, since its introduction in 1977, has established Queensland as a leader in surveying legislation. It introduced the concept of professional self-regulation almost a decade before it received wider recognition in the community. The Act has been the bench-mark from which much of the recent major changes in surveying practice have been developed.

Mr Speaker, I seek leave to table my second-reading speech and ask that the remainder of it be incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

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

The Surveying Profession in Queensland has embraced the underlying philosophies of the Act and fully supports the deregulation of the technical areas of surveying and welcomes the self regulatory environment created for the conduct of Surveyors and the practice of Surveying.

The Act has enabled the Registered Surveyor to exercise his professional discretion in dealing with many matters which formerly, were rigidly controlled by Regulation.

However with the passage of time the need for some further fine-tuning of the legislation has been identified. This will provide increased flexibility for both the profession and the community it serves. Changes are now proposed to ensure that persons registered under the Act have the appropriate skills and experience to more effectively provide consulting services to the public.

There is also a need to provide an additional mechanism which will enable the Surveyors Board to discipline Registered persons against whom minor complaints are made. There are occasions when the existing disciplinary procedures are seen as unnecessarily involved and expensive.

The Bill has three main objectives:

- (1) To make it compulsory for Registered Surveyors who provide consulting services to the public for a fee to be formally endorsed as Consulting Surveyors in the Register of the Surveyors Board.
- (2) To include the words “Licensed Surveyor” and “Consulting Surveyor” in a section dealing with Regulations for courses of study, conditions of service and examinations, where they were previously omitted in error.
- (3) To provide the Queensland Surveyors Board with a mechanism for disciplining Surveyors for misconduct of a minor nature committed under this Act.

In 1983 the Principal Act was amended to provide a category for the endorsement of surveyors who provide a service to the public for a fee. The term Consulting Surveyor was

introduced. The amendment also provided a means by which a surveying firm, operating as a Body Corporate, could be endorsed as a Consulting Surveyor.

However, the 1983 amendment did not require Surveyors, who were consulting to the public, to have their registration so endorsed. While the majority of consulting surveyors have sought endorsement on the register, there are some who have not.

The Board believes that it is in the public interest to further amend the Act to require Surveyors, who intend to practise as consultants, to have their registration so endorsed. This will ensure that only those persons, who can demonstrate that they have sufficient experience, business knowledge and technical qualification, are permitted to offer a consulting service to the public.

It is a matter of record that the majority of complaints against Surveyors relate to their business acumen rather than their technical competence.

The proposed amendments relate only to those surveyors who are registered under this Act, and will not effect the right to practice of any unregistered surveyors who are specifically excluded from the provisions of the Act.

The Bill also provides that, where a Registered Body Corporate is providing services to the public, then the Directors of the Body Corporate who are Registered Surveyors should also be endorsed as Consulting surveyors. This will ensure that the persons responsible for the management of the firm have the appropriate skills and experience.

A provision to allow the Board to make regulations regarding these matters is also provided in the Bill.

The second matter deals with an omission in the principal Act which failed to include the terms "Licensed Surveyor" and "Consulting Surveyor" in that section of the Act dealing with Registration criteria which empowers the Board to make regulations prescribing:

- courses of study
- professional practice
- conditions of service
- training and examinations

The Bill proposes to add "Licensed Surveyor" and "Consulting Surveyor" to the existing terms "Surveyor", "Surveying Graduate" and "Surveying Associate".

The third matter seeks to introduce more flexibility into the principal Act in dealing with Surveyors Disciplinary matters. Under existing legislation, the Board has few options when dealing with a complaint concerning the conduct of Registered Persons. It may either:—

- cause a charge to be drawn against a registered person for referral to a Surveyors Disciplinary Committee for hearing and determination as provided for in the Principal Act

or

- attempt to mediate when complaints arise from inexperience or misunderstanding

or

- elect to take no action in the matter.

For any charge to be heard it is necessary for the Governor in Council to appoint, on recommendation of the Minister, a Disciplinary Committee consisting of a Judge of the District Court and two suitably qualified Surveyors. The Committee has wide-ranging powers which include the power to suspend or cancel a surveyor's endorsement or Registration and impose a maximum fine of \$2000.

The cost to all parties of appointing a Disciplinary Committee and hearing a charge can be considerable, particularly if the charge is defended and legal counsel is engaged. Where the charge relates to an alleged offence of a relatively minor nature the Board is of the view that to initiate proceedings before a Committee is unwarranted.

The public policy objective is to provide a means to resolve complaints which are seen as fair and involve less overall expense. It aims to improve both equity and efficiency by increasing the range of options available to the Board in dealing with alleged breaches of conduct against Registered Persons.

The proposed legislation which is modelled on Sections 22, 22A and 22B of the Veterinary Surgeons Act 1936-1986 proposes to widen the Board's disciplinary powers by providing it with an additional option to proceeding with a charge for hearing before a Committee. It allows the Board to make its own determinations on alleged minor offences.

The proposed legislation will:

- Give the Board the discretionary power to decide on the severity of the alleged misconduct.
- Provide an option for the person charged under this section to elect to be heard by a Disciplinary Committee. This second feature of the Bill is important as it preserves the right of the person charged to be heard by a Disciplinary Committee if he so desires.

In determining a matter under this section the Board may:—

- (a) order such offender to pay a penalty not exceeding 10 penalty units (\$600)
- (b) admonish or reprimand him,
- (c) adjourn the matter for a period not exceeding 12 months.
- (d) make a determination as to costs.

The proposal is consistent with other Policy objectives of Government in that:—

- it seeks to arrive at less expensive methods of resolving issues raised by complaints and is consistent with the stated efficiency objectives of the Regulatory Reform Act 1986.
- in accepting the existing model provided by the Veterinary Surgeons Act is consistent with procedures of another registration board.

The net benefits of the proposal are:—

- flexibility and reduced costs in resolving some forms of complaint.
- a more conciliatory approach in dealing with some complaints leading to a greater likelihood of establishing truth and learning from mistakes.
- members of the public aggrieved by the conduct of registered persons will have some complaints dealt with more expeditiously.
- increased perception of fairness in dealing summarily with matters acknowledged as unsatisfactory but which do not warrant severe disciplinary measures.

The proposals contained in this Bill have received wide circulation within the various professional sectors of the Surveying and Mapping Industry.

The Institution of Surveyors Australia, Queensland Division and the Association of Consulting Surveyors, Queensland have expressed their full support.

The Institution of Engineering and Mining Surveyors has been fully briefed on the effect of the legislation. As the majority of their members are not Registered Surveyors that have offered no opposition to the Bill.

Mr HARPER: I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Eaton, adjourned.

IPSWICH TRADES HALL (VALIDATION) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 6 September (see p. 452).

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (11.01 p.m.): The Opposition supports the Bill, which is a machinery measure to remove any doubt about proclamations made in respect of a land swap between Ipswich Trades Hall and Kern Corporation for the development of a shopping complex in Ipswich.

Hon. W. D. LICKISS (Moggill) (11.01 p.m.): The Liberal Party supports the Bill, which is merely validating legislation. The principles of the original Act have not been varied in any way. The purpose of the Bill is to create legal certainty. As I said, the Liberal Party supports the Bill.

Motion agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 4, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL**Second Reading**

Debate resumed from 6 September (see p. 453).

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (11.03 p.m.): The Opposition has no objection to this Bill but it has a couple of queries, one of which has already been mentioned to the Minister, namely, the word "sire".

When a person is starting up a stud he is often looking for dams for breeding purposes, particularly in the beef industry. One cannot build up a good stud simply by buying good sires; good dams are also necessary. The Minister has assured me that the word "sire" is taken for granted to refer to stud purposes.

