

NOTE: There could be differences between this document and the official printed Hansard, Vol. 314

TUESDAY, 27 MARCH 1990

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. J. Fouras, Ashgrove) read prayers and took the chair at 10 a.m.

ASSENT TO BILL

Assent to the Members (E.A.R.C. and C.J.C.) Bill reported by Mr Speaker—

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table—

Reports for the year ended 30 June 1989---

Bore Water Boards

Drainage Boards

Water Boards

River Improvement Trusts

Orders in Council under---

Harbours Act 1955-1989

Fishing Industry Organization and Marketing Act 1982-1989

Fauna Conservation Act 1974-1989

Land Act 1962-1988

National Parks and Wildlife Act 1975-1989

Regulations under--

Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act 1926-1989

Fauna Conservation Act 1974-1989

By-laws under---

Harbours Act 1955-1989

Harbours Act 1955-1989 and the Mackay Airport Act 1989

Proclamation under the Fishing Industry Organization and Marketing Act and

Other Acts Amendment Act 1989

Proposal by the Governor in Council to revoke the setting apart and declaration

as State Forest under the Forestry Act 1959-1987 of---

(A) All those parts of State Forest 3, parishes of Bowarraday and Moonbi described as Areas "A" and "B" as shown on plan FTY 1566 prepared under the authority of the Conservator of Forests, Department of Primary Industries and containing in total an area of about 19 824 hectares.

(B) A brief explanation of the proposal

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

ALP Election Promises

Hon. W. K. GOSS (Logan—Premier, Minister for Economic and Trade Development and Minister for the Arts) (10.05 a.m.), by leave: Last week, in response to a question by the member for Sherwood, I undertook to table a copy of a document that I released last year concerning a consultancy obtained from Peat Marwick Hungerford Management Consultants in respect of the pre-election promises of the Australian Labor Party. In accordance with that undertaking, I table a letter from that firm dated 23 November

1989 and a supplementary letter of the same date, with attachments A and B; attachment A being sources of reference and attachment B being a list of 53 programs or policy statements issued last year by the Labor Party.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the documents on the table.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Extension of Time for Debate

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth—Leader of the House) (10.06 a.m.): I move—

"That, under the provisions of Standing Order No. 17, the period allotted to debate on the Address in Reply be extended to eight full sitting days."

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Firearm Legislation

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth—Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (10.06 a.m.), by leave: Honourable members would be aware that it is the Government's intention to bring a new weapons Bill before the Parliament later this year. The Government has a stated policy of licensing all shooters. Contrary to theories being expounded both by the Opposition and by some shooting organisations, the Government does not intend to license individual firearms. Part of its election commitment was to establish a consultative committee to advise on the introduction of that legislation.

Today, I am pleased to inform the Parliament of the membership of that committee. It will consist of Alan Smith, who will be chairman, and representatives of the Queensland Farmers Federation, the Firearm Dealers Association, the Sporting Shooters Association of Australia, the Commonwealth Bank Officers Association and the Australian Bank Employees Union. The secretary of the committee will be a member of the Queensland Police Department.

I am delighted that Mr Alan Smith, Queensland's best-known shooter, has agreed to chair the committee. He is an Australian Olympic Games representative and a three-times Commonwealth Games gold medallist. He brings to the committee nearly 20 years experience as a shooter. His high standing among all shooters should reassure Queenslanders that this matter will receive fair and just treatment and consideration.

It is proposed that the legislation will come before the Parliament later this year. Members of the general public who wish to make a submission to the committee may do so by writing to the Firearms Consultative Committee at GPO Box 1425, Brisbane, 4001.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Proposed Workers Heritage Centre at Barcaldine

Hon. R. J. GIBBS (Wolston—Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing) (10.04 a.m.), by leave: I am pleased to advise the House that yesterday Cabinet approved funding of \$385,000 to assist with feasibility studies required to develop an important new tourism project—the Workers Heritage Centre at Barcaldine.

The centre will commemorate and record for posterity two of the most significant events in Australia's political history—the great shearers' strike of 1891 and the formation of the Australia Labor Party.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr GIBBS: Members of the Opposition should not laugh. The previous Government was prepared to support the project.

This centre, together with other projects in western Queensland such as the Australian Stockman's Hall of Fame, will provide a powerful focus for outback tourism. This Government is committed to developing tourism in the west of the State to give country towns a stable economic base. Our undertaking to fund the first stage of the Workers Heritage Centre is in line with our election policies regarding the development of inland tourism.

I feel sure that many Australians, as well as visitors from overseas, will be interested in the events that led up to the birth of the world's first social democratic party. This centre will be important not just for Queenslanders, not just for Australians, but for people everywhere who are inspired by the notion that disenchanted workers found a common voice which subsequently changed a nation's political system.

This is a project with great integrity. It is not something artificial that we have imported from another country or built as an eye-catching gimmick. This is a genuine Australian memorial to the workers of this country. It is not a memorial for Queenslanders only, although Queenslanders did play the leading role in the important events of 1891 and they should be pleased and proud that the centre will be located in their State.

I look forward to the cooperation of the member for Gregory, Mr Vaughan Johnson, and his assistance with the ongoing development of this project. He is as enthusiastic about this centre as are we on this side of the House, and his assistance will be appreciated. Indeed, although this project was initially the brainchild of a small group of local Labor people in Barcaldine, the Tree of Knowledge Committee, which is developing the project, now comprises people of all political persuasions. That is how it should be, because this monument is important for all Australians.

The opening of the Workers Heritage Centre should be a spectacular six-day event. Every night between 1 and 6 May next year there will be a torchlight procession through the streets of Barcaldine re-enacting the shearers' strike and involving virtually all the people of Barcaldine.

In addition to the \$385,000 grant for this project which Cabinet approved yesterday, the State Government has also donated the former Barcaldine State School to the Barcaldine Shire Council. That school, which is valued at \$84,200, is located on the site on which the centre will be situated.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr GIBBS: This project has the potential to be a great tourist attraction for Queensland, as well as an educational centre at which people can step back into the history of this nation and learn about it. Members of the Opposition have got to learn very quickly that there are no prizes for second.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Review of Organisational and Administrative Arrangements for Queensland Public Sector Health Service

Hon. K. V. McELLIGOTT (Thuringowa—Minister for Health) (10.11 a.m.), by leave: Mr Speaker, you may recall that soon after my appointment as Minister for Health I implemented a review of organisational and administrative arrangements for Queensland public hospitals. The present arrangements have been in place for over 40 years and it was appropriate to consider whether those arrangements were meeting the contemporary health care needs of the community. Currently, there are 60 hospitals boards administering 144 hospitals and 21 nursing homes.

This review was undertaken by a special Department of Health task force. I take this opportunity to place on record my appreciation of the work that that task force did. As a result, a Green Paper has been formulated to provide the opportunity for individuals, interested groups and the community at large to provide submissions and comments on proposed arrangements for public sector health services as a whole. As you will be aware, Mr Speaker, the release of this paper is in accordance with the Goss Labor Government's commitment to public sector reform. The policy objectives of the Government underlying the issue of the Green Paper are to maintain the provision of optional free treatment to the people of this State in public hospitals and in the community and to ensure that future administrative and management arrangements are commensurate with the provision of high-quality, cost-effective public sector health services.

Proposals outlined in the Green Paper relate to the regionalisation of health care services and the delegation of decision-making and accountability to professional managers at regional level in association with area health authorities. The primary thrust is based on the integration of hospital and community health services within geographic areas, each coordinated by a semi-autonomous body known as an area health authority. The authority would have responsibility for the implementation of policy, resource allocation and planning. The authority would be managed by an area director who would be accountable directly to the Department of Health. Each health authority would be comprised of no more than five community representatives.

The management of hospital services within the area would be coordinated by a base hospital executive directorate consisting of the hospital manager, the medical superintendent and the director of nursing. Similarly, executive directorates would be established for each district hospital within the area, with statutory accountability for the management of hospital services in that hospital and any smaller subsidiary hospitals or outpatient clinics within its district. Those directorates would have a reporting line to the base hospital executive directorate.

The Department of Health would need to undergo significant functional rearrangement. All health care provision, except for the most specialised services, would be undertaken through the area health authorities. Policy, planning, research, corporate services and overall financial control would remain central responsibilities.

The advantages of this organisational model would be that it would allow for the coordination and management of all community health and hospital services within geographic areas of the State; community representation in the delivery of public sector health services through area health authorities; accountability for service delivery centred upon the office of area director; and maintenance of the executive committee system for the delivery of hospital services.

The benefits to the community would be the development of increasingly responsive public sector health services due to area rather than central decision-making. That would ensure that local health services would be appropriate to local requirements within a Statewide planning framework. The community would continue to be involved in the management of hospital services through membership on the area health authority.

The Green Paper also proposes that the current Hospitals Act be repealed from 30 June 1991, with a new Act to be drafted for consideration of Parliament. The new legislation would have an operative date of 1 July 1991.

In conclusion, I believe that the proposal outlined in the Green Paper provides a basis for informed and constructive debate and discussion and ultimately for sound decisions by the Government regarding future arrangements for the provision of high-quality, cost-effective health services to the Queensland community.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE
Poker Machine Manufacturers

1.

Mr BORBIDGE asked the Treasurer and Minister for Regional Development—

"(1) Which companies in Australia have the capabilities to manufacture and supply poker machines for introduction to licensed premises in Queensland?

(2) What are the names of the directors, major shareholders and chief executives of those companies?

(3) What are the names of any subsidiary companies or trading names under which those companies could operate to supply the poker machine market in Queensland and what are the names of the directors, major shareholders and chief executives of those entities?"

Mr De LACY: (1 to 3): At this point in time, information regarding companies with the capacity to manufacture and supply gaming machines for introduction to licensed clubs in Queensland has not been officially sought. Accordingly, the very detailed information sought by the honourable member is not available at present. However, I can assure him that through the tender process for the supply of gaming machines in Queensland, all companies seeking to participate will be required to provide to the Casino Control Division of Treasury the information sought in the honourable member's question, plus additional material.

This Government is determined to ensure that the introduction of gaming machines into this State will be free of the taint of the criminal activity which the industry has attracted in some other places. The tender process will be exhaustive and complete, ensuring that the best available machines from the approved suppliers are provided to Queensland hotels and clubs under the best and most honest terms.

I should note that this Government's measured and careful response to this issue contrasts sharply with the pseudo arrangements for de facto poker machines that were hastily concocted by the honourable member and his colleagues in the desperate dying days of their Government. The Goss Government is committed to a system that will provide gaming opportunities to all Queenslanders while providing a much-needed boost to club revenues.

To enable the honourable member to pursue his research—should he wish to do so—I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a list of the major manufacturers that supply gaming machines in New South Wales and the ACT.

Leave granted.

POKER MACHINE MANUFACTURERS

Ainsworth Nominees Pty Ltd.

108 Dunning Ave.

Rosebery 2018.

Mailing address: Possibility Box 155 Rosebery N.S.W. 2018.

Lic. nbr: AAD 21100094, PM 24001778

Milwell Pty Ltd

531 535 George St

Sydney N.S.W. 2000.

Mailing address: As above

Lic. nbr: AAD 21100116.

IGT (Australia) Pty Ltd.

Units 1 & 2 286-288 Coward St.

Mascot N.S.W.

Mailing address: As above

Lic. nbr: AAD 24001311, PM 24001310

Badel Pty Ltd.

84 Batten St
North Albury N.S.W.
MAILING ADDRESS: AS ABOVE
Lic. nbr: PM 24002344
N.S.W. Poker Machine Supply & Service Pty Ltd.
350 Merrylands Rd
Merrylands N.S.W.
Mailing address: As above
Lic. nbr: NIL
Precise Craft
Unit 13 380 Marion St
Bankstown N.S.W. 2200
Mailing address: As above
Lic. nbr: PM 24001890
Olympic Amusements Pty Ltd.
City South Business Park
Unit 5 5 - 15 Epsom Rd
Rosebery N.S.W. 2018
Mailing address: As above
Lic. nbr: AAD 21100027, PM 24001932
Universal Australia Pty. Ltd.
23 27 Bourke Rd
Alexandria. N.S.W. 2015
Mailing address: As above
Lic. nbr: AAD 24002366, PM 24002365
P. Annechini Amusements Pty Ltd.
8 Page St
Oakflats N.S.W. 2529
Mailing address: As above
Lic. nbr: Nil.
A. Hankin & Co Pty Ltd.
183 187 Darby St.
Newcastle N.S.W. 2300
Mailing address: As above
Lic. Nbr: AAD 21100086
Video Distributors Pty Ltd,
Unit 13,
380 Marion Street,
Bankstown. N.S.W. 2200
Mailing address: As above
Lic. nbr: PMD 24001890, PMS 24001884

Mr De LACY: The list is not exhaustive, nor does it mean that all of the manufacturers that are listed will either wish to or will be able to participate in the provision of gaming machines in Queensland. Any further public information on the operations of those companies is as available to the honourable member as it is to the Government through the relevant corporate affairs commission.

2.

Oxley Police Academy

Mr SANTORO asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services—

- "(1) What is the maximum annual training capacity of the Oxley Police Academy?
- (2) What is the current rate of resignation from the Queensland Police Force?
- (3) How many intakes into the Oxley Police Academy have occurred since the Goss Labor Government came to power and what is the number of recruits that have been enlisted?
- (4) What is his estimate of the number of recruits who will graduate from the Oxley Police Academy in the first 12 months of the Goss Labor Government?"

Mr MACKENROTH: (1) 625 pre-service students.

(2) Since 1 July 1989 there have been an average of 12 resignations per month.

(3) There have been three intakes for a total of 200 recruits.

(4) 513.

Since the election of the Goss Labor Government and my appointment to the Police Ministry, I have taken a number of steps to meet the Government's election commitment of providing 1 200 extra operational police during its first term of office. To achieve that, it will be necessary to increase the number of probationary squads at the Oxley Police Academy. However, before doing that, the important question of training methods needs to be addressed.

Contrary to what some people believe, producing extra police is not simply a matter of luring a number of young men and women to Oxley and slapping blue uniforms on them. In his report, Mr Fitzgerald made a specific recommendation about this.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr MACKENROTH: The honourable member would know, because, if I remember correctly, he was the Police Minister for three weeks. Mr Fitzgerald made a specific recommendation in relation to this matter in recommendation C.III.17, which states—

"existing systems of recruitment and training (should) be pursued to maintain the current level of police trainee intake, but no significantly greater number of additional police (should) be recruited and trained under the present inadequate systems;".

As Mr Fitzgerald identified, police training has not adequately equipped police officers to deal with the multitude of situations that arise, nor has it given them the skills that are increasingly expected of them in dealing with the whole range of community problems. That issue is now being addressed by interim changes to the syllabus approved by the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission, Sir Max Bingham, and a full review of the syllabus to be conducted by the CJC.

As well, the Government has allocated \$1.4m to create an extra 100 positions in the public service. In the short term we are negotiating the transfer of watchhouse duties to corrective services officers. That move will immediately release 120 experienced, operational police.

In relation to new probationary squads—in its Budget review, Cabinet approved funding of up to \$2.86m for extra squads for this financial year. Those squads and their commencement dates are as follows—

Probationary squad E/90, 30 April 1990;

Probationary squad F/90, 30 April 1990;

Probationary squad G/90, 30 April 1990;

Probationary squad H/90, 28 May 1990;

Probationary squad I/90, 28 May 1990;

Probationary squad J/90, 25 June 1990; and

Probationary squad K/90, 25 June 1990.

In relation to the suggestion that large numbers of police are leaving the police force—which is, I believe, a result of a rather creative interpretation of figures by the Queensland Police Union—I provide the following percentages—

1985-86, 4.3 per cent;

1986-87, 5.1 per cent;

1987-88, 4.2 per cent;

1988-89, 4.3 per cent; and

1989-90, to date, 3.9 per cent.

Those percentages of police leaving the force need to be compared with the percentages of police leaving police forces in other States. For instance, in the past financial year, the New South Wales police force recorded a wastage of 6.3 per cent, and in Victoria the figure was 8 per cent.

3.

Australian Workers Union Accounts

Mr LINGARD asked the Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Relations—

"With reference to a conversation during the week ending 10 February in which he discussed the problem of the sum of \$7m which was, and I quote, 'astray', in the accounts of the Australian Workers' Union—

(1) What was he referring to when he said, 'six weeks and we'll have it all wrapped up—certainly before August'?

(2) Who is the person named 'Angelo' referred to in the conversation?

(3) Is he still certain there is 'no record' of the \$7m that is 'astray'?"

Mr WARBURTON: (1 to 3) Last Thursday, when a question without notice was asked about this issue, I indicated that I had no idea what the honourable member was talking about. That is still the case.

Mr Lingard: I am talking about the Cooke inquiry.

Mr WARBURTON: I am giving the honourable member a chance.

However, the honourable member has made certain implications that reflect upon me as a Minister. That leaves me with no alternative other than to challenge him to be more specific about his allegations. If he is not prepared to accept the challenge, then he shows himself as lacking credibility and as being capable of inventing stories to meet his own peculiar brand of satisfaction.

4.

Baillie Henderson Hospital Funding

Dr FLYNN asked the Minister for Health—

"With reference to the situation where increasing numbers of disturbed and aggressive patients are being transferred to Baillie Henderson Hospital since the closure of the security patients hospital at Wacol and also to the fact that Baillie Henderson Hospital currently lacks a suitable medium security facility to house these patients and, in view of the increasingly dangerous situation for staff and other patients—

Is an early funding allocation expected for this urgent capital works project?"

Mr McELLIGOTT: The Baillie Henderson Hospital at Toowoomba is a 434-bed psychiatric hospital which accepts referrals from all parts of Queensland. The hospital does accept a small number of patients on transfer from security facilities in Brisbane. However, the majority of admissions comes from outside the south-east corner of the State. The majority of the patients who were previously detained in the Security Patients Hospital at Wacol were transferred to the new John Oxley Memorial Hospital at Wacol, which is now administered by the Department of Health.

Unfortunately, the Baillie Henderson Hospital has no specially designed secure facility to provide intensive treatment and security for seriously mentally disturbed patients. As a result, patients are being nursed in wards which are not optimal for this purpose.

I have therefore directed that planning commence for a new 25-bed medium-security unit to partially replace existing suboptimal accommodation provided in the Gowrie Hall Ward at the hospital. This new development will provide an additional 10 beds

for the hospital and also allow appropriate patient rehabilitation areas to be constructed. It is expected that this facility will cost \$3m. The commencement of the project will be dependent upon funds being allocated in the 1990-91 capital works program.

Separate attention is being given to augmenting the staffing establishment of Baillie Henderson Hospital to ensure that there are sufficient numbers of health professional staff to ensure adequate treatment and care of patients.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Aboriginal Land Rights

Mr COOPER: I refer the Premier to the ALP's policy commitment to grant Aboriginal land rights in Queensland under freehold title, and I ask: when will such land rights be granted in Queensland to fulfil his promise? Approximately what percentage of Queensland land will be granted in this manner? Finally, does he support the signing of the national Aboriginal treaty, which obviously has the potential to create further division, on racial grounds, in our society?

Mr W. K. GOSS: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. I did not realise that after 32 years he was in such a hurry to ensure the granting of land rights to Aborigines. I will deal with the various parts of the question. We have not yet considered the treaty. We will do so in due course.

Mr Cooper: You don't know.

Mr W. K. GOSS: Well, that is the answer.

In relation to the granting of freehold land, I understand that at present the Minister is obtaining advice, which will come to the Government shortly, in relation to certain defects or anomalies in the legislation that was passed by the previous Government. I understand that some of those defects may have been inadvertent, as opposed to intentional. When that advice is received, we will, if necessary, bring amending legislation into the House, and that will resolve the matter.

As for the percentage of land in Queensland that may be involved—at this stage, I simply do not have any idea.

Australian Economy; Comments by Senator Walsh

Mr COOPER: I ask the Treasurer and Minister for Regional Development: has his attention been drawn to the lead story in today's *Sydney Morning Herald* headlined "We're in trouble: Minister". That is a startling admission by Senator Walsh, who questions whether the Hawke Labor Government has the courage to tackle a deteriorating economy. Does the Treasurer support the criticisms by Senator Walsh, namely—

1. that Australians are living on borrowed money and borrowed time, leading to lower standards of living;
2. that pressure groups are running Australia and shutting out valid economic development;
3. that Australia's economic position has deteriorated since 1986 under Labor Party policies; and
4. the senator's stinging attack of locking up Australia?

Finally, in view of the Treasurer's lame-duck approach to the Queensland economy, can he guarantee Queenslanders that he will not be letting the Environment Minister and pressure groups take it down the Third World road, as suggested by Senator Walsh, and inflict the same havoc as is the habit of Labor in every Australian State it governs?

Mr De LACY: My word, the questions that are coming from the Opposition these days are dreadful. That really is a question that should be placed on notice, but I will endeavour to answer it as best I can.

I have seen the comments attributed to Senator Walsh. Essentially, I agree with them. Australia is in some trouble. I do not think that in the article there are any great revelations on that point. If Peacock and Blunt took over the reins of the economic direction of Australia, I think we would be in much greater trouble. There is no secret that Australia is facing a very difficult time; that we are consuming more than we are earning; that we are importing more than we are exporting, that we are not working hard enough and smart enough—and a variety of other things—and that we are losing our competitive edge. But there is nothing novel about that. I think that they were frank comments made by a Finance Minister who may be looking for greener fields—I do not know. However, they certainly were frank and refreshing. In general terms, I agree with them.

In respect to being held hostage by interest groups—I think Senator Walsh was making a point that needs to be made from time to time. However, the Goss Labor Government will not be held hostage by any interest groups at all. We will be governing on behalf of the people of Queensland and we will be implementing our platform on that basis.

South Bank Redevelopment

Mr PREST: I ask the Deputy Premier and Minister for Housing and Local Government: can he inform the House of what the Government has done to keep the Brisbane City Council informed on the progress of the south bank redevelopment plan? Has the Brisbane City Council given any assurances that it will honour its commitment to contribute to the funding of the redevelopment?

Mr BURNS: I thank the honourable member for that question. The question of consultation about the Expo site comes back to the Act that was passed by the Parliament and the decisions that were made by the previous Government. Those consultations have been carried on for some time. First, a draft development plan was prepared by Mr Pullar and the South Bank Redevelopment Authority, which comprises two council appointees, two Government appointees and Mr Puller, making a total of five. I congratulate Mr Pullar on the work that he has done. He was a good appointment. He worked hard on that particular issue and stood up for the recommendations of his commission. We should give him credit for that. He will be a good chairman of the South Bank Redevelopment Authority and he will produce a good conclusion for the people of Queensland. Let us not attack him for what he has done.

Mr Pullar will be a good chairman of the South Bank Redevelopment Authority and he will produce a good conclusion for the people of Queensland. He should not be attacked for what he has done.

When the draft development plan was laid on the table and made available to the public, 4 000 people objected. Those objections were considered, and Mr Pullar then produced a revised draft development plan. The consultative process requires that he discuss the proposal with me as the Minister responsible for the Cabinet committee looking after the South Bank redevelopment. He took the revised draft development plan to the Brisbane City Council on about 12 March. The council had a couple of weeks to look at it. Yesterday the council approved the revised draft development plan. The intention of this Government is to get on with the job of developing the South Bank site. Brisbane is not going to be like Vancouver and for years leave the site looking like an empty Beirut bomb shelter. That site is going to be a great credit to this State.

Turning to the next part of the process—I met the Lord Mayor on 8 March—in fact, the Premier called in on that meeting to acknowledge the Lord mayor's presence. The parties have agreed to meet again. Yesterday one of my officers rang the Lord Mayor, after her return from Vancouver, and offered five or six dates that would be suitable for consultation. The Lord Mayor's officer said that those dates were not suitable. That officer then submitted other dates.

I am not going to try to bag the Lord Mayor on the issue. I do not think that would be the correct approach. This Government has to develop a major area on the south side of the river. There is an argument about whether one has 300 000 square metres of developed property—buildings—or whether one has park.

Mr Cooper: Commercial development?

Mr BURNS: Not only commercial development but some housing development. "Development" is the best way to describe the proposal.

On the one hand, the Brisbane City Council is saying to this Government that one ought to have more park and less commercial and housing development; on the other hand, the council is saying—or so the newspaper states this morning—that it does not want to contribute \$25m towards the cost of the park itself.

The council is arguing that it has a \$50m investment in the Clem Jones Park. No-one is denying that. At the Cabinet meeting at which I was appointed chairman of the committee, agreement was reached for the purchase, at a cost of \$50m, of 5 hectares from the South Bank Redevelopment Authority. The previous Government had nearly reached agreement on that purchase. Cabinet also agreed to pay \$15m towards infrastructure costs. The Government's \$50m purchase matches the \$50m claimed for the Clem Jones site.

Another \$50m is to be spent on developing that park. This Government says that \$25m should come from the council and \$25m from the Government. That proposal is no different from the one submitted to the Townsville City Council, which wishes to provide an entertainment centre in north Queensland—\$5m on a dollar-for-dollar basis. There is no reason why Brisbane should be treated any differently from Townsville on an issue like this.

It is not a matter for argument. If the Brisbane City Council cannot provide the \$25m, this Government is prepared to make a loan arrangement through the Treasury so that the council can borrow that amount of money. This Government will carry out that development and develop that park concept on a joint venture basis between it and the Brisbane City Council.

I do not feel that there is any need for the Lord Mayor and I to be exchanging any arguments about that. Let me make this point: there is a suggestion around that there are some Liberal elements, other than the Lord Mayor, who have suggested that the best way to pursue this matter would be for the Liberal council not to be involved on the South Bank so that the Liberal Party could stand off and pick away at the issue. I am sure that the Lord Mayor wants to be involved. It is a major park and development site for the people of Brisbane, and it is my intention to work with the Lord Mayor and the Brisbane City Council to bring the redevelopment to a successful conclusion.

Proposed Multifunction Polis

Mr PREST: In directing my second question to the Premier, I refer to the issue of the multifunction polis. I ask: will he outline to the House the latest position concerning steps being taken by Queensland to attract the project to our State?

Mr W. K. GOSS: I thank the honourable member for the question. It must be understood that the multifunction polis is a concept only. There is a long way to go before it is decided whether or not this project will proceed in Australia and, if it is to proceed in Australia, where it will be built.

The previous Government had commenced certain work. My Government has continued that work and has committed substantial resources of time and money to pursuing the opportunity to have the multifunction polis sited here in Queensland.

At the moment, this Government is engaged in a very comprehensive feasibility study. We have a couple of months to complete it and to lodge Queensland's submission. This Government will be pursuing that course. I stress that it is a feasibility study only. At the end of that process, a decision has to be made as to whether or not the project goes ahead. The outcome is still uncertain. The Government has committed resources to the project.

The report recently issued by Andersen Consulting—I have some extracts here—makes some important points in relation to the prospects of the various States. I wish to refer to one section in the conclusion of the report. It states that when one applies the criteria that are being used to the proposals—

"The New South Wales, Queensland, Victorian and South Australian proposals seems most likely to attract attention;"

However, the report goes on to state that Queensland, while generally providing the lowest costs for an MFP, has some problems. The report states that—

" . . . the NIEIR'S data indicates that the Gold Coast region is somewhat underdeveloped. As a result, it may be difficult to reach the 100,000 population base required in the MFP"—

Mr Borbridge interjected.

Mr W. K. GOSS: I am quoting from the report. I know that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has been down talking to some syndicate people on the Gold Coast trying to undermine the Queensland Government's effort. That is point-scoring that does the honourable member's reputation no good at all.

Mr BORBIDGE: I rise to a point of order. I have had no discussions with a syndicate—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order.

Mr BORBIDGE: Under Standing Order 119 I ask that the allegation be withdrawn.

Mr W. K. GOSS: I accept the honourable member's denial.

The report goes on to state—

"With respect to job formation, a Queensland MFP would generate some 20,000 direct jobs by 2005 with a corresponding lower total indirect job formation rate."

Interestingly enough—I want to throw this in for the benefit of the honourable member who is so sensitive—

"The Queensland economy is less well integrated with the national economy, therefore in the medium term it will have slightly smaller national GDP impacts than the other nominated States."

The report goes on to state that—

"Sydney's linkages with the national and international economy are relatively strong so that the cumulative impact of an MFP on both the State and national GDP is greater than the other proposed sites."

It has to be acknowledged that their proximity to the industrial and technological centres of Australia will provide something of an advantage to Sydney and to the southern States. Queensland has some different advantages, but I do not think that one can, by any stretch of the imagination, take it for granted that Queensland is the front-runner. A good deal of work has to be done and the Government will pursue it.

Unfortunately, considerable harm was done to the prospects for foreign investor confidence by the positions taken by the National Party and the Liberal Party during the last two weeks for what was unfortunate, short-term, political point-scoring. Nevertheless, I place on the record that, despite the matters referred to in the report from Andersen Consulting, the Government is continuing to pursue this project and continuing to participate in a complete way in the feasibility study process.

Labor Party Election Promises

Mr INNES: Mr Speaker, I ask for your ruling. The question I intend to ask is really supplementary to the Premier's tabling of certain documents this morning, which disclose the accountants' verification of the figures that the Premier released before the

last election, but which do not attach or disclose the figures for which I asked. I therefore ask the Premier: is he prepared to table the figures which this document verifies? That is what I asked for.

Mr W. K. GOSS: The answer to the question is that the honourable member asked me for the documents which were released last year. He has been given the documents that were released last year. That is all that I propose to table.

Small Business Debt Assistance Scheme

Mr PALASZCZUK: I ask the Treasurer and Minister for Regional Development: given the difficulties which have been faced in recent months by small businesses, affected by the airline dispute and high interest rates, will he advise the House of the value of the loans approved to date under the Small Business Debt Assistance Scheme and the likely level of approvals for 1989-90?

Mr De LACY: I thank the honourable member for Archerfield for the question. As all honourable members would know, certain sectors of the Queensland economy are experiencing very difficult times, particularly those based on the tourism industry, not the least of all being those in Cairns, where I come from, Whitsunday and the Gold Coast.

These very difficult times are being addressed by the Queensland Government to the greatest extent possible. The Small Business Debt Assistance Scheme is administered by the QIDC and the problem is being addressed. I understand that some people believe that the Government should be doing more. I must say that it is very difficult to achieve that balance between responsibly and frugally administering taxpayers' money on the one hand and, on the other hand, doing what can be done to assist small businesses and stop them from going over the edge. Unfortunately, many small business will go over the edge. The straw that broke the camel's back, as it were, was the pilots dispute. I must say that there are a number of other factors which have led to this very serious state of affairs.

An honourable member: High interest rates.

Mr De LACY: Yes, high interest rates and overcapacity in certain sectors of the tourism economy, certainly in the Cairns region, including overcapacity of bedrooms and tour operators and, certainly, specialty shops. So a whole variety of factors has impacted on and led to a very serious situation indeed.

No Government, including the Queensland Government, can bail out every person who is in difficulty. I must say that there is really no point in a Government coming in and deferring the inevitable. There is no point in providing short-term assistance to a business to stop it from going broke, for instance, in March and simply deferring that inevitability until June or July. The Queensland Government cannot compensate everybody for losses sustained during the pilots dispute.

Through the Small Business Debt Assistance Scheme, which is administered by the QIDC, the Government is making money available. So far it has cost something like \$3m and 90 small businesses have been assisted. With all of this in mind, the Budget Review Committee, during its January deliberations, put aside \$6.5m for this scheme. It is expected that, by the end of this financial year, that amount will be fully expended.

The Queensland Government has some other schemes in place to assist. They include tourist promotion, which is being organised through the QTTC. That is a \$4m scheme funded \$2m by the Commonwealth Government and \$2m by the State Government. There is also a scheme to defer payroll tax for businesses that are particularly affected. The Queensland Government is committed to assisting those sectors of the economy and those businesspeople who are suffering short-term debt problems as a consequence of these particular factors.

Cairns Workers Club

Mr PALASZCZUK: I refer the Treasurer to recent questions to him from the Opposition on the financial affairs of the Cairns Workers Club. I ask: will he inform the House whether he has undertaken an investigation into this matter?

Mr De LACY: I thank the honourable member for Archerfield for the question. Yes—surprise, surprise—I did go to the Cairns Workers Club over the weekend to find out what it knew about all of these scurrilous allegations. The club has delivered to me a letter, the contents of which I would like to make known.

The letter states—

"Dear Mr Cooper,

The Cairns Workers Club is insulted and offended by the defamatory allegations made by you under privilege in State Parliament last week.

Our books are independently audited each year and we abide by all tax laws. Your allegations are denied absolutely.

The Cairns Workers Club is a significant and honourable institution in Cairns with over 700 members. As well as running a licensed club and providing facilities to members, we contribute widely to charities. Our last contribution was \$1000 to people affected by the Newcastle earthquake.

Your comments are a slur not only on the management of the club, but on the membership as well. We are outraged that you should seek to impugn our reputation in order to score cheap political points.

We are disappointed also that Tom Gilmore, a North Queenslander, would stoop so low as to be part of such a grubby exercise.

The Cairns Workers Club believes it is entitled to a public apology."

That letter is signed by John Meade, the secretary/manager of the club.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

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

Mr De LACY: The honourable member has just heard the story.

Whilst I am on this subject, I wish to draw the attention of honourable members to an article appearing in the *Cairns Post* on 23 March headlined "De Lacy accused of indirect tax dodge." Those comments are defamatory in the extreme. The article states—

"The State Opposition yesterday accused the Treasurer, Mr Keith De Lacy, of being indirectly involved in \$15,000 worth of tax dodging as president of the Cairns Workers Club."

The article continues—

"The Treasurer must have a finely honed financial priority."

Whatever that means. The article further states—

"He is supposed to know revenue, and it seems his Workers Club has knowingly dodged the taxation," an official in Mr Cooper's office said."

This article is clearly defamatory. It does not have the defences which are usually available to people who commit defamation: it is not privileged—there is not one reference in that article to State Parliament—it does not have the defence of truth, because it is not true; and it is manifestly not fair comment. I have had legal advice to the effect that, if I decided to take legal action, it is an open and shut case.

Mr Gunn: They all say that.

Mr De LACY: Opposition members ought to know, because they conducted defamation actions with public money and, once the public money went, they had to creep out.

I am still considering my options, but some people must understand that they cannot pick up half-baked stories and scurrilous rumours that are going around and publish them as fact in a daily newspaper.

If the Leader of the Opposition had any integrity or honour he would stand up and apologise not only to me for making defamatory allegations, but also to the Cairns Workers Club.

Mr KATTER: Mr Speaker, he is taking up all of question time.

Mr De LACY: If the honourable member likes, I will take all day.

I am giving the Leader of the Opposition this opportunity. The eyes of all members of Parliament and everyone else are on him. We will see if he has any honour. The ball is back in his court.

Appointment of Senior Officers in Department of Housing

Mr BORBIDGE: I draw the attention of the Deputy Premier, Minister for Housing and Local Government to Labor's statement last August on public sector reform when Mr Goss said—

"For the public service, a Goss Government will herald an end to patronage and cronyism and a return to professionalism, the reintroduction of merit as the only principle of recruitment and promotion."

Firstly, I ask: in view of the Goss Government's stated policy, how does the Minister justify the appointment of Mr Richard Perrson as Acting Director-General of Housing, in view of the fact that Mr Perrson worked for the Wran Government, the failed Unsworth Government and then the Federal Labor Government before heading north? Secondly, I ask: how many other senior officers previously associated with Mr Perrson in Sydney or Canberra have come north to occupy positions in his department, how many of these are staying at an inner city hotel apparently at public expense, and are any of them being provided with air travel to allow them to return south towards the end of each week after only four days work?

Mr BURNS: Obviously the honourable member did not read the ministerial statement I made last week on this issue. This week the Machinery of Government Committee approved the reorganisation and restructuring of my department. All of those top positions will now be advertised and will be subject to a merit test by the Public Sector Management Commission. All of the other matters raised were covered in my ministerial statement and all of the applicants for the positions will be appointed on merit, as promised by the Premier.

Fibre Optic Network Linking Queensland Universities

Mr FENLON: I ask the Minister for Manufacturing and Commerce: can he confirm that yesterday Cabinet approved the installation of a \$160,000 fibre optic network linking south-east Queensland's four universities, and can he outline the benefits to Queensland accruing from this decision?

Mr SMITH: The honourable member for Greenslopes is an active member of the Griffith University council and has taken a keen interest in this subject. In fact, he has been a strong advocate of the installation of the fibre optic system.

The strategic plan to bring fibre optic networks to Queensland to underpin commercially relevant research and development has been in place for some time. The major industrialised countries all have nationally funded nationwide communication networks that act as national backbones to link regional centres and provide them with access to expensive shared research facilities, such as supercomputers. Regional networks supported by State Governments will connect member institutions to the national backbones via the regional centres.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SMITH: For the information of honourable members opposite, I point out that, by the use of Commonwealth Government funding, Australia will implement a high-speed computer network known as the Australian Academic and Research Network in mid-1990. This network will link centres in each State, including the Prentice Computer Centre at the University of Queensland, for the purpose of communication in applied research projects. During the first stage of the existing network, it will be increased in capacity to 2 megabits per second. Because it will provide a service to users who wish to transmit data to each other, it will be called a service network. In the latest stages of the strategic plan, it is proposed that this service network will be further enhanced. However, even after that, it will still not provide the very large capacity that would allow Queensland to remain a major player in the game.

The work on this seeding venture will allow necessary research to take place and will enable planning for exactly what is required in the future to take place. If Australia is to be a major player in research and development, a 100-megabit per second installation will be required. It is proposed that that installation will be provided primarily by commercial users.

I hope that this project has the support of the Opposition. If it does not have that support, that will mean that the National Party Opposition wants this State to remain for ever dependent on primary and resource industries. If members of the Opposition want this State to go ahead, they will support this project.

Queensland Railways Driver-only Operations

Mr FENLON: I am sure that the Minister for Transport will be aware that in the past few months some disquiet has been expressed about the impact of the introduction of driver-only operations for Queensland Railways. I ask: can he advise the House of the current situation concerning the implementation of driver-only operations, with particular regard to its effects on the Queensland Railways work force?

An honourable member interjected.

Mr HAMILL: Someone suggested that I should answer "No", but I actually happen to have some information with me in relation to this matter. Honourable members should realise that driver-only operations came into effect through an award variation made on 23 October last year by the State Industrial Commission when all parties before the commission were in agreement.

The decision of the commission involved a 5 per cent pay increase for drivers working under the single-manning mode in rail motors and EMUs. Also involved in the agreement were a number of improvements to working conditions which involved the modification of locomotives and a whole range of workplace-related improvements. The Industrial Commission requires a report back on 18 April in relation to the implementation of the driver-only operations.

Originally, as part of that agreement, the driver assistant was to be removed from locomotives on 23 February this year. All honourable members who are concerned about the welfare of railways in this State should take note of the process of consultation that has taken place since the commission brought down its decision in October last year. Last Friday, the driver-only operation committee met for the sixteenth time. At that time, officers from Queensland Railways met with representatives of the Australian Railways Union, the Queensland Railway Employees Union and, significantly, the AFULE—although that other major union had not been involved up to that point. It should be noted that for the second time, following consultations between management and the unions, the removal of driver assistants has been postponed. Because of important concerns that have been expressed by the unions with respect to the unsuitability of the existing radio system, removal of that second employee from locomotives has now been put back to 14 May.

I believe that this exercise represents a model of proper consultation in industrial relations in this State. All members of this House have my assurance that, as Minister for Transport, I am committed to consultative processes being put in place in Queensland Railways. This is something that is long overdue. It will revamp the conduct of industrial relations in this very important facet of Queensland's transport network.

Police Station Facilities in Far-north Queensland

Mr BREDHAUER: I ask the Minister for Police and Emergency Services: given the disgraceful condition in which the former Government left police detention centres in Doomadgee and Wujal Wujal, can the Minister inform the House of the Government's intentions in relation to upgrading these facilities?

Mr MACKENROTH: I am aware of deplorable conditions, not only at Doomadgee and Wujal Wujal but also at many police establishments throughout the State. Approximately three weeks ago I visited the Cairns Police Station, where the police inspector has been forced to set up his office in a store room. That is the type of condition in which the previous National Party Government left police establishments.

I believe that Doomadgee is No. 4 on the priority list and will be replaced during the next financial year. Although Wujal Wujal is further down the list, it certainly has a high priority. At this stage, I am unable to advise the House—until I know the funds to be allocated in the Budget for the next financial year—whether its replacement will take place in the next financial year. However, I can assure the honourable member that all police establishments throughout this State will receive a much higher priority than they have received during the past 32 years.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Government Appointments; Poker Machines

Mr COOPER (Roma—Leader of the Opposition) (11 a.m.): Shortly, a jobs-for-the-boys episode, heavily subsidised by the taxpayer, will be outlined to the House by the honourable member for Somerset. It will signal yet another break-down in the creed that, on their election, members opposite purportedly brought to this House and this State. They have been holier than thou in the extreme in their rhetoric both before and since their election, and totally hypocritical in reality. The jobs for the boys and the girls to be outlined by the member for Somerset, along with weekly taxpayer supported flights to and from the south, are examples of just a handful of the appointments that have been made by this Government on the basis of loyalty to the Labor cause; they were most certainly not based solely on merit, a concept which has become a Labor furphy.

I appreciate fully that few people will be shocked or excited to see the syndrome at work, particularly as in recent years it has been such a hallmark of Labor Governments, which have made it an art form from Paris to Yarralumla. But it is another stark example of the hypocrisy of this Government, and particularly of its leader and his public relations gurus. They quite successfully pulled the wool over the eyes of the general public via the media, or certain elements of it, with the claim that this new administration was absolutely squeaky clean and that it contains the most honest, the most accountable and the most sanctimonious bunch of men and women—angels all—who could ever hope to be elected.

It is all a sham and, time and time again during this first session of this Parliament, the Opposition has shown it as such. That began on the very first business day of the session when the Education Minister admitted to the House that he had abused his rights in relation to a Government vehicle.

Mr BRADDY: I rise to a point of order. I find those remarks offensive. When I was called upon in the House, I indicated that I had acted entirely within the guidelines

operating on the use of motor vehicles. The Leader of the Opposition is saying that I made an admission; I did not. I find the remarks offensive. They should be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw.

Mr COOPER: It is by the honourable member's own admission that there have been certain abuses of the use of the vehicle. However, in deference to you, Mr Speaker, I will withdraw. Of course, the guidelines have since been altered.

At that time, the Premier, this whiter-than-white politician, was at sixes and sevens explaining how his ministerial code of conduct might be imperfect and might, from time to time, have to be adjusted. I find that rather hypocritical. The Premier told the House that the Minister had transgressed and said, "But that's all right. Don't you worry about that. We'll just vary the guidelines." No wonder the Special Prosecutor was concerned! The Premier said, "When Ministers transgress, we'll fix up the problem, and we'll do it retrospectively."

Then we had the extraordinary episode of Mr Casey and the \$30,000 donation from the poker machine lobby. How the Government the violins—the string section—over this! There is no question about that. The Government said, "It's all old hat." But let us look at a couple of the very pertinent points that members opposite and some members of the gallery have managed to assiduously ignore to date. I stress "to date", because I promise that the poker machine issue will not go away for the Australian Labor Party. The very same people who were involved in the 1980 pay-off episode are also involved in the 1990 decisions the Australian Labor Party is taking on poker machines. That is the real story in this caper.

In 1980, the honourable member for Mackay ultimately admitted, after lying to the media, that he had received a \$30,000 donation from the poker machine lobby and that he had laundered it in a bank account through invoices that suggested that they were payments for advertising. The man who gave him the money was a Mr Ainsworth.

Members on this side of the House now find it more than passing curious—or passing strange, to use the honourable member's vernacular—that in 1990 Mr Ainsworth is building a factory in Brisbane to manufacture gaming machines. He plans to manufacture the Aristocrat machine, the very machine that in 1981 Mr Casey saw in the United States and was so impressed by that, on his return, he felt compelled to write to Mr Ted Vibert—a member of the poker machine lobby and a person not entirely unknown to Mr Ainsworth—and comment on it quite specifically. He told Mr Vibert that he had especially noted the Aristocrat machine and that it was very prominent.

That is the very same machine manufactured by the very same Mr Ainsworth which the Tourism, Sport and Racing Minister, Mr Gibbs, has openly touted on the *7.30 Report* as being one of the machines that the Government will buy as part of its \$100m spending spree on pokies. Tenders for the supply of those machines have not been called, yet Mr Gibbs told Alan Hogan of the *7.30 Report*—I might add that he should be congratulated on turning that show from one of free time for the ALP into a genuine current affairs program—that it would be inane to suggest that Ainsworth would not be a supplier to the market. The word that he used was "inane". Yet tenders have not been called.

We want to know what is going on under this Government. We have one Minister who has received a \$30,000 donation from a particular member of the poker machine lobby and another Minister saying that the poker machines which that man produces will be one of the poker machines bought by the Government. What a fantastic coincidence! That is not the only amazing point of this episode that has been roundly misrepresented by the ALP.

Last week, the Premier produced a copy of the Solicitor-General's report on the police investigation into the Caspala scandal, purporting that it totally cleared Mr Casey of any illegal acts. It did nothing of the kind, despite the fact that at least two reports suggested that it did. The first point is that the Premier did not produce the police

report. We suspect very strongly that it will prove to be inconclusive on the point that Mr Casey had broken laws. Did Mr Casey himself withdraw his cooperation from the police inquiry and thereby frustrate it? Without that cooperation, the police would have been unable to test certain matters, particularly those in relation to \$8,000 that was not accounted for at the time.

The Solicitor-General's report was, similarly, inconclusive. On more than one occasion, the Solicitor-General made the point that in his opinion the material with which he had been presented and on which he based his opinion was inconclusive. I repeat that: the material was inconclusive. How in the eyes of any impartial observer that could be determined as exoneration is beyond me. Quite clearly, and quite emphatically, it is not.

Mr Casey may have a very reasonable explanation as to what happened to the missing \$8,000. I will be pleased if he does. However, his feet still will not be off the sticky paper.

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition is endeavouring to deliberately mislead the House. All moneys that were paid into any funds that were under my control were accounted for. The details of those moneys were tabled 10 years ago.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! What is the Minister's point of order?

Mr CASEY: The Leader of the Opposition is trying to deliberately mislead the House in assertions that he is making about me. They are offensive to me. I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Minister asks that the remarks be withdrawn.

Mr COOPER: Well, how—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is entitled to seek a withdrawal. He has asked that the remarks be withdrawn.

Mr COOPER: Purely in deference to your position, Mr Speaker, I withdraw.

It is appropriate that there now be a full investigation by the Government into possible breaches of the Commonwealth Crimes Act by the honourable member for Mackay and others. There can be only two explanations for the fact that Mr Casey laundered the \$30,000 through invoices disguised as payments for advertising by Ainsworth Industries in ALP publications. I wish to table a copy of a letter from Mr Ted Vibert to Mr Casey outlining how the invoices should be prepared, a draft copy of an invoice and a copy of an actual invoice.

One explanation is that Mr Ainsworth wished to use the invoices given to him by Mr Casey to suggest to other persons involved in his company that the expenditure was genuinely for advertising. The other—and I suggest more likely—explanation is that it was to enable Mr Ainsworth to claim a tax deduction for the alleged \$30,000 advertising expense. An advertising expense would, of course, be deductible in computing the tax liability of the entity that claimed the deduction whereas a political donation would not. Given the tax rates applicable in 1980, the effect of an allowable deduction would be that between one half and 65 per cent of the donation to the ALP was contributed by the Australian taxpayer.

Whichever is the position, Mr Ainsworth was engaged in illegal conduct. To the extent that Mr Casey knowingly enabled him to do so by the supply of invoices which he knew to be false, he himself committed an offence. If deceit of the Taxation Commissioner was involved, an offence was committed under section 29B of the Commonwealth Crimes Act by Mr Ainsworth, and by Mr Casey under a section of the same Act that is mirrored by section 7 of the Queensland Criminal Code. As this was a Commonwealth matter, no doubt the Solicitor-General did not concern himself with this aspect. If deceit of persons in a company is involved, its published accounts for

the year will not present a true and fair view of its affairs and the preparation and publication of such accounts would have contravened section 267 of the Companies Code.

If Mr Ainsworth deceived neither the Commissioner of Taxation nor others in his company, he can prove it easily by making available copies of the relevant tax returns that show that no deduction was claimed for the \$30,000 and also make available his company's accounts for the year, which would show the sum as a political donation rather than as an advertising expense. If he is unable to do so, quite plainly his company is not fit and proper to be entrusted with such a sensitive business as the manufacturing of poker machines.

The Opposition will be pressing this matter with the CJC, and elsewhere—

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

Time expired.

Cyclone-tracking Facilities in Far-north and North-western Queensland

Mr BREDHAUER (Cook) (11.10 a.m.): I wish to raise a matter of considerable concern to the constituents of my electorate. I refer to the ongoing threat posed by this year's cyclone season and difficulties experienced by people in my electorate with what is regarded as the inadequacies of cyclone-tracking facilities in far-north and north-western Queensland. In particular, I want to refer to recent cyclone experiences throughout far-north and north-western Queensland. I also advise honourable members that in recent years cyclones such as Winifred, Aivu and Charles have shown that the cyclone threat is not confined to that area of far-north Queensland that involves my constituency but also is obviously a major concern to, in the main, coastal communities throughout Queensland.

In particular I want to refer to the two most recent cyclones in my area—cyclone Greg, which was in the Gulf of Carpentaria for a lengthy period, and subsequently cyclone Ivor which, over a period of about 10 days, menaced communities on the east coast of Cape York peninsula in far-north Queensland and, after crossing Cape York, moved into the gulf where, over a period of about another three days, it menaced communities on the west coast of Cape York at Aurukun, Kowanyama and Edward River.

I suppose it is history now that cyclone Ivor will be remembered not for its potential threat as a cyclone but for the effects that were felt after it had degenerated into a rain depression. I refer, of course, to the recent flooding in far-north Queensland that has interrupted the election in the Federal electorate of Kennedy. That will live long in the minds of people as being unique. I might say that the adverse weather conditions did not deter the good officers of the Australian Electoral Commission from getting out materials for voting day. In fact, in a couple of centres in my electorate, polling materials had to be taken by helicopter into places such as Aurukun, Edward River, Pormpuraaw and Kowanyama.

I point out also that it does not seem that the adverse weather conditions have deterred the voters. I am pleased to announce the re-election of John Gayler as the member for Leichhardt and the virtually certain election of Rob Hulls in the electorate of Kennedy, which means that both far-north and north-western Queensland are in good hands and that State and Federal Labor representatives will represent that part of Queensland for a long time to come.

At this point I commend the Bureau of Meteorology for the work that it does in the cyclone season. Cyclones are extremely stressful occurrences, not just for the people who are in the immediate danger zone but also for those who are charged with the responsibility of tracking them and issuing warnings. After all, their warnings have an effect on people's safety and on potential loss to property.

The services of the Bureau of Meteorology are run from Brisbane. I know that there is some consternation among north Queenslanders about that but, if one looks at it from a practical viewpoint, one realises that Brisbane is the only place that has the staff and the communication links to enable the job to be done. Having said that I am very proud of the efforts of the Bureau of Meteorology in tracking cyclones, I do need to express some reservations about the efficacy of the present services and continue to impress upon the decision-makers the need to improve cyclone-tracking services.

Recently my office has been contacted continually by people who live in the path taken by both cyclones Greg and Ivor. They have told me that they are concerned with the reports of the position of cyclones and the likely effect of the cyclones on the area in which they reside or work and that they do not believe that the reported warnings and watches for their particular area were accurate. Some of the people who contacted my office have reported that their on-the-ground perceptions of a cyclone's whereabouts and also its impact were at considerable variance with the official reports.

I think there needs to be a general understanding that a cyclone is not a pinpoint on a map. It is a broad weather influence, and it is not possible to plot or map precisely the course or whereabouts of a cyclone, which is why the warnings and watches are couched in terms that give a general indication of its location.

The potential cost of cyclones through the threat to personal safety and the economic cost through loss of property and stock means that we cannot rest on our laurels with the present cyclone-warning services. Over a long period the Bureau of Meteorology and others have attempted to upgrade those cyclone-warning services, and those efforts must continue.

I refer to an article that appeared in the *Sun* on Friday, 16 March 1990. It referred to the SES deputy controller and member of the Gulf Local Authorities Development Association, Don McIntosh. It stated—

"SES deputy controller and GLADA member Don McIntosh said the evacuation of trawlers from Karumba when Cyclone Greg was threatening cost the community \$100,000.

'The reported positioning of the cyclone was incorrect and the community must bear the cost of the mistake,' he said.

'We can't blame the bureau because we realise how hard it is to track particularly the low-intensity cyclones without the radar.

'But the same thing happened in 1978 with Cyclone Jason, when we evacuated the town and the cyclone crossed 100 km to the west.'

Mr McIntosh said the decision to delay the radar station for another year could cost lives."

I am aware that the Bureau of Meteorology intends to upgrade cyclone-tracking facilities by establishing in 1991 a radar installation on Mornington Island. However, because I share the concerns that were expressed in that article in the Brisbane *Sun*, I pledge myself to endeavouring to ensure that the cyclone-tracking facility, which will cost approximately \$560,000, is in place prior to the next cyclone season. Because of the lack of cyclone-warning facilities, the potential exists for loss of lives and property damage, which would have an adverse effect on commercial enterprises in the gulf area.

I am aware also of a proposal in 1992 to upgrade the Willis Island radar system to include cyclone surveillance. Although I believe that the upgrading will be useful, it is important to ensure that it is expedited so that people in the far north and the north-west of Queensland can expect a reasonable standard of cyclone-tracking services and reporting.

I understand that the bureau conducts post-surveys of people who were in areas in which cyclone warnings and watches occurred. In the past those surveys have proved quite fruitful. As a result, changes have been made to the terminology used in cyclone watches and warnings. People were asked about cyclone warnings that were given during the period of

a cyclone. They were asked also about how those warnings and watches could be improved. Because of the changes in terminology, cyclone winds are now described as destructive or very destructive. As well, cyclones have been categorised on a 1 to 5 basis so that people are able quickly to assess the potential of the threat. There is a need for constant vigilance and attention in order to continue to provide much better services for the people in those regions. The people on the ground are able to participate very positively in that process.

I commend the actions of the State Emergency Service and other emergency services that played an important role in the areas in far-north Queensland that were affected this year by cyclones. Difficulties have been experienced with electricity supplies. For instance, the cutting of the electricity supply to the Cooktown region for approximately 36 hours greatly disadvantaged the town. Investigations are being conducted to circumvent that problem, should it arise again. I commend the FNQEB employees who, in the height of the cyclone, walked through the rainforest to find the fault and to restore the electricity supply.

Approximately a week ago in this House, a question was asked of the Minister for Emergency Services about the effect of cyclone Ivor. Because of the interruptions by members of the National Party and other members of the Opposition, his reply to that question was totally inaudible. The message is clear from my constituents—

Time expired.

Industrial Relations

Mr SANTORO (Merthyr) (11.20 a.m.): Today I intend to speak about issues that should be of great public interest to all Queenslanders. Since the election of the Goss Labor Government and—without being too cynical—because of the outcome of the recent Federal election, these issues have been sidestepped. The issues that I wish to mention could be grouped basically within the broad heading of industrial relations, which I am sure will become far more dominant because of the result of last Saturday's Federal election.

These issues include a hidden industrial relations agenda which I will attempt to demonstrate to the House has no mandate or public support. Included on that agenda are—

- the repeal of legislation that enables the registration of voluntary employment agreements with the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission;
- the repeal of the essential services legislation;
- the introduction of legislation that will impose compulsory unionism on all facets of private enterprise and the public service;
- the politicisation of existing industrial relations institutions; and
- the quashing of the Cooke inquiry into union activities, particularly unions other than those that are being considered at the moment.

There can be no doubt that those reforms are on the combined agenda of the State Labor Government and the extreme, radical, union allies that it represents within this Parliament. Actions and statements by members of the Government and the union movement indicate clearly a strong desire to undertake those reforms.

For example, through the mouthpiece of Ray Dempsey, the trade union movement has said—

"When you look at the provisions of those that have been registered so far"—

and he was referring to voluntary employment agreements—

"all they have done is take away conditions from the workers."

In February, during the *7.30 Report*, Mr Dempsey made the totally scandalous claim that "bosses are thieving from workers".

In the *Sun* of 10 February 1990, the Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Relations stated—

"People can argue and debate all they like but we have made it clear that VEA's are not in the best interests of the community and we would abolish them."

He went on to instruct the industrial affairs department to refuse to process applications from companies wanting to set up voluntary employment agreements. Mr Warburton condoned that denial of the rights of small businesses even though the law was and still is current.

The Liberal Party intends to argue within this place and outside it that VEAs have a fundamentally important role to play within the Australian and Queensland economies and that, where they have been introduced as part of the operations of firms such as the Metway Bank, Power Brewing and Mini Movers, they have led to improved productivity, the improved competitiveness of those firms on the domestic market, higher levels of remuneration for all the workers within the firms and a level of involvement and pride by the workers within those workplaces.

Far from "the bosses thieving from the workers", as Ray Dempsey suggested, the employees of such firms are enjoying significant increases in financial remuneration and vast improvements in working conditions. This Government will not be able to prove otherwise in this place or outside it. The Liberal Party looks forward to putting to this House the arguments and the facts which will clearly debunk Labor's coercive and centrally oriented position on VEAs.

Equally alarming are the statements that have been made by Labor Ministers and members of the trade union movement in relation to the essential services legislation. From what has been said by members opposite when they were in Opposition and since the election, it is clear that there is no place for the essential services legislation which has, since its proclamation, guaranteed an available supply of electricity to industry, consumers and essential services such as hospitals and nursing homes. The Liberal Party will again stand for the retention of the essential services legislation. It will be only the dogmatic tyranny of numbers, the application of numbers, that will in fact deny that good legislation to Queensland.

The introduction of compulsory unionism is also one of the more sinister plans of the new Labor Government. These days one hears with monotonous regularity of meetings between industry representatives and Ministers. Invariably, as industry representatives leave such meetings with the clear view that the Government is totally committed to measures which will see the introduction of compulsory unionism right across the board, they despair as to where our State is heading, particularly in relation to industrial relations.

Another matter that is becoming very obvious and is of great alarm to the Liberal Party—and I would suggest to all responsible people in the State—is the attitude that the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission adopts to applications that come before it. This attitude was irreparably compromised and politicised by statements that were made by the newly appointed commissioner, Ms Glenys Fisher, shortly after her appointment to the commission. The Liberal Party greeted with disbelief and dismay claims made by Ms Fisher at her first press conference after her appointment that she was a Labor Party sympathiser and that she was opposed to voluntary employment agreements. By expressing those subjective sentiments Ms Fisher blew her credibility, certainly in relation to her attitude on VEAs, and it is doubtful that any employer organisation or other representatives of the private-enterprise point of view would be comfortable in appearing before her and believing that she would be impartial towards the consideration of their interests and their case.

At the time of Ms Fisher's statement, the Liberal Party said that it is essential that people in positions of importance such as that of an industrial commissioner are not only impartial but also are seen to be impartial. We on this side of the House called for her dismissal. There is no doubt in my mind that, if an appointee by a Liberal

Government had made similar statements, the Labor Opposition would have been calling for the immediate sacking of such a person. It was disappointing to see that Mr Goss did not display that courage and principle and take the necessary action in relation to Ms Fisher and thus restore integrity and credibility to the operations of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission.

The attempted interference by this Government in the Cooke inquiry is equally alarming. To spark public disillusionment with that inquiry, the ALP has leaked the amount of the fees that are being paid to Marshall Cooke. In this Parliament the Premier has refused to give a guarantee that he will implement lock, stock and barrel the recommendations of the Cooke inquiry.

The trade union movement has treated the inquiry with apathy, tendering only a three-page submission to the inquiry, despite allegations that involve a union chief putting millions of dollars through secret bank accounts to buy himself a luxury Gold Coast home unit and the services of prostitutes. A submission from the Minister's department has questioned the very existence of the Cooke inquiry. It is clear that the Labor Government is trying to scare the Cooke inquiry away from investigating the Australian Workers Union, the very union which represents the power base of the Honourable the Premier and which, in partnership with the Socialist Left, in fact runs the State. ALP heavyweight Errol Hodder is the national president of the Australian Workers Union, and one would suspect that people within this place are seeking to protect that individual.

This hidden agenda is being proffered despite the declining base of the union movement within Australia. Members of this House should be reminded of some important statistics in relation to union membership. In mid-June 1989, the Australian Bureau of Statistics released figures which showed that only 42 per cent of the Australian work force belonged to the trade union movement, compared with 51 per cent in 1976. More significantly, the percentage of the private sector work force belonging to unions fell from 39 per cent in 1982 to 32 per cent in 1989.

The most revealing of all, however, was the huge rejection of the trade union movement by the young. Only 32 per cent of those under 25 years of age held union tickets, down from 43 per cent in 1976. Since 1983, some 1.5 million jobs have been created and, according to the union movement itself, only 100 000 of those people have in fact been recruited into the union movement. They are indeed alarming statistics—statistics which indicate that the union movement and the party that represents it within this Parliament do not have the mandate to undertake the radical reforms that undoubtedly will be forthcoming.

In Queensland the figures are even more troubling for union leaders and the Labor Government, for it would seem that over the past two decades the State has slumped from having the most unionised work force in the country to having the second-lowest representation. I suggest that those trends in union membership indicate that the Labor Party and the union movement that it represents in this place do not have a mandate to govern.

In conclusion, one can only refer to the words of the ACTU secretary, Bill Kelty. At last year's ACTU congress, he told delegates—

"We don't have the God given right to survive. We'd be less than truthful to say of ourselves that we are an adequate trade union movement. We are not and we must simply face up to that fact."

It is important that the Labor Party within this Parliament face up to the facts and accept the reality that it is not representative of the work force within this State or across Australia. In fact, the Labor Party should throw its hidden agenda to the wind.

Time expired.

Townsville Land Scam; Mrs M. Srebnik

Mr DAVIES (Townsville) (11.30 a.m.): Following on from the Fitzgerald inquiry, which revealed massive, entrenched cronyism in this State, and the then National Party Premier Mike Ahern's statements that all that happened before his administration, let me show this House that cronyism remained alive and well in Queensland under Mr Ahern, and latterly, Mr Cooper, particularly in Townsville.

Let me reveal to the House a National Party scam involving the previous member for Townsville, Mr Burreket; a well-known National Party supporter, Mrs Margaret Srebnik; the then Minister for Community Services, Mr Katter; and the then Minister for Land Management, Mr Glasson. The scam involves a land swap with Mrs Srebnik's family. In this House on 13 April 1989 she was acknowledged by Mr Katter as "in fact, a supporter of the National Party" and by Mr Burreket in the *Townsville Twin Cities Advertiser* on 22 June 1989 as "a known National Party supporter who lived in the ward of which he, Mr Burreket, was alderman when he served on the Townsville City Council".

The scam was of some concern to me during the election campaign because of my concern for the corruption which has pervaded the Parliament, the police force, the judiciary, and virtually every facet of Queensland life. Despite tremendous opposition from the Townsville City Council, the *Townsville Bulletin*, numerous others and me, this land swap went ahead during the death throes of the last Government.

In this land swap scam, the Srebniks received freehold title, as they requested, to 10 acres of land at Belgian Gardens zoned public open space—that is, parkland. Mrs Srebnik has exchanged her land worth, according to Mr Katter's statement to this House on 13 April 1989, \$60,000 for land at Belgian Gardens which, because of its zoning as parkland, could be said to be valueless.

On 22 June 1989, I am reported as saying in the *Townsville Twin Cities Advertiser*—

". . . most thinking people would shake their heads in disbelief at the Minister's (Mr Glasson) decision, and would not be able to understand why anybody would be prepared to exchange land at Black River worth many thousands of dollars, for land at Belgian Gardens zoned as parkland and therefore apparently of no value unless some secret deal had been done to agree to rezoning."

Mr Burreket, in the *Twin Cities Advertiser* of 29 June 1989 in reply said—

" . . . the destiny of the future of the land will rest with the Townsville City Council

... Cabinet . . . directed that if the exchange proceed that Mrs Srebnik be given no rezoning advantage for the land in Belgian Gardens and that it be zoned parkland."

Honourable members might ask what is the scam in that? Let me show this House step by step. The first scenario is that the National Party Government could overrule the Townsville City Council, which has consistently opposed the land swap on town planning-principles. Then, according to Mr Burreket, Cabinet could direct that no rezoning advantage be given to Mrs Srebnik but, having just overruled the council to proceed with the exchange, swiftly says that the future zoning of the land rests with the council.

The second point is that as the land is zoned "public open space", or parkland, it can be said to have no commercial value and therefore, unless it is rezoned, to be virtually valueless. The third matter is that as owners of freehold land—in this instance, freehold parkland—the Srebniks are entitled to apply for rezoning because it is a basic principle of land ownership—more specifically, freehold land ownership—that an owner is entitled to realise the land's real value. That is where the scam really is because, when rezoned, the real value of the land could be as high as—wait for it—\$2m. Let me show this House how that figure is calculated.

I will give the House the rezonings which could be applicable. As residential land that raw 10 acres of land would be worth \$50,000 to \$60,000 an acre, giving a total

value of \$500,000 to \$600,000. With a medium density or residential D zoning, it would be eligible for unit development. The value, again as raw land, would be in the vicinity of \$750,000 to \$1m, or even higher. Similar land in Cairns would not be available for any less than \$2m. Large parcels of that type of land centrally located between the airport and the city would be snapped up for an accommodation resort or something similar, and hence, given the recent property boom in Townsville \$2m is what could be demanded. As industrial land it would retail at between \$35 and \$40 a square metre, giving a value of \$1.4m.

That is the nature of the potential windfall that the previous National Party Government gave to a loyal National Party supporter for \$60,000, which was the value of the Black River land accepted in exchange yet Mr Burreket would have us believe that Mrs Srebniak would be given no rezoning advantage for the land in Belgian Gardens and that it would be zoned parkland. Mr Burreket should have known better than that because he used to be a real estate agent. For all I know, he might have been a real estate agent in this transaction. Mr Burreket should have known that the destiny of the future of the land would not rest with the Townsville City Council.

Given the council's opposition to the land swap in the first place, Mrs Srebniak could hardly expect the council to support her application. The council has objections based on town-planning principles. The Srebniaks can appeal against the council's presumed disallowance of their application for rezoning to the Local Government Court, which may consider that an owner of land with freehold title, albeit parkland, should not be prejudiced by owning freehold land which is valueless and useless, as in the case of this parkland, and rezone that land. The court would then take into account the legal arguments submitted by both sides and be influenced in its decision by the current zonings in the vicinity which are residential, residential D or medium density, and industrial.

That is where the scam is, in the major financial windfall that will accrue to the Srebniaks upon rezoning. Despite what Mr Burreket said, the Townsville City Council does not have the final say rather, it is the Local Government Court. Mr Burreket, being a former practising real estate agent, should have known that. If the previous Land Management Minister, Mr Glasson, who was the one who finally approved the land swap, did not know that, he should have been sacked.

The second scenario, which is a possibility, is associated with the new town plan, due within the next 12 months. The Srebniaks could simply sit on the land until the new town plan is completed; that is to say, not apply for rezoning at all. Then, if the Nationals regained power, what could have happened was this: the council would obviously leave the land zoned as public open space when preparing the new town plan, given its current town-planning objections to any proposals for freeholding or rezoning. But it is the Minister, not the council, who has the final say. A National Party Minister could simply decide to extend the existing adjacent industrial zoning to include the Srebniak's newly acquired land without any reference to anyone, including the council, and it would be all over. The Srebniaks would have a massive windfall virtually without any costs at all, including legal costs. Of course, that will not happen under the Labor Government.

The third scenario involves the attempt by the Independent last year to take over the mayoralty of the Townsville City Council. I should correct that before going on. It was an Independent National Party attempt because, as we all know, it was a National Party front funded by the National Party and staffed by the National Party. Anybody going around the booths that day knew that because they were the same old National Party faces we saw during the State and Federal elections.

Anyhow, the wheels really got moving in this land-swap deal with an advertisement in the *Townsville Bulletin* on Christmas Eve—24 December 1988. That advertisement included the possibility of a land swap. One might ask why it suddenly became so important. After all, Mr Burreket had supported the Srebniak's application by letter to Mr Katter on 7 June 1988. The responsible Minister could have shortened the protracted

process which resulted from this course of action by simply asking one of the northern real estate cronies of the National Party to buy a block of land for the Government. But no, that would be too simple. Instead of that, an advertisement tailor made for Mrs Srebnik's situation was devised and placed understand the newspaper on Christmas Eve. Obviously it was hoped that, with the holiday period coming on, no-one would notice.

The other reason that that time was chosen was that there were rumours that the Labor Mayor, Mike Reynolds, was thinking of retiring, and the Independent Nationals thought that they would win control of the council by running as Independents. They also thought that that would help them win control of the council in March 1991 and that, when that happened, they would be able to help all of their National Party cronies, such as the Srebniks. It is history that the Independent Nationals were beaten, so scenario No. 3 is out of contention.

I submit that this is a scam of massive proportions and it shows that, despite Mr Ahern's "vision of excellence", the good old days of National Party cronyism were there to stay.

Time expired.

Criticism of Labor Ministerial and Public Service Appointments

Mr GUNN (Somerset) (11.41 a.m.): Since the Goss Labor Government came to power, the media and the public generally have been fed the Premier's line of steady reform and overhaul of the public service. Labor has portrayed a holier-than-thou approach, aided by the frequent use of buzzwords such as "accountability" and the selection of staff based on "merit", while steadfastly maintaining that under Labor there would be no jobs for the boys.

I rise today to outline to this House and Queenslanders generally what a sham and a farce this charade by Labor is. The true situation is that, while the Christmas silly season proceeded and the media were lulled into relative complacency by the Labor honeymoon, Mr Goss and his colleagues were systematically gutting the public service and some statutory authorities of talent with the sole aim of inserting, in several instances, their own Labor cronies. The Opposition will be highlighting some of the more blatant examples but, before I go further, I would like to remind honourable members of what Mr Goss said on this matter in outlining Labor policy last year. Last August, when Mr Goss was enunciating Labor's policy for public sector reform, he said—

" . . . for the public service, a Goss Labor Government will herald an end to patronage and cronyism and a return to professionalism, the reintroduction of merit as the only principle of recruitment and promotion".

That was the stated aim—or the promise—but let us look at the reality. When Labor came to power, it was literally paranoid about the public service. Its attitude was fixed from day one when a verbal instruction went out that no person who had previously worked in a ministerial office was to be re-employed in any new Minister's office. That may be understandable for a Minister's private and press secretarial staff, but it was grossly unfair to the many skilled stenographers, typists and filing clerks who had served previous Ministers. Surely their skills could have been used instead of the casual employment agency staff who were brought in to help get some ministerial offices under way. Such was the degree of Labor paranoia about the public service! Labor believed that everyone was tainted, so to speak, right down to the filing girls.

However, the greatest abuse of Mr Goss' promise occurred in the selection and appointment of some departmental heads, in particular, the Director-General of the Department of Housing, Mr Richard Perrson.

Let us look at the track record of this Mr Perrson who, I am informed, has been staying at the Gateway Hotel during the three or four days that he is in Brisbane each week to administer his department. After that, he flies home to Sydney for the weekend, returning on Monday.

This Mr Perrson was a former member of the staff of Jack Ferguson, a former Housing Minister in the Wran Government as well as leader of the Labor Left. When Ferguson retired, Perrson moved to the staff of Frank Walker, who took over leadership of the Left and, at various times, had ministerial responsibility for Attorney-General, Housing and Cooperatives.

The Walker/Perrson trademark was to politicise each department down to the third or fourth level. I am told that, despite the cleansing purges of Premier Greiner, the New South Wales Housing Department, in particular, still has deeply entrenched Walker/Perrson people in positions of influence. Perrson was given his marching orders by Mr Greiner and promptly strode off to Canberra, where he was looked after by Peter Staples. I understand that he was taken on as a contract consultant to Staples in relation to the Commonwealth/State Housing Agreement. I understand that his brief there was to bring New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmania—those being the only non-Labor States—into line with the Federal policy of providing rental housing only. ,

It will be interesting to watch closely what transpires with public housing in Queensland where, in the past at least, the Queensland Housing Commission was able to help thousands of Queenslanders to buy a home of their own rather than sentence them to a life of rental accommodation. Indeed, there is some doubt about the status of Perrson's Commonwealth contract, which may still be current with the Federal Government. If that is the case, I suggest to Mr Goss that he investigate the matter urgently and end any situation which may allow an individual to hold two offices of profit under the Crown.

Unfortunately, this sorry tale involving the Housing Department does not end with Mr Perrson. True to form, apparently, he has brought up a couple of former colleagues from his previous New South Wales regime. The most senior of them seems to be a Ms Vivienne Milligan, who apparently has been appointed on a consultancy contract for four days a week. She, too, stays at the Gateway Hotel. She flies in to Brisbane on Monday and flies back to Sydney on Thursday nights with, I suspect, the Government picking up the tab for the hotel and airfares. Ms Milligan's position is titled "Director of Housing Policy Review".

Ms Milligan has already attended a couple of meetings, one involving housing referral workers, and on two occasions has been heard to state words to the effect, and I quote—

"There's only two people who really know what housing policy here is and that's Dick Perrson and myself."

If that is the case, I suggest that the Premier and his Housing Minister move quickly to reiterate the Government's housing policy for fear that it may be taken over by this southern-based dynamic duo. T h e third import is Jenny Clarke who, I understand, has at least condescended to live up here during her six-month job with the department.

Mr Gibbs interjected.

Mr GUNN: As Mr Burns advised the House last week, she is on maternity leave from her job as chief loans officer in the New South Wales Housing Department.

Mr Gibbs interjected.

Mr GUNN: What about Labor's view of one person for one job? Mr Perrson also looked after a consultant, a Mr Gary Aitcheson, who operates out of Sydney as Deen Systems.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Honourable Minister for Tourism will cease interjecting.

Mr Gibbs interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Minister for Tourism under Standing Order 123A.

Mr GUNN: Mr Perrson gave him the job of examining the department's EDP and accounting procedures which he reportedly did in about two days, presumably for a fat fee.

The track record of Mr Perrson gives the lie to Mr Goss' claim that there are no jobs for the boys, or the girls, for that matter. Here is a person who is obviously a dyed-in-the-wool Labor man. We are told that in New South Wales Mr Perrson carried his political role as far as having close liaison with supporters of public housing groups in Labor electorates.

Notwithstanding Mr Perrson's track record, from the Opposition's viewpoint I find it intolerable that the new Goss Government would even consider appointing a departmental head on virtually a part-time basis and then put him up with at least one of his colleagues at an inner-city hotel. This is only the start. The Premier may say that there will be no political patronage or cronyism in his Government's appointments, but it is obvious that what Mr Goss says and what he actually does are two different things. If the Premier is fair dinkum about his public service standards, he should sack Mr Perrson on the basis that his track record breaches the Goss promise for public service reform.

I turn now to look at some more examples of the Goss Government's appointments, which are supposed to be free from cronyism. The Premier's private secretary, Miss Lynette Hewlett, is a former office manager for the Queensland branch of the ALP and, before joining Mr Goss' staff, worked as a private secretary for the Federal Veterans Affairs Minister, Mr Humphreys. Prior to that, Miss Hewlett was personal assistant to the Queensland branch secretary of the AWU. In the Deputy Premier's office, there is Dr Gary Chittick who, from 1981 to 1988, served as economic adviser to the Leader and Deputy Leader of the then State Opposition. He got the job of private secretary on the words of Tom Burns and Nev Warburton. In the Transport Minister's office, a Mr Ross Ploetz has been appointed to the position of research officer on electoral matters. Mr Ploetz is a Labor stalwart who just happens to have acted as campaign director for his boss, the Transport Minister, Mr Hamill. One can only wonder why the Transport Minister needs a research officer on electoral matters. Perhaps Mr Hamill needs help in juggling departmental projects into Labor electorates.

I turn now to look at the office of the Administrative Services Minister, Mr McLean, who has hired Mr Reginald Mickel as private secretary. Mr Mickel is an ALP member and was a Labor candidate for the seat of Yeronga in 1986. Last year he acted as the Labor Party's co-organiser for the seats of Maryborough, Isis and Broadsound.

Mr Elder interjected.

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

Mr GUNN: During the past decade he worked as electorate officer for David Beddall, MP, in Rankin and spent a year in a similar position with the Federal member for Hinkler. In the Justice Minister's office, Joan McGrath, who has been a member of the Labor Party since 1974, has been given the job of private secretary. She has been a member of Labor's State council and has served as a local campaign director.

In Mr De Lacy's office—yes, the Treasurer who could not find the State debt section of the Budget papers even with the aid of consultants—we have Mr Chris Begley as private secretary. Mr Begley is a former Labor Party candidate for the seat of Wavell and, as a former Treasury officer, was quick to appear on the scene after the 2 December election.

Mr Beattie interjected.

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

Mr GUNN: I turn now to look quickly at Queensland's Canberra connection, that band of ministerial appointees who apparently could not get out of Canberra quick enough now that the Hawke Government's days are numbered. They include Mrs

Beverley Miller, a former press secretary and consultant to Federal Transport Minister Willis. She was backed for the job by a person from the ALP secretariat in Canberra.

There is Mr David Butt, who is the Health Minister's private secretary. He was formerly a press and private secretary to Dr Blewett and a political and policy adviser to Federal Cabinet. Mr Butt also worked as a press officer to the Labor Opposition in 1983. Michael Kaiser, who is press secretary to the Minister for Manufacturing and Commerce, is a former national media liaison secretary to Ben Humphreys and press secretary to Con Sciacca. John Tanzer, who is private secretary to the Minister for Primary Industries, is a former private secretary and policy adviser to Federal Primary Industries Minister Kerin.

Time expired.

Decline of National Party

Mrs WOODGATE (Pine Rivers) (11.50 a.m.): The complete destruction of the once-great Queensland National Party over the past three months in Queensland is a matter of genuine public importance, because the Nationals decline at State and, now, Federal level will have a significant impact on the quality of Opposition in both our State Parliament and in Canberra.

When the Queensland public finally belted the corrupt and incompetent Nationals from office last December, few thought that they would get another bite at the cherry, but last Saturday saw the total rejection of the Bjelke-Petersen/Cooper/Sparkes regime all over again. It was not just any old defeat; it was a complete collapse, a massive dismissal of the dark, corrupt past. Although it used to govern this State with barely more than 16 per cent of the vote, the National Party polled only a disgraceful 16 per cent of the primary vote. The statistics from Saturday's election must make tragic reading for all those honest, dyed-in-the-wool conservatives who have stuck by this disgraced and discredited party.

Not content with holding 54 per cent of the seats in Queensland after the last Federal election, the Hawke Labor Government now looks set to win 15 or even 16 of the 24 seats in Queensland, that is, 66 per cent in what is supposedly the ideological home of conservatism. As in the State election, the Labor Party has not simply won seats in the metropolitan area, but the Nationals heartland seat of Kennedy will almost certainly be a Labor gain, and Dawson is looking good as well.

The significance of Saturday's result is not only in the seats won by the Labor Party but also in the magnitude of the swings away from the Nationals across all seats. Voters left the National Party in droves, with swings since the last Federal election of over 10 per cent in 15 of the 24 seats. The National Party lost votes in the city, the suburbs, the bush, the north and on the coasts—everywhere! Nobody wants it, not even its former white-shoe mates on the Gold Coast. The brown paper bags have gone back to Woolworths for good.

Look at the swings against the Nationals in the two Gold Coast seats. In Moncrieff, they lost 18 per cent and in McPherson—the electorate that Brisbane's Lord Mayor rejected because it was too far away from the Brisbane media—the drop was 17.5 per cent. Look also at the swings in the north and the west. In Leichhardt, there was a decline of almost 16 per cent and in Kennedy the swing against the Nationals was 14 per cent. There was almost a 10 per cent decline in Herbert.

I should not, of course, forget Brisbane because, on Saturday's evidence of their showing in this city, the Nationals may as well give the game away. In Brisbane, it is not only the size of the swings that is remarkable but also the lack of strength of the primary vote. Who would have thought that the Nationals so-called well-oiled political machine would be crushed to single pathetic figures or, for that matter, would be beaten by the Democrats?

In all 10 Brisbane Federal electorates, the Nationals failed to reach 10 per cent of the votes. In fact, they failed to hit either 9 per cent, 8 per cent or even 7 per cent of the vote. The best the Nationals could do in Brisbane was a measly 6.2 per cent in Bowman. It was all downhill from there to 6 per cent in Ryan, just over 3 per cent in Fadden, Lilley, Oxley and Petrie, and down to 2.8 per cent in Forde, Griffith and Brisbane. The vote went down even further to what is probably the worst major party result in history—a minuscule 2 per cent in Moreton, which was brilliantly won for Labor by the talented Garrie Gibson.

This National Party is the same party as the one that just a few short months ago governed this State and had sitting city members. The Nationals have now even been out-polled to the tune of 3 to 1 and 4 to 1 by the Democrats. I have left till last—which is where it belongs—the most pathetic example of the Nationals' decline. Honourable members would remember John Stone—or should I say "Big" John Stone, Mr Cooper? Mr Stone is not so big now. He was the man who stood by while the Liberals destroyed the Australian economy in the seventies and the early eighties. He was going to Canberra as the conservative's saviour in the House of Representatives. He was the Nationals' north coast hope who was going to lead the New Right take-over of the new Peacock Government. Not only did "Big" John Stone fail to win Fairfax, but he also lost more than 13 per cent of the Nationals' vote in the attempt. Not only did he lose 13 per cent of the vote in trying, but he also lost the seat to a Queensland Liberal—something that most of us have been able to avoid without too much difficulty. Even the limp-as-lettuce Liberals were able to knock off "Big" John.

Above all, Saturday's election debacle for the Nationals should primarily concern all those who are committed to the Westminster style of Government in this country. All honourable members know that a strong, viable Opposition is vital to the parliamentary process, especially in this period of Fitzgerald reform. But now, not only are the Nationals no better than a noisy, unrepresentative gaggle in this Parliament, they have been further reduced to a miserably insignificant rump in Canberra.

While there is no question that the Nationals deserved the treatment dished out by Queenslanders, it is surely about time that they took a long, hard look at themselves. If they fail to take stock, the steady southward creep of the Nationals' disease will certainly also wipe out their base in New South Wales. Perhaps the way ahead is to apologise to Queenslanders—and now Australians—for their role in the corruption of the past. Is it any wonder that the electorate is cynical when the Nationals refuse point-blank to own up? Surely that is a first step for any party so roundly and absolutely rejected by the community. The integrity of the parliamentary institution depends on it.

Australian Labor Party

Mr FITZGERALD (Lockyer) (11.56 a.m.): I rise to totally reject the assertions made by the honourable member for Pine Rivers, who said that the so-called great election that was held on the weekend turned out to be a rout of the National Party and a victory to the Labor Party. Australiawide, people are now in a position of not knowing who will be the Prime Minister in a couple of months' time. How can the honourable member call that state of affairs a victory for the Labor Party?

This morning I listened to questions being asked with regard to the economy and interest rates.

Government members interjected.

Mr FITZGERALD: Members of the Labor Party know the issues that will hurt them. Mark my words! At the end of the Federal Labor Government's three-year term, Hawke will not be Prime Minister; the Labor Party will have him replaced.

The honourable member who has just resumed her seat had 10 minutes available to her to deliver a eulogy on the National Party, but what happened? She spoke for

only five minutes. She is all talked out and cannot even use up the time that has been allocated to her under Standing Orders. I have never seen such a disgrace. I thought the honourable member was making her maiden speech. Respectfully, I sat back and listened to her in silence. As it happens, she has used five minutes of the time allocated to members during this debate, and I will use the remaining five minutes.

If the people of Queensland want the Federal Labor Party's example of continuing maladministration to continue, they will have to cop it. They will also have to cop the "great" expertise bestowed upon them by the Treasurer of Queensland and his inability to understand the economy.

Government members interjected.

Mr FITZGERALD: I can assure members opposite that in less than three years' time when the Federal Government again faces the electorate, members of the Labor Party will suddenly realise what has been happening. After Whitlam was thrown out, the Labor Party was left with one electorate in Queensland. Although I congratulate State Labor Party members on winning the last election, I can assure them that the present Opposition will use its numbers as a launching-pad and a platform to again point out all the problems that beset the Australia Labor Party.

Mrs Woodgate interjected.

Mr FITZGERALD: What happened to the Federal Labor Party's vote in Victoria? Despite their being a Labor Government in Victoria, in that State the Federal counterparts of members of the Labor Party went down the drain. I know that people often refer to the way in which the pendulum swings in politics. The pendulum may have swung in favour of State Labor members, but at the next election they will be shivering in their shoes. They are being led by an incompetent Ministry.

Government members interjected.

Mr FITZGERALD: Plenty of representatives have come into the Parliament and said, "We will never lose out seats. The pendulum never swings backwards; it continues to go in one direction, in a complete circle." I can assure Government members that, irrespective of whether the pendulum swings back and forth or turns full circle, they will end up losing their seats when the pendulum of public opinion swings against them.

Mrs Edmond interjected.

Mrs Woodgate interjected.

Mr FITZGERALD: I will guarantee that all new Labor members are not re-elected. I would put all the money that I could afford on a wager that they will not be returned at the next election. As their first term goes by, they will gradually realise that the Labor Party has its problems. They will begin to notice the whirlpools of insurrection and discontent and realise that it may happen that they rejoin the workers in the community. It is quite possible. Now we have the ladies on the back bench talking. They have been stirred up by the member for Pine Rivers. She has started a little pressure group.

Ms Warner interjected.

Mr FITZGERALD: The Minister for Family Services should not look so smug. I know that going on behind her back is quite a coup that is designed to discredit her.

From our point of view, it is very sad to hear the Minister's colleagues telling us that her days are numbered. It is happening to a number of her colleagues. The Minister for Manufacturing and Commerce is in exactly the same boat. His colleagues are after him. It is sad.

The Opposition will attack the state of the economy. Because the economy has problems, the Government has problems.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Under the provisions of Standing Order 36A and the Sessional Order, the time allowed for the debate on Matters of Public Interest has now expired.

At 12 noon,

In accordance with the Sessional Order, the House proceeded with the debate on the Address in Reply.

ADDRESS IN REPLY Seventh Allotted Day

Debate resumed from 22 March (see p. 667) on Mr McGrady's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, to which Mr Cooper had moved an amendment.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Before calling the member for Ipswich West, I remind honourable members that he is making his maiden speech and that he should be heard in silence.

Mr LIVINGSTONE (Ipswich West) (12.01 p.m.): At the outset, may I say that I am very proud to be here today as the member for Ipswich West. I am proud also to be here as a member of the Australian Labor Party. May I first congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your appointment and convey to you the best wishes of the residents of Ipswich West.

If tradition is followed here today, I suspect that this will be the first and last time that I will be allowed to speak uninterrupted in this House for any length of time. So I will make the most of it by detailing a few home truths about the last 32 years in Queensland.

As the recently elected member for Ipswich West, I would like to thank the greatly reduced National Party on the Opposition benches for everything it did for Ipswich during its 32 years in Government! On behalf of my electorate, to the Nationals and their Liberal mates who were in Government with them for 26 years, thanks for nothing—because nothing is exactly what that mob gave Ipswich West for 32 years. For nearly all of that 32 years, the State schools in Ipswich West were underfunded, as were the roads, police, transport—and the list goes on and on.

In one of the world's wealthiest countries, the schools in Ipswich West are of Third World standard. At one high school in Ipswich West, the disgusting situation arose in which a teacher, totally embarrassed by the lack of Government funds, paid out of his own pocket for paint and went in on school holidays to paint classrooms that had not been painted for 17 years. As well, in the same school in Ipswich West where the temperature reaches 40 degrees in the classrooms, in one room alone nine windows have been welded shut simply because the latches are so old that they can no longer be patched up. There are dozens of other windows throughout that school that cannot be opened.