As to the restructuring of the advisory committee on stud holdings—although the Bill provides for a fixed term of three years for members there is no mention of the fees or expenses that may be incurred from time to time.

The Opposition has no problems with the conditions of lease of existing stud holdings that provide for specified numbers of sires to be sold each year. I understand that stud holdings are governed by circumstances, particularly in drought years when buyers are unable financially to purchase breeding stock, which could create problems for sellers. The Bill really just changes the wording.

Because I know a little about the breeding of cattle and sheep, I go along with the proposed amendments. Some years ago the former Minister said that long-term leases had outlived their usefulness. I notice that stud leases have a term of 70-odd years, which I draw to the Minister's attention. I have always argued that long-term secure leases are necessary. I note that the terms of leases for stud purposes have been increased since the former Minister abolished perpetual leasing. The Opposition supports the Bill.

Hon. W. D. LICKISS (Moggill) (11.06 p.m.): The Liberal Party supports the provisions of the Bill and notes that the committee will advise the Minister on such matters as may arise from time to time or on such matters as the Minister may direct and on which he requires advice.

The Liberal Party notes the means by which casual vacancies may be filled on the committee and that the term of office of members of the committee will be three years.

The previous speaker outlined the uncertainty of sale during various climatic and market conditions. The Liberal Party believes that the reasoning put forward is satisfactory and, in general, it supports the provisions of the Bill.

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Land Management) (11.07 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions. As to the advisory committee—to the best of my recollection, I cannot recall any advisory committee members who have been paid a fee for their attendance at meetings. I thank honourable members for their support of this legislation.

Motion agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 5, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

PARTNERSHIP (LIMITED LIABILITY) ACT AMENDMENT BILL**Second Reading**

Debate resumed from 7 September (see p. 579).

Mr WELLS (Murrumba) (11.10 p.m.): The Opposition has some hesitation about this Bill. The ground of that hesitation is the fear of a possibility that the legislation might be used for tax minimisation purposes. Honourable members will be aware that partnerships of themselves provide a more convenient vehicle for tax minimisation than do corporations. For example, in the circumstances in which a particular enterprise makes a loss, partners can take immediate benefit from tax losses because it is very easy to say that each of the partners lost such and such an amount of the total loss which was incurred by the partnership.

In the case of companies, however, they must hold losses and it takes a much more Byzantine and complex procedure in order to wring from a company a situation in which tax can be minimised. As partnerships operate as such a convenient vehicle for tax minimisation, they cause the Opposition not necessarily concern in the face of a Bill like this but give it reason to consider whether or not there is any possibility of tax minimisation occurring.

In the context of this Bill, the Opposition is seriously concerned. The reason for that relates basically to the proposed amendment of section 6. Firstly, that proposed amendment removes the requirement that partners must be shown in the register. Secondly, it takes away the provision that a corporate person must be "constituted or registered in Australia". As a result, the Bill no longer contains a requirement that the organisation or the partnership should be registered in Australia.

The consequences of this are not immediately negative as far as tax is concerned, because it is still a requirement that all residents of Australia, or people who are deemed to be earning income in Australia, must pay tax on their income. However, if a partnership entered into an arrangement under the Foreign Tax Credit Agreement, it would be possible for the partnership to lodge its tax return in a country other than Australia. If that partnership then chose to issue its capital from a tax haven such as the Cook Islands, the Bahamas or the Channel Islands, very little tax would in fact be payable.

It would be in these circumstances that the Opposition would have serious concern about the Bill. I raise this matter at the second-reading stage in order to give the Minister notice of that concern. During the Committee stage of the debate I will raise the matter further with the Minister.

The Opposition has this hesitancy about the Bill. I rise at this stage merely to acquaint the Minister with that concern.

Mr HOBBS (Warrego) (11.14 p.m.): I have much pleasure in supporting the Partnership (Limited Liability) Act Amendment Bill. Since the Act commenced on 15 May 1989, some 15 limited liability partnerships have been registered. The types of businesses carried on under the partnerships registered so far are diverse and include gold and nickel mining, thoroughbred horse breeding, aquaculture, a tissue-culture laboratory, a vineyard and a tourist resort.

At this stage, the largest number of limited partners in any one business is 320. Other partnerships have 80, 66 and 43 limited partners respectively. The total liability of the limited partners in all partnerships registered so far is \$24.85m.

The legislation has been welcomed in commercial circles, and these amendments to the Act should make limited liability partnerships even more attractive as a vehicle to induce the injection of venture capital and, of course, they will benefit small business particularly.

In an article published in the Queensland Law Society journal in August this year, Mr Keith Fletcher, reader in law at the University of Queensland and the author of a textbook on the law of partnership, said that if certain problems could be overcome in the legislation, Queensland could claim to have provided a simple and secure statutory basis for an old-established concept. The problems he referred to will be overcome by these amendments.

The limited liability partnership concept is being viewed with renewed interest by other States. I understand that the Queensland Act will serve as a model for legislation which is being considered by the New South Wales Government. According to an article published in the *Australian Financial Review* on 8 August 1989, the Federal Government is also sympathetic to recommendations of the venture-capital industry working party to replace the management and investment companies scheme with a limited partnership system.

I support the Bill.

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (11.16 p.m.): The Liberal Party will support the amendments that are before the Parliament because they are important. They accord with professional opinion and seek to solve some of the problems involved with making the Partnership (Limited Liability) Act work. Those honourable members who do their own thinking and who have followed the progress of this matter would be aware that there is a great need in the world to obtain easier, more convenient ways of doing business that involve less red tape. The ramifications of modern corporate law are very great. They provide a disincentive to use some of the structures to mobilise capital.

The Partnership (Limited Liability) Act provides a modest extent of control to the State so that it can provide commercial business people who wish to conduct their affairs in Queensland with a more convenient avenue by which to mobilise capital than would otherwise be the case. The legislation provides great benefit.

On earlier occasions in this Parliament I have mentioned places such as the Grand Cayman Islands and other small territories. They are not merely tax havens but are places where the best brains are hired to examine commercial and maritime insurance law. They are smart places at which to do business where people can conveniently take advantage of the best, most sophisticated and most modern types of commercial legislation.

There are not many fields left in which the State can obtain the edge in providing incentive or commercial attraction to persuade people to commence a business in Queensland. By the time the Government runs the gauntlet of all the obsessions of the Labor Party—

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You've always got to be nasty.

Mr INNES: It is because I understand that objections are raised. The first Opposition speaker in this debate said that this legislation is about tax evasion. The Labor Party reduces everything to its lowest common denominator, but that is not appropriate in this case.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: I can sense a certain frustration coming into your performance in this House.

Mr INNES: The member for Wolston has been a member of this Assembly for some time. He would appreciate that hearing the same nonsense as is usually carried on with spoken about during this debate leads to a modest amount of frustration. It is absolute nonsense to assume that commercial legislation introduced into the Parliament is brought forward at the behest of some evil shark who is trying to rip somebody off. If it had not been for the invention of the joint stock company and the limited liability company, the modern Western World would never have developed. There can be no question that the ability to assume limited liability and mobilise capital from a variety of sources without jeopardising personal property was the basis upon which the Western World made a quantum leap and was able to provide far more jobs than were destroyed.

Mr Wells: Why do you think they are taking out the requirement to be registered in Australia?

Mr INNES: Because there are people who wish to be involved in Queensland-based and Queensland-registered limited partnerships who are not necessarily resident in this country. Also, people who are resident in Queensland wish to be involved in joint ventures with companies that are not wholly registered in this State.

Mr Wells: It is no great problem to get registered.

Mr INNES: I know that this legislation originates from advice given by the better commercial lawyers who operate in this State. They, together with the Law Reform Commission, have wanted to make the vehicle work. The Partnership (Limited Liability) Act was introduced precisely to provide a simple and convenient way of mobilising capital. It did not work because of some of the complications and uncertainties associated with its provisions. The amendments presently before the Parliament remove those impediments and will make the legislation work in the way in which it was intended; not in the interests of ripping people off, but in the interests of providing a simple commercial vehicle.

In recent times lawyers in the United Kingdom have searched for new and simpler forms of commercial entities to get away from the host of prospectuses, enormous expense and complication of registration procedures for a whole variety of modern commercial transactions. Society benefits from legislation that provides simple and even novel vehicles for commercial activity. The principal Act has been on the statute-books for many years. It was not used because of some of its complications. The legislation presently before the Parliament seeks to remove some of the uncertainties and complications. It will allow the real and original intent of the Act to be carried out.

The Liberal Party has no reservations in supporting the amendments. They are long overdue and will hopefully give businesses a reason to establish a home base in this State.

Earlier, a member of the Labor Party commented on the small number of mining companies that have a registered home base in this State compared with the number registered in Western Australia. Frankly, it indicates a simple function of geography.

A great deal of mining activity is carried on in Western Australia but, because of its detachment from other parts of Australia, Western Australia has a particular and peculiar reason for being. One cannot simply hop in a plane and arrive in that State in a short time. It is a major undertaking to travel from Western Australia to other parts of the nation. There are also time zone considerations and midnight horror flights from Western Australia to the eastern States that have to be taken into account. In contrast, the eastern seaboard provides very quick and readily available communications between States such as Queensland and New South Wales.

Mr Casey: And Melbourne, where most of our Queensland companies are based.

Mr INNES: It was originally Melbourne. Many of Queensland's mining companies were located originally in Victoria because that was where the gold-fields were situated. Although those companies were originally registered in Victoria, perhaps in recent times

there has been a movement towards Sydney. Because the eastern States share a similar longitude, time zone, easy access to communications and flights, many companies were registered in Sydney where the main financial markets are located. That is where access to large amounts of capital can be found and that is where, as a matter of convenience, companies have tended to be established.

Queensland really needs to be in the business of attracting companies to this State. That is one of the reasons why the Liberal Party has proposed reduced taxation. It is important to maintain a competitive edge and provide businesses with a reason for establishing their bases here. Similarly, it is not simply a matter of doing business in this State; the Liberal Party would like the source and legal vehicle for doing business to be registered in this State. The Liberal Party supports anything which gives Queensland a competitive edge in the commercial market-place and a reason why the structure should be created and registered in Queensland.

The Liberal Party supports and welcomes this amendment and believes it can provide a real competitive edge to commercial activity in this State.

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (11.24 p.m.): I rise to speak briefly in this debate because I have been following the limited partnership legislation in this Parliament for a number of years. Twelve years or more ago I first raised the matter in the temporary chamber in the Parliamentary Annexe during the refurbishment of this building.

The provisions contained in this legislation have been taken from the old Mercantile Acts. In recent times there have been a number of amendments, but there is no question that the major users of this legislation are people who want to rot the taxation system. These amendments will give people further scope for their endeavours in that direction.

To most people the legislation seems fairly innocuous, but it is not the vehicle chosen by most people in business when they are trading. They use the normal companies legislation. A few moments ago the Leader of the Liberal Party, the honourable member for Sherwood, mentioned that the legislation has not been used and that therefore these amendments are required. This is totally incorrect. The legislation has been used for specific reasons by specific people. It has been used to form partnerships of local organisations, people and investors, but surprisingly—over the number of years that I have followed the legislation closely—the people who have used the legislation have mostly come from interstate. They have deliberately used this Queensland legislation as a vehicle for financial and investment purposes because of certain taxation concessions involved in some of their transactions. In addition, there are hidden coverages when it comes to liability should the companies go into liquidation or encounter problems with the venture which they have undertaken. The legislation has also been used as a vehicle by many overseas and international companies. These companies have all been set up and registered through the same accountant or group of accountancy firms. Someone in the know is setting up these companies.

There would not be too many honourable members in this House who would be aware that the redevelopment that is occurring at the old McWhirters building in the Valley is being financed by a limited partnership under this legislation. This was approved in the *Queensland Government Gazette* dated 8 May 1989 and, with only one exception—a Canadian—the investors are a group of people with Swiss bank addresses. When one looks through the names, one finds that there are other than Swiss people involved, and that the deal is organised through financial houses. For instance, Dr Mohammed M.R. Amin does not sound like a Swiss gentleman. He has a quarter of a million dollars invested in the reconstruction of the business premises at the Valley.

The most famous project which has caused the doubt and hesitation in the mind of the shadow Minister for Justice, the honourable member for Murrumba, concerns the limited partnership granted to the deal struck between the Bond Corporation and the Queensland Government to set up the re-establishment of the nickel plant at Yabulu north of Townsville through a body called Nickel Resources North Queensland Pty Ltd. The major partner happens to be that company and the special partner is the Queensland

Treasury Corporation, Executive Building, 100 George Street, Brisbane. The sum of \$38 was invested in this deal. This legislation was the vehicle used in that deal by this State Government in conjunction with the Bond Corporation. Everyone knows the propensity of Mr Alan Bond and certain of his companies to move off shore into tax havens. Mr Bond is well known for that. It is one of the reasons why he is in trouble with many of the financial institutions in Australia. I would like the Minister to give me a firm guarantee that this amendment will not suit the establishment of James Bond—I should say Alan Bond—and the Queensland Government in its corporate partnership.

Mr Harper: Like a James Bond mystery.

Mr CASEY: Yes, it sounds a little like a James Bond mystery.

It is a mystery why these amendments are coming forward so soon after other recent amendments to the legislation. This matter must be looked at closely and the Queensland Government must give an assurance that it is not involved in taxation rort legislation that will be beneficial only to the Bond Corporation as the major share-holder in the Yabulu nickel plant, and not to the Queensland Government or the people of Queensland.

Having followed this legislation for a number of years, my own firm conviction is that this legislation has been used as host legislation for what could be regarded as another piece of bottom-of-the-harbour legislation for the tax-dodgers of this nation. The people who are earning funds through this company ought to pay their taxes in this country.

Hon. I. T. HENDERSON (Mount Gravatt—Minister for Justice and Minister for Corrective Services) (11.30 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions. The honourable member for Murrumba raised a series of issues that I would prefer to leave aside for the moment and discuss at the Committee stage. In the meantime, I point out to him that solicitors who have sought this Bill have complained that there is no point in the current restriction on the participation of overseas companies. Overseas companies hold shares in Australian companies. Why cannot they invest as partners in a limited partnership? That is the principal question that the Government has endeavoured to answer.

I thank the honourable member for Warrego for his contribution which, as usual, was very good.

I come back to the speech of the Leader of the Liberal Party. A very good assessment of this Bill has been written by Mr Peter McDermott in the Butterworths Company *Law Bulletin*. I have read the assessment. It really highlights what the Bill is about, that is, the two points made by the Leader of the Liberal Party.

First of all, the Bill is aimed principally at streamlining the operation of this aspect of company law. That is very important because, as the Leader of the Liberal Party said, the company laws of the State and the nation in general are so complex and at times so difficult that they can inhibit business investment.

The second point about the Bill is that it is designed to facilitate venture capital investment in the State. The point that the honourable member for Murrumba raised that, somehow or other, everybody will grab his money and run off shore with it or something like that, and set up a tax haven, is quite incorrect. The Bill is designed to promote investment in Queensland in such a way that it will maximise participation by the maximum number of people. The Government thinks that that can only be positive in terms of the business operation in this State.

I thank all honourable members for their contributions and, as I said before, the particular point raised by my honourable and learned friend opposite will be dealt with when the clauses are debated.

Motion agreed to.