Something is wrong when a National Party Government expects a p. and c. association to look after 5.34 hectares of land because the Government will not supply a janitor. Something is very suspicious when a National Party Government employs contractors to do maintenance work at schools, the contractors get paid but the work is rarely finished. I give an undertaking here today that I will not rest until all schools in Ipswich West reach a standard comparable with Australian schools.

During that period of neglect in Ipswich, facilities suddenly improved in one-horse towns around the State in which the people voted for the National Party, including areas in the seat of Somerset held by the former Deputy Premier. Yes, the former Deputy Premier did very well, thanks very much, on the border of Ipswich West; but we will never really know how many lives were ruined by the National Party's blatant pork-barrelling policies. How many wives and young children suffered over the years from domestic violence because there were simply not enough police around at night to come to their aid?

In Ipswich West, we have one police station—North Ipswich—which is one of the oldest stations in Queensland. I am sure that members of the Opposition will be amused to know that that police station does not even have hot water.

Government members: Shame!

Mr LIVINGSTONE: It is a shame. However, the best is yet to come.

At Karana Downs, at a cost of \$400,000 the National Party built a fire station which was only small, but very modern and with the latest in fire equipment. It was built, rightly so, to service the rapidly expanding areas of Karana Downs, Karalee, Chuwar and the northern side of Tivoli—a very large area. I know that it is hard to believe, but the fire station actually had no firemen. Even though the people who live in the area paid their fire levies, there were no firemen there to protect them. Thanks to the Minister for Emergency Services, the member for Chatsworth, that situation has now, thankfully, been corrected.

In the area of juvenile aid, children who have been sexually abused are being interviewed in a room no larger than 10 feet by 9 feet with six and seven other people all working with typewriters and phones in that room at the same time. Thanks to the Minister for Justice and Corrective Services, that disgusting situation will be rectified.

The member for Roma leads a party that really knew how to do business in its own seats, while neglecting Ipswich West and the rest of the Labor stronghold of Ipswich and Wolston. I am happy to say that the Government of which I am now a member will slowly but surely redress that imbalance in Ipswich West and the rest of the west Moreton district.

On behalf of the people of Ipswich, Queensland's oldest provincial city, I would like to thank the National Party for everything that it has done for employment in Ipswich city! In recent years, in a desperate bid to break the back of the Labor vote in Ipswich, the Bjelke-Petersen Government went on a deliberate rampage aimed at reducing the number of blue-collar workers in Ipswich city. Firstly, the crazy grazier and his mob announced that the Swanbank Power Station would be wound down and that workers would be retrenched. That hit the local coal-mining industry that supplied coal to the power station, which led to a further loss of jobs in the area. In the 1970s, 1 100 people were employed in the mining industry in the west Moreton coal fields. Thanks to the National Party, less than 300 remain. But that was not enough. The crazy grazier and his mob continued—this time announcing that hundreds of jobs would go at the Ipswich railway workshops.

The Ipswich West area which I represent covers two local authority areas—Ipswich city and Moreton Shire. During my time in this Parliament, I will be seeking to help improve the economy of that area. It is an economy in which coal-mining, power generation and the Queensland Government Railways were the principal activities. Many associated industries and their employees depended on these industries to purchase their goods and services. However, thanks to the short-sighted policies of the former Government, more than 3 000 families in the district were directly affected and their lives and earning capacities changed forever. I want this trend reversed, and I will seek to have the Swanbank Power Station brought back into full production.

The future of the West Moreton coal field is heavily dependent on power generation for its market. Without guaranteed contracts, the field will continue to languish and possibly even cease operations. These jobs in the mining and associated power generation area are needed in Ipswich to ensure the future of the local economy. I say to the Leader of the Opposition and former leaders and Ministers of the Bjelke-Petersen Government—some of whom are thankfully no longer allowed to soil the reputation of this House because they are making appearances elsewhere—thanks for nothing.

We must not let the gang of nine led by the member for Sherwood forget their role in what was a Liberal/National coalition for 26 of those years. It was the failure of the Liberals to stand up to the Nationals all those years which ensured that the

electorate did not support them at the recent State election after which their leader, the member for Sherwood, confidently predicted that his team would be the senior partner in a coalition Government. Boy, did the Liberals fall a long way short when they actually lost one of their 10 existing seats and finished with nine! In a party with any sort of talent, that would have put its leader behind the eight ball. But not in the Liberal Party. The reward for such a humiliating defeat was to be re-elected leader of what is now the gang of nine.

I suppose the only question for the Liberals is: how soon can we expect Brisbane Lord Mayor, Sallyanne Atkinson, to move into State politics and take the reins, or will the former bank Johnny, the member for Toowong, make a move on his boss? These are probably the only issues which the Liberals will really be concerned with in the coming months, because the Queensland Liberals lack policies and simply seek power for power's sake.

I turn now to the broader picture and what 32 years of National Party rule has done for this State. I believe that 1971 was the year when the fascist regime of the Bjelke-Petersen era very publicly displayed its distaste for democracy when, during the Springbok Rugby tour, police charged down demonstrators in this city after the Government declared a state of emergency. After that event, there seemed no turning back as Bjelke-Petersen and his henchmen, some of whom now sit on the Opposition benches, sought to corrupt the institutions of this State.

It was during the Springbok tour that it became clear that the police force had been politicised by the Nationals. The event which highlighted this process was the bashing of a female demonstrator during a student protest in 1976 in Roma Street. Despite this event being recorded by television cameras, the National Party saw to it that there was no inquiry into that very public and well-documented piece of police thuggery. It was also the beginning of the end of the then Police Commissioner and an honest man, Ray Whitrod, who was subsequently forced to resign when a man well known to this Parliament was promoted rapidly through the ranks to eventually head Joh's police force.

That was the type of "strong and free" Government that the Nationals delivered for Queensland. The fact was that any honest copper in Queensland who dared to speak out was branded a liar and forced to resign. Tony Fitzgerald highlighted the corruption that the Nationals brought to the police force, but the selling of Queensland down the drain under the National and Liberal Parties went much further than just the police force. The corruption of Queensland covered every aspect of life in this State, and it will probably be many years before the various cases are all cleared through the courts.

In the late 1970s, in this very House, the Nationals, with the help of their Liberal mates, pushed through a Bill which virtually gave away all the land on the central Queensland coast north of Yeppoon up to the Shoalwater Bay military reserve to a Japanese businessman named Iwasaki. This was the first of many shonky deals. The Iwasaki resort was, and still is, a dud. Despite promises, deadlines were consistently broken and nothing near what was promised was ever built on the site. The rip-off that was known as Iwasaki ceased only because the former Premier, the member for Landsborough, moved after 10 years to stop the rip-off. However, for this and other sensible decisions, his backward and, in many cases, less than honest National Party mates knifed him in the back, dumped him as leader and replaced him with the member for Roma, who, at the last election, led them to a massive defeat.

The shonky land and development deals for National Party mates continued throughout Queensland for many years and included the Skasse/Qintex deal for the Mirage resort at Port Douglas and special assistance to the white-shoe brigade leader, Mike Gore, at Sanctuary Cove. However, these are just a few of the very public scams which the taxpayers of Queensland funded. It is very likely that the full extent of the plundering of the public purse and public assets such as Crown land will never be fully exposed. It is known that, in order to ensure that the public records did not contain

any evidence of wrong-doing, some assessments of tenders were done with handwritten notes which were later destroyed.

We have had 32 years of what the National Party termed during its recent failed election campaign as keeping Queensland "strong and free". The fact of the matter is that the National Party Government was only strong and free when it came to helping its own mates, who topped up the National Party coffers via the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation and other National Party buckets, which were then used to fund expensive election campaigns. "Strong and free" are simply not words that could possibly describe what the Nationals created in Queensland over 32 years, with the aid of their Liberal mates for 26 of those years.

There was nothing free or democratic about the legislation that was rammed through this Parliament and used in a very savage fashion against hundreds of honest workers during the SEQEB pickets of 1985. That fascist push in 1985 was simply a further development of the blatant abuse of the police force to ruthlessly crush a very democratic protest. The only thing that was free in Queensland in recent years was the freebies handed out to developer mates of the National Party and the cheap drought assistance loans handed out to wealthy graziers.

During the recent election campaign, the National Party declared that it would keep Queensland strong. However, the reality was that there was nothing strong about the Queensland economy. The only strong thing about the former Queensland Government was the stench of corruption coming from within its own ranks.

The National Party created a huge PR machine with more than 100 highly paid journalists who, day after day via press releases, created an image that Joh and the Nationals had created this wonderful State. However, behind that illusion was the clear economic fact that Queensland was not a low-tax State but a high-charge State.

Joh's PR machine operated on the Nazi belief that, if one makes a lie big enough and tells it often enough, people will actually believe it. That propaganda machine with National Party Ministers and, until 1983, Liberal Ministers at the helm, ensured that any proposed investment or development in Queensland was announced by a Minister even when the Government had absolutely nothing to do with it. That machine also saw to it that, in the run-up to State elections, phantom projects were promoted throughout the State.

In 1980, Joh and his Ministers claimed that, in 10 years, Gladstone would be the Newcastle of the north. In fact, within two years of that claim the population of Gladstone declined. A similar picture existed throughout the State. The National Party propaganda preached decentralisation while the economies of regional Queensland, including Ipswich, Rockhampton and Maryborough—to name just a few—were being forced down the drain because of the Government's failure to properly fund services and encourage development in those areas. Because of its consistent support for Labor at a State level, Rockhampton suffered the same fate as Ipswich suffered and State services were blatantly underfunded because the local population voted for the Australian Labor Party.

That is the real legacy of 32 years of National Party rule in Queensland, including 26 years during which the Liberals were in Government with it. During those 32 years—contrary to popular belief which was largely created by Joh's PR machine—business suffered in Queensland. For example, Government tenders were often handed out to National Party mates while honest businesspeople were simply left on the sidelines.

During those 32 years, "environment" and "heritage" were dirty words for the former Government. As a result, very little of the State's beautiful natural areas are protected by national park declarations. For Joh and his mates, the words "pollution control" were simply something that a Government journalist included in press releases from time to time. The fact is that no real pollution control legislation was in place. For example, for many years the Government's largest power station at Gladstone, which in the early 1980s produced approximately 60 per cent of the State's power, was one of the State's largest polluters. Only after many years of public pressure did the Government

finally start to reduce the emissions from that station. Time will tell what that has done for the lungs of many of the people who lived in that area during those years.

If we in this Parliament are all going to help build a better Queensland in the years ahead for our children and their children, the failures of the past must be examined. If the Nationals and the Liberals are to play their part in this process, they will have to bend to public opinion and ensure that the words "honest and accountable" are taken into account when they frame their policies and take part in the democratic process of this Parliament. It will no longer be good enough for the Nationals to claim that they stand for Christian values when, in fact, on the numerous admissions of many of those who were associated with the former Government, they were involved in less than Christian activities.

The National Party's days in Government of publicly pushing Bible politics while privately taking brown paper bags of cash are gone. For that we can thank the good judgment of the people of Queensland who deserted the National Party en masse on 2 December. Queenslanders elected a Labor Government with realistic, honest policies that are based on accountability and what the electorate is seeking in terms of life-style into the 1990s, including a balanced approach to the environment.

The electorate clearly rejected the red-neck, gay-bashing, moralistic band wagon that the nationals quickly patched together just before the election. The electorate clearly rejected also whatever it was that the Liberals thought they were offering to the people of Queensland. The Liberals have to come up with something better than just a short slogan about keeping the National so-and-sos honest and a few other one-liners that they tried to pass off as policies during the recent, failed, election campaign. The electorate is seeking—and deserves—alternative policies from the Nationals and the Liberals, not simply bland opposition to the very forward-thinking policies of the Goss Labor Government.

The corrupt excesses of the former National Party Government will not go away overnight. During the next few years, the courts and the media will ensure that the public gets more of the truth. As the Labor Government starts into its first year, no doubt more of the excesses and corrupt practices of the former Government will be exposed. That exposure will ensure that we build a cleaner and better future for the population of Queensland who, after all, are our masters and the people whom we came here to serve.

Those members on the crossbenches, such as the member for Somerset who was the former loyal deputy to more Premiers than he can remember, might take note of my advice. Now is the time to get out if they do not think that they can go the distance. If they are not going to provide a service for the people of their electorates, they should retire. Now that the member for Somerset is no longer the Deputy Premier, as he was to many Premiers, he will have to do a bit of his own work in the electorate rather than leaving it to his ministerial staff. We are here to work for the people of Queensland. As one of the newcomers to this House I will endeavour to do my best to help to create a real Parliament in Queensland where real debate takes place to ensure the best possible legislation for my fellow Queenslanders.

I take this opportunity to thank very publicly the electors of Ipswich who delivered the votes to ensure that I am here today to represent them. I am here to voice their concerns and the concerns of all the people of Ipswich West, including those few who did not vote for me on 2 December.

I would like to place on record my appreciation of Dave Underwood for his support and help. I am sure that Dave would like to be standing on this side of the House today, to rectify the injustices that the National Party inflicted on Ipswich West. However, after serving this House with distinction for 12 years, Dave has decided to put his family first. I am sure that each and every person who knew Dave in this House wishes him well in the future.

Although it is not possible or appropriate to name each and every one of those people who worked tirelessly during the historic election campaign, it would be a serious omission if I let this occasion pass without noting the efforts of my campaign manager, Jeff Murphy, who took leave to work full-time for the Australian Labor Party campaign, and Stan Godbold, Barry Wallace, Jim Doolan, Barry Davey, Les Brown, Jim Battersby and Ray Rogan, who have worked hundreds of hours to see a Labor victory in Queensland.

I pay a special thanks to my wife, Cheryl, who as usual has given me 110 per cent support. She is in the gallery today. I pay a special thanks to my children, Graham and Karen, for doing their best to understand why Dad is rarely at home.

I thank the House for allowing me to speak uninterrupted.

Mr ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (12.24 p.m.): I take pleasure in rising today to take part in this Address in Reply debate. In doing so, I firstly pledge my loyalty and that of my constituents, through His Excellency the Governor, to Her Gracious Majesty.

I also take the opportunity to thank my campaign director, Mr Peter McIntyre, secretary Lila Hanlon and all the members of the committee who were involved in what, as many of us have come to realise, was probably the most difficult election that any of us has experienced. It was quite different; it was very, very difficult.

Mr Palaszczuk: From your side.

Mr ELLIOTT: From our side, true.

Like our leader, the honourable member for Roma, I think we have realised that the public has given us a message. We have to go out and do our job as an Opposition. I for one certainly plan to be one of those people who will be constructive. I do not believe that we should allow our performance to degenerate to a point at which all we can do is throw verbal abuse. Quite frankly, if we do that, I think that the public of Queensland will take a more than charitable view of our performance and we can expect to reap the rewards of that at the next election.

In my opinion, we in the Opposition will not have a great deal of difficulty pointing out differences between this Government's performance, which has been very apparent already in the House in the time that this Parliament has sat, and that of the previous Government. It is very easy for Oppositions to think that all they have to do is criticise. It is very important for us to ensure that we do not fall into that trap. Today, I for one plan to use this time to put forward constructive ideas and constructive propositions in relation to some of those matters on which I am Opposition spokesman.

Before doing that, as well as thanking my campaign committee, I thank also the constituents of Cunningham who saw fit to give me an absolute majority. Although I was elected with an absolute majority, I take this opportunity to thank those ALP supporters who gave me their preferences. It is amazing that a number of people will go into a member's electorate office and tell him that they voted for him when he knows damned well that they did not. Quite a few people have had the honesty to come to me and say, "I voted Labor. I am an ALP supporter, but will you help me?" It has always been my attitude on representation that, regardless of whether people vote for me and regardless of their allegiances, I should bend over backwards to do absolutely everything possible for them. During the 15 years that I have been the member for Cunningham, I have done various things for different people, such as railway fettlers and others who were involved in some very difficult tasks and whose lot was not always easy. I have taken great pride in working for them.

When the chips were really down—and this time they were; I am quite honest about that—although I was elected with an absolute majority, I received the message not only from my own scrutineers but also from the returning officer that there was a 25 per cent drift in preferences away from the ALP how-to-vote card, which directed preferences to the Liberal Party candidate. In this instance, 25 per cent of the 23 per cent who voted for the ALP gave me their preference. I really appreciated that. I guess that proves to all of us that sometimes a member feels that what he does is taken

for granted. In fact, worse than that, people sometimes take a cynical attitude and say, "To hell with him. We don't give a damn about him." Although the Labor supporters voted Labor, they appreciated what I had done for them over the years. I place on record that I thank them for that gesture. One needs to take stock of such things.

I take this opportunity also to urge the Federal Government, regardless of however it is made up or whichever party is in power after the final count in the election that was held last Saturday, to consider as a matter of urgency taking some remedial action on the economy of this nation. Quite frankly, for almost the last decade not only the farmers of my area but also all small businesses have faced problems of almost disastrous proportions. No-one knows that better than the businesspeople of Toowoomba or, for that matter, anywhere else in Cunningham. Quite often, one hears the honourable member for Toowoomba South quite clearly indicate that he understands that the businesses in towns and cities such as Toowoomba, Pittsworth, Oakey and others rely heavily for a reasonable standard of living on the income of the farmers in their districts. If the farmers are not doing well, believe me, the economy of those regions will not be doing well either.

Honourable members have seen the results of the unfortunate liaison between Sir Peter Abeles and Bob Hawke's little group that culminated in the debacle that was the pilots strike. Tourism has been one of the strengths that did underpin Queensland's economy. Queensland underwent difficult times and if one looks—

Mr Beattie: Are you supporting the pilots?

Mr ELLIOTT: I am not for one second supporting the pilots; I am saying that the dispute was exacerbated and used by Abeles and Hawke.

Cairns, in particular, was not only able to withstand but also actually sail right through the downturn in the economy that was the result of the decrease in the number of tourists visiting that region. Because of its attractions, including national parks, the Cairns region was able to survive. People have always been attracted to the Cairns region because of its natural beauty. Hawke and Abeles have virtually killed the tourist industry. I urge the members of the new Federal Government to take stock of the state of this nation.

I know that the electorates of Gregory, Warrego and Balonne, as well as those adjoining my electorate, face similar problems. The people of this State need to see a sustained fall in interest rates, coupled with an increase in returns, particularly for grain. At the moment, the grain industry is suffering as badly as any other industry. The wool industry is down slightly, but seems to be coming back up again. Over the years, the wool industry has been fortunate enough to have had the good sense to work with previous coalition Governments and, with the support of Doug Anthony and Ian Sinclair, put in place the reserve price scheme. That scheme has been probably one of the success stories of agriculture in Australia.

At the moment the grain industry is experiencing a very difficult period. If that industry does not see some sustained fall in interest rates and an improvement in prices, coupled with an overall improvement in the seasons, one will see a massive increase in the number of bankruptcies. Honourable members have already seen an increase in the number of bankruptcies. The incidence of bankruptcy is also increasing in the area of small business. No-one can hang on.

When people do not have the money to pay their bills, the first people who cop it in the neck are the small business people. They cop it probably more than any other businesses. The first businesses that do not get paid are the storekeeper on the corner or the local engineering works. Everyone drags their feet. Instead of paying their bills in 30 days, they drag them out for 60, 90 and 120 days. One does not have to be too smart to understand how long one's cash flow will last when that occurs.

It is absolutely imperative that this House takes stock of this state of affairs. At the moment this nation has tremendous problems. It was interesting to see the old sackcloth

and ashes and a little bit of honesty from Peter Walsh this morning. Unfortunately, before the election people such as Peter Walsh were not honest and courageous enough to stand up and be counted.

A Government member interjected.

Mr ELLIOTT: It is not just a case of not being prepared to say it during the election campaign. It would be useful if federal Ministers would be honest with the public when carrying out the normal processes of Government. That is what all Opposition members have been saying, yet all Government members, when they were in Opposition, were denying that that was the case.

When honourable members are being honest with themselves and not trying to score political points, they admit that that is the case. Something must be done about the present state of affairs. How far down into the gutter does this nation have to go before people are prepared to pick up their act and decide to do something for the nation instead of worrying about their own self interests—whether they have enough money in their pockets to go down to the pub and have a beer with their mates and perhaps put a few bob on the horses at the weekend? The people of this nation will have to rise above that attitude and take stock of where Australia is at if this nation is to survive what is coming.

There has been a suggestion that a recession is coming. I believe that Australia is in a recession right now. All of my business contacts tell me that that belief is correct. In fact, I believe Australia's economy is going to get much, much worse. If honourable members think that the future is not going to be difficult, then they are living in cloud-cuckoo-land.

I take this opportunity to mention what is to be foisted on this House by this new ALP Government in respect of the heritage legislation which has been floated before the public. I believe that a Green Paper is to be issued by a committee that is to be formed. I support the formation of a committee to look at proposed heritage legislation.

Since 1981, I have been involved in the formulation of Queensland's heritage legislation. I find it a very interesting area. Anyone who has common sense and is prepared to look reasonably and with some foresight at the problem would agree that there is a need to look after historic buildings. Up and down George Street one can see some of the restoration work that has been done on some of those historic buildings. All honourable members should forget party politics for a time and look at the work which has been completed. One only has to look at the building we are sitting in now, the Mansions building, Harris Terrace, and the old colonial store. Some brilliant restoration work has also been completed in Warwick and Maryborough. One could go on instancing such restoration work all around the State.

Unfortunately, it is easy for the media to trivialise the whole matter by pointing out what they believe is not happening or a building that they believe should not have been knocked down. It is very simple for a person to make a big fellow of himself by pointing to a building that he believes should be saved.

I have the distinct impression that the Government is confused and does not know where it is going. The Premier says one thing and a Minister says another. It is very important for the Government to get its act together and indicate where it is going in regard to our heritage. As I said, it is a very important subject.

Confusing reports are coming from Ministers indicating very long sentences and fines of \$1m. That sort of uncertainty has already panicked developers and property-owners into taking precipitous action which they may well have not taken had those sorts of statements not been made. Some people are running round trying to work out how they can knock buildings down before the legislation is in place. Others are simply neglecting buildings. They do not need a big machine with a chain and ball to destroy a building; in some instances all they need do is neglect the building. For instance, they

could let the roof deteriorate so that water could get into the foundations and the building could become beyond repair. It is not helpful for the Government to adopt Gestapo tactics and make wild threats. That is not the way to go. I have said that previously, and some honourable members would have seen my press release on it. It is more important to adopt a carrot-on-a-stick approach. More flies are caught with honey than vinegar. It is important to work along those lines.

It does not matter how much each tier of Government argues that it is not its problem; it still comes out of the taxpayers' pocket. What is required is a package offering income tax relief in the Federal area, land tax relief in the State area and rate remissions in the local government area. That would be a reasonable and constructive approach to the preservation of our heritage. Let me give an example. The film industry in this country was given tax incentives so that, for every dollar spent, more than a dollar was allowed as a tax deduction. The provision of such a taxation incentive would save many buildings that would otherwise be demolished.

Mr Beattie: Which taxation? Would you look at straight-out income tax?

Mr ELLIOTT: The first would be income tax. For every dollar spent, more than a dollar should be allowed as an income tax benefit for refurbishing and resurrecting buildings to a prescribed standard. Obviously there would need to be a standard. A body involved in heritage would need the power to approve architects' suggestions. I do not believe that we should go over the top and insist on complete authenticity in renovations, which would make the task impracticable. For instance, modern techniques rather than old-fashioned techniques could be used to repair foundations. We do not need to be so paranoid that we would not allow that to happen. An obvious benefit in the State Government area would be a reduction in land tax.

In the local government area, the benefit could be in the form of reduced rates. If one person renovates a six-storey building of historical note and another person constructs a 30-storey building opposite, it is obvious that they should not be required to pay the same rates. We should all be honest enough to accept that. Obviously, rate remissions must be offered to people who protect our heritage.

The other area in which the National Party Government was involved was transferable development rights. It is really important to look at this suggestion. If a developer owns two buildings five blocks apart, it is quite reasonable to say to him, "If you are prepared to save that building, we are prepared to make concessions on what you need do to the other building." That sort of arrangement could be made as long as the result was not a ghetto or a narrow canyon such as can be seen in New York. I think we should be able to enter into such a negotiation.

Mr Prest: A ministerial rezoning?

Mr ELLIOTT: That is typical of what we have come to expect from the honourable member for Port Curtis. All other honourable members are interested and involved in heritage matters. Although he is an old-fashioned person who has no interest in our heritage, he should not make remarks such as that. They are not appropriate or helpful. All of his colleagues are quite interested in this subject. He is always the odd man out. He is always the one who makes such comments.

Before the honourable member interjected, I was dealing with transferable development rights. The use of transferable development rights will encourage development. Many people ask what practical use can be made of historical buildings. They can be put to a myriad of uses. A central business district has not yet been established in the Brisbane city centre and many buildings close to this House could be included in a CBD category.

An honourable member: In the Valley.

Mr ELLIOTT: Yes, and in the Valley.

The long-term purpose must be borne in mind. Adequate services, such as plumbing, should be installed in the buildings whilst they are being renovated so that later on they can be turned into office space. In the mean time, they could be used as inner-city living accommodation. There is a tremendous demand for apartments in the inner city. For business reasons, many people are interested in living in the Brisbane central area and are prepared to pay good money for such accommodation. These buildings can be restored well and made attractive, practical and very pleasant to live in. If that is done, there will be ready buyers. It is essential that this Government comes to grips with such a project. If one looks at the interim paper and at the attitude of the Labor Party in the past, one finds that it owned an historic building listed by the National Trust.

An honourable member: Trades Hall.

Mr ELLIOTT: Yes, Trades Hall.

It is a case of "Do as I say, not as I do." I am reminded of that famous book *Animal Farm* in which it is stated that under socialism some people are more equal than others. It is all right for the Labor Party to knock down Trades Hall, but it is not appropriate for a developer to knock down some other building.

Mrs Edmond: What about Christ Church? Are you going to help us save Christ Church? Are you going to cross the floor on Christ Church?

Mr ELLIOTT: Many people in the community do not realise that some work has already been done in that area.

Mr Littleproud: I think she's trying to get away from Trades Hall.

Mr ELLIOTT: Yes, the honourable member is trying to get away from Trades Hall. I can understand why she is not keen to talk about Trades Hall.

The Cultural Record (Landscapes Queensland and Queensland Estate) Act 1987 provides for the maintenance of a register where the registered sites are protected by law. Sites can only be registered with the approval of the owner or occupier and the Act upholds the principle that freehold property is sacrosanct. Owners are encouraged through incentives, not threats. The previous Government established an annual \$1m grant fund for restoration and research and approved changes to the Brisbane Town Plan allowing transferable development rights and other procedures. That is already in place.

Not too many people fully understood that. The Labor Party has knocked down its own history, yet is now saying that it will introduce retrospective legislation. When the public of Queensland asked for the Commonwealth Bank building to be saved, the Goss Government said, "There is no legislation. We are unable to do that. We could not legislate retrospectively." In the face of a Federal Government election, the Goss Government suddenly had new-found enthusiasm for retrospectivity and introduced seven years' gaol and \$1m fines.

Mr Ardill: You're cynical.

Mr ELLIOTT: It is not surprising that I am cynical. At the time, the Minister, Pat Comben, was unable to move to save that building, nor was the Government prepared to make any statement or do anything in regard to it. It is not surprising that the members of the public are beginning to get rather cynical about this Government's attitude. They might feel that the Goss Government trotted this legislation out just in time for the Federal election. Perhaps it was coincidental. The honourable member for Brisbane Central's smile—

Mr Littleproud: His body language.

Mr ELLIOTT: Yes, his body language tells me that he thought it was not really a coincidence.

Mr Beattie: I think this is a great speech. Don't ruin it. I think he ought to be invited to join the Labor Party. It is the most enlightened speech that I have heard from your side of the House for a long time.

Mr ELLIOTT: I am simply espousing our side's policy.

Mr Beattie: I've never heard it before, though.

Mr ELLIOTT: The reason the honourable member has not heard it before is that at times, when matters of conservation and forestry were debated in this House, some of the gentlemen in the press gallery took great delight in firstly showing on the television screen some clear felling in Tasmania, which had nothing to do with the debate. It was probably 15-year old footage. That occurred throughout the whole heritage debate over the north Queensland rainforests. The forestry workers have been looking after and husbanding that area for 100 years. The actions I have outlined are typical of the trivialisation of many of these issues. This is what we are all up against.

Mrs Edmond: Nothing was said about the Bellevue.

Mr ELLIOTT: I will be the first to accept that the Bellevue was knocked down by the previous Government. I and other honourable members in this House lived in the Bellevue.

Mrs Edmond: Cloudland.

Mr Beattie: Finish what you were saying about the Bellevue. I was enjoying that.

Mr ELLIOTT: Cloudland was made from papier-mache. If the honourable member had a good look at it, she honestly could not suggest that it was some sort of wonderful, historical building. It was an interesting building. Everyone gets a warm inner glow from having attended a ball at Cloudland during his youth. There is a dreadful nostalgia for the place. I will not mention some of the things that Peter Beattie did there in his youth.

In my opinion, the whole issue of heritage legislation should be approached from a different perspective. I suggest that the attitude adopted by the Labor Government will simply result in 1 800 sites listed by the National Trust and the National Estate being protected. I suggest also that that is not a good basis upon which to start. It shows a lack of professionalism. I acknowledge that, under very difficult circumstances and with limited funds, the National Trust has done a great job. However, the adoption of its list of heritage sites is not the way in which to achieve a balanced approach. For argument's sake, in the Paddington area, workers' cottages in a specified street should be retained as a representative sample so that people can see what they look like.

Mr Beattie: I totally agree.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is the type of approach that should be adopted across the whole spectrum of heritage issues. It is not good enough to say, "That is a worker's cottage. Don't dare touch it.", because that approach is not practical. Representative samples of heritage sites have to be selected across the board, but the approach adopted by the Labor Party has created a lot of problems.

I contend that the list compiled by the Labor Government has been inadequately researched. It is also unrepresentative and full of omissions. The International Council on Monuments and On Sites—ICOMOS—has developed acceptable principles on conservation of the built environment. Most people who are involved in heritage issues know that that is an international organisation, yet I notice that it has not been consulted by this Government. The whole issue has not been approached on a consultative basis.

Each country that is interested in preserving its heritage can vary the ICOMOS principles to suit the local environment. In Australia, the principles are embodied in the Burra Charter. Established procedures under the Burra Charter have been ignored. The location, recording, management and protection of sites have been neglected. It is irresponsible to arbitrarily adopt an unvetted list. Each site should be researched properly and then measured against a set of criteria to determine the significance of the site.

before it is protected. If the Minister does not follow that course of action, complete chaos will result. As I said earlier, the Premier and the Minister have made conflicting statements.

The previous National Party Government introduced legislation to protect heritage sites. This Government proposes to introduce legislation that will replace the Aboriginal Relics Preservation Act 1967, which established a cultural record based on a philosophy of a continuum of history from earliest times. The point I make is that heritage sites are not limited to white settlement or colonial buildings. If this Government wishes to honestly approach the issue, it should approach it on the basis that Queensland's heritage spans 40 000 years. I suggest that the Minister is silent on the future and management of 10 000 Aboriginal and Islander sites.

Mr Comben: No, he's not.

Mr ELLIOTT: It is good to see that the Minister has entered the Chamber.

Mr Comben: If you talk to the Aboriginal people, you will find that for the last three months we have been discussing with them this matter and what we are planning to do. You should talk to the Aboriginal people.

Mr ELLIOTT: All right. I suggest that the Minister will cast off responsibility for prehistoric sites to the Department of Family Services.

Mr Comben: No.

Mr ELLIOTT: I am glad to hear it. I understand that a paper on departmental restructuring has proposed a branch in charge of rights and culture but that no mention has been made of heritage. Is that correct or not?

Mr Comben: Who is doing that?

Mr ELLIOTT: It has been suggested that a departmental paper on restructuring proposes establishment of a branch in charge of rights and culture but that no mention has been made of Aboriginal heritage provisions.

Mr Comben: That is up to the Department of Family Services. That has nothing to do with me.

Mr ELLIOTT: The point I make is that Aboriginal and Islander heritage sites will not be protected by the proposed legislation.

Mr Comben: If you are talking about my department and not about Aboriginal Affairs, then I would probably be able to give you some answers.

Mr ELLIOTT: I am saying that the whole heritage issue encompasses a span of 40 000 years. It does not only involve workers' cottages in Paddington or colonial wool stores.

Mr Comben: Yes, that is right.

Mr ELLIOTT: Heritage issues involve very much more than that.

Mr Comben: Yes.

Mr ELLIOTT: I think that the Government should be looking very seriously at all those matters.

Mr Comben: We are.

Mr ELLIOTT: I am very pleased to hear that.

Mr Comben: You should have asked me.

Mr ELLIOTT: It took me until 19 March to be able to see the Minister. I communicated with the Minister's office and stated that I was even prepared to visit

him during the holidays in January. I could not get an appointment. In fact, I could not even get in the door. It took me until 19 March to make contact. I have not had much time to look into this matter in detail. I am pleased that the Minister eventually was able to give me an appointment, because I realise he is a very important person who has a lot of work to do.

Mr Comben: You would remember. You were the Minister for Heritage for about three weeks.

Mr ELLIOTT: In fact, I was the Minister for three years. The Minister is thinking of someone else when he mentions three weeks.

Mr Comben: I am sorry. I do not want to embarrass your friend.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is all right.

I await with interest the Minister's proposals in relation to heritage. I hope that he will prove to be a good Minister because heritage is a very important issue.

Mr Heath: This legislation is pretty good. The retrospectivity is pretty good.

Mr ELLIOTT: But it is interesting that the retrospective legislation was unable to encompass the Commonwealth Bank building. At an earlier stage, the Government did not seem to be very enthusiastic about heritage legislation.

In the time that remains for my speech, I wish to point out another matter of concern to the people of my electorate, namely, soil conservation. In 1983 the Federal coalition promised an initial allocation of \$5m which would gradually increase to \$15m by 1987-88. At that time, the Federal Labor Party promised an amount of \$4m which would increase to a minimum of \$20m a year.

The reality is that in the first year, 1983-84, the Labor Government allocated only \$1m to the soil conservation program. According to the Federal Budget Papers, during the period 1983-84 to 1988-89, Labor's allocations for soil conservation were \$1m, \$4m, \$4.7m, \$5.5m, \$6m and \$9.8m. In that six-and-a-half year period, Labor allocated a total of \$31m to national soil conservation. The coalition's program of expenditure between 1983-84 and 1988-89 would have totalled \$50m.

It is interesting to note that in 1987-88 Labor allocated \$6m to national soil conservation whereas, at the same time, as the new member for Carnarvon rightly pointed out, it spent \$5m on landscaping the grounds of the new Parliament House in Canberra. I find it quite amazing that Labor spent almost as much on growing pretty flowers and shrubs around Parliament House as it spent in the whole nation on soil conservation. At the same time, Labor spent \$40m on a referendum that no-one wanted. It was beaten on every question. They are examples of the priority that the Government gives to the environment.

I am amazed that the Government has the hide to talk about conservation. It panders to the public. It cons the people, the greens and the Australian Democrats into believing that it has a marvellous concept for the environment. It really is staggering. It gives me no joy to stand here today and give those figures to the House.

Mr Comben: \$34m. It is \$34m more than your Government ever gave.

Mr ELLIOTT: If the honourable member examines the program that was to be instituted, he will see that the coalition had already indicated its commitment. As I indicated earlier, the only reason that the Labor Party promised \$4m was that the coalition put it on the record—

Mr Comben: \$34m.

Mr ELLIOTT: No. I am referring to the first year, not the whole program. The coalition was prepared to institute the program, so the Labor Party matched it. Unfortunately, it did not keep its promise. We have seen that happen in many other areas.

The Labor Party did not keep its promises on the economy, which is suffering. That is why the Federal Labor Party is a mess today and is facing the prospect of a hung Parliament. That is why this nation has to come to grips with the problem and do something about it.

Mr Comben: We did win, didn't we?

Mr ELLIOTT: The Labor Party has not won yet. The honourable member should not count his chickens before they hatch. He has a terrible habit of doing that.

Sitting suspended from 1.03 to 2.30 p.m.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the honourable member for Glass House, I remind honourable members that it is the honourable member's maiden speech and I ask that it be heard in silence.

Mr SULLIVAN (Glass House) (2.30 p.m.) Mr Speaker, it is with infinite pride that I rise for the first time in this place as the member for Glass House to support the motion moved by the honourable member for Mount Isa and seconded by the honourable member for Barron River. To be the representative of the people of the Glass House electorate is an honour and a privilege. I am acutely aware of the responsibility that it entails and I thank them for their confidence and for the support that they gave me, as expressed at the election on 2 December 1989. I am conscious of the need to represent all of my constituents, regardless of their political affiliations, and my pledge to them today is that I will do that to the very best of my ability.

Mr Speaker, may I add my congratulations to those that you have already received from others on your elevation to the honoured office of Speaker of this Parliament. I do so, not out of the hollow observance of a parliamentary tradition, but as a very real expression of my own satisfaction at the result of the ballot of members. I have followed your career, both in this place and elsewhere, and, based on those observations, I am certain that the Parliament has selected as its Speaker a member who is truly worthy of the honour. For my part, Mr Speaker, I express the hope that I shall do nothing in the future that will vex you in any way.

I would like to acknowledge the contributions of the honourable members who have preceded me in this debate, and particularly congratulate my fellow "maidens" on the quality and diversity of their speeches. It is pleasing to note that the print media have seen fit to reward many of those efforts with some acknowledgment in their publications.

I am reminded of the words of the great New South Wales Labor leader, Neville Wran, who, in the introduction to a book on Prime Minister Bob Hawke's speeches, wrote of speeches and the press—

"The public address and parliamentary speech have long ceased to be the principal means of communication between the people . . . and their political leaders. This reflects . . . a change in the style and role of the newspapers. Lengthy reports of speeches have been replaced almost entirely by the skimpiest of summaries . . . straight reporting tends more and more to take second place to commentary, informed or otherwise.

Yet the formal speech and the considered address remain an important part of the political and parliamentary process. They remain the principal means of articulating Government policy . . . in any meaningful way. They remain the most valuable public record of the decisions of our Governments, our Parliaments, and our leaders."

Mr Speaker, the speeches that you have heard from the new members of this Parliament may not have exposed to public scrutiny matters of great national importance; they are, nevertheless, events of some moment to the members and their constituents. I hope that, during the course of this Forty-sixth Parliament, the members of the press can continue to extend the courtesy of coverage to the speeches of all members. Should

they be able to do so, I am sure that there will be not only an improvement in the standard of debate offered, but also a welcome improvement in the level of public awareness of matters before the Parliament.

On 2 December last year, the electors of Queensland rewarded the Australian Labor Party, led by Wayne Goss, with a stunning, if overdue, victory. I congratulate the Premier on that achievement. For the first time the electors of Glass House have selected a candidate from our great party, the Australian Labor Party, to represent them. I am extremely proud to be a member of a State Labor Government, the first for over three decades, as our party approaches its centenary year.

There is an aura of history surrounding this Government, a mood that I find very agreeable indeed. We have been entrusted with Government by a State that expects a fresh start. The Honourable the Premier offered just that to the people, and I look forward to my role in the delivery of that commitment.

No woman or man can hope to enter this place as a member without the assistance and sacrifice freely given by a large number of people. I take advantage of this opportunity to publicly express my gratitude to the many people who assisted me during the campaign and on polling-day.

Firstly, I thank my wife, Carryn, and my daughters, Casey and Tai, for their support and encouragement, and for their love and understanding, without which the rigours of a 14-month campaign would have been unbearable. I thank my mother, Pat, who, although not enjoying good health, was always available for help and advice, proving once again that we never stop owing our parents. I would like to acknowledge that my mother and family are in the public gallery today.

I applaud the efforts of my campaign troika, Lorraine McColl, Eileen Wood and Vicky Hendricks, without whose direction and help the campaign would have been impossible. A man whom I shall never be able to adequately repay shares a name with the member for Caboolture. Bribie Island's Ken Hayward is the kind of friend and supporter that very few people are privileged to acquire in their lifetime. I thank him for his many sacrifices for me.

Bill Osborne and the members of the Bribie Island branch of the ALP, Ken Male and the members of the Caboolture/Beachmere branch, and the members of the Sunshine Coast hinterland branch all deserve and have my gratitude. To the many people, too many to name, who assisted my campaign simply because they believe in us and the need for change, I give my thanks.

I acknowledge and thank the dedicated staff of the Australian Labor Party State branch, without whom my campaign would have been unimaginable. I also acknowledge assistance from the Australian Workers Union, the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Association and the Federated Clerks Union.

I am sure that my colleagues on this side of the House will join me in praising our brilliant State campaign director, Wayne Swan, whose role in the magnificent victory seems to have been somewhat forgotten in the euphoria surrounding that event. Wayne believed in me before I believed in myself, and he restored my faith in myself whenever it wavered even just a little. The difference between winning and losing Glass House was the lesson that we learned daily from Wayne Swan. My victory is his victory, and I thank him for it.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the role of my late father, Keith, from whom I learned the principles that have guided my life and led me to this place as a representative of the people of Glass House.

The electorate of Glass House was created in the 1985 redistribution, and contested for the first time in the election held in November 1986. On that occasion it was won for the National Party by Mr L. E. Newton. I take this opportunity to acknowledge his efforts on behalf of the electorate.

The electorate includes parts of four local authority areas: Widgee Shire, Maroochy Shire, Caloundra City and Caboolture Shire. The electorate covers a little over 2 600 square kilometres. The major population centres are that part of Caboolture north of the Caboolture River, Bribie Island, Maleny, Woodford, Beerwah and Beachmere. In total there are some 30 smaller villages.

Primary industries provide the main economic base for the electorate. Dairying, horticulture—particularly pineapples, bananas and berry crops—beef cattle, poultry, timber and fishing are all of significant importance.

Tourism has been, and will continue to be, of particular importance to Bribie Island, thanks to its unique advantages.

The electors of Glass House have the same aspirations as those of other electorates and ask of their Government the same services. Roads, schools, health facilities, housing, police and emergency services figure prominently in any list of needs they present. However, it is in their special affinity with our natural environment that the electors of Glass House are beginning to distinguish themselves, and several excellent environmental organisations are active. I mention particularly the Bribie Island Environment Protection Association, the Caboolture Environment Defence Association and the Conondale Range Committee.

The Glass House electorate and surrounding areas are typical of the environmental challenge confronting all of us. In little more than 100 years the magnificent rainforests of the Maleny plateau have been reduced to a few small remnants. Their rich floristic diversity has been all but destroyed. Equally, the preservation of biodiversity across all of Queensland is the most exciting challenge before us as we move to establish a world-class system of national parks. The achievement of such a park system, representing all our land forms, habitats and vegetation types, will be unique in the world and a magnificent legacy for our future generations. Happily, the Glass House electorate will provide Queensland with a number of the national park areas in that estate.

The electorate takes its name from one of Queensland's most recognisable features, the Glasshouse Mountains, which are already protected by national park status. One of the group—Coonowrin, or Crookneck—was only last week afforded an additional measure of protection, thanks to the refusal by the Caloundra City Council to allow the expansion of a quarry near its base. The local Aboriginal people have a story—some would say a legend—that explains how Coonowrin got its name.

It seems that Tibrogargan, the father, and Beerwah, the mother, had many children, the eldest of which was Coonowrin. One day, while he was looking out to sea, Tibrogargan noticed that the sea was rising. He gathered his younger children in order to flee to the safety of the mountains to the west and called out to Coonowrin to help his mother, who, unknown to Coonowrin, was again pregnant. Looking back, Tibrogargan was angry to see Coonowrin running off alone. He pursued him and, raising his club, struck him such a mighty blow that his neck was dislocated, and he has not been able to straighten it since. Coonowrin's brothers and sisters, and his parents, wept at the shame of his cowardice, which explains the many small streams in the area today. To this day, Tibrogargan gazes out to sea, never turning to look at his son, who hangs his head and cries. Beerwah is still pregnant, because it takes a long, long time to give birth to a mountain.