Committee

Hon. I. T. Henderson (Mount Gravatt—Minister for Justice and Minister for Corrective Services) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3, as read, agreed to.

Clause 4—

Mr WELLS (11.32 p.m.): I thank the Minister for his partial explanation and his promise of a further explanation. I make it clear that the Opposition was not saying that this Bill is merely a shonk. We acknowledge the desirable objectives to which the Minister referred. What we are concerned about is a loophole. We are not dismissing the Bill as a whole. We are concerned that the Minister may be importing a loophole by introducing this Bill. I again say to him that I would be grateful if he could explain the matter to us in terms that would convince the Opposition that a loophole is not being introduced.

Our concern is that he is taking away the requirement that the registration should be in Australia. He is taking away the requirement that the registrar must register the partnership and a similar requirement for corporations. That might have tax consequences. Certainly it is the case that an overseas investor who earns income in Australia is supposed to pay income tax in Australia. However, there is an arrangement called the foreign tax credit agreement. Under it, it is possible for somebody to pay tax overseas rather than in Australia. If the source of the capital that will be allowed to be unregistered according to this Bill happens to be a tax haven, will it not be the case that no tax will be payable? Neither the tax-payers of the investing country nor the tax-payers of Australia will benefit. If that is the case, what we have is a loophole, and the Labor Party would have difficulty in voting for it. I raise that as a serious concern and would be grateful for the Minister's response.

Mr CASEY: I was disappointed that the Minister made no response to the matters I requested him to look at, so I raise them again. In his reply at the second-reading stage, the Minister said that the legislation was being amended to allow for overseas investment. I assure honourable members that I do not have my complete file with me; it is in my office in Mackay. I have a very thick file on this matter. I have been following it through for the 12 years during which I have been watching this legislation. An enormous number of people from overseas have been able to invest over that period using these partnerships.

I have referred to the redevelopment of the old McWhirters building in Fortitude Valley. It is gazetted under these Acts that 20 people from Switzerland, one person from Canada and one from West Germany are involved to the extent of about \$8m or \$9m in the limited partnership involved in that redevelopment. The document states quite clearly that they are participating in a joint venture for the establishment, development, construction and management of the McWhirters market-place project in Fortitude Valley, Brisbane.

Quite obviously the accountants and solicitors acting on behalf of those firms found no difficulties or problems. The Minister indicated that the solicitor who sought the changes to the legislation indicated certain things to him. I think that they should be substantiated by the Minister and that he has a duty to tell us exactly why these people were listened to instead of the comments being made by honourable members. I think the Minister should look seriously at delaying this legislation until those claims can be answered. More especially, I am concerned as to the Government's position, through the Queensland Treasury Corporation, and its deal with the Bond Corporation over the Yabulu nickel plant that is registered under this Act.

Mr HENDERSON: Clause 4 amends section 6, which defines what is a limited partnership. A limited partnership which complies with section 6 will maintain its status subject to section 9, which deals with changes in the partners thereafter and the effect of changes of partners.

Section 6 (2) is amended by expanding the reference to corporate persons who may be a general partner or a limited partner. This is accomplished by omitting the words "constituted or registered in Australia" which qualify the preceding words "a corporate person". The amendment allows foreign companies to be partners in a limited partnership, for example, in the same way that overseas companies may be share-holders in Australian companies. Foreign companies would need to comply with the requirements of divisions 4 and 5 of Part XIII of the Companies Code and the requirements of the Foreign Investment Review Tribunal with respect to foreign investment. If foreign companies can hold shares in Australian companies subject to State and Federal requirements, there does not appear to be any reason for restricting the benefits of the Act only to corporations constituted or registered in Australia. I guess that in the final analysis that is a policy decision, and that is the policy decision that the Queensland Government has made.

The control of foreign companies is under the provisions of the Companies Code and the Foreign Investment Review Tribunal. That control is not exercised under this Act. The proper place for control of foreign companies is under the Companies Code, not under this Act.

I accept what the honourable member for Mackay is saying, that is, that under the Act there is no doubt that considerable numbers of partners will be forming these companies for investment purposes. The Government does not consider that necessarily to be a bad thing or a tax-evasion situation. As I said, finally, it is probably a policy decision, and that is the policy decision that the Queensland Government has made.

Mr WELLS: I thank the Minister. I make it perfectly clear that there are two things that should not be confused. The desirability of allowing foreign companies to participate in Australian ventures has nothing to do with this amendment. It is perfectly possible for foreign companies to participate. The only question is whether they will be registered in Australia.

In spite of what the Minister said, it does not seem to be a tremendously onerous requirement to place on a corporation that it should be registered in Australia in order to fall within the provisions of this Act, nor does it seem to be a terribly onerous requirement to place on a limited liability partner that he or she should be on the register that is set up under section 8 of the Act.

The Opposition is concerned about the reason why the quite minimal requirement that previously existed in the Act is being taken away. It does not accept in any way that taking away that very minimal requirement will be a disincentive to honest foreign investors, because it does not see that the requirement of registration is a particularly onerous one or one that impedes the flow of capital.

Unless the Minister is able to explain why such a minor administrative burden is of necessity to be removed in order to save Queensland's industry, the Opposition will oppose the clause.

Mr HENDERSON: The honourable member has no doubt read the Act. However, it states—

"A corporate person constituted or registered in Australia may be a general partner or a limited partner in a limited partnership."

As I said originally, it is a policy decision. The policy decision was that that clause totally precluded foreign investment.

Mr Casey: That is not correct.

Mr HENDERSON: I am advised that that is the case, that it prohibited foreign investment in Australian companies. The policy decision made was that that should be removed in order to remove that restriction.

Mr WELLS: I thank the Minister. Simply as a matter of fact, it is not the case that that clause prohibited foreign investment. Foreign investment occurred under the provisions of this Act and under the provisions of the predecessors of this Act. That

clause did not prevent foreign investment; it prevented foreign companies from investing without being registered in Australia. It also prevented foreign individuals from investing without being registered under section 8 of the Act as established.

The Opposition would like to maintain the situation as it existed in the original Act. Therefore, with regret, on only his second Bill, the Opposition will divide against the Minister's wishes.

Nevertheless, I thank the Minister for his assistance and the endeavours that he made to satisfy the Opposition on the point. However, the Opposition simply cannot accept that. It believes that the Minister has made an error of fact in his last statement, and the Opposition will divide on the clause.

Question—That clause 4, as read, stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 54		NOES, 28	
Ahern	Katter	Ardill	
Alison	Knox	Braddy	
Austin	Lee	Burns	
Beanland	Lester	Campbell	
Beard	Lickiss	Casey	
Berghofer	Littleproud	Comben	
Booth	McCauley	D'Arcy	
Borbidge	McKechnie	De Lacy	
Burreket	McPhie	Eaton	
Chapman	Menzel	Gibbs, R. J.	
Clauson	Muntz	Goss	
Cooper	Nelson	Hamill	
Elliott	Newton	Hayward	
FitzGerald	Perrett	McElligott	
Fraser	Randell	Mackenroth	
Gamin	Santoro	McLean	
Gately	Schuntner	Milliner	
Gibbs, I. J.	Sherlock	Palaszczuk	
Gilmore	Sherrin	Smith	
Glasson	Simpson	Smyth	
Gunn	Slack	Underwood	
Gygar	Stoneman	Vaughan	
Harper	Tenni	Warburton	
Harvey	Veivers	Warner	
Henderson		Wells	
Hinton	<i>Tellers:</i>	Yewdale	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hobbs	Stephan		Davis
Innes	Hynd		Prest

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clauses 5 to 8, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

BOND UNIVERSITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 10 August (see p. 296).

Mr BRADDY (Rockhampton) (11.54 p.m.): This legislation is, of course, very brief, as the original legislation was only passed in 1987.

Most of the provisions in the Bond University Act Amendment Bill will receive the support of the Opposition.

The Opposition is pleased to see that the legislation provides for the appointment by the university council of the Bond University of a visitor, who will be of assistance

to the university in relation to standards required to be met by a university and will ensure that, as far as possible, the university meets the standards that should be met.

Another principal provision of the Bill, of course, is that there be provision for a general staff association. In general terms, the Opposition supports the principle of a staff association. However, the people who would be represented on the staff association are concerned that they will be a very small organisation which will be expected to carry out the processes that would normally be carried out by more powerful unions and associations. Therefore, there is an element of concern about that. In the circumstances, I foreshadow that at the Committee stage I will raise objections to the provision relating to the general staff association.

I have outlined the two basic matters that are before the House and indicated the Opposition's concern. Most of the provisions in relation to the general staff association are not challengeable and are acceptable. I will have more to say about the negotiation process when the clauses are being discussed.

Mr SCHUNTNER (Mount Coot-tha) (11.56 p.m.): The Bond University has endured quite severe difficulties during the few months of its operation. I do not intend to debate in detail the financial difficulties or the financial aspects of the Bond financial empire. Members of the Liberal Party are, of course, in favour of private enterprise and we wish the Bond University well in its endeavours. The staff and the students at that university are a committed group. The objectives of the university are laudable and we wish the university success in turning out quality graduates.

The construction work that has taken place at the university over the last couple of years has been on a massive scale. Many people have been employed in the area, with the result that the construction of the university itself is an important part of the local economy. A need exists for expansion in tertiary education. In that capacity, the Bond University can meet a need in the community.

I do not seek any special privileges for the Bond University. I made that clear in an incident a few months ago. The Bond University was not successful in obtaining some financial assistance from some semi-Government institutions. It is important that the university be judged on its merits, and the standard of the graduates from the institution will be very important in the years ahead.

The two particular aspects that are dealt with in this legislation are those provisions dealing with the establishment of the position of visitor and those provisions dealing with the establishment of a general staff association. An academic staff association is, of course, already in place. It is reasonable that the university is now looking to the formation of a general staff association to cater for all of those employees in the organisation who do not qualify for membership of the academic staff association. If they are taken separately, about 15 different unions would be involved. I can understand how a single general staff association covering the range of people employed there would facilitate some negotiations.

I would like to say a few words about the position of visitor. This is a rather quaint position that has a long history in common law and in the development of universities over many centuries. I have read an article by an author named Christopher Forsyth, who is a fellow and director of studies in law at Robinson College, Cambridge. It provides a great deal of quite fascinating information about the role of visitor in a university. The basic thrust of the position is that the visitor is a type of independent umpire who sees that the statutes in the institution are upheld.

There are a number of cases in English law, going back to one in 1694 and another one in much more recent times, in 1978, in which the role of visitor has been challenged in the courts. These cases have established quite clearly that the visitor does play a very significant role in providing arbitration when the student feels aggrieved. This does not prevent the aggrieved student challenging in the courts of law the way in which the visitor may have gone about establishing his judgment in a particular case. But the role

is not one that is just in name only; it does have a particular purpose, and it is a purpose that has been proven over the years to be worth while.

One thing that is significant about the role of visitor is that it allows an arbitration to be made without enormous expense being incurred. There is a certain lack of formality that is not available through the official courts of law and a flexibility that is available to the participants. All of those things are worth while in the arbitration process that might occur. It can be rather intimidating for some of the people who are involved if the participants are not bound by those formalised rules. An element of privacy exists in the visitor process that would not be available through some of the more formalised procedures.

It is important to sum up the role of visitor by referring to an article that states that a visitor—

“ . . . retains in his ancient office a useful and convenient function and there is little evidence that a visitor is likely to make more unjust decisions than a judge.”

All in all there is a strong argument for saying that the role of visitor is very worth while. The Liberal Party is pleased to support the Bill.

The role of visitor is particularly important in an organisation such as the Bond University, which is somewhat different from the mainstream universities. Therefore, a different kind of procedure from that which is applicable in most of the universities in Australia would be appropriate.

Hon. B. G. LITTLEPROUD (Condamine—Minister for Education, Youth, Sport and Recreation) (12.03 a.m.), in reply: I acknowledge the support of honourable members for the visitor, which was explained by the honourable member for Mount Coot-tha. I understand that the member for Rockhampton has a disagreement with the clause relating to the general staff association.

It is quite correct to say that a number of unions are represented within the general staff association on the university campus. The proposition for a staff association is put forward by the people who administer the university. It is designed to enable them to be more efficient and to overcome demarcation disputes. It is not uncommon in Japan and West Germany for a company to have one association. That system seems to work extremely well and I see no reason why it should not work well within the Bond University.

The Queensland Government is supportive of the new private-enterprise push into tertiary education, which is to be expected. For a long time in Queensland the private and non-Government sectors have provided primary and secondary education. As society expects higher levels of education it is only understandable that the private sector should become involved in tertiary education. It is already happening in business colleges.

The university has received all sorts of publicity, none of which has related to its standards but mostly to its financial status. I am sure that the university has the capacity to overcome its financial problems. I am pleased that both honourable members have supported the general thrust of this short Bill. I commend it to the House.

Motion agreed to.

Committee

Hon. B. G. Littleproud (Condamine—Minister for Education, Youth, Sport and Recreation) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—

Mr BRADDY (Rockhampton) (12.06 a.m.): Clause 5, which sets out the duties of the general staff association, states, amongst other things—

“An association of members of the general staff that . . . has a constitution that includes in the objects of the association the following objects:—

- (ii) to negotiate on behalf of . . . general staff with the employer in relation to the conditions of employment of the general staff;
- (iii) to develop in conjunction with the employer a procedure for settlement of industrial disputes between the general staff and the employer . . .”

I am informed that quite a few members of the general staff have met and have voted against forming a general staff association. They realised that they were small in number and that, by the formation of that association in conjunction with this legislation, they would be largely left to their own devices in negotiations with the employer. Therefore, they sought the experience and guidance of unions that are experienced in that field, such as the Professional Officers Association.

The Minister stated that those circumstances are normal, but they are not. In the history of Queensland's universities and colleges, industrial disputes have never got out of hand. Therefore, there is no legitimate fear of any extraordinary industrial trouble arising from general staff members being able to join associations and unions that would normally apply to their particular callings. I understand that general staff members expressed a preference to do that.

It seems that because the members of the general staff association will be small in number, it will be left substantially to its own comparatively weak muscle in negotiations with the employer. History and experience have shown that minuscule unions are incapable of standing up for their rights sufficiently, which is when injustices can be visited upon workers.

The general staff members stated that they should be able to join the unions that would normally be appropriate for their particular callings. The Opposition believes that that is appropriate and correct. Therefore, in the circumstances it cannot support a proposal that could result in workers not receiving proper experienced advice and help in their negotiations. In the circumstances the Opposition opposes clause 5 and will divide the Committee accordingly.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I am reminded of events that have occurred in recent months in the grain industry. A great deal of supposed consultation occurred throughout the grain industry in Australia whereby Mr McColl was supposed to pick up the thoughts of a minority of people within the industry. However, the Hawke Labor Government stood on them and said, “We know what we want. Hard luck.”

On another occasion, when the Leader of the House was out of the country and I was acting as Minister for Primary Industries for a couple of weeks, I was a member of a delegation that went to Canberra when the Federal Government was considering the abolition of the sugar embargo. Mike Ahern spoke extremely well on behalf of the Queensland delegation and pointed out how important the sugar industry was to Queensland and Australia. He appealed to the Prime Minister to negotiate, because consideration needed to be given to the sugar industry. When Mike Ahern finished speaking, John Kerin rose to his feet and said, “We knew you people wouldn't agree with what it was all about so we didn't bother consulting.” I find that an example of double standards.