I suggest that it is because it does take such a considerable time for our natural environment to evolve that it is so important for us to act now to protect what we still have. The Booloumba Creek catchment area of the Conondale Range is an example of the need to take that action. The first attempt to have this area declared was, I am told, made by the member for Landsborough in the late 1970s. At that time it seems that his vision was not shared by his party colleagues, which is a problem that also seems to have dogged him in the late 1980s. Since then there has not only been logging in the area—from which, I hasten to add, the area can still recover—but also the disaster of the Asterik Resources Agricola mine site, which is not only unsightly but also poses some very real dangers with regard to the materials used in that mining operation. The

company has now gone into liquidation, with the responsibility for rehabilitation now falling by default to the State Government. Further interest in the area by other mining companies means that we must move quickly to protect the region from any similar catastrophe.

The need for sustainable use of our natural resources is another of the global imperatives confronting mankind that is typified in my electorate. Pumicestone Passage is the last relatively undeveloped part of the coastline between Brisbane and Noosa. The value of this estuary for its fishery and for recreation is worth tens of millions of dollars annually. It sustains not only our essentials of life in its rich seafoods but also our quality of life for recreation, for habitat of our wildlife and for open space between expanding cities. Regrettably, human activity has jeopardised the integrity of this unique and valuable environmental precinct. Fish numbers are down; siltation is an increasing problem; pollution levels are alarming fishermen; and the destruction of significant mangrove areas has taken place. Against this backdrop, the Caloundra City Council seems intent on allowing the giant Pelican Waters development at Golden Beach, which, although not in my electorate, poses an unacceptable threat to Pumicestone Passage.

The public increasingly demands, as do the electors of Glass House, that we protect the diversity of life around us and sustain the use of our natural resources. We must plan specifically for this purpose.

Reform of the Queensland electoral system is a matter of great importance in the electorate I represent. It was therefore very pleasing to hear in His Excellency's Speech that leading the Government's priorities will be—

" . . . the restructuring of Queensland's electoral laws so that the next election can be contested on fair and honest boundaries."

Electorates such as Glass House are forgotten in the debate on Queensland's electoral gerrymander. There are 28 000 electors in Glass House. Put another way, under a one vote, one value system, that is about a full quota more than in the electorate of Roma. But it is not the number of electors that is so irksome. The insult is in the boundaries of the electorate.

I said earlier that the electorate of Glass House was created in 1985. What I should have said was that it was manufactured in 1985—manufactured, that is, in order to return a representative of the National Party. Why else would the boundary divide the town of Caboolture, with half in Glass House and half in the electorate of Caboolture? Why else would the Caloundra suburb of Little Mountain be included in Glass House and not in Landsborough, where it ought to be? Why else would the Blackall Range towns be included in Glass House, rather than Gympie, or Cooroora, either of which makes more sense?

I will illustrate that by citing the predicament of my constituents from the town of Imbil, which is in the northern reaches of the Glass House electorate. By car, Imbil is about 25 minutes from Gympie, where the member for Gympie has his electorate office. It is a similar journey from Noosaville, and the electorate office of the member for Cooroora. However, it is about 90 minutes from the biggest town in the Glass House electorate, namely, Caboolture, where my office and that of my predecessor is located.

What is even worse is that, in the course of driving from Imbil to Caboolture, approximately 50 minutes before my constituents would get to Caboolture they actually pass the front door of the office of the member for Nicklin. As they pass the Caloundra exit on the Bruce Highway some 25 minutes before they reach Caboolture, my constituents will also actually be closer to the office of the member for Landsborough than to my office.

Every one of those electorates has a greater number of voters than a fair distribution would assign. Prior to the last election, each of them was represented in this House by a National Party member. In fact, there was a conscious effort by the National Party to promote a Sunshine Coast five-pack, which was no doubt intended to rival the Gold Coast six-pack. That led to some fun at its expense, based on the old Australian

expression that describes an idiot as being one sandwich short of a picnic. The National Party in that area was one member short of a six-pack.

If each of those five seats was represented by the National Party and each of them was considerably in excess of a fair quota of electors—although honourable members know that that concept is rather lost on the National Party—why was the town of Imbil included in the seat that had the most distant natural headquarters? The answer is fairly simple. The voters of Imbil have a long history of generously supporting National Party candidates at election time. Imbil was included in Glass House simply to ensure a National Party win—to hell with the voters being inconvenienced. Because the commissioners did not include Imbil in their initial proposals for the electorate, they should not be blamed. It seems that there was some encouragement to include the area in their final blueprint for the electorate. I am very pleased to report that, last December, those electors who were so disregarded by the former Government voted for the Labor Party in unprecedented numbers.

I turn now to some matters that have become apparent to me since the election. On Monday, 19 March, during ABC radio's *Rod Henshaw* program, the Leader of the Opposition stated that, judging by the way that the Goss Labor Government was dealing with public servants and board members, it almost seemed as if the Government did not trust them. I do not wish to malign any individual or suggest that anyone is untrustworthy, but the actions of such people can often leave much to be desired.

I would like to instance two examples of problems I have encountered in my dealings on behalf of my constituents. The first matter concerns the Podiatrists Board of Queensland. Recently, the Minister tabled and moved for the printing of that board's annual report. I can hardly wait to get my hands on it. I am sure that it will make fascinating reading.

In 1986, a constituent of mine who was then living in Victoria and practising chiropody, as it was then called, was seeking to relocate to Queensland for family reasons. He applied to the Queensland board for registration. In December 1986, without explanation, his application was refused.

At regular intervals over the next three years my constituent sought to have the board review that decision. However, the result was always a steadfast refusal to budge from the original decision. Interestingly, during those three years the board quoted as its authority an Act of the Queensland Parliament that did not come into force until mid-1977, which was many months after the board had refused to register my constituent.

Under that new Act my constituent clearly does not qualify. His course of study, which was undertaken in Victoria over 20 years ago, was of only two years' duration and not the three years that is currently required. However, at the time of the refusal the board had the discretion to grant registration to my constituent to practise in this State. The board chose not to exercise that discretion. Apparently, 20 years of successfully caring for the feet of Victorians counts for nothing. Because my constituent is entitled to practise on people in Victoria, the ACT and the Northern Territory, I ask: are their feet so different from ours?

In December last year, after three years of quoting the wrong authority, the board finally realised that it had to justify itself in terms of the Act that was in force at the time of the application. To do that, it declared that it did not recognise the institution at which my constituent had obtained his qualification.

My understanding is that that institution was the first in Australia to offer courses in chiropody. Therefore, in some terms it is the mother of the profession in Australia. That rejection of its "mother" by the board must be worrying for those practising podiatrists whose primary qualification is the one that the board now rejects. While the board continues to exist and to adhere to that ridiculous and unjustifiable decision, honourable members can expect to hear more from me on this subject.

The actions of the fire service board in relation to fire service levies in the townships of Beerwah and Glass House Mountains are equally as appalling. I am more than a little annoyed by the arrogance of the State Fire Services in this matter.

On 26 March 1988, as a result of the expansion of the Caloundra Fire Brigade Board boundaries, residents of Beerwah and Glass House Mountains were levied for fire levies for the period 1 July 1987 to 30 June 1988. However, those levies did not take into account that no service was provided for that period because the nearest appliance is 20 minutes away and, therefore, useless in the event of any fire.

On 20 October 1988, a fire station at Beerwah became operational, meaning that residents of those towns were expected to contribute nearly 16 months' worth of levies for a service that could not be and was not provided. A total of 15 ratepayers in the area withheld the portion of the levy that represented that period.

On 21 November 1989, 17 months after the original levy notices had been sent out, the State Fire Services employed the services of a mercantile agency, namely, Commercial Collection Services Pty Ltd, to take action, including possible legal action, to recover the outstanding amounts. Fourteen of the 15 people who were threatened with the possibility of expensive legal proceedings swallowed their principles and—if honourable members will forgive a mixed metaphor—coughed up the money. However, the fifteenth discovered that the board was acting illegally.

The Fire Brigades Act allows for legal recovery only after three years have elapsed. In December I wrote to the Minister asking him to advise me on the issues of the collection of a levy for a service that cannot be provided and the action taken to recover the moneys outstanding well within the period prescribed under the Act. Two weeks ago I received his reply.

The Minister's letter bore more than a passing resemblance to a letter that was sent to my constituents on 1 December 1989 under the signature of Mr W. H. Belcher, Commissioner. It may interest you to know, Mr Deputy Speaker, that this letter did not address either of the points I have raised.

Since then I have learned that the fire services have returned the account to the Caloundra City Council for collection. The reason is, of course, that the council can take recovery action without violating the Fire Brigades Act. The people of Queensland do not need a public service that behaves so badly. The Leader of the Opposition says we appear not to trust the public service. If this is indicative of the way in which the public service works, then I very much hope that the Leader of the Opposition is right.

Earlier, I said that the electors of Glass House have the same needs as those of other electorates. A natural consequence of being one of the fastest-growing regions of the State is the inadequacy of Government services to the area. We share with my colleagues from Redcliffe and Pine Rivers the dubious benefits of the Redcliffe police region. This region shares with other city-fringe regions the distinction of being the most understaffed regions in the State. This impacts on my electorate in the same way as it does on the others—unacceptably high levels of unlawful activity simply because there are no police available to control and prevent that behaviour.

Our schools are fast becoming more than just inadequate; they are becoming dangerously overcrowded. At least two more high schools and two more primary schools are required now.

I am pleased that the Premier has committed the Government to the construction of the Caboolture hospital that has been promised by our opponents since 1977.

The delivery of a community health centre, due to open shortly, cannot be regarded as even remotely satisfying the needs of the community.

The roads that are the responsibility of the Main Roads Division of the Transport Department are exceptional only for their sorry state.

The rural industries are suffering from some very real problems, and in that regard I mention particularly the pineapple-growers and professional fishermen.

There is much work to be done yet in the electorate of Glass House. I look forward to the challenge of the next three years. I also extend my thanks to the members present in the House for their courtesies during this my maiden speech.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hollis): I call the honourable member for Currumbin. I remind members that this is his maiden speech.

Mr COOMBER (Currumbin) (2.55 p.m.): It is a great privilege to rise in this House for the first time. I express my personal loyalty, and that of the people of Currumbin, to the Queen and Crown.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I would hope that you would congratulate Mr Fouras on his election as Speaker and I would hope that his strong control, strict discipline and impartiality produce the dignity that this House of Parliament desires and deserves.

I thank the people of Currumbin for their confidence to elect a Liberal member to the Queensland Parliament. I assure the people in my electorate that I will represent them in a manner transcending party politics. I will pursue my parliamentary responsibilities with vigour, dedication and integrity.

The Currumbin electorate forms part of the fastest-growing area in Australia. Both the Gold Coast City and the Albert Shire have recorded population increases far in excess of projected growth. As a Gold Coast City Council alderman for eight years, I have been proud to be associated with the planning and implementation of policies which will make the Gold Coast not only the tourist destination of Australia but also an international tourist paradise. I would like to include as part of this, my maiden speech in this House, some aspects of the Gold Coast.

In the past, the name Gold Coast was synonymous with Surfers Paradise. Today, the Gold Coast is a young, vibrant, growing city which has less dependence on the name Surfers Paradise. The region now has balance. I say that because, although tourism will always be the region's major industry and employer, the Gold Coast has developed many other attributes to attract business and people.

The population of the Gold Coast officially has passed 250 000. With tourist numbers included, the population on any day is closer to 350 000, and the number swells to 750 000 at peak holiday times. The Gold Coast City Council and the Albert Shire Council should be congratulated on maintaining and being able to keep ahead of this tremendous need and growth, with such a small ratepayer base to fund such works.

Why is the Gold Coast so popular? The Gold Coast is a healthy, clean, vibrant place to live. The region is growing younger. No longer are Australians relocating to the Gold Coast to retire, but they now see the Gold Coast as a place to start a family, educate their children and succeed in private enterprise. Bond University, Australia's first private university, and the Gold Coast College of Advanced Education provide some of the tertiary education requirements for the region.

But the key ingredient is private enterprise. The development of the Gold Coast, both structural and in character, has resulted from initiative, faith and vision by a handful of men and women. The raw materials, being good beaches, a pristine environment, a subtropical climate and the Australian love of the outdoors, enabled a balanced form of development to occur.

However, the image is changing, and changing rapidly. The Gold Coast will become the technology centre of Queensland. Environmentally clean, white-collar, research and development industry will increase and supplement the Bond University. But Government and local government need to have a common purpose in encouraging new industry to the Gold Coast by providing attractive inducements to build or relocate.

In the past, the Gold Coast has enjoyed a close working relationship with Government and local government. The need for this working relationship to continue is paramount. When business or private enterprise is investing many millions of dollars, answers have to be given within reasonable time. It is imperative that the Government is aware that high interest rate policies of the Federal Labor Government are halting development.

and, at best, placing at risk current projects caught with spiralling interest rates. Regional planning authorities, regional water authorities and regional fire boards would only add to the delay. The multiplier effect to the community of the Gold Coast from the development industry is significant. The Gold Coast provides millions of dollars to the State Budget through stamp duties, payroll taxes, taxes, fees and licences—so look after the Gold Coast, as the Gold Coast has been used in the past to look after Queensland.

The residential part of the Gold Coast is situated in the Currumbin electorate. The electorate provides an alternative to the glitter of Surfers Paradise but it allows residents, if they choose, to be part of the tourist city.

The electorate is blessed with natural features such as the Tallebudgera and Currumbin estuaries and the national park of Mount Coogal. The beaches are prolific but are suffering from years of erosion.

The electorate has a pleasant mix of tourist, residential and rural life-styles. Its people are warm and friendly people of all ages. Demographically, the electorate is getting younger. The high-growth areas of Elanora and Currumbin Waters are comprised predominantly of younger families and complement the retirement areas of Palm Beach and Tugun. The electorate has a mix of community groups and interests, employment opportunities and life-styles. An outstanding characteristic is the sense of belonging and pride possessed by people who live in the Currumbin electorate.

Coolangatta is the business heart of the electorate and is undergoing massive redevelopment and revitalisation. The second and third generation tenants in some of the newer complexes in Coolangatta are finding considerable financial success.

The introduction of daylight-saving has halted the drain of business to nearby Tweed Heads. Daylight-saving must be retained to enable future growth to take place. Without daylight-saving, one problem encountered by tourists is that they have to leave the Gold Coast one day earlier than necessary simply to coordinate international or domestic plane travel in Sydney or Melbourne. That loss in visitor nights impacts on the local economy—a simple but costly loss that is suffered by all tourist centres of Queensland.

Kirra, including Kirra Point is the surfing capital of the Gold Coast. Major redevelopment of the Kirra Hotel will see Kirra as a major tourist destination once again. Beach restoration is in progress and wide beaches will be generated. No longer will the local surf clubs be without beaches to patrol. Residents and businesses have suffered for far too long. The beach replenishment program must be completed, and I hope that this Government continues the restoration program for which the Gold Coast City Council has argued for so many years.

The Currumbin township, Currumbin Hill and the Currumbin estuary are the centrepiece of the electorate. The environment and the amenity are zealously guarded by active environmental groups, and they also closely watch developments. The Currumbin Bird Sanctuary is a destination tourist attraction visited by hundreds of thousands of tourists annually.

Palm Beach, Elanora and the inland residential growth areas are the residential life-blood of the Currumbin electorate. Retirees and young families enjoy the benefits of quality suburban living.

I must draw attention to an issue which threatens the future not only of Kirra, Bilinga and Tugun, but of the whole Gold Coast. The matter of beach erosion has been debated in this Parliament for several years. Last year, the previous National Party Government, after years of neglect, started a sand-replenishment program. I implore the new Government to continue that program and to restore southern Gold Coast beaches to their former state. Before New South Wales constructed the trained entrance extensions to the Tweed River in 1962, southern Gold Coast beaches had over 150 metres of sand above the high-water mark. In the past several surf clubs had, and at present some of them have the distinction of being surf clubs without a beach.

The economy of the southern Gold Coast businesses is suffering. Just as the beaches are eroding, so is business. Tourist numbers are down.

In conjunction with the New South Wales Government, the Queensland Government must install the Tweed River sand by-pass. The cost benefit of such a by-pass to Queensland is so high that threats to sue New South Wales for damages are both self-defeating and not cost effective. I say "self-defeating", because my advice is that for Queensland to be successful in any court action against New South Wales, the Constitution of Australia has to be changed. Even then, legal opinion suggests it is doubtful that any such action would succeed. Legal action also is not cost effective, since each year that passes without a solution being found to this problem costs the Gold Coast \$1m in beach maintenance.

Negotiations must take place immediately with New South Wales to find a long-term solution to the problem. A Tweed River study recently completed by the New South Wales Government confirmed that sand is not by-passing the Tweed entrance in sufficient quantity. Each year the Gold Coast beaches are being starved of approximately 250 000 cubic metres of sand. Those figures agree with the figures in surveys that have been undertaken by the Gold Coast City Council during the past 20 years. The only professional body which disagrees with those figures is the Beach Protection Authority of Queensland. When questioned on how the authority arrived at that conclusion, the answer was that by visual evaluation it was concluded that a total by-pass was occurring.

I respectfully ask this Parliament to seek urgent talks with the New South Wales Government to achieve a cost-sharing agreement with that State to construct a mechanical sand by-pass system for the Tweed River entrance. Once installed, navigation in the Tweed River would improve and sand trapped on the Tweed bar would migrate to the Gold Coast beaches. The capital costs should be shared equally between the two States and, the two local authorities, being the Gold Coast City Council and the Tweed Shire Council, could share the annual running costs. That, I believe, would be fair to all concerned.

Members of this House are well acquainted with the problems of land subsidence. Palm Beach, the heart of the Currumbin electorate, is suffering due to the lingering suggestion of land subsidence. And subsidence is real. Some 110 home-owners have lodged damages claims with the Gold Coast City Council, and the condition of the homes varies from minor structural damage through to the need for total demolition. The lives, futures and dreams of elderly people, who have invested their life-savings in quality homes, have been shattered. The strain of knowing that a home is slowly being destroyed because of poor development, poor supervision and non-compliance with development conditions set by the local authority, has contributed to stress, hardship and death. The futility of the legal system, the delays and the costs have reduced the affected parties to despair.

The Gold Coast City Council and its insurers, Suncorp Insurance, must resolve this problem using their own means. The need to determine liability or negligence is academic. To the home-owner, that is irrelevant. What is needed is compensation. Let the local authority or its insurer recover costs by legal action against the developer.

I remind the Government that the ALP candidate, Mr Michael Batkin, campaigned on and championed a Goss Government initiative if elected. Now that it is elected, I remind the Government of that promise to commit funds to a court case lodged on behalf of affected parties. Although that promise is honourable, I submit that the Government must facilitate a meeting between home-owners, the Gold Coast City Council and Suncorp Insurance to negotiate fair compensation. The homes must be restored, rebuilt or stabilised immediately. Mr Keith Smith and others have argued admirably for years. Their efforts will be vindicated and justice will prevail.

When I think of the Gold Coast, I prefer to adopt a regional approach. The elected representatives of the six State seats in the Gold Coast area must coordinate their efforts to allow the unlimited potential of the Gold Coast to materialise. Development parameters and the finished product are constantly criticised by people outside the Gold Coast.

area—more through jealousy, ill-informed comment and political point-scoring than anything else.

Development is easier to accomplish within the Gold Coast City Council and Albert Shire areas than in other areas, simply because answers are given. I have heard suggestions in this House of a development tax, an environment tax and perhaps an unknown agenda of taxes awaiting the attention of this Government but, really, is it not the purpose of the Government to make decisions? The Gold Coast City Council processes twice as many development applications per annum as does the Brisbane City Council. Why endanger an industry by charging additional taxes when the industry is supplying growth, infrastructure, employment and security?

Every ratepayer on the Gold Coast has benefited from growth. The city's rates are not in the top 20 rates and charges in this great State which are due directly to contribution through headwork charges levied by the local authorities. The city is completely sewered. Stage 2 of the Hinze Dam, is completed, with water to the region guaranteed well into the next century. The dam wall is to be raised to Stage 3 when demand increases, and this will double the capacity to 340 000 megalitres.

The decision to abandon Wolffdene dam, which was made by this Labor Government, must be followed immediately by an investigation to find alternative sources of water. I encourage the Government to explore alternative methods of water production, for example, desalination, reverse osmosis or, in the extreme, recycling of waste water. These processes are now in use throughout the world and, as time passes, technology is making these processes, particularly desalination, cost-effective. Treated water from the Hinze Dam costs about 38c a kilolitre. Desalination currently costs about \$1.50 a kilolitre. However, 10 years ago, the cost was closer to \$6 a kilolitre. Technology will make alternative sources of water a viable answer to water shortages. Wolffdene was an environmental and social disaster. If proceeded with, the project would have caused the biggest social relocation in Australian history; even larger than the Snowy Mountains Engineering Project. This cost was never included in the costing of the dam; nor was the cost of losing for all time perhaps one of the most beautiful valleys in Australia.

However, we on the Gold Coast are concerned that, as a major growth area, we will be included as part of a south-east Queensland water network and, as a consequence, be asked to contribute to huge capital works. The Gold Coast is self-sufficient, and will be so well into the twenty-first century. Technology will then produce water by methods other than huge water storage areas.

Recycling of water is the growth industry of the future. Re-use of resources, whether they be wood, metal, plastic, paper or water, will be a major benefit to society and the environment. This Government must initiate a recycling-education process. Conservation of our environment will occur only by educating our society. I like to regard the environment as something we have borrowed from our children. Recycling will preserve and retain our desired environment.

The image of the Gold Coast is one of good beaches and good surf. The tragedy of Sydney's beaches must not occur to Gold Coast beaches. I have the greatest confidence in the Gold Coast City Council staff and the area's representatives. Effluent quality is strictly monitored and current planning is to upgrade effluent to advanced tertiary standard, which is almost the standard of potable water.

I would like to draw attention to a problem pertaining to the Gold Coast, the issue of land-banking. By this, I mean the accumulation or amalgamation of land and then leaving it idle to appreciate in value. Areas of the central business districts in Surfers Paradise and Broadbeach remain overgrown, desolate development sites. In fact, areas of Main Beach would be better situated in Beirut than on the Gold Coast. Such are the benefits of development or lack of development. This problem can be resolved simply by changing sections of the Building Act. If the demolition of buildings was not allowed until building applications were processed and passed by the local authority, then vacant blocks would not scar the streetscape. Unfortunately, it is a practice of Japanese investors that, before settlement of a land package, the site is cleared of buildings. This practice

needs to be moderated so that if there are changes in the economy or demand the central business district heart is not removed. A simple change to the Building Act may moderate this practice. As a result, buildings may remain and their tenants may continue to trade and provide a healthy shopping environment.

The Gold Coast has to come to grips with foreign investment. It is a well-known fact that 90 per cent of land in Surfers Paradise is under Japanese control. The question of foreign investment on the Gold Coast has become a racist one. The Foreign Investment Review Board has become ineffective. The requirement to begin construction within one year is ignored. This Government must provide guidelines to allow investment in this State, but not the wholesale release of Queensland real estate. If the Government wants development and investment in Queensland, and particularly investment in the tourist industry, it must then immediately set parameters for all to see.

High capital investment and low long-term return are, unfortunately, a fact of life in tourism ventures. Queensland and Australian national companies are loath to invest large sums of money to provide the infrastructure. Hence the need for foreign investment. One aspect of change that is not acceptable to me is the immediate vertical integration of activities related to tourism. A holiday package from Japan now includes bus travel, trips, meals, destination resorts and shopping, which are all paid for in Japan. Most Japanese tourists are directed towards Japanese outlets on the Gold Coast. Regularly, coach-drivers are heard touting business and requesting commission from shop-owners. If their demands are not met, then the total shopping complex is black-banned.

My professional background is that of a qualified pharmacist. I studied at the University of Queensland and entered private practice in 1971. In 1974, I purchased my first pharmacy at Palm Beach. Since 1979, my pharmacy has participated in the methadone program and, on average, treated 20 heroin addicts every day of the week. Drug addiction and the associated crime and disease would, in my opinion, be the hardest problem for society and Governments to resolve. The Fitzgerald report promised so much. An inquiry into organised crime and the drug trade would have served this State far better. This is one area where Fitzgerald failed. The Gold Coast and my electorate are not isolated from the evils of the drug trade. Development sites are used by itinerants and drug-users.

As someone associated with the health industry, the problem and treatment of AIDS is a major concern to me. This Government must address the AIDS question medically and socially. It concerns me that this Government may change the laws relating to homosexuality. It is acknowledged that the AIDS virus was originally confined to the gay community and intravenous drug-users. Today, this is not the case. All sections of our community are at risk. I support the request of the Gold Coast branch of the Australian Medical Association to allow AIDS testing of patients in hospitals who require surgery. We test our newborn for syphilis, without consent, in the interests of good medicine. The health of our medical staff, both doctors and nurses, must be considered equally with the rights of the patient.

I would like to include in this maiden speech comments about the Bond University, which will be one of the Gold Coast's greatest assets for the future of business, education, research and growth. Education and research go hand in hand, and I expect many white-coat industries to relocate to the Gold Coast to work in conjunction with the Bond University. As well, the quality of graduates will, in my opinion, better suit them to enter the work force. Degrees granted by the university are hands-on degrees, making the graduate immediately productive in the workplace. It is not a case of finishing study and starting to learn. Subjects in State secondary schools should include time spent in the work force. Teachers should also upgrade, and experience the real work force to better prepare students for the workplace. The Moran Hospital of Excellence will open its doors shortly. This hospital, which is compared with the Mayo Clinic, will provide health-care facilities and health-care expertise not before seen in Queensland.

In conclusion, the problems of the Currumbin electorate are no different from other regions experiencing massive growth. In the past, the electorate has been a National

Party seat. Currumbin is a relatively new electorate that once formed part of the old South Coast seat. On 2 December, the seat changed to the Liberal Party in a huge rebuff to the Nationals. The people of Currumbin now have a member who understands the area and its problems and who, above all, will listen to the people. Even though Currumbin was a National seat, fundamental problems remain unresolved. For example, Coolangatta Police Station does not have a fax machine. Police officers have to travel to Broadbeach to send or collect facsimiles. Police numbers are inadequate to provide adequate law enforcement. Local residents and tourists alike demand an adequate police presence. The nearest juvenile aid officer is at Broadbeach. Getting down to basics, the Currumbin State School is without necessary class rooms and teacher rooms.

Traffic is a major problem on the Gold Coast. This Government must resolve the road corridor problems by completing the Tweed by-pass. Eighty per cent of visitors—some 2.5 million—come to the Gold Coast by car or coach. A safe highway network from Sydney and Brisbane to the Gold Coast is imperative. Coolangatta Airport is the gateway to the Gold Coast. Further growth will add to the economy of the area—but at some cost. Noise problems for residents of Tugun are significant and even the new generation jets, with reduced engine noise, will not allay the concern of elderly residents.

It is my hope and desire that this Government gets back to basics—the maintenance of our essential services such as police, fire and ambulance and the retention of our teachers, nurses, etc., instead of resorting to political expediency by carrying out a major capital works program—the veneer of good government. Our standard of living is under attack by an incompetent Federal Labor Government, but the electors of Currumbin will evaluate the performance of this Government over the next three years.

I look forward to being an active member of this Parliament—to participating, and to representing the views of my electorate in this House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hollis): Order! I call the honourable member for Mulgrave and remind members that this is his maiden speech.

Mr PITTS (Mulgrave) (3.25 p.m.): In rising to speak to the amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, at the outset, Mr Deputy Speaker, I congratulate you on your appointment to the panel of Temporary Chairmen. I ask you to convey to Mr Speaker my congratulations on his elevation to that high and honourable office. I am aware that, in the past, the dignity of this Chamber has not always been preserved by those who have occupied the chair. I have every confidence that the individuals entrusted with that task, in this historic Forth-sixth Parliament, will discharge their duties with fairness and firmness.

If the people of Queensland are to have their faith in the ideals of the democratic process restored, the processes must start right here in this Chamber. To this end, I pledge to the electors of Mulgrave that, during my time as their representative, I will observe the dignity of, and the traditions which govern this House. I further pledge that, although elected on the platform of my party and being committed to the implementation of its policies, I will promote the interests of all sectors of my electorate irrespective of their colour, creed or political persuasion. To do otherwise would be to debase the system of parliamentary democracy whose ideals I hold so dear.

The date, 2 December 1989, marks a watershed in politics in this State. The election of the first Labor Government in 32 years ends a long period of political domination by the conservative parties. It is ironic that those very parties inherited the mantle of Government from a Labor Party which had torn itself asunder. Here we are, some three decades later, acting out what some would argue is a very similar scenario. I must point out, though, the fundamental differences patently obvious on this occasion. The decimation of the Labor Party in Queensland in 1957 was largely of its own doing. The former Country and Liberal Parties had Government handed to them by default. The mandate of the people was one for the restoration of security—the maintenance of the status quo. By contrast, the overwhelming mandate delivered to Labor on 2 December 1989 was for change. It was a mandate for reform. I would remind all honourable

members that the election was not so much lost by the National Party Government of the day but was won by a resurgent Labor Party—a Labor Party unified as never before; a Labor Party characterised by strong leadership and armed with positive policy initiatives, capable of guiding Queensland confidently towards the turn of the century.

The strength and drive of Wayne Goss and the organisational and conceptual skills of campaign director, Wayne Swan, enabled our party to convince the majority of the population of Queensland that the Labor Party had again earned the right to govern. On a more personal level, I must acknowledge the efforts of north Queensland organiser, David Barbagallo, who approached his task with enthusiasm. David was of immeasurable assistance to me and other candidates in north Queensland. He pushed himself to the limit and demanded similar commitment from our northern candidates. Evidence of David's effectiveness is the fact that four northern seats—Mount Isa, Townsville, Barron River, and Mulgrave, fell to Labor. I offer David my sincere thanks.

As a candidate, I was indeed fortunate to be able to rely upon the support of two longstanding members, Bill Eaton and Keith De Lacy, whose electorates border that of Mulgrave to the south and north respectively. Each supported me in 1986 when we came tantalisingly close to securing the seat of Mulgrave. The Premier has also recognised their abilities by elevating them to Cabinet. Bill, with his great compassion for his fellow man, is much loved by all who know him. His portfolio of Land Management will be well served by a man of wide practical knowledge, who will approach the complex tasks ahead with skills developed through a life-time of service. As Queensland's new Treasurer, Keith faces the demanding task of mapping out a blueprint for the State's economic future. I have great respect for his sharp intellect and strength of purpose. Both of these qualities will be tested in the years to come. Keith is a man of courage and, as such, will not only meet the challenges of his portfolio, but also will thrive on them.

I turn now to my colleague and friend sitting next to me, the member for Cook. Steve Bredhauer and I first became acquainted in the mid-seventies as young school teachers and unionists. As is often the case with the Department of Education, the transfer system took us in opposite directions. Both of us, however, joined the Australian Labor Party—with Steve contesting the seat of Hinchinbrook in 1983 and, as I said earlier, my contesting Mulgrave in 1986. It is with a great deal of satisfaction that I take my seat here in this Chamber with my good friend.

Most people who embark upon a career in politics are able to identify an individual who sparked their interest in pursuing the course of service to the public. I am no exception. My long-time friend and mentor, Tom Pyne, is such a person. The affable and hard-working Chairman of the Mulgrave Shire Council, Tom has provided me with a role model to which I aspire, but realistically know will be all but impossible to achieve. In 1975 Tom sowed in me the seeds of interest in public life and he has been a source of encouragement ever since. His stewardship in local government may best be characterised by the phrase "service before self", which has won him the respect of the people of the far north. Tom Pyne never allows politics to interfere with his judgment of issues of right and wrong. With so many new faces on both sides of the House, we would do well to adopt that basic philosophy. The abuses uncovered by Tony Fitzgerald, QC, should be a lesson to all of us.

During the election campaign, I was fortunate to have behind me a large band of helpers drawn from the ranks of party members and other people who saw the need for a change in Government. I owe much to my campaign committee and will be forever in their debt. To name individuals is always fraught with danger, but I feel special acknowledgment is in order for three people who have dedicated themselves to the Labor cause. Maisie Boland and Billie Pelling have served the Australian Labor Party with great distinction. My admiration for them is boundless. I feel our success is just, if overdue, reward for their untiring efforts. I hope our program of reform will establish for them a Queensland of which they can be proud.

All political parties have within their ranks individuals who ensure their elected representatives adhere to the underlying philosophies which separate their party from

others. In far-north Queensland that role is ably carried out by my campaign manager, and president of the Leichhardt FDE, John Phillips. A successful businessman, John has served the Labor movement well. Throughout his life-time he has been a candidate, a State council delegate, and branch official. His impact, though, is more particularly felt by the way he offers a constant reminder to us of the reasons why the Labor Party is different from all other parties. John Phillips is the conscience of Labor. I thank him for his support and, most importantly, his valuable advice.

The electorate of Mulgrave was established in the 1949 redistribution and is based on the coastal strip north of Innisfail through Babinda, Gordonvale and Edmonton to the southern suburbs of Cairns, Bayview and Woree. It also encompasses the Eacham Shire on the Atherton Tableland, including the towns of Millaa Millaa, Malanda, and Yungaburra. The seat was first held for the Country Party by Robert Watson from 1950 to 1953, and then was held by Charles English for the Labor Party from 1954 until the 1957 election, when Robert Watson regained the seat for the Country Party.

It is interesting to note that the current Chairman of the Eacham Shire, Mr Phil English, is the nephew of the last Labor member to represent Mulgrave until this current Parliament. For a short period from 1959 to 1960, Mulgrave had as its member Carlisle Wordsworth, who died on 7 May 1960. He was replaced at a by-election in July of that year by Roy Armstrong, a Country Party and later National Party member. Roy Armstrong served the people of Mulgrave well from 1960 till 1980. He is still very highly thought of in the electorate and does, I believe, still take an interest in the workings of Parliament, being a frequent visitor to the public gallery of this Chamber.

My immediate predecessor, the National Party member, Max Menzel, held office for some nine years and, I am sure, represented the electorate to the best of his ability. Having fought two close campaigns against Max, I am pleased to declare that at no stage did we become involved in those gutter contests which quite often mar public life. I wish him, his wife, Margaret, and two young sons all the happiness they deserve in their new life. My election on 2 December marks the end of a 32-year conservative hold on the seat of Mulgrave. It would be remiss of me, however, not to acknowledge the fact that during his term of office Max was caught up in those discredited tactics which typified the Bjelke-Petersen regime—the vilification of people under parliamentary privilege and the use of defamation writs to silence critics. I, therefore, signal my intention to publicly restore, during my first term, the good names of those who thus suffered.

Besides the Eacham Shire, the electorate of Mulgrave also touches upon the Johnstone Shire in the south and includes most of division one and divisions two and three of the Mulgrave Shire. As I firmly believe in the central importance to the community of the most intimate level of government, local government, every endeavour will be made to foster positive and mutually beneficial relations with the respective councils. This process has already begun via joint representations involving myself and local authorities with the Main Roads Department and the Minister for Transport, the Honourable David Hamill.

On the tableland, the Eacham Shire Council, with its limited rate base, has found it extremely difficult to fund adequately the roadworks necessary to service the important dairy industry. The road between Millaa Millaa and Malanda is in an appalling state. This is no more starkly illustrated than by the condition of the archaic structure known as the Ithaca River bridge. Discussions with Mr Lyle Ford, the new Main Roads Department district engineer, have seen this much-needed work brought forward to the 1990-91 financial year, depending, of course, on the availability of funding. Should, through misfortune, this bridge be lost as a means of access, the valuable dairy industry on the tableland would suffer a serious blow which would have far-reaching economic impact.

Anyone who has travelled the Bruce Highway in far-north Queensland will readily testify that the worst stretch of that road passes through the small township of Babinda. The much maligned Babinda bypass has, unfortunately, become a political football. At various times the project has been stalled by disagreement between the State and Federal

Governments and, it must be stated, by internal community politics over the actual route the road should take. Firstly, it was the eastern route and then the western route which sharply divided the townspeople. It has now been decided to follow a path known as the central route. At this point in time all levels of government, local, State and Federal, are agreed upon the issue. Funding is available and the Main Roads Department will soon commence the actual construction. As this issue has been a festering sore on the life of the residents of Babinda, it is my intention to see the construction of an acceptable standard highway a reality in my first term. The people of Babinda have suffered long enough.

Demographic trends indicate that the urbanisation of the coastal belt near Cairns will proceed in a southward direction over the next few years, encompassing the Mulgrave electorate. The Bruce Highway will experience growth in its traffic volumes which reflect the large increases in population and employment experienced in the area. It is estimated that use of the highway will increase by some 7 per cent per annum for many years to come. Road construction to accommodate predicted traffic volumes of this order must be done now. The Main Roads Department has the task well in hand as part of a joint Federal and State funding program designed to improve our national highways.

Preliminary work has already been undertaken on the long overdue Cairns southern access road, which will provide a more direct route for heavy vehicles to the industrial suburb of Portsmith and the important port facilities. Now, with the resiting of the railways goods facility in the same area, a great deal of congestion in the transport network can be alleviated. Further work to be carried out over the next three years includes the completion of the Bruce Highway duplication south to Edmonton. Additional passing lanes, bringing that section of the road also up to four lanes, are planned on the Kamma straight south of the Yarrabah road turn-off. Both of these projects should be in place prior to there arising circumstances of an intolerable nature with respect to the road corridor.

A matter that has always been of concern to me is the underutilisation of our railway system. In this age of high density vehicular transport, it seems nothing short of scandalous that we should put further pressure on our already overtaxed road system whilst our rail network carries only a fraction of the traffic of which it is capable. I have always failed to understand the rationale used to justify the transportation of raw sugar by road rather than rail. The economic arguments presented at the time were based on a false premise. The very Government which refused to take steps to supply a rail contract at a reasonable rate was also unwilling to commit funds to highway repairs necessitated by the additional heavy vehicle movement of large sugar trucks through urban areas. With the contract for the transport of raw sugar up for renewal in the near future, I strongly urge our Government to make every effort possible to get sugar back onto rail. Large, heavily laden vehicles have no place on a congested road system when there is a perfectly viable alternative.

The cancellation of the railmotor service which links coastal communities to the south of Cairns with that city was an act of the previous Government which elicited widespread condemnation. When public transport capacity is reduced it always affects the young, the elderly and the disadvantaged. The loss of the railmotor service has brought a great deal of hardship to the people of my electorate. I have already approached the Minister for Transport, the Honourable David Hamill, urging him to consider its reinstatement. As the urbanisation of the region progresses, rail transport can and should play an integral role.

At this point I must congratulate Cairns Trans, the bus company which services the Cairns-Gordonvale route. They have approached the task of providing a reliable and efficient bus service in a most professional manner. Some difficulty is being experienced with the transportation of schoolstudents, but I would suggest this is a problem that cannot be solved in isolation. Its resolution lies in a careful assessment of the whole regional transport network, and a funded study of the problem is warranted.

During the recent election campaign, the National Party attempted a political beat-up over the proposal by KEL Watpac and an individual land-holder to establish an industrial complex on the old Queerah meatworks site and adjacent land. Wild claims of environmental damage and the horrors of any industrial development were used to frighten nearby residents. In a blatant attempt at pork-barrelling, some \$21m was to be made available to establish a minicity consisting of a virtual shopping list of establishments and services that would cater for the needs of a multitude of interest groups. This far-fetched scheme would have unnecessarily swallowed valuable financial resources that could have been directed towards roads, education, police and fire services. As has been clearly demonstrated by the Treasurer in his report to this House, the money was not available for this purpose and the Government of the day knew very well that it was not. Upon my election, after consultation with the Mulgrave Shire Council, an approach was made to the Premier to authorise a joint State Government/Mulgrave Shire study into the need for industrial land in the Mulgrave electorate based upon its predicted population capacity.

In 1989 the Mulgrave Shire was facing an upsurge in rezoning applications for industrial land in areas south of Cairns. These applications were causing considerable concern to residents and land-owners in the White Rock to Edmonton area. At the same time, the council was made aware of problems businesses were experiencing with the availability, utility and cost of industrial land. I am pleased to announce that the study has now been completed and the recommendation has been made for the Mulgrave Shire to establish a strategic plan in relation to industrial areas. The study identified the DID land at East Woree, the area at Queerah and a possible area south of Collinson Creek east of the Bruce Highway, and west of the Bruce Highway between Davis Road and Maitland Road. It is suggested that these clearly identifiable zones, capable of being buffered from residential development, will meet the needs of the projected population in the area.

Besides the issues of transport and employment opportunities, the rapid population growth in the electorate will make heavy demands upon the services provided by all levels of government. As I made clear during the election campaign, I believe it is of the utmost importance to put in place the infrastructure required for basic services well in advance of eleventh hour needs.

The Honourable Terry Mackenroth, Minister for Police and Emergency Services, has already embarked upon a reorganisation of fire services. He has also begun the onerous task of restructuring the Queensland police force. In addition, a select committee of this House will undertake an evaluation of the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade, with the responsibility to report to the Parliament on its findings and recommendations by 31 December of this year.

It rests well with me that I am able to serve on the police and emergency services legislative committee, as well as on the select committee previously mentioned. I believe that the central function of the State is to provide its citizens with the very best of basic services—such as health, education, policing and emergency services—that society can reasonably afford. In that context, I look forward to my involvement on those committees.

The Minister has demonstrated a willingness to make the tough decisions, and for this he has my support. I take this opportunity to bring to his attention and to the attention of the House two priority needs within the electorate of Mulgrave. The Woree substation of the Cairns Fire Brigade—as is the case with other substations in the electorate—is not manned on a 24-hour basis. As the population grows, the need for a 24-hour service becomes more acute. I have already made representations to the Minister in this regard, and will continue to do so. The absence of around-the-clock protection is compounded by the fact that, because of the lack of funding by the previous Government, the one and only appliance at Woree was frequently relocated to Cairns to cover that city when the headquarters units were off the road owing to mechanical break-down or work-related damage. This is a most unsatisfactory state of affairs.

Queensland police have come under a great deal of criticism in recent years, resulting in a lowering of officer morale and a crisis of confidence on the part of the public. It would be remiss of me to say that that criticism is not justified. However, I point out that the vast majority of men and woman who constitute the thin blue line do a magnificent job and deserve the wholehearted support of the community they serve. Sadly, the activities of a few rotten apples have damaged the professional image of those to whom we look for protection. My personal experience of police officers gives me cause for great hope for the future. With the right leadership, broader training opportunities and better resourcing, our police will emerge from the shadow of the Fitzgerald inquiry and will be better able to serve the people of Queensland.

As is the case in many areas of the State, the Mulgrave electorate has a serious shortfall in manpower and equipment. Steps need to be taken right now to establish a modern police complex which is staffed on a 24-hour basis and will service the needs of the rapidly developing area to the south of Cairns. As it is, traffic duties alone are onerous. Frequent complaints are made that the police are "not around when you need them". Although that criticism is understandable, it is quite unfair, because officers cannot be in two places at once. The number of traffic movements along the Bruce Highway between Babinda and Cairns warrants a significant police presence. Of course, that diminishes the capacity of the police to carry out other tasks. I am proud to say that our Government is addressing the manpower question, and I look forward to some relief in Mulgrave.

The township of Gordonvale has taken a leading role in the electorate with the establishment of a very successful Neighbourhood Watch program. Because of the growing number of break-and-enter offences in the town, the community responded by accepting a degree of responsibility for its own security. Neighbourhood Watch coordinator Lorraine Fisher and liaison officer Constable Trevor Crawford can feel well satisfied with the outcome of their hard work. In the first six months of operation of the Neighbourhood Watch program, the number of break-and-enter offences has dropped from quite alarming proportions to zero. Obviously, it is unrealistic to expect such a perfect record to continue. However, it does underline the potential of the scheme. I recommend that other communities within the electorate consider becoming involved in the Neighbourhood Watch network.

For the past several years, together with other citizens, I have been actively involved in efforts to maintain the public hospital facility at Gordonvale. The attitude of the previous Government was ambivalent, to say the least. Its policy swung from one of imminent closure of the hospital to that of offering up to \$2m to carry out major construction work on it. The timing of such announcements was related closely to the proximity of State elections. Even the much-appreciated recent \$500,000 extension fell short of its intended provisions. The hospital still does not have a patients' sitting room. Renovations of the existing pan room, tea room, nurses station, clean utility room and the children's ward have not been carried out. Conversion of the old infant nursery into a four-bed ward has not occurred. Additionally, no funds are available to landscape the site of the demolished section. I am led to believe that a further \$100,000 is needed to complete that work.

The Minister for Health, the Honourable Ken McElligott, has been apprised of the situation by both the manager of the Cairns Base Hospital, Mr Rob Gray, and me. A recent meeting of all sectors of the health-care network in the area has resulted in initial steps being undertaken to carry out a survey designed to ascertain what the community itself requires of its hospital. I do not believe that any need exists to duplicate the more specialised services that are available through the region's major hospital, namely, the Cairns Base Hospital, which is only some 20 kilometres away. It would be more appropriate for the hospital at Gordonvale to offer an excellent round-the-clock outpatients facility along with an emphasis on geriatric care. My early approaches indicate that there is a real possibility of establishing a regular program of visiting specialists, which would be of great benefit to the local community.

Long-serving medical superintendent Dr Ray Davis, who has worked hard on behalf of the people of the area, is due to retire in 1991. I will be soliciting his support and drawing upon his vast experience to put in place the changes that the nineties are to bring. At the top of the list is the need for the appointment of a full-time medical superintendent. The Director of Nursing, Robyn Greenfield, has accepted the challenge that was offered to her and has impressed as a professional who is capable of providing the necessary leadership to carry out the innovations that the future will require.

Recent announcements by the Minister for Housing and Local Government, the Honourable Tom Burns, are welcomed by the people of Mulgrave. The department has embarked upon a program of land purchase, the acquisition of existing dwellings and the building of further accommodation units, which has seen several million dollars injected into the electorate. In the past, the provision of public housing in Mulgrave has not been adequately addressed. With the demands of a growing population, there was an obvious need for prompt action. I extend to the Minister my personal thanks for his quick response in this regard. He can be assured that I will continue to keep him adequately informed of the needs of the area on an ongoing basis.

Having spent over 20 years as a teacher, I have a keen interest in developments in education and the capital works requirements in the electorate. The decision that was taken by the Minister for Education, the Honourable Paul Braddy, to replace the TE score, which was poorly understood by the community and, unfortunately, misused by many employers as a selection criterion, has been widely acclaimed. That is one of many reforms on the Government's agenda. As a member of the legislative committee on education, I look forward to making a contribution to education in this State. The Labor Party realises the central role that a well-structured, efficient and responsive education system will play in the economic future and social well-being of Queensland. With the planned phasing-out of demountable class rooms over a three-year period, hopefully we will at last see an end to the perennial problems that are associated with the need for permanent, covered walkways. There would not be one major school in the electorate that does not require attention in that regard.

The tropical downpours on the coast and the sustained drizzle that is experienced on the tableland every year, which wreak havoc for schoolchildren, are a fact of life in far-north Queensland. Babinda, which lays claim to being one of the wettest towns in the nation, has a local school with no large, covered play area for its students. Repeated requests by the parents and citizens association have not met with success. A suitable hall would also be of great benefit to the community because it would provide an all-weather venue for a range of sporting and social activities.

I turn now to the Gordonvale State School at which a covered play area is seriously lacking. However, the school is in more desperate need of a modern tuckshop to replace the existing facility which, I am sure—if it were not on Crown land—would fail to measure up to the requirements of the local authority. To my knowledge, for over 20 years applications have been lodged by a succession of principals, and still the school is without an adequate tuckshop. A similar circumstance had existed at the Hambledon State School. With the redistribution prior to the 1986 election, the school, which was formerly in the Labor-held electorate of Cairns, passed into the then National-held electorate of Mulgrave. Despite the efforts of the former member for Cairns, Ray Jones, and later Keith De Lacy, Hambledon State School had been denied a suitable tuckshop. The 1986 election miraculously saw approval and construction take place with almost indecent haste. Surely the provision of basic facilities should be above politics.

A similar case history exists in relation to the provision of a modern library complex at the Woree State High School. As well, the students at the Gordonvale State High School, which was established approximately 25 years ago, must make do with a converted class room which, despite the best efforts of the teacher/librarian, cannot meet the educational demands of the students.

I give a commitment to the people of Mulgrave to lend my support to calls for the establishment, or improvement, of facilities not on the basis of political patronage but on the basis of need.

I must place on record the opposition of the vast majority of my constituents to the continuation of daylight-saving. While there may be some very compelling reasons in the south-east corner of this State to adopt this practice, it is definitely not a plus in the north. It is to be hoped that, when deliberations begin on the issue, all concerned will take into account the wishes of people living outside the metropolitan and near-metropolitan areas.

Over the years, I have had the pleasure of working with and, I believe, being accepted by various Aboriginal groups in the region. This association began with a teaching appointment at Yarrabah in the late sixties. Over the intervening years, I have maintained my contact with the people of Yarrabah through my involvement in sport and youth development. Although Yarrabah is not in my electorate but in the adjoining electorate of Cairns, I can assure the people of Yarrabah that my interests in their well-being will remain as strong as ever.

Two Aboriginal groups within the Mulgrave electorate are making a valuable contribution to the economic, cultural and social advancement of their people. This is a contribution which has my full support. The Mullen-Budda organisation in Gordonvale, although only in its infancy, has done much to address social problems affecting the welfare of its members. Interest has been shown in the preservation of sites of historical significance in the Upper Mulgrave valley and I expect their efforts will receive the support of Aborigines and the wider community.

The Deeral Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Co-operative at Babinda is an excellent example of the entrepreneurial capabilities of Aboriginal people. With a minimum of Government support, the Deeral cooperative has established a tourist facility which is centred around a thriving artefact trade. The organisation and work is all carried out by Aboriginal people and their success is evidence of what can be achieved by this section of the community. The economic viability of the cooperative is assured and, to its credit, the board of management of the Deeral cooperative has turned the cooperative's profits back into the acquisition of housing for the Aboriginal and Islander people of the Babinda area. As member for Mulgrave, I am determined to foster this spirit of self-help which I believe is so important to the future of Aboriginal people.

It would be true to say that much of the prosperity of the far north has been built on the success of our sugar industry. I have already mentioned the fragile nature of the tourist industry, which has played and will continue to play an increasing role in the region's prosperity. However, it is obvious that the production of sugar is still the most stable component of far-north Queensland's economy.

The encroachment of urban development onto valuable agricultural land is cause for great concern. As a joint effort, the Mulgrave Shire Council, mill suppliers and mill management have given priorities to land under cane according to its importance to the long-term viability of the industry. This is an initiative which I fully support. Common sense would dictate that the less fertile areas should be given over to housing before consideration is given to taking valuable and highly productive cane land. Our Government has recently set up the sugar industry working party with terms of reference designed to investigate the improvement and protection of the industry. I use the word "protection" advisedly, being well aware of the nationwide scramble to deregulate as Australia grapples with its balance of trade problems.

Prior to the establishment of the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board some 70 years ago by the then Queensland Labor Government, the growers were reduced to the status of peasant farmers at the mercy of a small but powerful group of millers. The board, along with other Labor initiatives which regulated activity within the industry, enabled the Queensland sugar industry to establish itself on firm foundations indeed. It is recognised worldwide that, with technological and scientific advances, along with ever-improving farm practices, the sugar industry in this country leads the world with a reputation of quality second to none.

I firmly believe that with Government support the industry is capable of making those adjustments necessary to maintain this prestigious position. The assignment and peak system provide a base from which growers, banks and other institutions can operate with a degree of security. Acquisition of the total crop has served us well and should not be tampered with. Given the right incentives, and assuming the formation of a single Queensland sugar industry authority which takes on the role of coordination rather than control, there is every reason to believe that through the production of raw sugar and other downstream products the industry will continue to be a major export-earner for this country.

In conclusion, I emphasise the central role of the family unit in our society. Family values are under threat and many of the social ills of modern society can trace their roots to this break-down. I pledge my support to any initiative which will see the maintenance or strengthening of the family unit.

I acknowledge the support and love of my wife, Linda, and our two children, Dionne and Curtis. Their understanding and forbearance enabled me to approach my duties with a sense of purpose that would otherwise be lacking.

To the constituents of Mulgrave I say, "Thank you for the faith you have placed in the Labor Party and in myself as your representative. I take great pride in being your voice in the Parliament of Queensland. You have my pledge that your interests and well-being will be my highest priorities. I will serve you conscientiously in the years ahead."

Mr SLACK (Burnett) (3.58 p.m.): Madam Deputy Speaker——

Mr Palaszczuk: Make it short.

Mr SLACK: I thank the honourable member.

In speaking to the amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, on behalf of my constituents and myself, I offer my allegiance to the Governor and, through him, to the Queen. I pledge our loyalty to them, particularly to the Queen.

I take the opportunity of congratulating Mr Speaker on his elevation to that position. When I first entered Parliament, he was not a member. However, I do recall the troubles that he had within his party some time prior to his exit from Parliament on that occasion. At that time I had some sympathy for him. I am pleased to see him back, although I say that from a non-party-political position.

I was very sorry that, because of the change in Government following the last election, some members left the Parliament. I refer not only to National Party members but also to Liberal Party members, and to some of the Labor Party members who retired. In doing so, I make particular mention of Bill Knox of the Liberal Party. Had he been returned at the last election, he would have been the longest-serving member in this Parliament.

I remember that when I first came into this place he was a senior figure who offered me help. He was not reluctant to advise me of Parliament's functions and to tell me why certain things happen here. He had my utmost respect. I was personally very sorry that he was not re-elected at the last election. There were others as well, but I will not mention their names. However, I refer particularly to Bill Knox because of his seniority in the House and because he was prepared to offer advice to people who asked him for it, no matter what their political party.

I congratulate members of the Labor Party on a well-organised, well-run campaign during the last election. That cannot be taken away from them. Credit must be given for that, particularly to their leader, as well as to the people inside and outside this Parliament who put every effort into their gaining Government. I congratulate those people for working hard and achieving success.

I can say that the National Party was not without its problems. That is probably an understatement. Basically the problem was that the National Party was in Government

for 32 years. One may wish to argue specific angles, but the fact remains that the National Party had been in Government for 32 years. At the end of that reign many problems were beginning to come through. The people of Queensland were looking for a change.

Labor Party members have been elected to Government. The former Premier, the honourable member for Landsborough, Mike Ahern, stated that the Labor Party is now in a position to get on with the business of Government. Government members should forget about the pettiness and actually get down to the business of Government. I refer to the speech to the House by the Treasurer, the honourable member for Cairns, Keith De Lacy, in which he challenged the National Party on the economy. He produced a little red booklet that said, quite plainly that previous National Party Governments had done a good job with the economy. I was pleased to see him table that booklet because, at the end of this three-year term, it will be there for reference. If this Government can maintain the record of economic achievement that is detailed in that booklet when comparing the position of Queensland to that of the other States, it can be very proud. The challenge is there for the Government. The Treasurer has put it on record. I thank him for doing that.

During the election campaign a number of true things were said about the previous Government, but a number were untrue. I refer to comments made by the honourable member for Lytton, now the Deputy Premier and Minister for Housing and Local Government, Tom Burns, about the toll on the Sunshine Motorway. The excuse proffered for imposing the toll after the election was the fact that the Government had not been told by the previous National Party Government the actual costs associated with that motorway. The Labor Party had costed the toll based on a construction figure of \$40m but, according to Mr Burns, that nasty National Party Government had not told the then Opposition that the motorway would cost in the vicinity of \$80m and that, therefore, the Government would have to retain the toll. In actual fact, it was proved in this House that the Opposition had asked the former Minister for Main Roads the costs of the motorway in the Maroochy Shire. The information supplied was that it would cost \$76m, but that that was not the final cost. Little things like that come out in elections.

Last week I asked the Minister for Family Services a question on her attitude to abortion. At first the Minister avoided the question by passing it off as being the responsibility of the Attorney-General. I repeated the question by asking if the Minister supported abortion on demand and she made the following statement—

"I think there is some considerable confusion about a number of issues that the honourable member has raised. First of all, one is his use of the semantic term 'abortion on demand', which is in fact a meaningless concept in itself. At this stage, that should be made very clear to the House."

The Minister then claimed again that the question did not come within the area of her responsibility.

However, what was the Minister making clear? "Abortion" is a definable term and so is "demand". The *Concise Oxford Dictionary* describes "abortion" as "a miscarriage of birth, esp. if deliberately induced", and "demand" as "ask for . . . as of right . . . request made as of right".

Madam Deputy Speaker, I seek leave to table the two definitions.

Leave granted.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the documents on the table.

Mr SLACK: Put the two together and one has, "a miscarriage of birth, to be deliberately induced, requested as of right"—in other words, abortion on demand. I note also that Judge McGuire, in delivering his judgment in the Bayliss case, uses the term "abortion on demand". It is quite clear; it is certainly not meaningless. In all fairness, I could hardly be accused of using semantics.

I now turn to Labor Party policy which lists the heading "Status of Women". It plainly states that a Labor Government will promote women's rights to "the control of

their own reproduction". That meaning is quite clear when one applies it to abortion. To me it means that, under a Labor Government, women will have the right, as of request, to have a pregnancy terminated at any stage of their pregnancy—that is, abortion on demand. If the Minister has strong personal views on the subject, they should be respected in that context but, as it relates to Labor policy, the issue goes a little further than that.

What is clear is that the Minister may have modified her stance from days gone by. Many of us in this House would have expected her to have given an emphatic, affirmative answer to the question which, using Labor policy as her guideline, she would have been entitled to do, or is it that she does not wish to use, or respond to, the term "abortion on demand" because it allows people to see Labor policy as it is?

To me, the significance of her answer, or failure to answer, is that now Labor is in Government it has a problem with that policy and is hoping that, by the careful use of terminology, the Government can hoodwink the public. The honourable member for Cairns said something about, "If it looks like a duck and quacks like a duck, then it is a duck."

Since being appointed shadow Minister for Family Services, I have had several conversations with the Minister. I am appreciative of her willingness to discuss impending legislation with me. While differences will occur on the floor of the House, I look forward to continuing cooperation between us, which can only be to the benefit of all parties.

An issue that I am heartily sick of—I believe this also applies to the general public—is the continuing slanging match over corruption. We are in a new Parliament. I expect that all honourable members are here for a genuine purpose, to contribute to the good government of this State. No-one, and I repeat "no-one", can be complacent about his own party's incorruptibility. All parties are made up of individuals, with their respective strengths and weaknesses, and in every barrel there will be a rotten apple or two, as has been amply demonstrated in all political parties in the past, both on this side and the other side of the border. Obviously, each of us has to be prepared to be put under scrutiny. However, if we continue this endless witch-hunt, we will denigrate ourselves and will have no-one to blame but ourselves for the low standing that, as politicians, we have in the community.

Since becoming shadow Minister for Family Services and Aboriginal and Islander Affairs, I have paid particular attention to newspaper reports which relate to issues covered by that portfolio, and I could not help but be struck by some of the ugly aspects of our society. I refer to crime, violence, juvenile delinquency, sex offences, drug and alcohol abuse, wife-bashing, rape, poverty, marriage break-downs and so on.

Those problems have always been part of society. It could well be argued that they have not increased in proportion to the increase in population but, rather, that they are subject to increasing media attention. People who are thus abused or are victims are more willing to come forward than previously was the case. Married women, for instance, are much more independent than they were in days gone by. Modern women will not put up with what their predecessors put up with. With the availability of social workers and counselling services, an increasing proportion of what was seething between the surface is being exposed.

Another significant factor in the equation has been the provision of welfare payments, which has allowed a wife, for instance, to be not completely dependent on her husband for financial support, has allowed a woman to choose whether she will have a husband or not and has allowed the male in the partnership not to contribute financially towards a child's upbringing.

If there has been an increase in the incidence of any of these social problems, we all have reason to be concerned, because I believe that it is not unreasonable to expect that the incidence of many of the problems mentioned should have declined in a modern, civilised society. If there has been an increase, we have definitely gone wrong somewhere;

consequently, it must have been very disturbing for all of us to read, in the *Courier-Mail* of 27 February 1990, an article headed "Bishops uncover 'hidden poverty' ". It is a reasonably long article so I shall read only three extracts from it. The first reads—

"The Catholic Bishops Committee for Justice, Development and Peace said yesterday Australia had a hidden 'underclass' of poor which was not visible enough to find its way into most surveys and statistics."

Further on, it reads—

"The Queensland Council of Social Services director, Ms Jacki Byrne, said thousands of people in Brisbane were living in desperate poverty.

'In the United States, researchers have been warning about the development of an underclass, a group of invisible people so poor they are not even considered part of the society,' she said.

'It is clear to anyone working in the welfare area that this is starting to happen in Australia.' "

The last paragraph in the article reads—

A Brisbane St Vincent De Paul Society spokesman said it was not uncommon for volunteer workers to come across people in 'absolute, desperate poverty' in Brisbane."

Mr Dollin interjected.

Mr SLACK: I will not respond to the interjection except to say that it was a very unfair interjection, because the problem exists Australiawide. In the article it is classed as being Australiawide. I quoted the instances that apply to Brisbane. However, I could table the document to indicate that it applies to other States. Also, I have read articles in other newspapers which apply it to other States. It is a shocking indictment of Australian society. Something is going wrong somewhere. I do not intend to point out specifically where it is going wrong. I simply say it is going wrong somewhere and needs to be addressed.

I hope that the article has been read by the Minister for Family Services and that she is contacting the bishops to find out whether what is stated in the article is authentic, how deep the problem is in this State and the ways and means of coming to grips with the problem. It is not specifically a problem arising out of one action; it is a problem that exists and needs addressing. Such problems cannot be ignored or swept under the carpet.

Such an article makes a mockery of the stupid statement of the Prime Minister that no child would live in poverty by 1990. It is all right to espouse such ideas, but what was promised was not and is not achievable. The Bible quotes Jesus as having said that the poor will always be with us. Unfortunately, there will always be people who, for various reasons, cannot look after and provide for themselves. There is no doubt that Governments recognise that and accept the responsibility to help those people. It is easy to argue that, now that 1990 is here, what the Prime Minister meant was that conditions would be such that no-one needs to be in a position of poverty. The fact remains, as shown by the bishops' inquiry, that many adults and children are living in poverty.

The question is why they are in that position and what can be done about it. The answer to both questions is complex. I would not be so bold as to suggest that I know all of the answers or solutions. However, there is no doubt that some of the causes are readily identifiable. Apart from those who have always had problems getting a job and managing, there are families who are finding it increasingly difficult to cope. This is placing a tremendous strain on those families and the result is marriage break-downs and many of the other nasty things we read about.

The financial pressures are unreal. Mortgage rates and the costs of owning and running a car, educating one's children, feeding them and providing entertainment are

huge. As children grow up in modern society they are demanding more and more. They are becoming increasingly independent and generally more difficult to handle. On top of that people are struggling simply to hold onto their homes, without any hope of getting ahead. For many people the great Australian dream of owning a home has become just that, a dream. Consequently, more women are forced into the work force, the pace quickens and the pressures continue to build up. An increasing number of people are feeling a sense of frustration, failure and hopelessness. The question is often asked, "What is life all about? Is it worth it?"

Politicians are held in poor regard. The media is in a similar position, if not worse! Regrettably, many people view the church as irrelevant, as having failed to change to meet the needs of modern youth. That is not to say that the church is not aware of the problems or that it is not trying to do something about them. In my opinion the need for the church, or its equivalent, has never been greater, because most of the teachings and the basis of Christianity are as relevant today as ever. Our society needs something it can believe in and respect. With the exposure of the hypocrisy surrounding us, we have become so cynical that we are in danger of losing our direction.

One of our biggest problems is that on the one hand we have failed to come to terms with our own human failings, and on the other we make a judgment that everyone is looking after himself while not being prepared to recognise the good in others. The real basis of our society has been the family unit based on marriage. The last speaker, the honourable member for Mulgrave, referred to the family unit, and I endorse his remarks. Consequently, it must be disturbing for everyone to note the increase in the numbers of divorces and the trend towards a decrease in the number of marriages taking place in our society. Articles have appeared in the press quoting marriage statistics, but there is no great evidence of concern for the adverse affects taking place within society as a result of the break-down of the family unit. However, when the monetary cost is evaluated, it makes large headlines on the front page of the *Courier-Mail*.

Some time ago an article in the *Courier-Mail* referred to the declining number of successful marriages. It was no big deal; it appeared on page five, but a week later a big cost analysis was published showing what this was costing the system and there was an outcry. What about all the other problems? It is sad that the problem has to be reduced to commercial terms before it becomes headlines and action is called for. Perhaps it would be more appropriate to say that calls for action are recognised only when they are demonstrated in monetary terms. Nevertheless, for whatever reasons we may use to support our case, the family unit, as promoted through marriage, is the cornerstone of our society. Governments need to recognise this fact and act accordingly.

The National Party's policy and priorities are unequivocal in their support for the family unit. This has always been the case and will continue to be so. Whilst promotion, encouragement and counselling to support a stable family unit will help people to cope with many of today's problems, it is incumbent on all of us to ensure that whatever laws we may pass or actions we may take will not have an adverse effect on that family unit. Whilst the intentions of Mr Hawke and others may be good, money, or the provision of it, does not necessarily solve the problems. Apart from people needing a sense of purpose and something to believe in, human nature being what it is there is also a need to be able to identify reward and punishment. It may be old hat, but nevertheless true that, if the incentive for people to help themselves is taken away, the number of people needing help will only increase. That is a problem that the Federal Labor Government must come to terms with.

My shadow portfolio also includes Aboriginal, Islander and ethnic affairs. Since I have been appointed to this position I have made contact with several people concerned about those matters. I am always willing to listen to what they have to say and I treat their problems sympathetically. The Minister has been prepared to talk to me on these issues and, when legislation is introduced into this House, she is prepared to brief me on it. I am appreciative of that. However, the people whom I have spoken to about Aboriginal, Islander and ethnic affairs are concerned that the Minister has not been

consulting the community as much as she could. That comment might be unfair. I do not know what her workload is, but it is coming through to me that there needs to be a consultative process.

At the moment several people do not know where they are going, particularly those people holding positions within the department. They do not know whether or not Aboriginals will be appointed as advisers to the Minister or how many will be appointed. They are concerned about the future of land rights and what the intention of the Minister or Government is in that respect. They are also concerned about the future of the Aboriginal Coordinating Councils. I look forward to working in cooperation with the Minister. I do not believe that the Family Services, Aboriginal, Islander and ethnic affairs issues should be political, and it will be all the better if problems can be resolved by the Government and the Opposition.

I turn now to my electorate of Burnett, which is situated around Bundaberg and west to Gayndah and is 10 750 square kilometres in area. It has a voting population of 15 500 and is basically a rural electorate. A significant aspect that became apparent during the last election was that, whilst it is considered to be a rural electorate, out of the 9 600 households in it, in excess of 5 500—5 800, if my memory serves me correctly—use the Bundaberg area post-code. The electorate is expanding around the city of Bundaberg. My electorate office is located in Bundaberg, which unfortunately is not situated in the centre of the electorate of Burnett. I have been forced to locate my office there because most of the people in the electorate use Bundaberg as their centre.

Although the character of my electorate is changing, it is still basically rural and is engaged in primary production, which is very dependent upon the weather. For the past seven or eight years, the district has been drought-stricken. The rain that recently fell in the area was very welcome indeed, because drought had been a continuing weather pattern.

Since November last year, sugarcane farmers who are fortunate enough to have irrigation equipment on their properties have been irrigating their crops continuously. Irrigation involves huge costs, not only in monetary terms but also in terms of application to the task and the time involved in physical work—sometimes 20 hours a day. Those farmers are not very pleased about the fact that, coupled with low commodity prices, weather patterns have not been good. As a consequence, many farmers in my electorate are in a desperate financial position. I compliment the member for Barambah, who referred to the problems being experienced by farmers in his electorate. He spoke very well when he outlined the problems being experienced by grain-growers and peanut-farmers in the South Burnett area. Those problems also apply to the farmers who live in my electorate. The honourable member made some suggestions that should be taken on board.

All factors have to be considered and a serious attempt has to be made to provide resources to overcome the problems besetting farmers in the primary production industry. Obviously, some rationalisation will take place; however, if the future of country towns is to be assured, it is imperative that as much as possible the livelihood of farmers be safeguarded. As I said earlier, the problems have been caused not only by bad weather but also by low commodity prices. Moreover, costs have spiralled to the point at which they now far outstrip the rate at which commodity prices have increased.

The beef industry is supposed to provide a reasonable return but, lately, the price obtained for beef would buy goods of nowhere near the same value as those that could have been obtained 10 years ago. The same loss in value applies to sugar and grain returns. Although sugar prices have improved recently and although it has been said that people who live in the Bundaberg area are obtaining a much better return, I point out that recently the Queensland Cane Growers Council decided to impose a levy on producers to meet the costs of refurbishing the council's building in Brisbane. Twenty-eight members of the council's executive approved the levy, and the resolution was sent to the Minister for approval. More than 10 per cent of growers have since petitioned the Minister for a poll to be undertaken with a view to having the levy rescinded. The

levy would have cost producers 10c per tonne. I am sure that the producers' decision was not made lightly. Although the amount involved may appear to be minor, relative to overall returns, it represented a major imposition.

Farmers in the Bundaberg area have shifted their attention from cane-growing to the growing of vegetables, small crops, and citrus. During the last few years, the horticulture industry has expanded tremendously, to such an extent that it has out-performed cane returns in the Bundaberg area to the tune of \$137m. However, a major problem in the small crops industry is the control of pests. Breaking the breeding cycle of pests that spoil tomatoes, zucchinis and other vegetables has been an initiative undertaken by the farmers in conjunction with the Department of Primary Industries. With the assistance of former and present Ministers for Primary Industries, the farmers have instigated a program of integrated pest control management by the use of biological controls and insecticides that allow the problems caused by pests to be assessed more accurately and more scientifically. In addition to the problems caused by pests and increasing costs, primary producers have also experienced the problems associated with high interest rates. High interest rates have not helped farmers or small-business operators in the Bundaberg district.

A matter of concern to beef producers is the discontinuation in New Guinea of development of a method of controlling screw-worm fly. If screw-worm flies were to infest areas in Queensland, that would be a cause of major disaster for the beef industry. The fact that the program has been discontinued in New Guinea makes it even more imperative that the Federal Government's CSIRO continue its investigation into control methods. I remind honourable members that New Guinea is not far away from Queensland and that it would not be too difficult for the screw-worm fly to cross over into Queensland. I understand that in other parts of the world there is a species of screw-worm fly that attacks people and affects them horribly. If that is the case, all available resources that can be provided in this country should be used to combat the potential for infestation. I remind honourable members that at risk is Australia's multimillion-dollar beef industry. I believe that the consequences of screw-worm fly infestation are nearly as great as those associated with foot-and-mouth disease.

Citrus-growing is carried on in areas surrounding Gayndah. The industry is not as viable as many people think it is. Up until this point, it has been one of the most viable industries in my electorate. However, farmers have a real fear of overproduction caused partly by the importation of produce that will cause a decline in the price of Australian-grown fruit. The threat of overproduction means that the future of citrus-producers is not bright. Although citrus-growers accept the Federal Government's policy regarding the importation of foreign produce and its attitude that producers should be able to stand on their own feet and make the industry efficient, they contend that for the industry to be efficient, the producers should not have to face up to the unfair practices, such as dumping, used by overseas producers. It may be the case that the Federal Government has anti-dumping regulations, but the problem is that farmers have to establish that the industry concerned—for example, citrus fruit, pig meat or fruit juice—is affected by produce that is actually being dumped on the Australian market. The establishment of those facts costs industry a great deal of money. It must be a matter of concern to everybody—irrespective of whether one is a primary producer, a wage-earner or a small-business operator—to see the quantity of primary produce imports on the Australian market. The problem is caused not only by the quantity of imported produce but also by the rapid increase in the quantity that has occurred over the last few years. This is a serious matter, particularly because Australia has a major balance of payments problem and an overseas debt in the vicinity of \$118 billion.

Mr Milliner: What utter drivel you are talking. Just wind it up.

Mr SLACK: What is drivel about that? I am sure that the constituents in my electorate would be interested to hear that the Minister is referring to those problems as drivel.

Mr Milliner: You are trying to blame the Federal Government for everything.

Mr SLACK: It is a fact of life that the products are coming in. The Federal Government has a responsibility for the import laws. If a problem is occurring, it must address the problem.

Mr Smyth: Wouldn't it be fair to say that the National Party State Government didn't do anything for our small crop farmers as far as overseas trade goes?

Mr SLACK: No, that is not a fair statement. The Department of Primary Industries, through the COD in Brisbane, introduced several initiatives to encourage small crop exports throughout the world.

Mr Smyth: What about oranges?

Mr SLACK: A large quantity of oranges is exported from my area. We have endeavoured to export oranges to Japan. The problem has been that Japanese quarantine restrictions on imports have been severe. It has not been a profitable exercise. We have encountered the same problem with exports to the European community. It has tended to be an unreliable market. Some growers have successfully exported to south-east Asia, but, because they have not received payment for their products, some growers have got their fingers burnt. They have not been able to bear that massive cost.

Export initiatives have been and are being taken. As well, the Federal Government has implemented initiatives in trade. It is unfair to say that we have not tried to promote that aspect.

In Bundaberg, to increase production, private enterprise is examining the use of excess production for tomato juice or tomato paste. A feasibility study is being carried out into the use of an old mill. If the sums add up, Bundaberg Sugar will proceed with that initiative.

Mr Ardill: Do you know that they use interstate orange juice and so forth on our trains? You don't even get Queensland orange juice or tomato juice on our trains.

Mr SLACK: I cannot comment on the truth of that remark. If it is true, it would be a matter of availability, supply and price. Is the honourable member suggesting that, if it is true, we make a rule that those products are taken from a particular district? In Queensland, depending on availability, the supply of those products has been competitive. I do not know whether that is occurring or not.

I turn now to dwindling health services in country areas. Country towns cannot obtain the services of doctors. The university is not producing enough medical graduates, and those who do graduate are not going to country areas. The problem is not peculiar to Queensland; it is a problem which must be addressed throughout Australia. I expect that the Government will attempt to address that matter. I do not know whether the problem is caused by Medicare or whether doctors just do not want to go to country areas because of a lack of facilities and the social aspect. The reality is that hospitals in country towns—not merely small towns; Bundaberg is a case in point—are short of medical services and doctors. Those services have been dwindling steadily.

Country people are concerned about proposed changes to the electoral boundaries and the electoral system. If a one vote, one value system were adopted, country people would have less representation in Parliament than those in the cities.

I turn now to daylight-saving, which was mentioned by other members. I adopted a neutral position publicly on the matter and asked for submissions to be made to my office. I deliberately adopted the neutral position because I did not wish it to be construed that I was pushing a particular barrow. Of the submissions that my office received, more than 90 per cent were against daylight-saving. For various reasons, my constituents feel deeply about the issue. The member for Tablelands obtained 12 000 signatures on a petition against daylight-saving. If I conducted a petition in my electorate, a similar percentage of people would be against daylight-saving.

The submissions that I received indicate a feeling that people do not want two time zones, because they feel that it would create confusion similar to that which occurred between the States. I hope that Government members appreciate that people in country areas are against daylight-saving.

Mr Milliner: What about Mr Veivers? He supports it.

Mr SLACK: That is his prerogative. I am merely relating to this Chamber the feedback that my office has received on the matter.

Mr Milliner: Do you support it?

Mr SLACK: I am not supporting daylight-saving. I am representing my electorate.

Mr Milliner: What is your personal preference?

Mr Slack: My personal view is that I do not support daylight-saving. However, when I canvassed the issue, I did not at any stage promote my personal view. The result was that old people, mothers with children at school and businesspeople were very heavily against daylight-saving. It is incorrect to say that businesspeople support daylight-saving in the area from which I come.

There is to be a review of local authorities. Local authorities have had a role to play in our community for 100 years—

Mr Milliner: Long overdue.

Mr SLACK: The National Party Government instigated it. It was examining the Local Government Act and it had a paper out on that Act.

Time expired.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Campbell): Order! I now call the honourable member for Isis. This is the honourable member's maiden speech. I ask that it be heard in silence, as is the custom.

Mr NUNN (Isis) (4.38 p.m.): On 2 December 1989 I was elected as part of the Wayne Goss Labor Government to represent the people of Isis, and I rise today to reaffirm my allegiance to the Crown and my duty to represent the people to the best of my ability.

I take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr Deputy Speaker, on the grace with which you occupy the chair, and I would appreciate it if you would convey my congratulations to the Speaker and tell him that, from my observations, he has carried out his job with an even hand and a great deal of tolerance.

At the outset, I wish to make mention of my wife, May, who is in the public gallery. She has had a lot to put up with. She bore me five beautiful daughters, who cannot be here today. They in turn presented me with eight grandchildren. Suffice it to say that I admire May for her forbearance in putting up with a husband who can best be described as a knock-about bloke. She has been my strength in adversity and my trusted friend and adviser in good times.

Isis is part of the Wide Bay region and stretches from Bundaberg in the north to Maryborough in the south. It holds within its boundaries the sugar town of Childers, the fast-growing centre of Hervey Bay and the northern half of Fraser Island. Small tourist resorts such as Woodgate, Burrum Head and Toogoom are important in that they provide tranquil retreats within a busy electorate. The twin towns of Howard and Torbanlea—once the centres of a busy mining and citrus-growing area—are now feeling the effects of isolation, and their problem of lack of transport, which cuts them off from the main centres of employment and commercial development, must be addressed.

I have mentioned that Isis is part of Wide Bay and, as regionalisation is the method by which Labor believes that this State will develop and prosper, I should more than briefly touch on the whole of the region. The region of Wide Bay is that region, proclaimed by the Governor in Council in the mid-nineteenth century, which contains all of the land encompassed in the watersheds of the rivers from the Kolan in the north to Noosa in the south and includes the Burnett, Gregory, Isis, Burrum and Mary Rivers.

A study of the regions of Australia, commissioned during World War II, identified Wide Bay as being one of the very few regions in Australia that was capable of being self-supporting. So rich in resources is the Wide Bay/Burnett region that it does not

really need the support of other regions and yet, so badly has this great region been managed, that it is now the home of one of the largest unemployed populations in Australia. Someone has short-changed us, and I am determined to turn the situation around.

Wide Bay has everything needed to make Labor's regional development plan work, but it needs the goodwill of everyone. It needs the goodwill of primary producers, whose ability to persevere in hard times must be coupled with the will to plan for the future in good times. We need the goodwill of secondary industry—the manufacturers—to provide the investment capital and expertise so that value-added goods may be produced and exported. We would exchange the produce of the region for the coin of the realm. We need the goodwill of the Government agencies and public servants, without whom there will be no liaison between the public and private sectors. Above all, we need the goodwill of the working man and woman, without whom all else fails. I ask the question: who in this House does not consider himself to be a worker? Which among us has an acquaintance who is so affluent that he has no need to do work of some kind? We look, then, at a country full of workers, and all are looking for justice.

We owe all workers a debt and, if we are to gain the goodwill of the worker, we must pay what we owe. We must be prepared to provide not only jobs but also well-paid jobs and jobs that require a skill. I know workers in Queensland with two or three children who are holding down full-time employment and who, at the end of the day, are worse off than pensioners.

The cane-farmers of Childers—indeed, all who rely on the sugar industry in that district—have had a hard time, but it lies within the power of this Government to make them more secure and their incomes more predictable. The tragedy for this area—blessed as it is with a deep, rich, volcanic soil—has been the lack of reliable rainfall. Farmers, mill workers and businesspeople were optimistic when an irrigation scheme for the area was proposed in 1970 as part of the Bundaberg irrigation scheme. It took until 1984 to start the Isis scheme and costs escalated from what should have been a \$20m proposition and turned it into an estimated \$69m nightmare. I make the plea now on behalf of the farmers and workers of Childers—give them the money in this year's Budget to complete the scheme. It will take \$20m. The completion of the scheme has become their right, and the cost will be recouped through increased production.

Earth, water and sky are the main components of our environment, and they are free. By "free", I mean that not only were they initially provided to us free of cost but also that these things—which are so important to life itself—must be free from freehold ownership in most circumstances. I contend—as did the old-time socialists—that, by and large, freeholding of land is just as immoral a proposition as the proposition that the very air that we breathe should be owned—possessed by the favoured few. The freeholding of Crown land by the Crown is an immoral act and, as a land tenure, is not to be compared with the system of long-term leases, which existed in the past. It is the people who are the custodians of the land, and it is to the people that the land must return after expiration of the tenure, or special use for which the land was designated.

Leasehold land has an initial cost that is less than freehold land. If a system of long-term leases were to be introduced instead of freeholding everything in sight, which is now prevalent, the need to borrow large sums of money to acquire the use of the land would cease to exist. People from all walks of life—from home-owners, industrialists and developers to producers—would need to borrow less. There would be less demand on banks' funds and, because they would have surplus to lend, the laws of supply and demand—those famous market forces about which we hear so much—would come into play and interest rates would drop dramatically. Surely that would be a desirable state of affairs.

In my opinion, the most immoral act of all in relation to land use is to allow the ownership of freehold land to fall into the hands of foreign investors. The very idea is repugnant to the true Australian and has no place in the structuring of our society. The

ideal situation would be to allow foreign investors access to long-term leases containing special conditions to preserve the integrity of the Australian cadastre.

I am not one who considers "profit" to be a dirty word. Indeed, anyone in our society who thinks so is a fool. On the contrary, some people have turned the making of profit into a dirty business. I do not need to enlarge on the suspect business practices that have emerged in Queensland during the past decade or the revelations that emerged from the recent inquiry into corrupt practices in Queensland. We all know the results of such practices. We now need a common resolve by all members of this Parliament that never again will Queenslanders be subject to assault from the white-shoe brigadiers—those latter-day wise men who came bearing gifts in brown paper bags and, it is suspected, departed with larger bags containing more than those with which they came.

I have mentioned that the northern half of Fraser Island is situated in the electorate of Isis. Much argument surrounds the future of the island. Great debate rages about the benefits or otherwise of the continued logging of its forests and the danger posed by tourists no matter how well meaning they might be. I do not intend to raise that debate here. To do so would be repetitive and would serve no purpose, because all the pros and cons have been canvassed and canvassed again to the point at which boredom with the issue is a distinct possibility. I make only one observation, namely, that those with the best interests of Fraser Island at heart know that the heart of the problem lies in people. People are the problem. If the people are managed, the island will look after itself.

The Great Sandy Straits, which are amongst the world's most beautiful and complex waterways, are a different matter. The straits and associated waterways are vitally important to the Wide Bay area. Their future and well-being is very much as important as, if not more than, Fraser Island itself. In fact, the existence of one depends totally on the existence of the other. If there is no island there will be no waterway, and if there is no waterway there will be no island.

It must be remembered also that, if the rivers which flow into the straits were to cease to flow, there would be an ecological disaster of such proportions that the problems of Fraser Island would become relatively unimportant. If the demands on the resource are not curtailed, those rivers will cease to flow. A more imaginative approach to the storage of water must be found. The salinity of the sea in that area would be altered and the primary food source for the marine life in those waters would no longer exist. Every amateur or professional fisherman in the district would be affected. The ramifications of such a disaster need to be considered. I will be calling for a complete study of those magnificent waterways and the rivers that flow into them. That important work needs to be undertaken not only for the protection of that environment but also for the well-being of those who gain pleasure from its existence and whose livelihoods depend on the good management of its resources.

Particular emphasis must be placed on the Mary River, which, with its large catchment area, was once considered to be the source of an inexhaustible supply of water. Two years ago, the Water Resources Commission told the Hervey Bay City Council that it could rely on the Mary River as a source of water supply for urban purposes for another 100 years. The commission is now retreating from that stance at a rate of knots. Rivers must be managed as part of all waterways. That must be done now if the position is to be stabilised.

The situation with regard to the Hervey Bay hospital is disgraceful. To have an ill-equipped hospital with one dedicated doctor who is supervising an equally dedicated staff and an operating theatre that cannot function is a sick joke. When the facility is the focal health centre for a population approaching 30 000, the joke turns into a comedy with a darker side.

The Premier has said that Governments must be prepared to listen to ordinary people. The ordinary people in Hervey Bay are saying loudly and clearly, "Enough is

enough. We need something better than that which has been casually given at election-time in times past." I serve notice that I intend to have the health problems of the people of Hervey Bay addressed, and addressed quickly.

I pay tribute to the little people who saw fit to work for my election to this Parliament. Those who worked in my electorate to bring about a change in Government did so because of their faith that the democratic system would one day work in the manner in which it was intended to work, namely, that one day it would work for them. Those people worked for change and reform. They charged Labor with the task of implementing that change and the performance of the duty of reform. The grim irony of the situation as it now stands is that the vanquished do not admit defeat.

Opposition members in this Parliament try to give the impression that the Opposition's defeat was some ghastly mistake made by the electors of Queensland. They refuse to admit that their style of Government was wrong, and perceived by the people to be wrong. I am here to remind them that a system of government which fosters the evils of corruption, cronyism and political patronage is wrong and will always be so.

I will not mention by name those who worked for my election, but I know there was not a self-seeking bone in the body of any one of them. I am proud to say that since the election not one of them has approached me to use my influence to favour him before his fellows. I can only say that I am fiercely proud to call them my friends and I am grateful to every one of them. They deserve to have justified their faith in democracy and in the ability of this Parliament to work in the interests of all Queenslanders. They have demonstrated their faith and goodwill to us and it is our duty to do likewise to them for, after all, they are the true believers.

Mr LINGARD (Fassifern) (4.54 p.m.): In speaking to the amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech, I wish to express my loyalty and also that of the people of the electorate of Fassifern to the monarchy.

I pass on my congratulations to Mr Speaker and also to you, Mr Deputy Speaker. As leader of Opposition business, it is my role to ensure that the Opposition gets a fair go and that it takes its correct place in this Parliament. Therefore, obviously, I will have to challenge many rulings. I hope that the Speaker sees this as my role rather than as a vindictive role.

Recently I went to the Speaker's office, offered him my personal congratulations and advised him that if he wanted any advice on any of the anomalies of the job I was certainly prepared to talk to him. Within minutes he threw me out of this House. I am not quite sure whether he wishes those discussions to continue or not.

However, as leader of Opposition business, I wish to convey some of the problems that the Opposition has had and is having in the 16 sitting days that this Parliament has officially sat. During that time I have taken note of some of the backbenchers' derogatory comments about the Opposition.

This House has already experienced certain problems. Initially, before coming into this Parliament after 2 December, the Opposition was the subject of some derogatory comments by the Leader of the House and also by the Speaker of the House, who indicated that many changes needed to be made in this House. The backbenchers have already indicated the similar changes should be made to the processes of this House. I say to the members of the back bench: let us have a look at some of the problems that have already occurred in the 16 days that this House has sat officially.

Days such as today are called double days. When they are referred to as such, they are counted as two days. As a result, the Parliament has sat for 16 days. During that time, only 21 people have been allowed to ask questions. Of that number, I do not count the Leader of the Opposition, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the Government Whip or the Government Deputy Whip, because they have an official role in this House. Nevertheless, in 16 sitting days, only 21 people have asked questions.

Just recently, a brochure was put on honourable members' tables. That document contains comments by Mr McLeay, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, about the number of questions asked in that House. The document speaks of bad averages of 8.5. It states that in the House of Commons, 77 or 80 questions are asked per day. In 16 days, only 21 people have asked a question in this House.

I refer also to some of the changes that have occurred in the order in which questions are asked.

An honourable member: Is that on both sides?

Mr LINGARD: On both sides of the House.

As I said recently, during the last six years that I have been a member, if the Deputy Premier, the honourable member for Lytton, was not given the second question, there would have been an absolute riot. Yet the Opposition has now had that second question taken away from it. If the Government ever has to return to this side of the Chamber, members who have been in this House previously know what the honourable member for Lytton will do if he does not get the second question. Yet the Opposition has been subjected to that and has evidently been told for at least four weeks that it would be subjected to that.