I am quite comfortable with the fact that the people who are on the general staff of the Bond University will find people in the administration of that university who have a common interest, namely, the university's well-being, and who will work out some way of coming up with the sorts of solutions that are needed to settle disputes.

I do not agree with the proposition put forward by the member for Rockhampton. I intend to leave the clause as it is.

Mr SCHUNTNER: Let us imagine a situation in which 50 employees working in an organisation such as the Bond University belong to 15 different unions. If that were the case, those 15 unions would each have three or four members.

Imagine a situation in which, on a particular day, one of those unions conducted Statewide action involving three people from Bond University. That would have a detrimental effect on a section of the operation of that organisation on that day. In three or four days' time, another of the unions may undertake Statewide action, and another three or four of the employees in that organisation could be affected. That could occur on 15 different occasions.

One of the most debilitating things that have affected activities in Australia have been demarcation disputes. That is another possibility that could arise. I am all for responsible unionism, but I am concerned about the fragmentation and the inefficiencies that can occur when a multiplicity of unions is involved with a small group of employees. I think common sense dictates that this clause makes eminent sense and ought to be supported.

Question—That clause 5, as read, stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 53		NOES, 28	
Ahern	Knox	Ardill	
Alison	Lee	Braddy	
Beanland	Lester	Burns	
Beard	Lickiss	Campbell	
Berghofer	Littleproud	Casey	
Booth	McCauley	Comben	
Borbidge	McKechnie	D'Arcy	
Burreket	McPhie	De Lacy	
Chapman	Menzel	Eaton	
Clauson	Muntz	Gibbs, R. J.	
Cooper	Nelson	Goss	
Elliott	Newton	Hamill	
FitzGerald	Perrett	Hayward	
Fraser	Randell	McElligott	
Gamin	Santoro	Mackenroth	
Gately	Schuntner	McLean	
Gibbs, I. J.	Sherlock	Milliner	
Gilmore	Sherrin	Palaszczuk	
Glasson	Simpson	Smith	
Gunn	Slack	Smyth	
Gygar	Stoneman	Underwood	
Harper	Tenni	Vaughan	
Harvey	Veivers	Warburton	
Henderson		Warner	
Hinton		Wells	
Hobbs	<i>Tellers:</i>	Yewdale	<i>Tellers:</i>
Innes	Stephan		Davis
Katter	Hynd		Prest

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Leader of the House) (12.19 a.m.): I move—

“That the House do now adjourn.”

Compensation and Reward Payments for Police Informants

Mr PREST (Port Curtis) (12.19 a.m.): It is pleasing to note that families of police officers receive medals in recognition of acts of bravery carried out in the course of the officer's duty. I refer particularly to Police Constable Kidd who lost his life in a dawn raid on a house in which Mullins and his de facto and their children had been living. Mullins was shot dead in that raid and his de facto was sentenced to several years in gaol for her part in holding up finance companies and banks over a period of years.

I have great sympathy for the families of officers involved in the raid. They will never forget that morning and the events that occurred. Police officers involved will never forgive themselves for the loss of their workmate. I have no doubt that their lives have been adversely affected. I guess they have been compensated for any work they may have lost through illness.

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

Mr PREST: Without doubt, any compensation that they may have received would not have been adequate for the great risks that were taken and for what the police officers went through in planning and making the raid in an attempt to arrest a dangerous criminal such as Mullins. What recognition was given to the informant? The answer is: nothing. The informant received no bravery awards and no compensation for a deterioration in health, loss of work and income.

In this particular instance, it took the informant months to obtain finance from the State Government. It was received a very short time before a finance company foreclosed on the mortgage over the informant's house. The informant was not able to work because of police protection and suffered from bad nerves. The informant was shattered and suffered loss of income. The Minister for Police at that time, Bill Gunn, gave the finance company a handful of cents to forestall repossession of the house, but throughout the entire period of the informant's suffering, banks had notices on the walls of their establishments stating that a reward of \$10,000 would be paid to any person who gave information leading to the arrest and conviction of those who took money from the bank or committed serious crimes against the bank.

When the informant was recommended to receive awards from the banks that had been robbed, at first the response was that Mullins had never been convicted and that the awards were not payable. In the end result, however, an ex gratia payment was made in a combined effort by the banks involved. The payment could be described as peanuts.

When I consider the amount of money that Mullins had taken from the banks and financial institutions over the years and also that bank staff were on a knife's edge because they did not know when or where he would strike next, or the actions he may take when cornered, I believe that greater recognition should have been given to the informant. I agree that awards should be given to police officers and to their families but I also believe that the part played by the informant in assisting the police should also receive greater recognition. After all, without the information given to police officers by the informant, they would never have had a clue as to Mullins' whereabouts. It was only by virtue of the information given by the informant that the raid was possible and that the criminal was apprehended. From the day after the raid, banks were a little more free from their major fear that Mullins would attempt another hold-up and that he would inflict physical injury on their staff. What did they do about adequate rewards? They shirked their responsibilities.

Under the circumstances, I would not advise any person to come forward and provide police with information that might lead to the apprehension of a bank-robber. I believe that in this instance the informant was treated very shabbily and should have received greater recognition for the part the informant played in the dawn raid that ultimately led to Mullins' apprehension.

Southern Gold Coast Chamber of Commerce Objection to Raptis Development; Federal Labor Government Policies

Mr GATELY (Currumbin) (12.24 a.m.): I wish to mention the contents of an article that I find rather bewildering. The article was published in today's Gold Coast *Daily News*. It attributes comments to Mr Dale Leo, who is the Chairman of the Southern Gold Coast Chamber of Commerce. He called on all those who had recently lodged objections to a proposal—known as the Kirra redevelopment project—submitted by Mr Brian Ray to support him and 120 other people who are objecting to a proposal presently before the Gold Coast City Council to construct an 11-storey block of units at Rainbow Bay. I am bewildered because, together with a group from the chamber of commerce, Mr Leo was quite happy to support other similar proposals. The article cites what Mr Leo said and states—

“Coolangatta has missed out on a generation of development, this is why we have it in our own hands to ensure the place is protected from the concrete look of high-rise Surfers Paradise.”

The same person and his chamber were prepared to allow the development of a concrete development of between 13 and 15 storeys at a cost of \$400m, and the closure of a number of roads in the area. Unfortunately, I was unable to save all of the roads; but, with the help of this Government, I was able to save the front road and a park. It is a sad indictment when a chamber of commerce buys into every development, but is not fair dinkum to the public in the way it goes about these developments.

The people who complained about the development at Kirra were not complaining about the construction itself, because they realise the importance of balanced development that will create job opportunities for workers in the building industry as well as people who will work in the project after its completion. I have never interfered with the normal running of council and its right to approve or reject projects, but that \$400m project was to take place in an area with a restriction on developments of more than three storeys. Now he wants to prevent the development of an 11-storey project in an area with a seven-storey restriction.

I turn now to the gloss and glitter of the supposed Goss Government. Honourable members will note that Mr Goss does not have the guts to call it the Labor Government. Mr Goss' mates in Canberra, that is Hawke and Keating, are perpetrating double standards by giving away a total of \$360m of tax-payers' money in the form of \$200m to the banks that made a profit of \$3.7 billion last year, \$100m to the airline companies to keep the strike going, and \$60m to Kodak. That money could build all of the Housing Commission houses that are desperately needed on the Gold Coast. We could do wonders if we had only half that amount to spend on roads and welfare housing on the Gold Coast.