Let us look at some of the practices of this House. The Standing Orders do not necessarily always pertain to the practices of this House. However, under Standing Order 123A, it has always been the practice of this House that a member is warned twice and on the third occasion he is removed from the House. If that rule is to be changed and if the practice of the House is to be changed, then the Speaker must inform members. A practice of the House cannot just be changed.

Let me refer to what happened recently. One member said to another member, "You live in the gutter." The other member replied, "You live in a brothel." Who got tossed out? It was the member who said, "You live in the gutter." How ridiculous can it be? The member who said, "You live in a brothel." was not even given a warning. Yet Government backbenchers say that the House has really gone down.

Look at what has happened in the Matters of Public Interest debate. For as long as I have been a member of this House, the Opposition has lead that debate. That is the role of an Opposition. The first speech has always been that of an Opposition member. Who makes the first speech now? A Government member! Who makes the first speech now in the Adjournment debate? It has always been an Opposition member, never a Government member. Yet Government backbenchers criticise the Opposition and, in maiden speeches, pass derogatory comments to which we in the Opposition, because of protocol, cannot say anything. As far as I am concerned, that is a pretty weak sort of an effort.

Look at what happened recently during the making of a ministerial statement. It is supposed to be a statement by a Minister on a matter of Government policy. Recently, the Premier interrupted a debate and made a ministerial statement.

Mr PREST: I rise to a point of order. The member is misleading the House. The order of speakers for the debate on the Address in Reply is allotted on a rotational basis.

Mr Lingard interjected.

Mr PREST: That is so. If a member of the National Party is the last speaker on the previous day, the first speaker the following day is a member of the Labor Party, and so on. The honourable member is misleading the House. I would like him to withdraw that statement.

Mr LINGARD: If the honourable member believes that that is what I said, I will withdraw it. However, I did not mean that and the honourable member knows that I did not mean that. I am talking about the first speech in the Matters of Public Interest debate and the first speech in the Adjournment debate.

Mrs Woodgate: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member is misleading the House. In the Matters of Public Interest debate today the Leader of the Opposition led off. I was the sixth speaker and I spoke last of our troop.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Campbell): I believe that is a true statement.

Mr LINGARD: Throughout history there have been many examples of political parties that have adopted special policies simply to gain the electoral support of significant groups of people. Unfortunately, there have been some despicable reversals by some political parties which having been elected, have reneged on a promise. Clearly the despicable and deceitful reversal by the Queensland ALP on its promise to make the Sunshine Coast toll-road a free road is now seen by the people of Queensland as one of the first of many lies that they will have to live with over the next two years.

Government members interjected.

Mr LINGARD: Yes. Just remember, "No child shall live in poverty", and let honourable members look at what the Prime Minister had to say when he had to answer questions about that statement. He did not have to answer such questions as many times as he should have done. Government members will have to answer that criticism. I said "two years" because there is no doubt in my mind that this Government is looking at only a two-year term before going back to the people.

This Government has given the EARC a timetable which will ensure that in six months it will report back on the present electoral boundaries. It is disconcerting to see the chairman already predicting a redistribution. However, there is no doubt that when the EARC does report, a redistribution will be necessary because seats like mine, and also that of the Premier, have 27 000 voters. I accept that. However, all honourable members know what is going to happen with one vote, one value. The ALP will find small electorates containing 20 000 voters. I cite the electorates of Woodridge, Kingston, South Brisbane, Townsville and Ipswich. The Government will adopt the principle of one man, one value. This Government will create electorates shaped like the Federal electorate of Rankin, with little tentacles going right out into Wacol, Inala, Marsden, Browns Plains and so on. This Government will find 50 such electorates. It will not worry about the other 39, because it does not need them. All it needs is 50 seats. This Government will create 50 seats that, following a redistribution, it can win. Then this Government will tell all of its backbenchers to keep the corruption debate going—corruption this, corruption that. One can see that thread coming through all the time in the speeches of Government backbenchers. They have been told to keep mentioning the word "corruption"; to keep the debate going for the next two years.

Once this Government has conducted the redistribution and has its 50 seats, it will tell the Queensland people, "We can't keep going like this. We have another 18 months of our term. We can't keep going like this with members jockeying for different electorates. It is just impractical to keep going. Let's go to the people on the angle of corruption and the fact that the redistribution is over. We know in our own heart we've found 50 definite seats. We don't care about the other 39; 50 is enough anyhow because we don't need any more than 50 backbenchers. If we had more than 50, there would be more factional fights than enough. Let's go for a referendum for a four-year term."

If the Government really does get around to introducing one man, one value then it should seriously consider the reintroduction of the Upper House. Admittedly, at this stage that is not a viable option. However, if Queensland does end up with one vote, one value, it will be faced with what happened in 1957. The then Government found that the people of north Queensland, central Queensland and far-west Queensland applied pressure and said that they were not going to be dominated by south-east Queensland.

This Government is going to have to look at the reintroduction of the Upper House. In 1915 the Labor Party came into office with a definite policy of getting rid of the Upper House. In 1917 the then Government held a referendum. In 1922 the Government put through legislation abolishing the Upper House. What legislation did the Labor Party

put through in 1933? Opposition members should go back and look at it. It states that Queensland must now hold a referendum before the Upper House can be reintroduced. The Labor Party locked out any possibility unless a referendum decides in favour of its reintroduction.

If the Government does opt for one vote, one value I invite it to consider the restoration of the Upper House, because otherwise far north Queensland, western Queensland and central Queensland will be dominated by south-east Queensland. People in those areas of Queensland will not cop it, just as they would not cop it in 1957.

The public is not going to cop this continued carping about corruption. The people of Queensland will not cop the Cooke inquiry being stopped. This morning I asked the Minister for Employment about a statement that he had made about the \$7m which has now gone absent from the Australian Workers Union. The Minister gave a naive answer. He challenged me. He knows that he has made that phone call. He was heard making that call. The statements refer to a person called "Angelo". The statements also refer to a bank manager. The Minister knows that he has made those statements. A person has heard the Minister make those statements and that person has referred those statements back to the Opposition.

Mr Beattie: When and where?

Mr LINGARD: I do not tell lies as far as that sort of thing is concerned.

Government members interjected.

Mr LINGARD: I have spoken about the deception of the Sunshine toll-road decision.

The second promise which was made simply to secure votes was that the Goss Government would shelve the Wolffdene dam.

In 1983, when I first entered this House, there was absolutely no mention of a Wolffdene dam. In 1986, once again, there was absolutely no mention about the Wolffdene Dam. However, in 1989 both the ALP and the Liberal Party seized on the dam issue to gain votes.

I certainly have no intention of raising the questions about the Wolffdene dam again. I am delighted that the people of the Albert valley and the Fassifern electorate have retained their properties and can continue to live there.

However, the ALP has not allowed the question to settle down. This is the first time that I have raised it in the House. The Opposition has not raised it since the 2 December election, but one should look at the Gold Coast papers. Right across the front page is the headline "Wolffdene Dam controversy starts again". The question was to be raised again on television last night at half past seven, but not because I have started it, and not because the Opposition has started it. The Minister for Primary Industries has not been able to control it because officers of the Water Resources Commission have said, "Yes, the dam is still on the drawing board". I will prove that it is still on the drawing board. The QEC has now been told to put its power lines across the top of the mountains. It is not allowed to go through the valleys, and the Minister knows it. The people in the Wolffdene dam area therefore say, "Who is telling the truth?" They know that Premier Goss can say, "This Government will not build the Wolffdene dam," but they also know that Premier Goss will not be around in 10, 15 or 20 years' time and, as soon as he is deposed as leader, his statement will go completely. As I said—and the Minister can check it—the QEC powerlines are to go across the top of the mountain and not through the valley because that is where the dam will go. If the Minister wants to stop it completely, he should stop it completely; he should not do another Sunshine toll-road exercise.

A Government member: It is dead.

Mr LINGARD: It is not dead, and the honourable member knows it.

The ALP has not been able to keep the lid on the Wolffdene dam controversy. The Government has not been able to stop the controversy. The Government cannot deny that the Gold Coast newspapers are carrying banner headlines; and that is not because of me and it is not because of the Opposition.

The ALP has many specific problems to overcome. The initial difficulty in the Wolffdene dam area has been the people who, because of transfers, financial difficulties or family problems have had to sell their properties. In 1983 and 1986, they were coming to me and saying, "We have received a genuine transfer. We have to buy a house in Townsville. We need to sell our house in the Wolffdene dam area. We cannot afford to have two homes. We cannot get the market value for our home in the Wolffdene dam area. The only price we can receive for our house and property is the speculators' price." I inform the Minister that that is still the position. No-one will buy in that area at the proper market value, so any young person, such as a teacher who is transferred from the Wolffdene dam area and needs to buy another home, cannot sell at market value.

The previous Government said that it would acquire the properties. Acquisition was very different from resumption. With acquisition, both the owner and the purchaser agreed on the price. The people in that area now cannot get that. They are in the same position as they were in 1983 and 1986 and now must arrange bridging finance because they have been transferred. Clearly, the Minister has to resolve that problem.

The Minister also has to prove to those people that there are alternatives. There are three reasons why water is necessary in that area. The first is population.

A Government member interjected.

Mr LINGARD: We know what the honourable member said in his dissenting report. He said that there was no proof of an actual increase in population. I have seen Kingston State High School develop from having 100 students in 1977 to having 2 000 students today. Anybody who knows the Kingston/Woodford/Springwood area knows the increase in population that has taken place. In the next 10 years, 600 000 people will move to the corridor between the Gold Coast and Brisbane; 300 000 moving north from the Gold Coast and 300 000 moving south from Brisbane. That is half the population of Brisbane.

Quite clearly, storage water will be necessary in that area. Quite clearly, water will be required by industry and for irrigation. We all remember what happened at Sunnybank. It was the salad bowl of Brisbane 12 years ago. We all remember how far out of Brisbane we considered Sunnybank to be. Now the salad bowl is moving south into the Boonah area. Such areas cannot exist without having access to irrigation. At present, the Logan City Council is writing to the Premier, saying, "We had a broken pipe the other day and we are short of water. What are you going to do about it?" Because of the increase in population and irrigation as well as the establishment of industry, there must be ready access to water.

I have spoken to people who attended meetings in the 1930s—I repeat, "the 1930s"—about the Wolffdene dam. Protest meetings were held in the 1960s. Cabinet made definite decisions in 1971 about both Wolffdene dam and Wivenhoe Dam, with Wivenhoe Dam going ahead in 1974 following the disastrous floods in Brisbane. Wolffdene dam has always been accepted as the dam of the future, and the parliamentary Public Works Committee in 1989 stated—

"There is a need for a new water storage in south-east Queensland by about 2010 at the earliest.

The Wolffdene Dam site is the most cost effective source of supply by a substantial margin over the next cheapest site.

Acquisition of land should be continued and accelerated to secure the site for development of the storage."

We all know that there was a dissenting report from two members of the ALP, which read—

"We can find no hard evidence to clearly establish the fact that population will increase and a dam will be needed."

That is the only derogatory statement made, and I will read others. If Government members claim that there is no hard evidence that there will be a dramatic population increase in the corridor, they have not been into the area.

The dissenting report also contained the following—

"However, we cannot ignore the possibility of a future without water and it is essential that steps be taken now to restrict further alienation and subdivision in possible water storage areas."

What do the people in the Wolffdene dam area think when they read that dissenting report? It continues—

"Some new source will be required for the future. This may be supplied by construction of a dam."

The big finale to the dissenting report reads—

"Wolffdene by present costing procedures would produce cheaper water than other dams."

That is the dissenting report, yet people in the Wolffdene dam area are expected to sit there thinking that this Government has honestly stopped the Wolffdene dam. They know that the QEC is now being told to put the power lines across the top of the mountains and not through the valley which was the site of the Wolffdene dam. If the ALP Government has cancelled Wolffdene, if it keeps to its promise and does not change its mind when it finds out how costly the alternatives will be, where will it find the storage water that everyone admits will be needed at some time in the future?

Honourable members who have visited Hong Kong will know that it is surrounded by salt water. Hong Kong seems to have all the money in the world and yet it still needs to build extremely costly dams in the mountains. Can honourable members tell me anywhere where they have gone through a process of desalination and treatment of effluent for the supply of water? If honourable members were to fly over the New Territories in a helicopter, they would see that they are building dams there. Even though Hong Kong is surrounded by sea water, they cannot find a process that can supplement the storage of water in dams.

This Government is embarking on stalling tactics, but this will not help the people in the valley who want to sell their properties. The ALP will seek further reviews and reports, and seek advice from the Water Resources Commission, which is the department that has supplied all the reports so far.

Mr Ardill: That's not true, either.

Mr LINGARD: The member for Salisbury says that that it is not true. In his letter, the Minister for Primary Industries states—

"I have instructed the Water Resources Commission to prepare a brief for, and undertake such a review . . ."

The letter continues—

"During the course of the review the following aspects will be addressed:

(a) Reappraise all existing storages with regard to the extent of commitment of existing storage capacities and implementation of strategies for demand management."

This was to be done through the Water Resources Commission, and the honourable member for Salisbury, who was one of the dissenting members of the committee, did

not know that. The Minister has recently written this letter, which was received on 23 February 1990. The Minister goes on to say—

- "(b) Conduct a detailed investigation of urban, industrial power generation and agricultural growth trends in South-East Queensland to establish future water supply demands and trends."

The poor little people affected by the Wolffdene dam have been given the promise that the dam will not go ahead. The letter continues—

- "(c) Re-assess all future water supply sources on a comparable basis, including wastewater reuse and desalination."

This has been done many, many times.

We have had the Fenwick report and other water resource reports. The honourable member for Salisbury can name them because he has seen them. In this letter the Minister is again asking for all of these reports. He wants to stall and keep it going long enough. He is not worried about the people in the Albert valley who want to sell but who cannot do so. The Minister continues in his letter—

- "(d) Investigate the use of small dams instead of large dams to meet ongoing long term needs.
- (e) Study the possibility of inter-basin transfers of water

...

- "(g) Examine the flood mitigation . . . "

This letter from the Minister is addressed to the Brisbane and Area Water Board. He is asking the commission to do exactly what the previous Government did for many years before it came up with the answer that the Wolffdene dam was necessary. I do not mind if this Government finds somewhere else for the dam, but, for goodness' sake, it should do so quickly and keep the promise it made to the people affected by the Wolffdene dam.

Many countries have rejected the use of sewerage effluent. Everyone knows that once sewerage effluent is treated, it must be pumped back to an area that is located higher than the areas that will use the water. It then has to be brought back into a water system before it is reused. That is a very costly process and sometimes it is geographically impossible. In 1987 the National Health and Medical Research Council stated—

"The direct use of reclaimed water is not warranted in Australia."

However, this Government has told the people affected by the Wolffdene dam that it will have another look at it. If the use of sewerage effluent was allowed, certain conditions are necessary. Sewerage effluent must be collected, treated and held below a populated area before being returned by some means to a point higher than the population, where it can then re-enter a water scheme or river before being reused. This is a costly and quite often geographically impossible task.

The technology of desalination is available; however, there is a higher operating cost of desalination plants. The cost of processing suitable water from sea water is approximately ten times the cost of treated water from a dam water supply. Another side effect of desalination is the impact that it has on the greenhouse effect. If this Government is concerned about the greenhouse effect, it will find that public pressure will prevent it from implementing desalination.

There is water on some of the islands. Bribie, Moreton, North Stradbroke and South Stradbroke Islands all have water. Large quantities of water seep from the dunes of North Stradbroke Island into Eighteen Mile Swamp. The Redland Shire Council has been allowed to use that water; but no-one knows the effects that the use of that water will have on the islands. Only this Government is in a position to judge the effect that the use of that water will have on North Stradbroke Island. It is obvious that that process is also impossible.

In south-east Queensland, one of our greatest difficulties is that there are no strong prevailing winds from across the ocean. In addition, we lack high ranges which would cause heavy rainfall and fast-flowing rivers. Although some people might think that south-east Queensland has plenty of water, that is not true because the population of south-east Queensland is increasing. Our mountain ranges are low and we do not have the necessary number of fast-flowing rivers.

Whilst the Minister states that this Government will resurvey possible dam sites, new dam sites cannot be invented; only different sites can be found. On the Nerang River, construction of Stages 2 and 3 of the Hinze Dam is proceeding. The honourable member for Currumbin said that the Gold Coast would need more water in the future. He made a general comment that in the future some recycling process would be found. Stages 2 and 3 of the Hinze Dam will cater for the future, but it will not cater past the year 2015. New dam sites cannot be found, nor can they be made; only the existing dam sites are available.

Mr Ardill: Where is all this misinformation coming from?

Mr LINGARD: At present, the Albert River is the centre of controversy because it involves the Wolffdene dam. The second alternative that was always being put forward by opponents of the Wolffdene dam is the site on the Logan River, south of Jimboomba. That is a very poor dam site and offers a very poor wall area. The site covers most of Beaudesert, and the member for Salisbury knows that. He knows that it also covers a fair area of the interstate railway line.

Mr Ardill: No, it doesn't—no way. That is another lie.

Mr LINGARD: I will not state the figure that the honourable member wants to talk about. It covers a fair area of the interstate railway line and also a fair area of the Mount Lindesay Highway. Clearly, a dam cannot be constructed on the Logan River site. The other alternative covers the Canungra army camp. The honourable member for Salisbury knows as well as I do that that camp cannot be included as part of a feasibility study. The alternative involving Christmas Creek proved to be only a very small dam site. Cainbable Creek is dependent upon the Wolffdene dam and is not a possible site. The Teviot Brook site was to be used for irrigation. What has the Government done about Teviot Brook? It has ordered another review. At no stage was it proposed to construct a dam for water-storage purposes; it was to be used for irrigation purposes. The Government pretends to be saving money by saying, "Let us have another review centred on Teviot Brook."

I say to all honourable members that although it is easy to say, "No Wolffdene dam. Let us find another alternative.", the Government has not been able to name another alternative because it has not been able to find one. Dam sites cannot be invented. The previous surveys undertaken by the Queensland Water Resources Commission probably contain exactly the same information as that contained in new surveys ordered by the Government.

I do not care whether or not the Government comes up with an alternative site; I simply say that, if that is the Government's intention, it should act quickly. If the Government is going to lie about this issue and say, "We as a Government are not going to build the Wolffdene dam.", and then change its mind in 10 or 20 years' time, that would be deceitful and disgraceful and a lie of exactly the same type as the one involving the Sunshine Motorway. I predict that the Government will find the alternative dam sites so costly that it will be forced to state, "We can't afford it.", in much the same way as it said it could not afford the cost of the Sunshine Motorway. I point out that in not one survey undertaken by the Government was it ever stated that the Wolffdene dam proposal was more expensive than an alternative proposal. Members of the Labor Party all said that the Wolffdene dam would cost much more, but they never said that it would be more expensive than some other alternative site. As far as I can tell, there are no other alternative sites.

At some time in the future, I will raise other matters that I wanted to refer to during this debate. At this stage, I will mention the Beaudesert hospital, which was promised by the previous Government. It was going to be not part of an upgrading program for an existing hospital, but a completely brand-new construction. I emphasise that the hospital was not going to be part of the South Brisbane Hospitals Board's usual upgrading program. It was to be a completely brand-new structure.

The Teviot dam was supposed to be built near Boonah. All the promises made by the previous Government, including the Teviot dam—an irrigation dam and a water-supplement dam—the Worrall Creek management plan, and the Mount Tamborine Police Station, have been shelved by the present Government. Quite honestly, those actions are disgraceful.

Personally, I do not mind whether the Wolffdene dam proposal goes ahead or not. I simply state that the Government must be fair to the people of Queensland. Government members must place themselves in the position of a young couple who may have transferred from interstate and live in the area of the proposed site for the dam, and who now cannot sell their property for its market value. Whereas the previous Government would have resumed the property and paid the market-value price, the present Government does not intend to do that now and, as far as I can see, does not intend to do that in the future.

Debate, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, adjourned.

POLICE SERVICE ADMINISTRATION BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 20 March (see p. 459).

Mr COOPER (Roma—Leader of the Opposition) (5.27 p.m.): Earlier today in this House, I detailed the way in which the Goss Government's promises of parliamentary and public service reform have evaporated since the Government was elected on 2 December last year. Barely more than 100 days after Mr Goss made those grand promises, the order of the business of this House is in such disarray that the Government will have to give more time and thought to the Parliament's procedures. Given the importance of this Bill, I think it is extremely unfortunate that—

Mr Mackenroth: Don't try to find five extra speakers at the last minute.

Mr COOPER: I will find as many speakers as the Opposition deems necessary to ensure—

Mr Borbridge: That is our right.

Mr COOPER: As the Opposition, that is our right.

Another promise made by the Goss Government was that members of the Opposition would be given ample time in which to study the issues and canvass the various aspects of important legislation.

Arguably, this legislation is probably one of the most important Bills that have come before the House this year. It is probably one of the most important Bills that have been introduced since the EARC and CJC legislation was introduced in October last year. I know for a fact that legislation of this type requires a great deal more consideration by people in the community and by members of the police union who have voiced their concerns and have echoed the concerns of other police officers. There are also many community interest groups throughout Queensland that have not been given sufficient time to study the import of this Bill.

The legislation was introduced into the House last Tuesday. It has laid on the table for the required six days but, nevertheless, in the interim the Public Service Management Commission Bill was debated. This very important Bill has now been brought forward

and is being rushed through on half an hour's notice, yet this is the very practice that members of the Parliament and members of the media were told would cease. In fact, the Government trumpeted its intentions from the hilltops. Members of the Opposition were told that those hasty practices would cease and that the Parliament would enter a more democratic, Westminster-style phase. Of course, as I observed earlier today, that promise has gone straight out the door in relation to this Bill and other procedures of the House. Honourable members were also told that there were to be no more late-night sittings, but we can bet our boots that this day's sitting will be late.

Mr Deputy Speaker, earlier I warned you that you would find your task a hell of a lot more difficult at a later stage—

Mr Casey: Why don't you cut the talking, get back to the Bill and get it out of the road?

Mr COOPER: These things need to be said. The Minister will not shift me from my point of view, or from any other point of view. He might as well get well and truly used to that.

The National Party Government allowed the member for Mackay a tremendous amount of time to study legislation to enable him to make valuable contributions to the House. Unfortunately, Opposition members have not been afforded that time. What is more important, community interests should be allowed time to study a Bill that is of the greatest importance to Queensland.

Judging by the business paper, which lists the business that the Government hopes to complete this week, we will have a succession of late nights when members have to give hasty consideration to important legislation that deserves far more attention. If the Labor Party had not made such an issue of parliamentary reform, to the extent of having a policy document produced on it—in his policy speech, the Premier made particular reference to it—the Opposition would not bother canvassing the matter at this time. However, it is important that those issues are raised. The Westminster system of democracy has gone out the door.

It is also clear that Labor underestimated grossly the challenge of making grand promises on the one hand—that is, that the House would have early nights and that members would have ample time for input into legislation and ample time for questions and speeches—and the reality of implementing those grand promises. It is a pity that it has had to break those promises. Reality is really coming home. What is more, members will be in for more of the same.

This Bill is a very important piece of legislation. In terms of law and order and its effect on Queenslanders generally, it is of similar importance to the Criminal Justice Commission legislation and the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission legislation which the National Party Government put through the House last year. The legislation has been forwarded to community groups throughout Queensland to ensure that the people of Queensland, firstly, know what is proposed and, secondly, can have input into it. They have been denied that privilege. The Government must wear the responsibility for that.

The Government has lost an opportunity. The Opposition will support the thrust and the principle of the Bill. The National Party had a considerable amount to do with the Fitzgerald report and will support the major thrust of its recommendations. However, because of its importance, the legislation should have been canvassed more widely than it has been.

The Minister deserves a certain amount of credit for having brought the Bill to its present stage. However, he lost that advantage by not allowing community groups to consider it. As well, he could have emphasised the historic importance of the Bill. It would be many decades since a completely new Police Act was brought to this place. For many years, honourable members have been aware of a need for a new Act. Admittedly, in the past, amendments have been made to the Police Act, but this is the

first opportunity for a comprehensive review of the police force. At the end of the day, because of its actions, the Government has lost a grand opportunity. Because the Opposition did not have time to receive input from the community, in Committee it will have to do the best that it can. I foreshadow Opposition amendments to the legislation that are considered to be in its best interests.

I reiterate that the business of the House could have been better organised by the Leader of the House. By not allowing ample time for consideration of the legislation, he has missed a good opportunity. Labor promised to deliver so much in its first session. However, it cannot hope to deliver without extending the parliamentary sittings. I am afraid that, in order to consider the legislation that is being presented, those promises will have to be broken.

Mr Mackenroth: We will be back on 8 May. That is still this session.

Mr COOPER: I agree. However, the Government will find that it has too much legislation to be dealt with in the time available. The promises that it made that there would be no late-night sittings and no extended sittings are out the door.

Despite its vast resources in the public service, the Government does not have a monopoly on wisdom and on contacts. We all know that the legislation derived from recommendations of the Fitzgerald report, which was an initiative of the National Party Government. At the outset of this debate, it is important that members concentrate not on what transpired to bring us to this point of changing the police force but on the future of the force and its importance to all Queenslanders. The legislation is not merely for the Police Service; it is for the people of Queensland. It is of vital importance that the legislation carries out the recommendations of the Fitzgerald report.

Many police in the community are concerned about the legislation. However, we must look at it not merely from their point of view but from the point of view of how it will affect and serve the people of Queensland for decades to come. It is in that frame of mind that the Opposition offers support for the basic thrust of the legislation.

I remind the House that I was Minister for Police during some of the most tumultuous and difficult times the force has experienced, yet there was never a day when I did not take some pride in the efforts of dedicated police officers. I had many great experiences—and some were not so good. The Toowoomba incident is one that I would rather forget, although I cannot. On that weekend, in a sense the police ran amok. Many of the citizens of Toowoomba will remember the incident. They will also remember the great difficulty that the Government had at the time. The system was at fault in coming to terms with, and in dealing with, the situation that arose.

The Criminal Justice Commission has been designed to cater for that. The Police Complaints Tribunal is no more and the CJC will take over the role that it played. I think that all of us need to be very supportive of the role that the CJC will play in dealing with matters such as the Toowoomba incident. There are others such as the Thursday Island social club. I well remember that one. However, I think one has to take into account the differences in life-style in various parts of the State. Although there is a need for consistency, some allowance must be made, I suppose, for different areas of the State, while at the same time trying to be consistent. The same applies to the Roma police social club and a number of others.

When I first became Police Minister, I was driven around Brisbane by the president of the police union, one John O'Gorman. John is a character in his own right. He is a totally dedicated police officer. One would not find a police officer who is more dedicated than John O'Gorman. It is quite an experience to go across the Story Bridge in a police mobile patrol car at 120 kilometres an hour to some action. After a police induction, I had the pleasure of accompanying John O'Gorman from about 9.30 at night through till 2.30 in the morning. I could almost write a book on the number of experiences we had in that time. We made a number of visits to the watchhouse at various stages of the night, and I witnessed some of the rougher elements that the police encounter towards the end of the night. It was a very interesting experience, which gave me

an insight into the tasks confronting a police officer and the dedication of so many of them. They are totally committed.

It is not hard to be proud of the police force in general. During my eight or nine months as Police Minister, I attended a police induction every month. The calibre of the men and women who were going through the Police Academy was very impressive. They certainly wanted a future in the force, and they expressed some concern about its future. They needed to have in place those checks and balances—those safeguards—so that they could look forward to a future in which they could develop and evolve and be trained as true and proper police officers. I certainly took their feelings well and truly on board, and I believe that a lot of those feelings are epitomised in this Bill.

Having said that, I must also say that that does not mean that my party and I are not aware of the difficulties confronting the police force. Commissioner Fitzgerald identified elements in the force who do not support reform and who do not want it at any cost. In some instances, they are attempting to subvert reform at every opportunity. A key plank in this legislation is aimed at ensuring that such elements are overcome. The mechanisms to enable such action are important parts of the Bill. I understand, therefore, that there is a need for some firm clauses in the Bill. That will ensure that certain elements within the force can be dealt with. As I have said, these elements in the police force will oppose reform at any cost, and they must be moved aside—removed from the force—by whatever means possible, yet as fairly as possible. True reform cannot occur while those elements are there.

Mr Mackenroth interjected.

Mr COOPER: There are mechanisms in the Bill. I am aware of them. I am also aware that there has to be a certain firmness—even a certain harshness—in order to overcome an extraordinary situation.

Mr Mackenroth interjected.

Mr COOPER: It is in the Bill. As I have said, there are elements of this Bill that the Opposition will support. The Opposition also wants the Government to listen and to take note of the amendments that it will propose. Obviously, the harsh mechanisms that are contained in the Bill cannot remain in place forever.

Mr Mackenroth interjected.

Mr COOPER: That is right. At some future time there has to be an effective appeals system.

Fitzgerald supplied the blueprint for police reform. It is up to all of us to ensure that the central thrust of his recommendations is carried through in this legislation. We must not shrink from the difficulty of the task before us, or be deviated by criticism which may be motivated by the desire to prevent reform. I give an unequivocal commitment that the amendments that the Opposition will move at the Committee stage will be of substance and will be made with a genuine desire to assist, and not impede, the reform process.

The Police Service Administration Bill is the last of the Fitzgerald trilogy of reform Bills. As I have said, the other two Bills—the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission Bill and the Criminal Justice Bill—were passed during the time of the National Party Government. I am proud to say that the National Party Government played the major role in the passage of those two Bills. Even though people said at the time that it could not be done, or would not be done, the fact is that it was done and that that legislation is in place today for all to see. No more need really be said.

However, I am greatly concerned by what I hear around the corridors. Although the National Party Government took the initiative and put in place those two important pieces of legislation and those two important commissions, doubt has been cast by quite a number of members of the Labor Party that those reforms are more of a hobble than an improvement to the reform system and that they are in fact an impediment to the

Labor Government doing certain things that it would like to be doing, such as reviewing the electoral system and making recommendations in regard to electoral boundaries. I have heard that that is being said, and it concerns me. The Opposition will be ensuring that EARC plays its role to the full. That is certainly what has been agreed to by the political parties in this place.

It is a shame that, in his second-reading speech, the Minister did not really acknowledge his place in history by introducing the last of this very important trilogy of unique reforms and initiatives. The Bill is all-encompassing. It means an overhaul of the police force, as recommended by Fitzgerald. It covers organisation, management and discipline in this vital transition period that we are now entering, and I emphasise the fact that this is a transition period for the implementation of those recommendations and reforms. They were to run for three years. During that time many difficult decisions about the police force will have to be made.

I am one of the first to say that the Fitzgerald recommendations are sound. However, that does not mean that they cannot be improved upon, because they can be. In fact, Mr Fitzgerald said that his recommendations do not contain all the answers; that there needs to be more discussion and review of the recommendations with a recognition that things can improve and that the reform is to be an evolutionary process. The word "reform" is certainly part of our everyday vocabulary. After this Bill has passed all its stages, the reforming zeal should continue to improve and to better the system under which the police force operates.

The vast majority of the members of the police force are dedicated people. However, those who have that reforming zeal will have to balance that zeal with the practicalities of being a police officer. I believe that most of them will be able to do that. However, as the reforms start to take effect, they must be considered coolly and rationally.

Starting on something new is always difficult. During the initial stages of travelling around the State with the police implementation unit and explaining to police officers what the reforms meant, what would be required of them in their duties, what community policing and many other things meant, police officers everywhere showed a very great interest in what was going on. There was certainly a recognition and understanding by the former National Party Government that it was not going to be possible to explain everything in one session; that there would have to be working seminars and so on in order to ensure that police officers learned about and were able to take part in the reform process. If that is successful, it will receive the support of the vast majority of the members of the police force, and that is absolutely vital. The worst possible scenario would be to ram it down their necks and say, "This is good for you." It has to be done on a careful basis but with their close involvement.

A major part of this Bill revolves around the position of the Commissioner of the Queensland Police Service. I restate that the Opposition wholeheartedly supports Police Commissioner Newnham, who was appointed by the National Party Government. Although he has a difficult job to do, the indications are that he is doing it well.

As honourable members would be aware, Mr Newnham is from Victoria. He has had a wealth of experience in running a police force and has the necessary education and credentials for that task. However, it does not matter how good one is, it is a question of how good one's support is. I believe that Mr Newnham's support staff has a view that is similar to his own, namely, that it wants to see it through and ensure that the reforms are carried out. It is vital that a support system is put in place so that the necessary reforms are not undermined or watered down from the top. Mr Newnham is aware of those dangers and has the feelings, thoughts and beliefs of the police force in mind. He knows the difficulties that the Queensland police force has faced and he is aware of the solid groundwork that he must undertake and for which he is responsible.

However long Mr Newnham remains as commissioner, after he has done his job he will be able to look back and history will judge just how successful he was. As parliamentarians and as citizens of the State of Queensland, we owe it to him to ensure that we offer and show him that support so that he is able to undertake his vital and

responsible task. It is not just a case of police officers carrying out a few arrests in the Queen Street Mall, picking up a few drink-drive offenders or something of that nature. Police work is a very deep, time-consuming, effort-consuming, emotive, dangerous and unique task. We should be fairly understanding of the role of police officers. As well, the checks and balances should exist so that things cannot get out of hand as they may have done in the past.

Clause 4.8 of the Bill deals with the commissioner's responsibility, which has been the subject of much public debate and criticism. It is important that everybody understands that, at this point, we are focussing on a transition period. The commissioner needs broadly based powers to oversee the restructuring process and to cleanse the force where necessary. I realise that some clauses in the Bill tend to be on the very harsh side but, as I said, a mechanism must be in place to ensure that the cleansing process can occur. However, the Opposition asks: should those harsh conditions or clauses exist forever? Perhaps a sunset clause should be included in the legislation or at least a review to enable reasonable appeals to take place.

As to employees of the Crown—on the surface it does not appear wise that the commissioner arbitrarily should determine such matters. The point is that the commissioner needs a certain amount of latitude in the early stages. I believe that, in the short term, the commissioner can undertake the difficult responsibilities that I have mentioned. Taking a longer view, continuing responsibility for such matters could embroil the commissioner in an industrial nightmare that impinges upon his other important responsibilities governing law and order. In the future, the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act and the industrial relations body will determine salary and wage levels.

I know that the concept of sunset clauses has previously received some support from sections of this House. I would certainly urge members to give that matter some thought so that it can be addressed at a later stage.

I turn now to the matter of appeals, which is a further proposed responsibility of the commissioner. As the Bill now stands, it is a classic case of Caesar appealing to Caesar. The Opposition believes that the concerns that have been voiced about this matter by members of the police force and union officials are fair and reasonable. However, I qualify that by saying that, in the initial stages, the legislation has to contain some mechanisms to enable the commissioner to carry out his task.

A vital component in the process of improving our police force is to lift morale, which we all acknowledge took a battering during the Fitzgerald inquiry. There is no question about that. The inquiry continued for two years and it had a tremendous effect on the morale of the police force. However, the force held together. Although some officers resigned, the resignation rates in this State were not as high as those in Victoria. I guess that it is not possible to retain all police officers so that they have a long career in the police force, just as it is not possible to retain people in the teaching profession, the medical profession or other professions. In this day and age, people can enter into other avenues of employment. They tend not to opt for a 30 or 40-year career in the one profession. In order to vary their lives, they tend to try something for, maybe, 10 years and then try something else. I think that is perfectly understandable. I know that police officers may do a 10-year stint in the force and then go into other ventures such as managing or owning hotels, driving taxis, or operating security firms or businesses of their own. I think that has a bearing on some of the resignations. When trying to build up police numbers, that matter should be taken into account, but it is difficult to do so. Although police may be coming in at one end of the academy, others are going out at the other end into other professions. Some of them leave the force because they are not satisfied or they feel that they would rather turn their attention elsewhere. Therefore, if they are not satisfied or are not enjoying their work, it is far better that they resign and move on to something else and allow their places to be taken by people who want to be in the force and who want to make the force something of which the State of Queensland and its people can be proud.

Even though we are in this transition period, there is an even more pressing need to enhance police morale, which in turn has a bearing on their professionalism. The lack of an appeal process in sections of the Bill is a serious deficiency which we in the Opposition are worried could impact adversely on police efficiency and administration. I think that is really the crux of our concern with the legislation. It could directly contribute to continued low police morale and the high resignation rates that are occurring, when every effort should be made to turn them around.

As I said, when consideration is being given to bringing the right people into the force in order to lower the resignation rate or to improve the low morale, a number of factors have to be taken into account. I refer to lateral entry and other means by which former police officers can come into the force in order not only to provide the expertise that is needed but also to lift police numbers, and lift them as soon as possible.

In Government, we found it difficult to increase the police strength. We intended to increase the staffing of the force by 200 a year over three years. The police administration found that although acceptable numbers were going into the academy—and those numbers were given this morning in answer to a question—there were problems with retaining them. I believe that consideration will have to be given to training an increased number of recruits as well as to entry on a lateral basis of police officers from elsewhere. Although that causes the force some concern, I am afraid that, if police numbers are to be increased and the tension and stress on present officers reduced, the bullet has to be bitten.

The office of Police Commissioner should be above the machinations of the appeal processes which can have their own implications not only on morale but also on the standing of the commissioner. I put it to the House that, before we reach the Committee stage, for this transition period consideration should be given to the need for an appeals system outside the powers of the commissioner. It has been suggested that there is a need for a promotions appeal board, or something similar, because police should not be asked to endure a period without access to an effective appeal system. It has also been suggested to me that, if there is a problem with such an appeal system, such appeals could be heard in camera by the Criminal Justice Commission, if necessary.

The transition period will last for probably a two to three-year period. Although in the early stages recognition will be given to the need to perhaps put aside an appeal system in a true sense, whether that concern will not make itself evident by the end of that three-year period is something that is debateable and arguable. A pretty close eye will have to be kept on it. Maybe the Government should not wait that period before having another look at how things are going as the transition period moves along.

An appeal system is also necessary with respect to the commissioner's power to terminate promotions, transfers, stand-downs and suspensions. That should also apply to unwanted transfers, which should be subject to an appeal process. Indeed, at the moment it is a difficult time for all Crown employees.

Mr Mackenroth: Why didn't you bring one in when you were the Police Minister?

Mr COOPER: This is the Bill that was being put together while we were in Government.

Mr Mackenroth: You were there for seven months.

Mr COOPER: That is correct, and we were working on this legislation. It was to be introduced as a result of Fitzgerald's recommendations.

Mr Mackenroth: Six months.

Mr COOPER: I think I was there for eight months. The Minister has been a member of the Government long enough to have made some of those adjustments. He will recall that Fitzgerald made three major recommendations regarding legislation. When we were in Government, we introduced two of them very rapidly—legislation setting up the EARC and the CJC.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr COOPER: Before the dinner recess I was discussing that aspect of the Bill concerned with the appointment of personnel. I have observed that the Minister is noting my various points of concern. I daresay that the explanation of the clauses can be given in the Minister's summing-up. That will take the place, in a certain sense, of his not being able to distribute the Bill widely throughout the State and receive the various community and police views that should be raised in this debate.

The clause that provides for the appointment of personnel and the provision that ranks of officers be declared for the time being by regulation is causing concern amongst police officers. That concern is based on the fear that the provision will result in a flattening of the rank structure.

The Opposition is not saying that it opposes a flattening of the rank structure. It is saying that difficulties exist and that they need to be addressed so that members of the Police Service in particular understand how those regulations are to operate. The operative words in the clause are "the flattening of the rank structure for the time being", and those words indicate the transitory nature of the Bill. The Opposition accepts that. However, such a provision could drive the morale of police officers even lower than it is unless those provisions are properly and thoroughly explained, both to members of this House and to the members of the police force.

Members of the police force feel that this procedure could provide an opportunity for abuse and the creation of instability amongst members of the Police Service. For example, the police union is wary of any attempt to flatten the rank structures. It considers that only the rank of sergeant third class could be dispensed with. The scenario put to me was that one would have various ranks of constable and sergeant. In an emergency invariably the most senior person is the one who takes charge. Unless police officers know at a moment's notice who is the most senior, then at a very difficult operational time a wrangle can easily ensue as to who is the most senior officer. The procedure for identifying seniority in relation to the various ranks needs to be clearly spelt out.

The commissioner will be swamped by administrative matters such as the determination of remuneration for relieving officers. The Opposition believes that the commissioner's time should not be occupied with such administrative matters. However, if there is a specific reason why this power is needed in the transition period, then the Minister should explain why.

One would imagine that the normal procedures for the payment of higher duties allowances would apply and that this is another area which falls under the industrial considerations and should be included in any sunset clause.

The initiative for the part-time employment of police requires careful explanation. There is mounting concern about the proposal and the feeling abroad is that it could undermine the Police Service. The advice to the Opposition is that efficiency would not be enhanced by the use of part-time police. Experience in places such as England and New Zealand indicates that the use of part-time police has not worked effectively.

The Opposition is not saying that the proposal should not be tried. We are saying, as we have said before, that there is a need to increase numbers and to make the force more flexible. The Opposition accepts that and is looking for careful explanations as to how this proposal is to work.

In relation to the proposed contract system and conditions of employment for police recruits, it is understood that that also is causing the police union some bother. In this transition period, I would say very sincerely to the police union that there is a need to do this and, on this measure, the police union may have to give ground with the aim of ensuring that only the best and most suitable recruits come forward into the force.

Turning to Part IX of the Bill, Review of Decisions, the police union has expressed deep concern about this entire matter. This House will need to address that concern.

and receive some answers from the Minister. The police union's concern is justified because the review process, as outlined, involves one person, the Commissioner for Police Service Reviews. At the end of the day, that person has to make recommendations to the Commissioner for Police.

At that point, it proposes that the Commissioner of Police—

"Upon consideration of the matter reviewed and having regard to the recommendations made, is to take such action as appears to him to be just and fair."

I draw the attention of this House to those concerns. That matter should be given careful consideration and explanation at the Committee stage. Perhaps the Minister can enlighten honourable members on a number of those matters as he goes along.

To my knowledge, the Commissioner of Police Service Reviews has not been appointed yet. Regardless of who fills the position, it is obviously going to be a very demanding role and perhaps a solution could be—

Mr Mackenroth: Do you realise who it will be?

Mr COOPER: Tell me?

Mr Mackenroth: Do you know?

Mr COOPER: No, I do not. Tell me.

Mr Mackenroth: One of the CJC members.

Mr COOPER: One of them, but who is it?

Mr Mackenroth: It could be any of them.

Mr COOPER: The Opposition knows that. I am saying, "Who?"

Mr Mackenroth: Any one of them appointed by Sir Max Bingham.

Mr COOPER: That is what the Opposition is saying it should be.

Mr Mackenroth: No, you are not.

Mr COOPER: The Opposition is saying that it should be. I am saying that the Minister was supposed to tell us who it was, but he does not know.

Mr Mackenroth: No.

Mr COOPER: The Minister has not got a clue. That is probably unfortunate, but again it is indicative of how raw this legislation is and just how raw the Minister is in handling the business of the House. He demonstrated that by not having this Bill canvassed widely across the State. It is extremely unfortunate. The Minister has missed a golden opportunity on this very historic occasion to really make something of this legislation. I am afraid it is just a rushing-through process which is a real pity. It is the sort of thing that the honourable member used to endlessly bellyache about. This Government said that it was going to do wonders and stop this sausage-machine mentality. Here we go; within the six statutory days this Government is ramming legislation of such major importance through—

Mr Mackenroth: It complies with the Standing Orders.

Mr COOPER: I know. I am thinking of the people in the force as well as the people of Queensland.

Mr Mackenroth: So am I.

Mr COOPER: The Minister is not. If he were, he would allow them to have a look at the Bill. He has allowed them no time, no chance, no anything, and he stands condemned for that.

Mr Mackenroth: Do you suggest it should be left until later?

Mr COOPER: People should have been given an opportunity during April to discuss the legislation and have some input. That should have been the role adopted by the Government. It is the people of Queensland who will be affected by the major changes to the police force. They should be given every right to consider the legislation. Guess who pays for the police service? The people again! They have been treated cruelly because they have not had an adequate opportunity to have any input into the legislation or any understanding of the legislation before it is passed.

Mr Gibbs: Your new-found concern?

Mr COOPER: It is not new found. I remember when we handled similar Bills such as those dealing with the EARC and the CJC. We went to extraordinary——

Mr Gibbs: But that was under pressure.

Mr COOPER: Not at all. We went to extraordinary lengths to make sure that the people of Queensland knew what the legislation was about. We knew that it was complex and that the Public Service Management and Employment Act was very complex, just as this legislation is. These things need to be canvassed in the community. That is what it is all about. Unfortunately, the Government has reached the stage at which it cannot quite handle the business of putting legislation through. It has barely passed one Bill in the past five weeks and is now realising that it is not easy to get legislation through. All of the Government's talk about no late sittings will change. It will find that Government is not as easy as it was cracked up to be. The Government has created a lot of furphies.

Mr De Lacy: We find it easy.

Mr COOPER: Dear Donald Duck! I would not open my mouth if I were the Minister. He has been totally discredited.

Mr De Lacy: You are not finding being in the Opposition too easy.

Mr COOPER: We have accepted this role and are carrying it out to the full. We will do our job with legislation. We will be very thorough about it. In three years' time, if the Minister lasts that long, the game might change again. In the meantime, we intend to carry out our role and do it well.

Mr De Lacy: The National Party is really thriving.

Mr COOPER: Well, the Labor Party did brilliantly! Just have a look at Victoria. It was a bloodbath there. What a mess! Look what we got for \$50m. It is unreal. Anyway, we will wait until the final result. Has the Minister been watching the count?

Mr De Lacy: Yes.

Mr COOPER: Keep an eye on it.

I shall return to the Bill, Mr Speaker, because I imagine that you would like me to do that. I turn now to the appeal processes which certainly form a major part of the Bill. It is about the appeal processes that the major concern is being expressed. These matters are delicate and sensitive and they have to be dealt with and explained. I am sure that can be done as we go on. The availability of appeal processes is an essential ingredient not only in maintaining police morale but also in building on it.

According to Fitzgerald, the lack of an appeal process was a fundamental flaw in the Public Service Management and Employment Act. He thought that the rest of the Act was extremely good but his feeling was that the lack of an appeals process was a flaw. Although this Bill will apply primarily for a transitional period, an appeals process will be needed to ensure that officers who strive to base their careers on professionalism and merit—a word we hear so often—have an avenue for redress if they feel unjustly dealt with in some way. We believe that there should eventually be, built into the

legislation, an appeals process which would certainly not diminish to any extent the role and responsibilities of the Police Commissioner.

As I said before, we recognise that he has a very onerous role and he needs all the support we can give him. That will certainly go a long way to restoring the morale in the police force and improve the relationship between the Minister for Police and the police union. Recently, there has been a public slanging match between the union and the Minister on talk-back programs and in the print media. Frankly, that has achieved very little, because all the union was looking for was consultation. Quite often the interpretation of that word is to inform and proceed regardless. That is the extent of it. The Minister used to cuddle up with the police union and now they are on opposite sides of the fence engaging in a slanging match. It is unseemly and unbecoming. Anyway, he is finding out what it is like to be in Government and it is not as easy as he thought it would be.

The counter accusations have been running backwards forwards, thick and fast. The union is claiming that it has not been consulted properly and it is quite right. That is an extreme disappointment to everybody. The union still feels that the legislation is being rushed through. Unless some of its concerns are explained and recognised in the form of amendments, no advancement will be made towards achieving a more harmonious and productive arrangement between the Minister and the police hierarchy and rank and file. Because of the divisions that have existed and the morale-shattering revelations over the last couple of years, we have to encourage that arrangement every inch of the way.

From a careful reading of the police union's statements, it appears that the relationship between the Minister and the union is nothing short of a stand-off. It is absolutely remarkable that the Labor Minister for Police, who used to get along so well with the union and who was so well informed, should be declaring the police union black. As I said, Labor is finding the vision and dream of Government to be different from what it thought it would be. The public perception is that all is not well. We have an aggressive Minister who has been effective in abusing and berating the police union on a range of issues when all it was looking for was some consultation. That sort of conduct does not encourage community respect for the Police Service at a time when that respect is sorely needed.

The police themselves claim that morale has never been lower. When I was the Minister, morale was low, but that was at the time the effects of the Fitzgerald report were at their zenith. Morale should be picking up by now because the police have some very positive things to look forward to. Unfortunately, they are still claiming that morale is extremely low. The average police officer feels insecure and concerned about the future of his job. He does not like being handled by the Minister in such a harsh and rough manner at a time when there should be a coming together.

The fact that this Bill is being rushed through the House tonight flies in the face of all the Labor Party's policies and its promised reforms. The Minister will have a lot of homework to do once this legislation is passed, because—even though it is like closing the stable door after the horse has bolted—the Minister will have to take on the responsibility of explaining the Bill in detail to the Police Service. Consultation must take place to ensure that this legislation has the desired effect not only for the police force, but also for the community at large.

Prior to the election the catchcry of the Labor Party was that officers were quitting the police force in droves. At that time the Labor Party tried to sheet the blame home to the National Party Government. However, an article in Saturday's *Courier-Mail* headed "Police quit in droves, says union" states—

"Police officers had resigned at a rate of more than one every two days since the appointment of the Goss Government, the police union said yesterday."

Mr Mackenroth: You shouldn't believe everything you read.

Mr COOPER: For the benefit of the House, and the Minister, I will read this article, which was written by Madonna King. It is pretty sharp and to the point.

Mr Mackenroth interjected.

Mr COOPER: Is the Minister going to rubbish him as well?

Mr Mackenroth: If he goes around telling lies like you, he deserves it.

Mr COOPER: I used to have a lot to do with all the people in the police union and, whether I agreed with them or not, I always listened to them and took note of their problems. Accommodating them all was a different matter, but obviously the Minister is not too hot on consultation now that the Labor Party is in Government.

Mr Mackenroth: I listen to them all the time.

Mr COOPER: They are not saying that. They are mighty cranky with the Minister because he has not given them a chance to even look at this Bill, which is a shame, to put it mildly.

Charlie Grimpel is an elected representative of the union and, whatever the Minister happens to think of him, he must respect Mr Grimpel's role. The article states that there were 47 resignations between July and 2 December and that there have been 61 resignations since 2 December. At this point the record is not too good. The article continues—

"Many of the latest round of resignations involved 'middle-ranking police with between five and 10 years' experience'.

'It's a lack of confidence in the way the implementation unit, the Government and the Police Minister are handling the police portfolio,' he said.

'Our members are voting with their feet.'

Sgt Grimpel said other officers had contacted the union about their resignation entitlements, but were 'holding off'.

'It will rise over the next few months when the (new Police Service Administration Bill) becomes law,' he said."

It is a pity that the Bill is being passed through this House tonight and that the union has not had a chance to have its say. The article continues—

"The Labor Government was aware of the situation, he said, and had slipped into panic mode because of low morale in the force.

The Police Minister's office had asked for figures on the resignation rate this week."

At least the Minister was concerned about that much. The article goes on—

"It is understood Mr Mackenroth's office requested the figures so that a question on notice could be answered in Parliament next week.

Sgt Grimpel said that if Mr Mackenroth's plan was to show that the resignation rate was more favourable since the Government's rise to power, then it had 'backfired'.

He said statements by Brisbane-based police chaplain Pastor Laurie Wilson that morale had hit rock-bottom was an 'accurate reflection' of how officers were feeling.

'But morale can go down further and it will . . . The Government's handling of the situation is poor—you can't whip the police force into shape,' Sgt Grimpel said.

Police did not want to be 'kicked in the guts'.

Corruption was 'no longer an issue'.

'It's not the power of the Commissioner to hire and fire that worries the officers. It's that the checks and balances are now gone.'

The new Bill was tabled in Parliament this week and is soon expected to become law."

Tonight members are debating this Bill and have very little understanding of some of its major ramifications. The members of the Labor Party should not come into this Chamber with a sanctimonious, holier-than-thou attitude. Two of the characters on the Government side of the House certainly do not have haloes around their heads.

Mr Gibbs: You are a fine one to talk about harmony and things like that.

Mr COOPER: We are going fine.

The Police Minister will find it extremely difficult to take the matter seriously and deliver on the promised 1 200 extra police officers during the first term of the Goss Government. The resignation rate is so high that it will detract from the numbers of recruits joining the force. I have discussed that matter before. There are other reasons for those resignations.

There are many areas which need attention if morale and confidence in the police force is to be built up in the eyes of the public. One is the expansion and improvement of training methods in the force. The National Party Government tried to come to grips with this in the past, but it cannot be done easily. However, it can be done. It is possible that the academy at Oxley could be expanded or other facilities, such as TAFE facilities, could be utilised. Those alternatives must be examined in an effort to attract more officers into the force.

As Mr Fitzgerald pointed out, training methods will have to be brought under close consideration. I understand that that matter is in hand, which will certainly go towards the benefit and improvement of the police force. Lateral entry provides for retired police officers to return to the Police Service after having reached the age of 50. A training program will be necessary and I understand that that matter is also in hand.

Community-based police activity involves contact with the public. This is a modern trend that will have to be well and truly considered. Countries such as Japan and the United States have employed this technique to a fairly advanced degree. The concept relieves police forces of the necessity to build massive police stations in which to house police officers. Shopfront police establishments in heavily populated areas, such as the Queen Street Mall, will provide good access by the public to the Police Service. Police officers can be seen to be available on a 24-hour basis, or at least when a police presence is required. I believe that that matter will also be receiving considerable attention.

The Opposition will certainly support moves towards a more community-based Police Service. Involvement of the community's input into police officers assigned to particular regions may mean that complaints can be dealt with on a more localised basis while maintaining harmony within the community, thus avoiding as much as possible a "them and us" situation.

A need will always exist for rural-based police officers. The necessity for maintaining country police stations in country towns must be understood. It is all very well to say that the crime rate in Queensland is not high, but in small country towns it would be useless to hope that crime would not increase after a police presence is removed.

The vast distances that confront police officers must also not be forgotten. One police officer is stationed in the town of Rolleston, which is situated in my electorate. Because of the massive area that has to be covered, two police officers are required. Remote areas must not be neglected in order to make available more police officers in the south-east region of the State. Distribution of a police presence must be handled in a decentralised and even-handed manner so that people who live in remote regions are adequately served by a police force.

I notice that the Government intends to expand considerably the Stock Squad. I believe that this section has needed attention for quite some time. The previous Government gave very considerable thought to expansion of the squad and took advice from specialist bodies such as the producer organisations—the UGA and the Cattlemen's

Union—and experts who had served in the Stock Squad, all of whom knew what was required to make the squad operate more efficiently. There is room for improvement in the prosecution work of the squad and also in the availability of experienced Stock Squad personnel. Scope had to be provided for people to not only join the squad, but also to remain active in it. Presently, advancement or promotion ceases at the rank of senior sergeant. That state of affairs needs to be changed so that an officer who holds the rank of superintendent, for example, could qualify for inclusion in the squad. Experience gathered over the years must be retained. It is often the case that, in dealing with stock-stealing matters, it could take years to obtain the necessary evidence and information. It takes years to get to know stock brands and the people who live in different regions. Knowledge of those two aspects is absolutely vital to the successful operations of the Stock Squad.

Mr Gibbs interjected.

Mr COOPER: The honourable member must be a mate of the late Key Hooper's because that was the very first name he called me when I came into this Chamber. But he said it in a nicer way than it was said by the Minister.

Mr Gibbs: They should have a look at him.

Mr COOPER: To whom is the Minister referring?

Mr Gibbs: The one that sits next to you.

Mr COOPER: The member for Burdekin is as right as rain.

Mr Gibbs: He was a robber—a couple here, and a couple there.

Mr COOPER: He has certainly been involved in the cattle industry, but involvement in the cattle industry does not automatically mean that a person is a cattle-duffer. Obviously the Minister has a rough idea of how cattle-duffing is done. I just wonder whether he has ever put it into practice.

Mr Gibbs: I keep away from you western boys, particularly those who live on sheep properties. I don't go near those.

Mr COOPER: We always get on very well with our neighbours. I am involved in raising cattle, but I know a number of people who are involved in grazing sheep. There is nothing wrong with being involved with sheep.

Government members interjected.

Mr COOPER: Honourable members should not respond in that manner. They should recognise the value of the sheep and wool industry to Queensland and the importance of the Stock Squad in preserving flocks. Obviously the Minister has had a fair bit to do with the rural industry, one way or another. In any event, everything is okay on this side of the House.

I would like to see the initiatives taken by the previous National Party Government in relation to expansion and improvement of the Stock Squad taken into account by the Minister. As I said earlier, I believe that that action should have been taken some time ago. The previous Government set in train the expansion and improvement methods and I would like to see those methods continue to enable the Stock Squad to provide an improved service to the community.

I mention also the problem of violence in the community. All honourable members would be aware that violence in society is increasing. It is a matter of concern to everyone. The solution to the problem is not necessarily a massive increase in police numbers. Police officers should not have to be mummy and daddy to everyone in the community. Although police officers have a role to play, there also has to be strong parental control of young people in the home. Controls should be placed by parents on the acquisition of violent videos, which have a large part to play in the increase of violence in the community.

Government members interjected.

Mr COOPER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I cannot hear myself speak.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hollis): Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr COOPER: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

I know that even Government members are concerned at the level of violence in the community. As I said earlier, that will not be controlled merely by increasing police numbers. If we are to stop violence in the community, a whole range of matters and issues must be taken into account. The community itself must play a big role. A return to the strength of home parenting is vital.

The people of a small town to the north of my electorate of Roma wanted a police station. The Police Department felt that the small town could be serviced from a larger town a small distance away. I helped to transport a delegation of 20 or 30 people from the small town to Moura to meet with the Police Minister and the inspector from Rockhampton. When those people were asked why they wanted police in the town, they replied that their kids were out at night causing major disruptions in the community and that they needed a policeman to put an end to it. The inspector said, "What you want is a policeman to play mum and dad for your kids when you should be doing the job yourself." The inspector was right. The town did not get its police station. Frankly, parents and people in the community in general must play a far more important role in controlling violence and in controlling their own kith and kin. They should not leave it to the police force to do the job.

Another reform issue in the police force is the employment of civilians. Some jobs in the police force can be carried out by civilians. That allows trained uniformed police officers to be out performing the job for which they are trained. The matter has to be handled carefully, and I am sure that it will be. However, it is an initiative that is of the utmost importance.

When the National Party was in Government, it put in place some very good programs. Some of those need to be enhanced and encouraged. *Crime Stoppers* was a program that we introduced to involve the community, the media and the police. That sort of program must be continued.

Another area of improvement in the police force is in the reduction of language barriers. Police officers are being trained in a number of languages so that they can deal more effectively with overseas tourists. As well, the National Party Government amended the Police Act to allow foreigners to enter the police force. Policemen from ethnic backgrounds are useful as interpreters and can also obtain valuable information from people in crime bodies in overseas countries such as Japan, China, Vietnam and elsewhere.

As I said earlier, the Opposition supports the Bill in principle, but it certainly does not appreciate the manner in which the legislation is being rammed through the House. The Labor Party election policy speech stated at page five—

"We will move to restore democracy to our parliamentary system."

Mr Gibbs: Do you still have nightmares over this?

Mr COOPER: Not at all. I am very relaxed and take a great interest in dealing with this legislation. Opposition members will make a tremendous contribution to the debate. I trust that Government members will match our contribution and that we will have informative debate about a matter serious to all Queenslanders.

The Police Minister is also the Leader of the House. If I could be so crude as to suggest it, by bringing the legislation forward and ramming it through the House without adequate consideration he is debasing the so-called democracy of our parliamentary system. I want the people of Queensland to know of the Labor Party's contribution.

to the debate. I have heard that the Government will have only one speaker. I sincerely hope there are more than that.

Mr Beattie: Fair go. I am speaking as well.

Mr COOPER: Terrific. The honourable member might be the only other one. Because the legislation is important, he should ensure that there are more contributions from the Government. I invite Government members who are speaking on this legislation to put their hands up.

Government members interjected.

Mr COOPER: I have noted the response. Honourable members should ensure that they speak in the debate. The Government has 54 members at its disposal. It should have them speak on this important piece of legislation.

All honourable members would agree that we should take a real interest in the operations of the police officers within our own electorates. In that way we gain an understanding of the nature of their task and the police acquire an understanding of the requirements of the people in the community so that they can operate far better than they have in the past.

I have mentioned that certain aspects of the Bill deal with the salaries and wages of police officers. Just how these are to be set needs to be spelt out a little more clearly. Is it to be done by the Police Commissioner or is it to be left to the industrial tribunal, which is what that tribunal is really there for. The Opposition understands that there could be reasons for this lack of detail. It simply wants to have those matters explained far more clearly than they have been to date. It is very unfortunate, as I have said, that these answers were not provided before today. That would have led to a far more constructive debate. Nevertheless, the Opposition will enter into the true spirit of the legislation.

As I have said, the Opposition supports the legislation, which is certainly historic. I believe it is the first time that the Police Act has been revitalised since about 1937. That is a mighty long time. A lot of sticking plaster has been used during that time. The introduction of this Bill has provided a golden opportunity to get things right. The legislation was brought on, of course, by the revelations at the Fitzgerald inquiry and the recommendations of Fitzgerald. I believe that the Bill adheres pretty closely to them. As I have said, the opportunity is there, and we must take full advantage of it to at least get the legislation right. After that, of course, we have to get the police force right. The police officers have to understand it and must be able to work with it and make it work in the public interest.

To that end, the Opposition will be supporting the legislation, but it will be taking up certain points at the Committee stage.

Mr FOLEY (Yeronga) (8.09 p.m.): When Sergeant Col Dillon produced that fateful bottle of scotch to the Fitzgerald inquiry, racked with remorse at not having produced it many years before when it was left in his locker, the people of Queensland realised for the first time that something was rotten in the organisation and the culture of the Queensland police force. From that day there has been a need to introduce legislation to clean up that problem. Clause 7.2 of this Bill does just that. It imposes for the first time a duty upon police officers to report conduct that they know, or reasonably suspect, to be conduct that requires the active consideration of the disciplinary mechanisms set out.

This legislation—once this Bill becomes law—will enable honest Queensland police officers to hold their heads up high yet again and be proud of their work, to be confident in the public eye that they are not turning a blind eye and not maintaining that code of silence that was so necessary to preserve the "joke". This Bill strikes at the heart of that brotherhood syndrome—that Broederbond—that conspiracy of silence that was so necessary to maintain the thoroughly corrupt system that has come to be a pall.

upon the good reputation of the Queensland police force and the good reputation of Queensland. Not only will that be cured—cured at long last, eight and a-half months after the Fitzgerald report was brought before the people of Queensland—but also clause 7.3 provides protection for any person who comes forward. This is the sort of whistle-blower protection that is so vital if we are to make a serious attack upon corruption. Clause 7.3 provides for the offence of victimising in respect of any person who has come forward to complain about misconduct or breaches of discipline by other officers.

This sort of legislation is long overdue. It is the sort of legislation which honest police officers will be proud of and which will enable them to regain the standing in the community that they so richly deserve.

This legislation breaks new ground for the rights of police officers. For decades, Queensland police officers have been subject to an unfair system. If they have been injured in the course of their work, they have not been covered by workers' compensation in the way that their fellow workers would be. That is unfair. It is imposing a burden upon these people of whom we ask so much in the execution of their duty. I am proud to be part of the Labor majority in this House which brings in legislation to introduce such an important Labor reform for the rights of workers in the Queensland police force.

Clause 10.8 of this Bill introduces for the first time a provision that the Crown shall indemnify an officer or recruit, or the dependents of the officer or recruit, as if that officer or recruit were covered by the provisions of a workers' compensation policy. Not only will officers be able to hold their heads up high at the new system of openness and honesty; they will be able to rest a little more comfortably, assured that, if they are injured in the course of their duties, their families will be looked after. They will have rights analogous to workers' compensation that they have been so long denied.

These are positive law reforms that have been introduced as a result of the recommendations of Mr Tony Fitzgerald. That previous recommendation arises out of the discussion at page 286 of the Fitzgerald report wherein it was recommended that the Police Rules should oblige every police officer to report any reasonable basis of suspicion of misconduct.

The reform in relation to workers' compensation arises out of recommendation 22 at page 383 of the report, wherein Mr Fitzgerald of Queens Counsel recommended that "current workers' compensation entitlements be extended to police officers". Not only will that benefit officers of the Queensland police force but, again, for the first time, in clause 10.7 of the Bill, provision is made for legal representation in respect of officers "against whom any action, claim or demand or proceeding in respect of an offence is brought or made otherwise than by or on behalf of the Crown". That very practical reform is long overdue. This Bill finally brings that reform into the arena of law and, hence, into the arena of actual practice on the ground for police officers.

That is not the only important law reform that this Bill introduces. This Bill introduces an important change to the common law rights of the average Queenslander and the average family. Several years ago, a disgraceful attempt was made to protect police officers who were acting in emergencies by introducing a cumbersome and unnecessary amendment to the then Police Act which ousted the rights of the ordinary citizen to sue in the case of emergencies during which police officers had, in the course of their duties, inflicted injury upon third parties.

Clause 10.5 of the Bill remedies that situation. It provides the necessary protection for the police officer to ensure that he or she will feel free to act in an emergency—and to act with vigour—and be assured that he or she will secure an indemnity against any liability. That clause remedies that pernicious previous amendment which frustrated the rights of any injured party to bring a claim arising from an emergency.

Several years ago this reform was urged by the Bar Association, the Law Society and me—as I then was—as President of the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties. I am delighted that the Government has brought this legislation before the House. On the one hand it enables a police officer to have the necessary protection to act vigorously

in an emergency and, on the other hand, it protects the rights of injured third parties. For example, I cite the case of a young child who might be injured by a motor cycle that is ridden by a police officer during the course of an emergency. Under the previous legislation that child would be precluded from claiming injury in a case in which the police officer had acted without gross negligence in an emergency--whatever that may mean.

Clause 10.5 of the Bill restores the ordinary, common law principles of negligence; that is to say that each of us has a duty of care towards his neighbour. Where that duty of care is breached, damages flow to compensate for the injury sustained. This clause restores the proper common law rights that should always have existed.

In the course of this debate it is necessary to keep in mind the overall philosophy and remedies that were prescribed by Mr Fitzgerald of Queens Counsel. One needs to look at the reform process, firstly, in terms of its impact upon the community at large and its relationship with the police force; secondly, in terms of the efficiency of operation of the department itself; and thirdly, in respect of the maintenance of discipline and good behaviour on the part of police officers. For the first time, that doctrine of community policing has some statutory backing.

For the first time in legislation governing police, in clause 2.4 of the Bill, a provision is made that the police force is to act in partnership with the community at large to the extent compatible with efficient and proper performance of its functions as set out in the Act. That is of importance to Neighbourhood Watch groups such as those in my local community of Yeronga. It is of importance also to those police officers who, in accordance with Mr Fitzgerald's recommendations, see the future of crime prevention arising out of a better relationship between the police and the community.

In that respect it is important to note that the common law duties of a constable have not been extinguished by this Bill. I refer to the relationship between the modern concept of a police officer in a disciplined organisation and the ancient office of constable, which is rooted in the history of the common law and in the history of its relationship between the local village community and the enforcement of the law. This legislation represents a thoughtful and careful approach at reconciling that ancient office of constable with the demands of a modern organisation that must be accountable. That reconciliation in clause 3.2 solves the problem that used to occur when there was a conflict between the direction of a superior and the so-called independent discretion of the constable at common law, which enabled confusion to occur and which brought about an ambiguity that prevented a proper command structure from operating.

The reforms to management set out in the Bill provide for an efficient department, not a ramshackle department choked with bureaucracy. They provide for clear powers to the commissioner, powers which are very necessary in a reform process. Those powers are in accordance with the recommendations of the Fitzgerald report.

As to the discipline and behaviour—it is important to read this Bill in accordance with the provisions of the Criminal Justice Act, with which it is intimately integrated. It is important in that respect to remember that allegations of official misconduct will be dealt with through the Official Misconduct Division and the Misconduct Tribunal of the Criminal Justice Commission. That provides, among other things, for the right of legal representation. Amidst the misinformation that has surrounded this debate, it is important to remember that there is in existence for investigating that evil of official misconduct a most powerful and fair system which must be read together with the provisions of the Police Service Administration Bill, dealing as they do with misconduct and breach of discipline. Those three concepts are defined in the respective pieces of legislation—official misconduct set out in the Criminal Justice Act and misconduct and breach of discipline as set out in the Police Service Administration Bill.

I turn to some criticisms of the legislation which have been made in the course of this debate and in the course of the public debate. It has been alleged that the process of legislation reflects a lack of consultation. Let us look at the facts.

On 26 May 1987, the Fitzgerald commission of inquiry was appointed by Order in Council--almost three years ago. From July 1987 Mr Fitzgerald commenced public hearings. He reported on 3 July 1989, which was eight and a-half months ago. In that process it is important to remember that submissions were sought from a wide cross-section of the community on what should be done about the police force. Not only were submissions sought, but also the various parties making submissions were entitled to look at the submissions of other parties and to come back and have another go by making submissions upon the other submissions. Thereupon the commission went into the deliberative phase and produced a report which dealt specifically with all of these matters. It provided for the sorts of reformist interim powers in the transitional period which are set out in this Bill.

Submissions were received from throughout Australia and from overseas. Draft legislation was prepared throughout the course of the life of the previous Government. It was discussed at that time with the Queensland Police Union and, in the event, the comprehensive reform was not introduced, but some amendments were made to the previous Police Act.

On 11 January this year a concept paper was prepared and issued by the implementation unit concerned with the police administration legislation. That concept paper set out what is in truth the basic conceptual foundations of this Bill. It may be that there are some who disagree with the concept. Yet, in the course of the debate, it is curious that one hears very little opposition to the substance. One hears an argument that is at shadow-boxing with the real issues. The draft Bill, prepared in late February, was made available to a number of interested parties. Arising out of that, some amendments and some adjustments have been made.

In that respect, it is salient to note the important contribution to the debate made by the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties, which has played an important role in the course of the debate. It is important to remember, however, that the reported comments of the vice-president of the council, Mr Terry O'Gorman, reflected an earlier stage of the Bill. Indeed, the process of legislation preparation has accommodated some of those concerns so that, for example, the criticism of taking away common law rights to sue in the tort of negligence has been accommodated and, indeed, this legislation sets out a positive reform to the law of the police and their immunity from suit in negligence.

It was claimed in the course of the debate that the legislation was too broadly drafted. I reject that criticism. It is unfounded and inaccurate. In particular, it was suggested that the Bill was drafted in terms sufficiently broad to penalise by way of an offence an officer who might, for example, have a cup of tea with a householder.

The relevant provision concerns clause 10.19(a) of the Bill, which provides that—

"A person—

(a) who knowingly—

- permits an officer to abide or linger in any place over which the person has and may exercise control;

at any time when the officer is on duty, except where actual performance of duty by the officer requires the officer's presence in that place;

commits an offence against this Act."

That clause is intended to catch or to remedy the mischief of police officers lingering improperly in hotels or in places of ill repute, which was the evidence before the Fitzgerald inquiry. The relevant provision which appears to have been ignored in the extreme example offered in the course of public debate is the clause—

" . . . except where actual performance of duty by the officer requires the officer's presence in that place;"

That is to say, for example, if an officer attends upon the house of a person recently deceased in order to communicate the sad news of the loss of a member of the family, and stays to have a cup of tea to express condolences, that clearly is part of the "actual performance of duty" is thus very properly included in the police officer's duties, and thus in no way constitutes an offence against the legislation.

In that respect, it is fair to say that that element of the criticism and the other comments made by the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties in the course of the public debate over the preliminary version have been, to some extent, accommodated. This Bill is well grounded in the civil libertarian tradition. It improves the civil rights of persons injured in the course of police duty. It improves the industrial rights of police officers injured in the course of their duties by way of providing what is analogous to workers' compensation. It improves their rights to legal representation and it enables them to return to the dignity which they deserve by enabling them to be assured that that conspiracy of silence about misconduct will be put to an end once and for all.

A second criticism advanced has been that of a lack of an independent appeals system. Let me turn to page 255 of Mr Fitzgerald's report, for that argument may be disposed of very simply. The previous appeals system existed and operated with all the panoply of the law while corruption had the police force by the throat.

Mr Fitzgerald reported—

"The Appeal Board is overly formal, legislative and cumbersome. Legal adversarial processes have no place in administrative and managerial promotion decisions. It is therefore proposed that designated senior officers from the inspectorate (mentioned later as the independent group established to ensure standards are maintained) should hear appeals."

Indeed, Mr Fitzgerald was very stern in his recommendations. No. 11 at page 387 went so far as to say that—

"internal appellate processes related to promotions and transfers be suspended during the first stage of transitional arrangements and interim appointments;"

Very severe medicine indeed, Mr Deputy Speaker.

This Bill, however, expresses some accommodation of the police union's concerns in that regard. Part IX of the Bill provides for a review of decisions. In clause 9.3, a Commissioner for Police Service Reviews is authorised to hear an application for a review and make a recommendation to the Police Commissioner. That Commissioner for Police Service Reviews will, of course, be a Criminal Justice Commissioner, and that input of an external process, albeit one that recommends to the Police Commissioner, is a vital remedy for any suggestion of a lack of some independence in the appeal process.

The criticisms of this Bill are marginal. This House should properly send a strong message to corrupt elements in the police force. This House should, in my submission, overwhelmingly endorse this Bill for it puts into place, not as the learned Leader of the Opposition observed, the final part of the trilogy, but rather the final part of the quartet of important fundamental reforms arising out of the Fitzgerald process, namely, the electoral and administrative review process, the Criminal Justice Commission and parliamentary committee, the Public Service Management Commission, and now the Police Service Administration Bill.

Those pieces of legislation, read together, make a powerful antidote to the sickness of corruption. However, it is not good enough simply to say that, because the disease has been so severe, we need a powerful remedy. History is littered with examples of situations where the remedy may be worse than the disease.

It is not good enough to focus our legislation simply to deal with the historical crisis of corruption. For that reason, it is important to note clause 10.27 of this Bill, which provides for a review of the Act to be carried out in the period of six months preceding the termination of the first term of the Police Commissioner—that is to say,

in practical terms, by May 1992—and a further review of the operation of the Act in the period of five years following completion of that review. That opportunity for review is the opportunity for us in this Assembly to ensure that those measures set in place to attack the reform process with vigour and determination are reviewed to ensure that, once the reform that is necessary has taken place, there be set in place those measures necessary and appropriate to the ongoing administration of a police force which will then be the pride of Australia.

Mr LESTER (Peak Downs) (8.39 p.m.): Often, in public life, many a good person is very quickly forgotten. The person I have in mind had quite a lot to do with the early stages of this Bill. I refer to Acting Commissioner Ron Redmond. I believe that we should put on the records of this House a tribute to the good work that Acting Commissioner Ron Redmond did. He was at the helm of the police force at a time when things were extremely difficult. Indeed, this played very heavily upon him. Having worked with him, I know that he had real dedication to the police force and a real dedication to ensuring that his men—his troops—were given a fair go. I say, "Thank you Acting Commissioner Ron Redmond. We are deeply grateful for what you have done."

I have always had a great deal of respect for the police force. Unfortunately, just a few officers created many of the problems that confront the force. I have said all along that the work performed by the great majority of police officers, their wives, their families and their supporters for the safety of the people of Queensland has been far beyond the call of duty. We should try to be as positive as possible when we talk about our police force. In some areas it has been fashionable to criticise the police force as a whole, but that is wrong. We should consider the additional efforts that so many officers make to protect us all.

The police union is a little concerned that it has not been afforded the appropriate level of consultation on this Bill. When I was in the job I consulted with the union once a week, and that was appreciated. I have chosen not to score points for doing that. It was a good relationship and we tried as hard as possible to work things out. We did not always agree, but I must say that the union came forward with many good ideas.

That brings me to say that with this Bill we should give the police as much involvement as possible in decision-making. I know that steps in this direction are being taken but some members of the union feel that their contributions are not being listened to with real sincerity. We should remember that members of the police force are the people out there doing the job. Therefore they have very practical knowledge of what is going on, and their contribution could be very worth while. I should like provision for the average policeman and the wife of the average policeman—or the husband of the average policewoman, as is the case so often these days—to make a contribution towards decision-making for the future. It is a serious matter. We are dealing with the people who protect us, who have given their lives to fight crime and who, because of their job, often have to suffer quite a lot.

I will deal later with a number of points that the police union thinks need consideration. We should try to be as positive as possible. Recently, a number of very good things have happened in the Police Department.

Mr Mackenroth: A new Minister, for one.

Mr LESTER: The Minister's predecessor had consultations with the union. The union will admit that my efforts to consult with it were very much appreciated. One of the initial moves made recently was the appointment of the new commissioner. The National Party Government searched hard to ensure that it appointed the right person for the job. I have no doubt that that has been achieved and that Commissioner Noel Newnham is doing a fine job.

When extra boats were needed the National Party Government was able to obtain them. I was distressed to find that some of the boats our police were using were not up to standard. One could not expect anyone to go out to sea in them,

especially to rescue people. The National Party Government started to investigate remunerations; the much-talked about bullet-proof vests became a reality. My department helped establish not only the Neighbourhood Watch scheme, but also the Rural Watch scheme. This was an attempt to get neighbours to watch one another's properties. This is a serious matter and I hope that some of the back-bench members of the Labor Party take issues concerning the police force very seriously. I take these issues seriously and, during the time I was Police Minister, I proved that. I put my heart and soul into trying to do the job properly. I consulted with the police force, and each police officer will confirm that. The Rural Watch scheme was initiated during my time as Minister. This scheme was necessary because a great deal of criminal hurt can be saved by simply following a few key rules, such as learning how to lock up one's property and watching out for something unusual occurring.

The conditions of Queensland country police need a great deal of attention. During my trips to western Queensland I realised that many policemen and women were living in conditions that did not befit the job.

Mr Prest: Thirty-two years of neglect.

Mr LESTER: When the Labor Party was in power in this State, Queensland hardly had one high school or any decent accommodation whatsoever for the police. People could not drive on a bitumen road west of Toowoomba or Rockhampton. The honourable member talks about 32 years! What about the total neglect by the Labor Party before that time? It was during these 32 years that the National Party came to grips with what was needed in this State. Everyone knows that the National Party put this State's finances into credit. The other day someone tried to say that that was not the case, but in fact the National Party Government has left this Government with something good to work on.

Government members interjected.

Mr LESTER: Progress must continue and now it is the National Party's role to support the Government so that it can achieve further progress for the future of Queensland. I hope that the Labor Party makes the most of it for the next three years, because the National Party will be returned to Government and then the progress will continue. Tonight I am very distressed that Government members are trying to take me off the subject matter of the Bill.

During my time as Minister some members of the police union came to see me. I made a very definite promise that, provided I was returned to Cabinet, the police station at Capalaba would go ahead and that the funds would be found for it. I understand that the Minister is delaying the construction of that police station for a while and is saying what would have happened if I had remained the Minister. His statements are not true. In fact I was given a commitment by the former Premier that the funds would be found. The Minister has cast aspersions on my integrity; I made a promise that the police station would go ahead. The Minister is not a bad fellow, but the simple fact is that I would have honoured that commitment, as I always have.

Government members interjected.

Mr LESTER: Can any Government member tell me when I have not honoured a commitment made to my electorate or when I was a Minister? Whatever I have promised, I have carried out, and honourable members know that.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Campbell): Order! Order!

Mr LESTER: Thank you for your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker. After the election of the Labor Government, the people in Capalaba—who had been promised a police station—suddenly found that this would not happen as quickly as they thought. The Labor Government has blamed me for this, but I was the one who

said that it would happen and arranged for the finance through the former Premier and Treasurer.

Mr Borbridge interjected.

Mr LESTER: The honourable member for Surfers Paradise advises me that certain commitments made in his electorate have not been honoured. No doubt he will speak at some point during this debate and will greatly elaborate on that.

I am endeavouring to draw the attention of this House to the practicalities stated in the Bill and the way in which this legislation will affect the ordinary, everyday life of policemen and policewomen in this State. Although it is sometimes necessary to adopt a legalistic approach in some fields, an even-handed approach must be taken with this Bill. The ordinary member of the Police Service who is trying to do a good job should not be forgotten. To ensure that policemen and policewomen are not forgotten by members of this Parliament during the debate, I am approaching the discussion on this legislation at a grassroots level. I am sure that they would not wish to be forgotten during consideration of these matters by the House.

Mr Beattie: The Bill—talk about the Bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Campbell): Order! It is customary for the second-reading stage to be a wide-ranging debate.

Mr LESTER: Once again, Mr Deputy Speaker, I thank you. You have proven me right.

Mr Hamill: You are always wide-ranging, but you are always tedious as well.

Mr LESTER: If I were tedious, the Minister would not seek to interject because he would be asleep. He is wide awake and interjecting, therefore he must find what I have to say very interesting indeed. I am pleased to be able to say that it seems that everybody in this Chamber is wide awake. Even Mr D'Arcy—who is here—is wide awake.

Mr D'Arcy interjected.

Mr LESTER: Of my own volition, Mr Deputy Speaker, I will withdraw the remarks I made about Mr D'Arcy. They were a little out of order. I do not think I needed to make that comment, so I will withdraw those remarks. Anyway, all honourable members know what I mean. The member for Woodridge is very much awake, which is good.

The lot of policemen and policewomen is not a happy one. They are often called to scenes of violence and endanger their own lives in protecting members of the public. They are the ones who have to try to deal with domestic violence. If ever there was a problem for police, domestic violence is it. Honourable members will recall that a few years ago in Rockhampton a policeman was shot while attending a scene of domestic violence. I inform the Minister for Transport that that is what I am talking about. The policeman was killed on the job.

Police officers also have to attend at the scene of road accidents.

Mr Hamill: I didn't know you were going to talk about domestic violence.

Mr LESTER: If the Minister will hang on, I will take his interjection in a moment.

It was with great distress that I learned that a policeman committed suicide after having attended one of those recent horrific bus crashes. That is the type of trauma to which police officers and their spouses are subjected.

Mr Hamill: That is right.

Mr LESTER: Yes. Police officers also have to inform next of kin whenever a death occurs.

I ask all honourable members to think deeply about the effects of this legislation. In particular, consideration ought to be given to the way in which the Bill affects the promotional opportunities for ordinary members of the Police Service. I believe that the ranks should not be set by regulation, because that type of procedure provides an opportunity for abuse of the system. That is one of the major concerns that has been expressed by members of the police force. I also believe that any officer who is relieving in a higher position should be paid at the same rate as that paid to the person who usually occupies the position. I do not think that that is unreasonable.

The provision enabling the Commissioner of Police to stop the promotion of a member of the police force must be subject to checks and balances. An adequate appeals system must also be put in place. Police officers place a great deal of importance on promotions and they view the process very seriously. In many instances, there is a great deal of competition for promotions. It is not unreasonable for every member to be given a fair go.

The Bill also provides that an officer may not refuse a transfer without reasonable grounds for doing so. A procedure for appeal against a transfer that was not applied for by a member of the police force must be put in place to reduce the potential for abuse and the transfer system's being used as a silencing measure. That is a very serious matter. I certainly hope that the provisions of the Bill adequately address those concerns. The powers given to the Commissioner of Police must also be carefully regulated in terms of the Bill's appeals provisions.

Tonight, the members of this Parliament take a great deal onto their shoulders. I will say without fear of contradiction that the Queensland Police Service can be the best law enforcement agency in Australia. There is no reason why Queensland's police force cannot be the best police force in Australia. As members of Parliament, we should not try to treat police officers as political pawns.

Government members interjected.

Mr Hamill: Now I know why they called you "Lester the Jester". You are a fraud.

Mr LESTER: I suggest to the Minister that at one stage it was very fashionable for the ALP to refer to the police as "pigs". Members of the Labor Party used to say that.

Government members interjected.

Mr LESTER: I did not want to come into this cross-fire, but members of the Government have thrown accusations at me.

Mr Beattie: You politicised the force.

Mr LESTER: I am, indeed, throwing back the accusations—and mine are accurate.

Mr Beattie: That's disgraceful.

Mr LESTER: Let me give the honourable member an example.

Mr Hamill: That's disgraceful.

Mr LESTER: No. I am only saying what members of the ALP have said.

An ALP member who once represented the electorate of Barcoo, the late Hughie O'Donnell—he was a decent man; I have no criticism of that—found himself greatly embarrassed because the then sergeant of police in Emerald, Sergeant Hannigan, really got stuck into him at a public place because of the activities of some members of the ALP—I am not referring to honourable members present—who had made that type of accusation about the police force. I was prepared to let the matter rest. However, Government members have made accusations that the National Party was not fair dinkum as far as the police force was concerned; in fact, it has been. If the National Party has been at fault, so has the Labor Party. That is the point that I wish to make.

I say to all honourable members: let us get behind our police force, put politics aside and work towards making the Queensland police force the best in Australia.

Mr SANTORO (Merthyr) (9 p.m.): The Liberal Party supports the legislation. However, it certainly has reservations about it. Given the circumstances in which members of the Liberal Party find themselves, we will do our best to ensure that those reservations are accommodated. At the Committee stage, we will raise many of the points to which I will now refer.

The Liberal Party agrees with the Minister's assessment, and with the assessment of the Leader of the Opposition and other people who have spoken, that this legislation is one of the fundamental reform packages that were recommended by Fitzgerald; that it springs from the heart of that report; and that it is a significant step forward in restoring public faith and confidence in our public institutions. The police force is certainly one of the most important of those institutions.

At the outset, I acknowledge and place on the record that the Liberal Party believes that there has been an acceptable level of consultation, which is very much appreciated. The Liberal Party thanks the Minister and the people from the implementation unit for the courtesy that they displayed towards its members as they sought to become acquainted with the contents of the Bill in advance so that they would be better prepared for the debate that is taking place this evening.

Having said that, I point out again that the Liberal Party has reservations about the legislation. It feels that in certain cases the Bill is incomplete. The Bill leaves much of the necessary administration to be laid down by the regulations. In this debate and at Committee stage, members of the Liberal Party will raise some issues that touch on matters of natural justice that we believe have been somewhat ignored.

As we have heard from previous speakers, the impression around this place and outside of it is that the Bill is a tough one. By all measures, it is very much a reformist Bill and seeks to redress very deep-rooted wrongs. It confers great power on individuals, it centralises power and, in particular, it creates a very powerful office of the Commissioner of Police. We would not be telling the truth in this place if we said that much concern had not been expressed to members of my party and me about the appeals provision and the discretion that is given to the commissioner.

Before dealing with those points at greater length, I wish to place on record our appreciation of the very difficult role that Commissioner Newnham has been playing and will undoubtedly continue to play once he takes full rein of his force armed with the Bill that we are considering this evening. We take this opportunity to wish him the very best to undertake the task with the zeal and the vigour that is necessary to ensure that the police force is reformed for the better.

Before going into detail, I point out that, at page 2 of his second-reading speech, the Minister said—

"The process of healing and commitment to honesty and integrity has already commenced and must continue within the organisation itself, assisted by organisations such as the Criminal Justice Commission. This legislation will enable these three priorities to be achieved."

I suggest to the Minister that the good intent which was expressed in his second-reading speech has been contradicted not only later in his speech but also by his strident attitude towards the union during the very public debate that has preceded this debate.

The Government promised consultation, not confrontation. Clearly, the police union believed that consultation was not taking place.

Mr Mackenroth: The only other consultation I could give, Mr Santoro, would be to sleep in their office.

Mr SANTORO: I understand what the Minister is saying. However, as anyone read through the original Explanatory Notes that were presented to the union and to members of the opposition parties, he would be having himself on if he did not admit that they were something less than clear. In many areas they were ambiguous. Constant reference was made to regulations rather than to legislation. One could excuse the union if it became slightly paranoid about the lack of detail that was contained within those Explanatory Notes.

Mr Mackenroth: They had an opportunity to be briefed on it.

Mr SANTORO: I acknowledge that. The Minister is correct.