There is a contrast between the way in which the Hawke Government deals with the airline pilots with a big sledge-hammer and the kid-glove approach it took with the Waterside Workers Federation. That Government embraces a theory of reform, but insists on a three-year transition on the expenditure of \$150m of tax-payers' money in sweetheart deals for the retirement of 3 000 elderly wharfies. There can hardly be a greater contrast between the Hawke Government's kid-glove approach to the Waterside Workers Federation and its unremitting hostility towards the Australian Federation of Air Pilots. Perhaps class distinction is the explanation. The pilots are fairly affluent and lack a history of solidarity with other workers. Wharfies are notably less affluent, but have long, working-class traditions.

The way in which the Federal Labor Government has tried to ban television advertisements prior to elections is further evidence of its hypocrisy. An article in the *Sunday Telegraph* of 1 October stated—

“The Federal Government is backing away from a plan to ban all political advertising on radio and television because it fears a massive political brawl in the run-up to the next election.

It is probable, however, that a ban will be enforced after the election if Labor wins.”

This is another example of the Federal Government's socialistic deals to prevent fair and reasonable debate in this country by people wanting a fair go. That Government has tried to manipulate the whole media and now it will ban advertising altogether prior to an election. The members of the Labor Party talk about honesty and accountability, but they could not be honest with their own members, their grandmothers or the voters. The voters are quickly beginning to wake up and will not put up with this hypocrisy. The voters of Australia are entitled to be fully informed and a Goss Government, together with its mates in Canberra, will do everything possible to stop that.

Budget Initiatives in Merthyr Electorate

Mr SANTORO (Merthyr) (12.29 a.m.): In the few minutes available to me I wish to speak on behalf of concerned citizens of Merthyr and about issues that are having an impact not only on Merthyr and the people who live in that electorate, but also right throughout Queensland.

From the outset I wish to acknowledge certain benefits that have flowed to Merthyr as a result of the recent State Budget. For example, for a period of four or five years several schools in my electorate have been making strong representations to the Government. Over a period of 10 or 15 years the New Farm State School has made representations to the Government about the extension of its playground. Honourable members who are familiar with that school will remember its small bitumen playground. When I toured the electorate during the by-election one of the main complaints was that children who attended that school were constantly hurting themselves in that playground.

Also the Ascot State School made representations to the Government for a subsidy of approximately \$14,000 to complement an equal amount raised by the school's p. and c. association. Following my election I made strong representations to the officers in the Education and Works Departments. I wish to place on record my appreciation for the courtesy extended to me by those officers. Even though those amounts did not appear in the major schedules to the Budget, those moneys were granted. My constituents are very happy that at long last these benefits have been forthcoming.

Having said that and having recognised the gains, I point out other issues that arose during the Merthyr by-election and that in fact were not redressed in the Budget. The major one is law and order. During the Merthyr by-election, all parties descended on the electorate and made a very big issue of law and order. So they should have, because people in that electorate, as in most other electorates, were sick of living in streets of fear, were sick of being subject to muggings and in fact feared for their property and their personal safety.

During that by-election, the cry went out that more police were needed on the beat, that the maintenance of the existing police stations was absolutely imperative and that a guarantee should be given that the police stations would not be closed. Assurances were given that, following the by-election, the police presence and other much-needed resources would be boosted.

But what has happened since the by-election? My leader has previously reported bashings and rapes in the New Farm and Fortitude Valley areas, and a vast increase in breaking and enterings. The people of Merthyr are still waiting for the promised increase in resources and personnel.

The Budget provided an extra 200 police for the coming year—a far cry from the 2 700 requested by Fitzgerald, admittedly over a period; so the Government has not gone anywhere close to satisfying that requirement.

Other promises made included cleaning up the Fortitude Valley area and removing the syringe-exchange program and the methadone clinic from that area. The syringe-exchange program was moved from its previous location but the methadone clinic is

still there. We do not wish to condemn the benefits that flow from the methadone clinic, but the many people who have invested millions of dollars in that area and have displayed courage and vision in making those investment decisions consider its relocation to be very desirable and urgent. So the people of the Merthyr electorate, and those in the Fortitude Valley area in particular, are still waiting for the Government to honour the promises it made during the by-election. I hope that those promises will be honoured in the near future.

Public Accounts Committee; Public Works Committee

Mr McPHIE (Toowoomba North) (12.33 a.m.): I wish to speak this morning about my grave concerns regarding the operation of the recently established Public Accounts Committee and Public Works Committee, and the developments that, quite frankly, were not intended when these committees were set up. If those committees are to be successful and operate as they were intended to operate, there must be a significant change of attitude by all parties in this Parliament.

The battle for the establishment of the Public Accounts Committee goes back many years. It was first mooted over six years ago. We remember the trauma and unhappiness that developed and the niggling that went on. Eventually, the Public Accounts Committee legislation was passed by this Parliament. It was set up as a select committee of this Parliament and, like all select committees, it was to have representation from all parties. The Public Works Committee legislation was passed a little later. That committee is somewhat different from the Public Accounts Committee. However, as I said, they are select committees and have special tasks to perform concerning the accountability of the operations of the Parliament, the Government and the Executive, and the way that this State is run. The ideals were great but in practice they have not been anywhere near as successful as was intended.

The Fitzgerald report mentions, in a number of places, both of those committees, more especially the Public Accounts Committee because it is, I suppose, the senior of the two committees. Mr Fitzgerald dealt with it at great length. The Public Works Committee came into being while the Fitzgerald inquiry was under way.

On page 124 of his report, Mr Fitzgerald said that the Public Works Committee—
“... has the potential to prevent many of the problems arising from Cabinet’s intrusion into the details of administrative decision making, and is to be commended.”

And later, referring to back-benchers—

“... as well as reinforcing their sense of purpose and appreciation of their independent Parliamentary role and responsibility.”

What have we got from the operation, during this session of Parliament, of both of those committees, especially the Public Accounts Committee?

Mr CAMPBELL: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member is casting aspersions on members of that select committee and I think it is improper that he does so.

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

Mr McPHIE: The operation has been poor in practice. I intend now to quote from press reports that relate to the work of the Public Accounts Committee. Almost before the committee was set up, it was being white-anted by leaks to the press and criticism appearing in the press. While hearings into certain areas were under way, there have been leaks. There have been leaks while the committee was completing its report on drought aid. Following the tabling of the report, we saw some members of the committee appearing on television and demanding action—

Mr CAMPBELL: I rise to a point of order.

Mr McPHIE: —and quoting figures that were not in the report.

Mr CAMPBELL: It is unacceptable that the Chairman of the Public Works Committee would reflect on another select committee of this Parliament. It is unheard of. I find some of his comments to be totally unacceptable.

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

Mr McPHIE: I have no difficulty with the Public Works Committee report. I do not mind that there was a dissenting report submitted, because that is in accordance with Standing Orders. I do not mind that the two dissenting members appeared on television. It is their right to do so, just as it is the right of the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Liberal Party to appear on television and make statements. However, I object to the Deputy Chairman being advised not to appear with the Chairman on television after the tabling of the report, when it was a Public Works Committee decision that he do so. I also question whether that dissenting report is really theirs or whether some direction was received.

In any case, both committees have been used for political purposes. I condemn the practice roundly. All members of Parliament must respect Parliament above all else, or forget the committees.

Mr ARDILL: I rise to a point of order. That is a most offensive remark coming from the Chairman of the Public Works Committee. He well knows that every word of those dissenting judgments was written by the two members concerned. He is well aware that all the points raised in the dissenting judgments were mentioned at the committee, with no support from anywhere else. That is a most offensive remark.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I note the comments of the member for Salisbury. I now call the member for Chatsworth.

Use of Ministerial Expenses by Premier

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (12.40 a.m.): Earlier today my colleague the shadow Minister for Justice, Deane Wells, told of yet another throw-back to the Bjelke-Petersen style of Government under Premier Cooper. We now have the situation in which the Premier of this State has threatened defamation action against Opposition members who dare to question Mr Cooper's use of tax-payers' funds. This is a return to the political thuggery that occurred under Bjelke-Petersen in the lead-up to the 1986 State election, when writs were issued against Labor Party figures for no other reason than to stifle legitimate public discussion of corruption and abuse of public funds.

It is no coincidence that the National Party Government decided to discontinue those writs in February this year, on the eve of a Supreme Court hearing which would have decided whether Tom Burns gained access to Government documents—including those relating to ministerial expenses—to help in his defence. The Premier—like his clone Bjelke-Petersen—is so desperate to keep the lid closed on his use of public funds that he now resorts to threatening legal action to those who simply seek an answer to a very basic question. That question is this: what did Mr Cooper spend the money on? What did he spend an average of \$150 per week in cash advances on as Minister for Corrective Services? Why was it necessary for a millionaire grazier to dip further into the public purse when he already received a huge ministerial salary, a big electorate allowance, a free limousine and driver, and free travel?

Tonight I want to raise three issues relating to Mr Cooper's record on ministerial expenses. They are—

1. The Cooper stooge who now shadows Jim Kennedy and Cooper's new Commission for Change and Reform;
2. Mr Cooper—the Roma romeo—who used public funds to buy flowers and chocolates—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The comment will be withdrawn.

Mr MACKENROTH: I withdraw the comment about the Roma romeo, but I will leave the other comments there.

The third issue is—

The top secret auditor's report that Mr Cooper refuses to release, even though he says it clears him of any wrong-doing.

Firstly, I want to talk about the person who helped protect Mr Cooper when he came under fire over his ministerial expenses. His name is Graham Dalton. Mr Dalton was the operational auditor in Mr Cooper's first department—the Prisons Department. It was Dalton who knew where the skeletons were buried and he did not balk at bullying his own staff to ensure they remained buried. For his loyalty as Cooper's stooge, Dalton was rewarded by being promoted.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The comment of "stooge" will be withdrawn.

Mr MACKENROTH: I withdraw that.

For his loyalty to Mr Cooper, Dalton was rewarded by being promoted to Deputy Director-General of Corrective Services. Now Premier Cooper has seconded Dalton to act as assistant to Jim Kennedy—Chairman of the Premier's Commission for Change and Reform. It is Dalton, who worked for Cooper, who is now shadowing Kennedy for the Premier. Russell Cooper has made sure that Dalton is Kennedy's minder so that the Premier knows what the supposedly independent commission gets up to.

Honest public servants are now expressing fears that information that they have supplied to the Fitzgerald inquiry and to the implemetation unit will be reported directly to the Premier. The joke is that, while Kennedy is reported to be looking at the efficiency of Treasury and statutory authorities, his new offsider, Dalton, has been responsible for a \$2m blow-out in the budget of the Corrective Services Commission, which he set up.

I now want to turn to Mr Cooper. The Special Prosecutor, Doug Drummond, who is conducting a criminal investigation into Mr Cooper and other Ministers over their use of public funds, has before him the following information. On Valentine's Day 1988, Mr Cooper—then still Minister for Corrective Services—used \$135 in public funds to buy chocolates and flowers. They are not exactly the essential items tax-payers would expect a Minister to buy with their money.

If Mr Cooper wants to deny this, let him stand up in this House tonight or tomorrow and state that there is no invoice in his former department dated Valentine's Day 1988 for \$135 for chocolates and flowers.

I now want to close by mentioning the third issue that Mr Cooper avoids, that is, the public release of his much-vaunted Price Waterhouse auditor's report into his ministerial expenses.

On 7 September, Mr Cooper said that that report cleared him. If he believes that, he will table that Price Waterhouse report in this Parliament for all members to see.

Labor Party Tactics against Premier

Mr HINTON (Broadsound) (12.45 a.m.): I wish to talk about the coastal-management Green Paper. Before I turn to that, I deplore what I have just heard from the member for Chatsworth. Is it not amazing that, when the National Party has had a bit of a bad run in the media and in the polls—it has had to fight the Murdoch press and the ABC—now that the new leader is starting to look good, the first thing that happens is that the boot goes in and the smear and the muck begin—anything to taint the National Party and its new leader, who is now looking good in Queensland? Opposition members do not like it, because now the National Party has the strongest leader in this State—a person who is starting to show a real lead in Queensland; a person who will bring in the Fitzgerald inquiry recommendations in legislation in this session, just as everyone said he would not. What comes from Opposition members? In goes the shovel, the dirt, the smear—anything to bring the Premier down.

I can assure members of the Opposition that they are wasting their time, that the National Party is too strong for them and that Mr Cooper will certainly demonstrate that he is one of the greatest leaders and one of the greatest Premiers that Queensland has ever had.

Mr Mackenroth: Do you think Mr Cooper should table those documents?

Mr HINTON: I am quite sure that Mr Cooper will be happy to do anything that is necessary to demonstrate that he is——

Mr Mackenroth: Let him table his ministerial expenses.

Mr HINTON: Mr Cooper has had his ministerial expenses properly audited, as has been explained to this House. Nobody else has had that done.

Honourable members have not seen the Leader of the Labor Party table his expenses in this House. No independent audit has been put forward——

Mr MACKENROTH: I rise to a point of order. The expenses of the Leader of the Opposition are part of the expenses of the Premier's Department. They are audited along with that department's expenses.

Mr HINTON: Yes, that is right, as are Mr Cooper's expenses and the expenses of every other Minister. But has that been good enough for members of the Opposition? No!

For two years members of the Government have put up with dirt; for two years they have put up with smear; and for two years they have put up with innuendo. I can tell members of the Opposition that the Government has had enough and the people of Queensland have had enough. After the bucket of dirt and slops that was dropped tonight, I can tell members of the Opposition that, because of this type of garbage, they will find themselves going down the tube.

However, I did not rise to speak about that. I got a bit carried away because I am tired of that sort of thing. Everyone is tired of it. Quite unfairly and quite unreasonably, the former Minister for Primary Industries has had to put up with that sort of bucketing for the last three months. I can tell members of the Opposition that the Queensland public is getting very tired of this sort of garbage. Those who throw mud lose ground, and members of the Opposition will most certainly be losing ground. They will go down the gurgler. I can assure them of that.

A resurgence of some substance in the National Party is taking place across Queensland. Last Saturday night I attended a National Party function. One hundred people turned up at a little place called The Caves, which is north of Rockhampton. I can tell members of the Opposition that only about 30-odd people attended similar functions two or three weeks ago, but with the new spirit, the new heart and the new strength that is being taken in the leadership of the National Party, people are returning to the fold and coming back in strength.

My colleagues and others tell me that that is happening all over the State. I can assure members of the Opposition that the next opinion polls to be released will strongly reflect that. What they will certainly reflect is that the people of Queensland are tired of the sort of product that members of the Opposition have put forward tonight.

The people of Queensland are tired of dirt; they are tired of muck; they are tired of smear; they are tired of misinformation; and they are tired of untruths and innuendo. I might say that the member for Chatsworth, the member for Cairns, and the member for Port Curtis are experts in that field. They are the grand champions of that kind of garbage and they will pay the penalty for it, because the National Party is on the way back and it will retain Government. Members of the Opposition will be sorry that they ever carried on with that sort of garbage.

Mr Hobbs: Sleazebags.

Mr HINTON: The member for Warrego says "sleazebags". That is not the kind of terminology that I use; that is the sort of garbage that comes from Mr Keating. Members of this Government do not need to resort to those sorts of tactics. I can tell members of the Opposition that the National Party runs a clean ship. It runs it straight and it runs it true.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.49 a.m. (Wednesday).