However, the union and other people who were concerned about information, or a lack of it, in that background paper wanted detail. Their protest and their antagonistic attitude needs to be viewed in terms of that lack of detail, particularly in the provisions relating to appeals. The Minister would not have expected the union to lie down and accept the elimination of many of what it had come to regard as normal practices.

Nobody in the Liberal Party is suggesting that all of those practices and all of those things that used to happen in the old days were in fact desirable or good. I respectfully suggest that perhaps the Minister should not have overreacted and should not have been as impatient as he obviously demonstrated himself to be during the debate that preceded what is being said in this place this evening.

The Police Minister goes on to say that, because of the provisions that are contained in this Bill, the police force will become an effective and efficient police force. By implication, and through some direct statements contained in that speech, the Minister says that good morale will again return to the police force. Because this is a wide-ranging debate, as the previous speaker mentioned, I simply say that we must not only set up the legal and administrative structures that are evident within the Bill but also be very committed to allocating resources to the Police Department. At the Committee stage, the responsibility falls upon us to ensure that the provisions within this legislation are clear and that people are able to look at them with confidence and without fear of ambiguity and without fear of undue discretion being applied.

Resources need to be allocated in terms of recruitment and, particularly, in terms of essential and vital equipment that the police force needs. We also need to give the police force financial resources that will enable it, for example, to work overtime that sometimes is not only necessary but also very urgent. I think that the reforming process that is necessary within the Police Service or the police force—whatever one wants to call it—certainly needs to be supplemented by a determination to provide resources, as well as administrative frameworks within which the Police Service operates.

I have already said that many of the provisions that will be contained within the scope of the Act will be contained within the regulations. In fact, there is constant reference in the Bill to the need for regulations. I suggest that a lot of regulations and a lot of law will come forth as a result of this legislation. I strongly recommend that, prior to consideration and passage of this legislation, such regulations be made available to organisations such as the Queensland Law Society, the Bar Association and the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties so that the significance of the law that is contained in those regulations can be evaluated by bodies that are competent and by bodies that pride themselves on being the watchdogs of civil liberties and of liberties that we, as free people, hold dear. If that is not done, many laws will be made by small clubs—by small groups of people—and that vital process that I have just outlined will fall by the wayside.

I also suggest that we in this place make a commitment to have compiled a consolidated public register of regulations as they are made. That register should be made available, for example, at police headquarters so that the consolidated regulations can be inspected by members of the general public and by people specialising in areas of research, such as lawyers and investigative journalists. People should have access to that register so that they do not have to refer to reams of Government gazettes or to the Government Printer in order to gain access to many regulations.

One of the major forms of representations that have been made to me and other members of the Liberal Party is the concern about the lack of a proper appeal system. We certainly acknowledge the statements that have been made by previous speakers, particularly the honourable member for Yeronga, who suggested that the previous system of appeal was cumbersome. It was a system that certainly was open to abuse and often slowed down and made the proper administration of the police force a very inefficient task indeed. Something had to be done in order to give the commissioner the power to run the police force in the best interests of the force and the people whom it serves.

In answer to the queries that have been raised about the lack, or the alleged lack, of proper appeal mechanisms, we constantly tell people that the role of the Criminal Justice Commission is in fact an important one. Previous speakers during this and previous debates have mentioned that reform structures that have been recommended by Fitzgerald—reformed administrative systems that have sprung from the Fitzgerald report—should be made accountable to the people via this Parliament. We see the Criminal Justice Committee, which reports directly and is responsible to the Criminal Justice Commission, as being a very proper, very strong and very accessible and valuable check against any possible abuse of any appeal or review system that will be put in place by this Bill. In fact, the role of the Criminal Justice Commissioner, who will be designated the Commissioner for Police Service Reviews, is an important one and will undoubtedly be closely looked at by the commission as a whole and by the parliamentary committee. The Liberal Party welcomes those provisions of the Bill.

I will refer only in a general sense to the provisions of the Bill that will encourage community policing. All political parties went to the last election with a commitment to increasing the resources of the Police Service—the police force—so that it would be better equipped to undertake general community policing. Throughout the sentiment that is contained within the Bill, one notes a commitment to community policing. The Liberal Party welcomes that commitment.

The Liberal Party welcomes also the flattening of the rank structures, which will be more evident in the regulations. As to the criticism that the Government has not made up its mind about the structure of the police force—the Liberal Party acknowledges that structures change. In the early stages of implementing new administrative structures such as the ones that are being set up and which will become more evident in the regulations, there may have to be reviews, which are a very valuable part of the reform process.

As I said—and without wanting to pre-empt anything that is contained in the regulations—the Liberal Party certainly welcomes the flattening of the rank structures and the greater accountability factor, which carries forward the spirit of the Fitzgerald report. The role of the Criminal Justice Commission and the parliamentary committee will be to oversee any real or imaginary abuses of power that may arise as a result of any provisions in this legislation.

I turn now to some specific queries of the Liberal Party, which will be raised in greater detail at the Committee stage.

Mr Mackenroth: Great detail?

Mr SANTORO: Yes, in detail.

The Liberal Party wishes to make the Criminal Justice Commission and its parliamentary committee accountable to the Parliament as quickly as possible. I foreshadow proposed amendments in relation to the recording and publication of communications as contained in clause 4.7.

At present, clause 4.7 provides that the certified copy of the register and all comment relating thereto should be tabled within 14 sitting days after the chairman's receipt thereof. The Liberal Party believes that that time limit could be contracted.

Clause 4.9 relates to the commissioner's directions, one of which can be of a general nature while giving guidance to various office-holders within the Police Service. The Liberal Party believes that general directions should be distinguished from specific

directions. Perhaps they could be recorded in permanent form and made available to the public. From time to time they should be subject to review as deemed necessary.

I turn now to clause 6.3 relating to salary and superannuation entitlements. Subclause 2 (b) appears to prohibit an officer who is suspended from duty and who is not entitled to be paid a salary during that suspension from receiving a salary, wages, fees or other remuneration unless the commissioner otherwise determines. If an officer is suspended without pay, he should be able to support himself and his family by seeking alternative remuneration. The Liberal Party hopes that that point is considered satisfactorily at the Committee stage.

Clause 7.4 relates to disciplinary action. The Liberal Party questions the ambiguity of line 31 on page 25 of the Bill and seeks clarification of it. It is highly desirable that the definition of "misconduct" be defined under the Bill rather than in the regulations. As the Bill currently stands, it is very subjective in relation to the definition of "misconduct", which could include matters such as breaches of regulations, being drunk either off duty or in uniform, and any other criteria that people may feel are worth while including.

Clause 8.2, which refers to retirement, allows an officer to resign if he feels that he is about to be charged and perhaps convicted at any time. In that case, an employee might retire with full superannuation benefits, as was the case in the past. That provision, which has been the subject of past complaints, should be reformed.

Clause 10.4 relates to the rejection of frivolous complaints. One of the major aims of this legislation is to help restore public confidence in the police force and to assist the public with complaints against police officers to ensure that they are adequately dealt with. The sorts of complaints that can be and probably will be legitimately made by members of the public may include, for example, constant dereliction of duty by police officers, radar traps in wrong places or a continuing and persistent degree of arrogance and rudeness. Faced with that sort of behaviour, members of the public have a legitimate right not only to complain but also to complain repeatedly, if necessary. The public should not be intimidated or restricted by what could develop into an attitude of, "If you complain about me, I will get you, and I will get you not because of another offence but because you are constantly complaining about me or a particular section of the Police Service." Frivolous complaints can be a bit of a bother, particularly to the Police Service. However, because we are in the public eye, from time to time we are all subject to frivolous complaints. That is one of the prices that we must pay.

I refer now to clause 10.5—Liability for tort generally. We in the Liberal Party suggest that one of the fundamental principles of our democracy is that the effects of actions and decisions by an administration should be able to be reviewed by the courts. If in fact a court suggests that the Police Service should be liable for certain punitive actions or punitive damages, the Police Service should not be exempted. It is a fundamental principle of our democracy that citizens should be able to seek redress from official actions by the administration.

At this stage I refer to clause 10.8—Compensation for injury or death. We congratulate the Minister and the Government on inserting this clause in the legislation. To the best of my knowledge, this is the first time that the Police Service will be covered by the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act 1916-1988. In fact, previously compensation was paid to members of the police force ex gratia, basically as an act of grace. When it is considered that members of the police force are one of the groups within our community that are most to suffer serious injury, including mutilation and permanent paralysis—for example, through car accidents that occur during high-speed chases in the course of their duty—it can be seen why this clause has been welcomed greatly by members of the union and, certainly, by members of the Liberal Party.

I refer to other clauses, including clause 10.6—Payment and recovery of damages. If a police officer makes a quick decision in good faith and if his action is later found by a court or by a review process to have been negligent, action should not be taken.

against him because that is likely to restrict police officers from pursuing their official duties to the full. If clause 10.6 comes into full play, police officers may start wondering what would happen to their house or their property if they were prosecuted under that clause.

During the Committee stage we will refer also to the various provisions in clause 10.19 which make the availability of certain information illegal. We feel that in clause 10.19 the word "confidential" could be replaced with the words "criminal intelligence". We raise this matter in view of the fact that certain information—including that disclosed by us during debates that occur in this place—may be sought by lawyers, investigative journalists and members of Parliament in the course of their duties. They should be able to scrutinise certain information. One would not be stretching the bow too much or too far to suggest that if this clause had applied when journalists were carrying out their investigations that led to the establishment of the Fitzgerald inquiry, that information would not have been able to be used.

As I said at the outset, we in the Liberal Party support the legislation. As I have indicated during this speech, we believe that there are deficiencies within it. We also believe that the legislation goes a long way to effecting the recommendations and the spirit of the Fitzgerald report. We look forward very much to this legislation being part of an effective and a real reform process within the Queensland Police Service.

Mr GUNN (Somerset) (9.27 p.m.): I wish to ask the Minister whether we will have ample opportunity to deal with the clauses at the Committee stage.

Mr Mackenroth: We have all night and all morning.

Mr GUNN: That is great. I will not touch on them now. I noticed that for most of the time previous speakers talked about the clauses. However, that is a matter for the Chair to decide.

This Bill has much to commend it. After all, it was based largely on the intensive work done last year during the term of the National Party Government. Being Police Minister for a couple of years, I was conscious of the problems that arose in every area of police administration. Previous National Party Ministers have already spoken. They put a great deal of thought into how the police force could be remodelled in the post-Fitzgerald era.

A number of objectives had to be achieved in order to restore full public confidence in the force. I refer to questions such as accountability and the impartial enforcement of the law. Something else also had to be achieved. The force had to be made one of which honest, decent men and women would be proud and would be eager to be a part of.

It is true to say that the period in which the Fitzgerald inquiry was held was the most difficult that the police force has ever known. During most of that time I was the Police Minister. I know the effect that the inquiry had on the rank and file policemen and particularly on their families. Only a minute number of police were found to be corrupt, but the public concept was that all police were corrupt. Families have suffered—and suffered greatly, I might say. It came to my notice that the young children of police officers attending school were berated by fellow-students about the corruption of the police force, which was definitely incorrect.

The Bill before us has the potential to achieve much in the way of obtaining an honest, accountable and efficient force. When it comes to how the police force would view its new working environment, we see major shortcomings. The police are greatly concerned about the almost untrammelled powers of the commissioner, and how those powers may be exercised. I have all the faith in the world in our present commissioner. However, there is nothing to say that he will be in the job for any great length of time.

When I came into this House, an appeals system was in place right throughout the public service. The chairman of the appeal board was a magistrate. I believe that the

removal of the appeal provision from this Bill is a major problem. Both commissioned officers and ordinary police are concerned that the commissioner has too much power, a concern that magnifies at the thought that in the future a corrupt commissioner may emerge. Members cannot say one will not.

I recall talking to Neville Wran just before he retired from politics. He said that he was most unlucky because he had had two corrupt Police Commissioners in a row. Only a very naive member would assert that that could never happen. It has happened before in Australia on a number of occasions, and I believe that it will happen again.

The absolute power that this Bill would put into the hands of the commissioner, now and in the future, should be very carefully considered indeed. Take, for example, disciplinary action or transfers. A member of the police force who feels aggrieved can approach a Commissioner for Police Service Reviews for a review. The result of that review is not binding on the Police Commissioner. He may take notice, or he may reverse or modify the original decision, but he is under no obligation to do so.

The former senior police officers who have approached the Opposition, now that they no longer have a vested interest, believe that the Bill gives the Commissioner far too much power over the lives and livelihoods of every policeman and policewoman. The commissioner has the right to decide where and how a member will work, what he will be paid and how often his salary will be reviewed. The commissioner also decides whether the member keeps his or her job in the force. That is a big task, and I say it is too big for one man, except in very special circumstances.

When it began work on this Bill, the previous Government believed that those special circumstances did exist, but only for a very short time. The previous Government did not feel that the commissioner should have so much absolute power indefinitely. The Opposition know that in the transition period there is a need for wide powers. We accept that there is much for the commissioner and his officers to do in the process of bringing the force up to the level that most of its members aspire to. We will support the police administration in its honest efforts to get things up and running properly again, but we make it quite clear that we regard the vesting of such power in one person over a long period as being absolutely repugnant.

The force will not operate effectively over the long term when its members have no real security of employment. Morale has to suffer when people know that their futures are totally dependent on the view taken by one man. Morale has to suffer when police officers realise that the commissioner is dependent on advice when he deals with personal matters, and that advice may come from an enemy or a bent cop. Morale has to suffer when police know that they are helpless in the face of leaders who may not be suitable to head such an important body.

The Opposition is well aware that the time has arrived for the passing of a new Police Act. We grant the Government that. Like everyone else, Opposition members were deeply disturbed by many of the problems revealed in Mr Fitzgerald's hearings and subsequent report.

When in Government, Opposition members moved quickly to get the reform process rolling. The previous Government gave total support to the implementation unit in its preparation of this Bill. The Opposition agrees with most of the Bill's provisions. We certainly find nothing to criticise in the aims of the people who have done the planning and the drafting. Those draftsmen have done a good job.

The Opposition wishes to see a police force that can take pride in its efficient and honest enforcement of all the laws of this State. The commissioner and all members of the police force are wished well in their endeavours to bring the police force back up to scratch. Much has been done and much remains to be done, but this Bill will help the process along. For the sake of the force and its members in the future, however, honourable members should be mindful of the need to place some limit on the commissioner's absolute powers in the long term.

I admit that when I took over the police portfolio there were grave divisions between the police union and myself. I was of the opinion—I am still of that opinion—that the members of the police union did not want a Minister but wanted to run the police force themselves. The police union condemned every Minister it had. It was impossible to talk to its members. The divisions between the police union and the present Minister were no surprise to me—he can join the club.

Mr Mackenroth: Do you sympathise with me?

Mr GUNN: I have been through it.

However, to the police union's credit, I believe that it had the best interests of its members at heart. As far as I was concerned it was just a clash of interests. I did not appreciate the fact that if the police union could not get what it wanted from me, it tried to go over my head.

Mr Mackenroth: And they did.

Mr GUNN: Although they tried that, its members did not succeed in that particular area. They did not like some of the things that I did such as the commissioning of the Andersen report. I handed it over to the Fitzgerald inquiry. Many of the recommendations in the Andersen report were exactly the same as those brought down by Mr Fitzgerald.

Mr Mackenroth: Some of them, not many of them.

Mr GUNN: Some of them. I thought the Andersen report was worth the money because it touched on many areas. I will deal with one of them now.

I was particularly concerned, and no doubt the Minister was concerned, about the number of policemen sitting behind a desk just doing clerical work. They have been trained as police officers. If the Minister spoke to most of those police officers, he would find that they wanted to be out doing the work that they were trained to do.

During the term that I was Police Minister, the previous Government employed an additional 134 clerks throughout the State. That did relieve police officers of a lot of the clerical work that they had to do.

I used to laugh to myself when I would go into a small police station and see the local policeman tap, tap, tapping away at a typewriter. I can tell members that he was not the best typist in the world.

Mr Mackenroth: Not with the typewriters that you supplied to them.

Mr GUNN: The typewriters may not have been the best, but the fact of the matter is that I did not believe it was a policeman's work. That came out loud and clear.

I pay a special tribute to the former Acting Police Commissioner, Ron Redmond. There is no doubt that Ron had the full support of the rank and file members of the police force. As I travelled throughout the State, that fact was fairly evident. A number of people—and the Minister would have found the same—did not always agree with the union. I can assure the Minister of that. I was received very well no matter where I went. There were many things that those police officers would have liked, and possibly should have received, but one is always limited by a budget and one cannot do much about that.

It will take a long time to overcome the problem. A big capital works program is necessary. In the early days—and I am thinking of not only when we were in Government but also when the Labor Party was previously in Government—not much was spent on capital works. The police sergeant or police constable had a little office alongside his house or even inside his house. That should never have happened. His family should never have been subjected to that. So the police have suffered. When I was Minister for Education, I can remember objecting strongly to having a budget of \$84m when the Police Department had a budget of \$7m or \$8m.

The new commissioner is a very strong man who has a major and difficult role to play. As I was a member of the National Crime Authority, I knew him long before he came here. Although I believe that he is capable of reorganising the force, he will need the cooperation of not only the union but also the Government, the Opposition and everybody else involved in government. The police have an unenviable role to play, and it is fraught with danger.

I have attended the funerals of many very young police officers who were killed in action. Members of my own family were in the police force for many years. I have spoken to many policemen and I have been told that the most dangerous situation that a police officer can attend is a domestic upheaval. I can very well recall a constable in our town who came to see me one Saturday afternoon. He was looking at some of my cattle when he heard a woman in the next house screaming, "He is killing me. He is choking me." This officer was in civilian clothes. He raced in, grabbed this fellow who had the woman by the throat and threw him to the ground. He pinned his arms behind his back and was telling him to cool down when he got a big clout behind the head with a broom held by the woman. She said, "That's what you get for interfering." He said, "The next time this sort of thing happens, he can damned well choke you." This is the sort of thing that police officers have to contend with. Attending domestic upheavals is very dangerous where there is a de facto relationship. As I said, the police have an unenviable task.

They are not overpaid by any stretch of the imagination. I do not know how that can be overcome with a limited budget. As the Minister will find out, everybody cries for money and very little can be done. Just how police officers can be helped must be decided by arbitration. They have a very good superannuation scheme and that is one way help can be given to them.

We have come a long way with the provision of equipment. I am old enough to recall that, many years ago, a policeman in the country did not have a car; he had a pushbike or a horse. The horse was ridden round the district so that stock fees, which was a tax inflicted on the pastoral industry at that time, could be collected.

I travelled to Europe with Ron Redmond. We saw one of the crack forces in Europe, the West German SGS9. We were treated very well. That group travelled to Queensland at the invitation of the Queensland Police Force and it had great admiration for our force. The West German police were taken mainly from the army. I think that the force was formed following the disaster at the Munich Olympic Games. Some of our ideas were applauded by that unit. I had the pleasure of being with the unit for a couple of days, and it was very interesting to see how it operated.

While we were in Europe, we saw commissioned officers working in the field most of the time with the younger police. We do not see much of that in Queensland or Australia. Commissioned officers generally work in offices. I do not think it hurts for the commissioned officers to work in the field as often as they can with the younger officers.

One thing about which I was proud as Minister for Police was the introduction of the first Neighbourhood Watch. That scheme must be continued and I advise the present Minister to keep it in mind. Victoria introduced the scheme a long time ago. I looked at it when I was in that State. At that time, Victoria had 100 Neighbour Watch groups whereas Queensland had only a few. It is imperative that there be cooperation from the public. The number of groups in Queensland has increased greatly.

Another scheme to be commended is "Adopt a Cop." There is a need for PR in the police force. In my electorate the police work very closely with the community, and that is very good. In Ipswich, a constable and his wife, who was also a constable, were adopted by the same school. I am sure that the officers enjoyed it and that the children will grow up looking up to police officers rather than avoiding them, as is the case in many areas.

I do not intend to speak for a long time. The important part of the debate is that on the clauses, and members will be given ample opportunity to discuss them if they so desire. The Bill contains many pluses for the police force. As a whole, I found the officers to be a great bunch of people. Unfortunately, all of them were tainted because of the actions of just a few. That is sad. It is wrong that the whole force should be brought down like that. Morale was very low during the Fitzgerald inquiry. Ron Redmond told the police officers that they had to go through this painful stage. They have done that and have come out of it fairly well.

I am convinced that in due course this Bill will do much to lift the morale of the police force, but there are a few sections of it about which the Opposition and the police union are very concerned. At times I may not have got on very well with the union, but it always acted in the best interests of its members, which is its role. The union must realise that this is an era of change. It must change if the Queensland police force is to become the greatest police force in Australia. The police force is capable of doing that because, even through that bad period, its clean-up rate was the best of any clean-up rate in Australia, which speaks for itself.

Finally, I have every respect and confidence in the Queensland police force. If we discuss the matters in the Bill that are of concern to the police force and if we amend certain clauses in it, this Bill will be very well received by the police force.

Mr BEATTIE (Brisbane Central) (9.47 p.m.): Tonight it gives me a great deal of pleasure to support the Police Service Administration Bill. In doing so I will return to the point at which this reform process began—the Fitzgerald report itself. I will quote three very relevant paragraphs on page 200 of the report under the heading "Police Culture". Commission Fitzgerald states—

"Both the community and the Police Force pay a heavy price as the effects of a culture of misconduct spread and sap the moral vigour of the entire Police Force.

The Queensland Police Force is debilitated by misconduct, inefficiency, incompetence, and deficient leadership. The situation is compounded by poor organization and administration, inadequate resources, and insufficiently developed techniques and skills for the task of law enforcement in a modern complex society. Lack of discipline, cynicism, disinterest, frustration, anger and low esteem are the result. The culture which shares responsibility for and is supported by this grossly unsatisfactory situation includes contempt for the criminal justice system, disdain for the law and rejection of its application to police, disregard for the truth, and abuse of authority.

Not all police officers are responsible for the nature of the police culture. Many officers retain their integrity and provide meritorious and usually unrecognized service. Most do not participate fully, especially in the various forms of misconduct which form part of the culture, but many acquiesce."

Tonight I do not wish to continue my speech in a negative vein, but at the outset of this debate it is important that this House examine what Commissioner Fitzgerald said in his report. In common with a number of members in this House, I have had discussions with representatives from the police union, John O'Gorman and Tom Mahon. On one occasion quite recently I even attended a meeting of the police union. The reform of the police force must be carried out with tolerance and understanding. I understand its members concerns about change. I have had some experience in the railway area in which CTC—a new signalling system—was introduced. Many parallels can be drawn between the Railway Department and the Police Department. In the Railway Department there were concerns about the rate of change and what it meant to jobs, security and promotion. I am familiar with the concerns. It is important that we are sensitive to those concerns in whatever we do, both in terms of the legislation and in this debate.

Nevertheless, as Commissioner Fitzgerald pointed out, there needs to be change. There are some matters contained in this Bill about which a number of members in

this House will feel unhappy, but which are recommendations from Commissioner Fitzgerald and need to be introduced. All honourable members and the police union must bear in mind that in about two years' time—that is May 1992—there will be a review of this legislation. This review process is provided in the legislation. If difficulties occur during that period of time, then all honourable members in this House will have an opportunity to further examine the Act. The police union and others who may be concerned about sections of the Act will have the opportunity to pursue those matters when the legislation is changed or considered in May 1992.

There is no-one in this House who would not believe that the restoration of morale in the police force is fundamental and important. The processes of the Fitzgerald inquiry, which were fundamental, important and necessary, nevertheless had an effect on morale amongst those honest members of the police force. Therefore, it is fundamentally important that this Parliament, together with the various pieces of legislation that come before it, seek to restore confidence in the force. The legislation that is currently before the House provides for the necessary change that must take place and, in the long term, will facilitate the restoration of morale.

When talking about change and the concern that people have about change, I was interested to read a document put out by Sir Gordon Jackson, who is Chairman of the Police Board of New South Wales. A seminar was held at the Sydney Opera House from 19 to 24 March 1989 at which he presented a paper titled *Reform of Policing in New South Wales*. On page 5 he refers to changes in the New South Wales force, and states—

"Some detectives deeply resented and still resent the breaking up of the C.I.B. Less able police were unhappy at the ending of the seniority system. Many middle ranking police in headquarters felt their careers and lifestyle threatened by regionalisation. Corrupt police resented the Board for their own reasons. Some public servants resented their integration with sworn police into one service. The pace of change became as fast as generally tolerable, and for some, so fast as to be traumatic.

Not surprisingly such concerns have been manifested in criticism of reforms and by dragging of the feet, by obstruction and outright opposition."

I refer to those matters simply to highlight the point that change is indeed a complicated exercise, irrespective of whether it takes place in the New South Wales police force, the Queensland police force or the Queensland Railways. It will cause some heartburn and anxiety but, as Commissioner Fitzgerald pointed out, if there is to be a restoration of public confidence in the police force, it is absolutely essential that reforms should be put into effect. It is the responsibility of every member of this House to ensure that those reforms take place.

I point out also that the Criminal Justice Act, which is of particular interest to me, and its provisions dealing with the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice, set out specific responsibilities in relation to police. In section 2.15(g), the responsibilities of the commission are set out and include—

- (g) monitoring the performance of the Police Force with a view to ensuring that the most appropriate policing methods are being used, consistently with trends in the nature and incidence of crime, and to ensuring the ability of the Police Force to respond to those trends;
- (h) providing the Commissioner of Police with policy directives based on the Commission's research, investigation and analysis, including with respect to law enforcement priorities, education and training of police"—

which is fundamental to the future—

"operation, and the optimum use of law enforcement resources."

Indeed, section 2.15 includes among the responsibilities of the commission subparagraph (i), which states—

"overseeing reform of the Police Force."

This Act, which has been introduced by the Police Minister, very clearly begins that process.

I wish to mention briefly the police unions. In common with many other members of this House, I have had discussions with them and understand their concerns. I was reminded that the previous National Party Government put a submission to the Fitzgerald inquiry. I think it is worth while reading part of the submission made by the previous Government because it puts into context a number of comments that have already been made by other honourable members tonight. I will read from the submission, which states—

"On any view, the force plainly has not been managed in the way in which a law enforcement agency should be. There is of course a further question, that is, as to the role of the unions themselves. Have they by intrusion into administrative matters themselves made it more difficult for well intentioned, efficient honest officers to perform their duty?

The police force (no more than any other department of Government), is not to be administered via or through the union, or union officials. There is no reason in principle why the Chief Executive, the Commissioner, should not interest himself in industrial matters, but generally only when major issues remain unresolved and upon and after all necessary consultations and efforts by properly informed and educated industrial officers.

There is much evidence to suggest that the police union and the police officers union have had . . . far too much influence upon police work and affairs generally. The unions, it is suggested, ought just as much have been aware of the corruption of the force as anyone else could possibly have been. In future, those who are responsible for industrial relations policy should be aware of what has gone before. Moreover, although of course the Government is anxious to foster good relations with the unions and is prepared to consult with them when appropriate, it should be stressed that the police force is to be administered by, and through the responsible Minister, and the chains of command in the force rather than through the unions. No doubt they may and should be consulted from time to time but they should not assume any right to administer or control the force."

Page 64 of the submission states—

"The force has effectively been free of any informed, external scrutiny and control for decades. The unions have joined in resisting scrutiny, even demanding on occasions, the right to select or bring about the removal of a Minister for Police."

Page 75 of the submission states—

"It has to be observed that some actions of the union have tended to politicise the role of the force generally."

That is an interesting comment, in the light of the comment made earlier by the honourable member for Peak Downs. The submission continues—

"Elsewhere in these submissions, reference has been made to the demands of the union to influence the appointment of Police Ministers. That can hardly be regarded as a satisfactory or indeed, appropriate aim for the union to pursue. In the end, a Minister so appointed may well lack the authority that will be required from time to time to deal with the force."

I do not read that extract into the *Hansard* record with any intention other than to ensure that the record in relation to this debate is kept very straight and clear.

The point must be made that the Police Service will go through some difficult times. In my own electorate, there are two matters of concern that require additional police resources. This matter has been the subject of considerable discussion between the Police Minister and me. I mention the matter referred to by the Leader of the Opposition earlier, namely, the Queen Street Mall and areas in Fortitude Valley.

As recently as last Thursday night outside Patches nightclub in Fortitude Valley, a brawl spilled into the streets. In addition to eight police cars called to the scene, two ambulances were also needed. A problem with law enforcement certainly exists. However, I am happy to say that the special task force that has been set up by the Minister for Police, Terry Mackenroth, is working towards resolving the problem. I am also happy to inform the House that, generally, in terms of both the Queen Street Mall and Fortitude Valley, crime rates have been reduced since the Minister's task force was established. I acknowledge the contribution made by the Minister in that respect. I am not saying that the problem is resolved, because it is not. Small gangs continue to operate in the Queen Street Mall and, to a lesser extent, in Fortitude Valley. That matter will have to be continually monitored by both the Police Minister and, I can assure him, the local member.

Anxiety over increasing the number of members in the Police Service and also the scope of some of its operations will continue. In common with many other honourable members, I was concerned when I read reports on the investigation of officers of the Queensland Police—Citizens Youth Welfare Association. Let me record that I believe the police youth citizens clubs perform a very important role in the community. I happen to be one who is a strong supporter of police youth citizens clubs. I hope this untidy and unfortunate matter involving the clubs will be cleared up very quickly so that public confidence will be restored. Those clubs do a darned good job. In my contact with those clubs, which has been relatively considerable, I have found their members to be people of whom all members of this House should be very supportive.

Before I deal with details of the Act, I will turn to some of the changes that have been made in terms of the force generally. Since coming to Government, we have progressed with the allocation of 100 public service positions to the police to release police for operational duties. That will solve some of the problems involving the Queen Street Mall and other places. The first 28 of those positions throughout the State have now been advertised and, indeed, the appointees will be selected on merit. We have started an overviewed continuing process of organisational change throughout the Police Department. That change process involves workshop activity that is intended to involve as many staff throughout the State as possible. To date, more than 120 of those workshops have been held, and they are fundamental to getting the police force itself through this process of change.

The Government has approved an increase of 28 officers to the Drug Squad to assist in combating crime involving drugs. The placement of a full-time Drug Squad in Townsville and Cairns has been possible with that increased staffing. Indeed, the Premier, Mr Goss, and the Police Minister, Mr Mackenroth, have fired the first shot in the new Government's war against drugs by announcing a 100 per cent increase in staff in the police Drug Squad and an upgrading in its equipment and resources. An extra \$760,000 has been allotted for that purpose. In fact, we have put our money where our mouth is.

The Government has progressed to the decentralisation of the metropolitan CIB, the Traffic Branch and the mobile patrols as part of the thrust towards regionalisation of policing services recommended in the Fitzgerald report. It has approved alterations to traffic procedures to ensure that traffic enforcement is no longer geared to revenue-raising, but has an emphasis upon traffic-safety measures. After all, that is what it ought to be. There was a lot of frustration in the community that traffic procedures were there simply as a means of raising money. Internal review of traffic procedures is also taking place to ensure greater efficiency. That is proceeding very well.

Another initiative is that the new Police Minister has abolished the controversial Special Branch. Earlier, I mentioned that a special police task force had been established to patrol the Queen Street Mall area during the holiday season. Simultaneously, a review of policing in the mall was undertaken to maximise resources and combat crime.

The Police Minister and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Ms Warner, announced a review of charges laid against Aboriginal and Islander people. Any Aboriginal and

Islander people with a complaint about their charges or treatment have been invited to lodge their complaints in writing.

I turn to deal in some detail with the police union's concerns about the Act. The police union submitted a three-part document on the Act. I do not intend to examine each of those parts, but I intend to deal significantly with the first and second parts of that document.

The union objects to the appointment of the commissioner for more than one term. However, the contractual arrangements for the commissioner provide for ample review of his performance and it is possible in some circumstances that more than one term of appointment would be in the interests of the Police Service. That matter is of considerable importance.

The union has concern relating to the commissioner's responsibilities as listed in clause 4.8. All those responsibilities are similar to those of chief executives in the public service, which are provided for by the Public Service Management and Employment Act. That point needs to be clearly set on the record.

Some of the union's specific concerns in that regard relate, firstly, to the selection of persons as officers. While lateral entry was not specifically envisaged by that clause, lateral entry was recommended by the Fitzgerald report.

The union also has concerns relating to the determination of salaries and wages and times within which members are to perform work. Both those matters are subject to industrial awards and agreements, and that is specifically provided for in that clause. However, hours of work may relate to shift arrangements and thus may be purely operational matters to be decided within the guidelines provided for by the relevant awards.

The union raised the matter of internal redeployment and the retraining of officers. Those are matters for personnel administration. The commissioner should have flexibility to redeploy staff as necessary within the organisation. Protection for the entitlements of those staff members to salary and so on is provided for under industrial awards and Acts and is therefore guaranteed and protected.

The union raises objections to the expression "convenient", which is expressed in clause 4.8 (3). The term used in the Public Service Management and Employment Act is "expedient". The commissioner must have flexibility to manage. That is, after all, why he was given this appointment.

The union requests that the commissioner be required by the Act to obey industrial awards and so on. The legislation has been changed to require him to comply with such awards.

The third point raised by the union deals with police ranks. The union requests that ranks not be set by regulation. However, the ranks within the service will be determined as an outcome of the current position and salary review, and it is not appropriate that that be specified in the Act itself. Public service classifications, which are similar to ranks, are not so specified.

The fourth point raised by the union deals with the determination of appropriate remuneration to persons relieving in executive officer or commissioned officer positions. The union objects to provisions which permit the commissioner to determine remunerations to be paid to persons acting in positions. However, as many of those positions will be subject to contractual arrangements, such a provision is necessary to permit remuneration to be determined. Contracts may include a package of benefits and the salary figure may undervalue the remuneration of the position, which is why the procedure has been followed in that way.

The fifth point raised by the union deals with the appointment of police officers on limited tenure. The union objects to the concept of employment on limited tenure. Limited tenure appointments for commissioned officers were specifically recommended by the Fitzgerald report, which is why the provision is included in the legislation. That

is to be extended to other ranks by the Act to permit persons who are appointed laterally to be appointed for limited terms in the first instance.

Limited tenure appointments also provide flexibility in the context of the present salary review, as certain specified positions—for example, witness protection and undercover duties—may, in future, attract benefits which are limited to those positions and which apply only whilst officers are performing those duties. I just digress and say that every member of this House needs to be fully aware that the area of witness protection is not only expensive but also one of the most difficult tasks given to the force. There has to be flexibility in terms of those conditions to make sure that those officers who are given that heavy responsibility are remunerated accordingly. Limited tenure could then be applied to enable officers to be appointed for stated periods to perform those duties.

I will move on to another concern that the union has—the election provisions for officers whose contracts or term appointments expire, etc. The union objects to the commissioner having discretion in the matter of reinstatement to previous rank or grade, etc. The Fitzgerald report—and I again come back to the Fitzgerald report because so much of this Act is based on what the report said—recommended that all appointments to commissioned officer positions should be reviewed during the transitional period and appropriate arrangements made so that officers not of retiring age whose appointments were terminated were appropriately compensated, in the case where they were not retained in the service, or permitted to return to their previous rank, etc. Consequently, the commissioner must have the discretion to make the necessary decisions in the appropriate circumstances.

I turn now to part-time employment for police—a point that was made very forcibly to me when I met with union representatives. The union objects to the concept of part-time employment or part-time police. However, the present shortage of police requires that as many options for employment of trained police as possible be available. Moreover, this provision provides an option for many union members who might otherwise resign from the service—and this is important—to continue their career in a part-time capacity in positions where this is appropriate. We thereby maintain that experience in the force. This provision should be of particular benefit to female officers who may wish to continue their career while child-rearing. One of the matters about which we ought to be concerned is increasing the number of women in the force. That would overcome some of the difficulty in terms of—

Mr Harper: We need people who have experience.

Mr BEATTIE: We certainly do. I agree with the honourable member in that regard.

I turn to the employment of police recruits on contract. This is a very sensitive area, both within the Labor Party and generally. The union objects to contract employment for recruits. I have some sympathy for that position. However, there are good reasons for making the employment of recruits subject to contract. The situation is analogous to an apprenticeship indenture where certain obligations and responsibilities are placed on both parties and both should be fully aware of them. The department should be able to dismiss recruits who are considered unsuitable; however, reasons should be given. The employment of recruits who demonstrate health or psychiatric problems should be terminated without the Pension Fund incurring liability for full medical retirement privileges. Recruits will be provided by the Act with cover against injury sustained in the course of employment. So they are indeed protected to that extent.

I turn to the matter of unapplied-for transfers—again, a sensitive area. The union expresses concerns relating to unapplied-for transfers. Review of transfer decisions will be provided for in the Act. Because of the difficulties that we face, I believe that the period up until May 1992 is adequate.

In regard to the suspension and standing-down provisions—the union asks that these be subject to appeal. Review of these decisions will be provided for by the Act.

I come to the possibility of suspension without pay of officers with health problems. This provision has been inserted to enable the standing down or suspension of officers

with serious health problems so that they will not be required to carry out the duties and responsibilities of police officers; for example, an officer recovering from a heart attack or one in advanced pregnancy not required to intervene in a violent confrontation which comes to the officer's notice. That is a very commonsense attitude to adopt. This provision could also be used to ensure that psychiatrically disturbed officers handed in their firearms, etc. It is highly unlikely that officers suffering ill-health would ever be suspended without pay. That is a point that needs to be made very clearly.

I turn now to the reimbursement of salary for suspended officers upon retirement. The union requested that officers, upon reinstatement, be entitled to salary and allowances, rather than to salaries. This will be accommodated. I stress that that will be accommodated in the Act. I deal now with the internal command requirements. The union asserts that internal command requirements dictate the retention of the present ranks and structure. The existing rank structure will continue until a new model is designed and introduced, and any new model must accommodate command requirements. So, to that extent, I believe that the union's concern has been overcome.

I turn now to the reporting of misconduct. The union is concerned that the provision imposing a duty to report misconduct or breaches of discipline must be subject to checks and balances. In the case of official misconduct and misconduct, these are already provided by the Criminal Justice Commission and in the case of disciplinary breaches, the necessary measures will be provided by the Commissioner of Police Service Reviews.

I move on now to the requirement for appeal upon disciplinary decisions. A review process is provided for and where the penalty imposed is dismissal, the normal avenue of appeal to the Industrial Court is also available. I want to make that clear. Any officer who is dismissed has an appeal to the Industrial Court. Nothing in this legislation takes away that right of appeal. That is a fundamental right, a right that is well respected by the Labor Party and has been for a long time.

I turn now to deal with the change of status of an officer on medical grounds. This change of status can occur only after the necessary medical examinations and opinions—including those of the officer's own doctors—are considered. This provision is intended to assist in offering officers suffering ill-health an option to medical retirement. There is no such option available at present. I stress that there is no such option available at the moment.

Proposed changes to the superannuation provisions will enable those officers to be placed in positions in which they are able to perform the required work even if the normal salary attaching to a position is lower than that of the officer prior to his ill health. A gap pension will be provided to fund the difference, as occurs presently with public servants. A review of those decisions could be provided for by regulation at the appropriate time if that was considered necessary.

I turn now to the external review of certain decisions. The union opposes the proposed review by a Commissioner for Police Service Review. The Fitzgerald report recommended that no external appeal or review be permitted until the end of the transitional period and that only an internal administrative review of certain decisions be permitted. I stress the source of that recommendation, namely, the Fitzgerald report.

The proposed review system is a compromise based upon low levels of trust within the service of any purely internal review mechanism. The old appeal system was administratively cumbersome and overly legalistic and took a long time to arrive at a decision. The proposed system is based upon the system that applies to public servants and attempts to be simple, informal and non-legalistic. The nomination of a CJC members as a commissioner is intended to ensure that the Commissioner of the Police Service is subject to the overview of the Criminal Justice Commission in administrative decision-making.

I realise that my allotted time has almost expired, although I could have canvassed many other aspects of the legislation. This will be a difficult time for the police. A non-partisan approach is needed to ensure that public faith in the force is restored. I believe that with the application of common sense, that can be achieved.

Mr HARPER (Auburn) (10.17 p.m.): The debate on this Bill provides an excellent opportunity to make a few comments about the conduct of honourable members in this House. I must say that, in Opposition, I look forward to constructive debate. I rather enjoyed the speech that was made to the House this afternoon by the member for Cunningham, during which he espoused somewhat similar views.

Debate in this House should not be hysterical. There should be no hysterical outbursts or cross-fire in the Chamber on matters that have very little relevance to the work of Government. Honourable members should be capable of mature debate without personal abuse. That has always been my belief. However, that is not to say that the recent bowing of the Goss Treasurer for a duck was anything but the sound, mature work of the man who brought down this State's last Budget, on which we are still working—the former Treasurer demonstrating the weakness of the present Treasurer.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Campbell): Order! The honourable member will come back to the Bill.

Mr HARPER: In considering the Bill before the House, we see another example of the——

Mr Lingard interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Lingard: No pointing in any way.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will apologise to the Chair.

Mr LINGARD: If you are going to direct that way, Mr Deputy Speaker, but quite honestly or pertinently——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have asked the honourable member to apologise to the Chair. He will do that immediately.

Mr LINGARD: I am apologising to you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will remain seated while I am on my feet. He will apologise and make no other comments.

Mr LINGARD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I now stand and apologise for asking you to stop pointing your finger.

Mr HARPER: Mr Deputy Speaker, that is a minute of my time gone.

As I was saying, in considering the Bill before the House we see another example of the Goss Labor Government refuting its own promises and its commitment to not rushing through legislation. The call that honourable members heard from the Government was for no late sittings. However, this Bill has come before the House before the average policeman in the State has had an opportunity to consider it and before members on this side of the House have had an opportunity to discuss it with policemen in their constituencies. The Goss Government is refuting its own promises and its own holier-than-thou utterings in the previous Parliament. If the Goss Labor Government wants to retain its gloss and glitter, it will listen to the words of wisdom that are being put forward from this side of the House and the words of wisdom from the practical, experienced policemen and policewomen around the State.

We have every right to be proud of our police force which, over the years, has demonstrated an ability to work for the community and continues to do so. I take this

opportunity to mention the role of the country policeman. A few minutes ago the honourable member for Somerset reminisced a little. That made me think of my childhood, when I had an uncle who was a damn good country policeman. He rode a horse, not a motor bike, and he did his job extremely well. I certainly enjoyed some hours, days and weeks when I had an opportunity to accompany him around the area for which he was responsible.

Without naming names, I am reminded of a fairly recent case involving a police sergeant in one of the towns in my electorate. He was doing his job as a country policeman extremely well, utilising the experience and ability that he had gained through practical experience in and knowledge of country areas. However, because he was not prepared to advance himself further than being a country sergeant who was running an extremely good police station, he was told that he had to get out of the police force. Because I believe that Mr Beattie has a genuine interest in this matter, it is a pity that he is not in the Chamber at the moment. The way to get my uncle out of the police force was to transfer him to Brisbane. Many policemen think that St George is too close to the coast. That country policeman certainly would have been out of place had he accepted being transferred to Brisbane to a desk job.

One of the problems that I have with this legislation is that the Police Commissioner will have an opportunity to effectively dismiss policemen by simply transferring them, without a right of appeal and without any right to protect their interests, to an area to which he knows they will not accept the transfer. I see that as a flaw. As I said, the man to whom I have referred was transferred against his will to Brisbane. He was a loss to the Queensland police force and to those men who serve in the country very, very well and very efficiently.

During his contribution, the honourable member for Brisbane Central agreed that such experience needs to be retained. It costs too much money. It is very cheap to sack people, but it is very expensive to train their replacements. That applies to the police force as much as it does to any other body.

Today we hear of the recruits at the Police Academy being told that they are the new force. They are being told, "We are getting rid of the old, corrupt force and you will be the new police force." Sure, let us get rid of the odd bad apple. But why should the great majority of serving officers be degraded in this way? I refer to those experienced, stable, mature women and men who have given so much to the community in what really can be a most unrewarding occupation—the police force.

This Labor Party of academics has attacked public servants at all levels. Tonight we see a further example of the Goss academics taking over. Experienced police officers—senior, practical police officers—are being told that they have no future; that they will not be allowed to advance to commissioned rank. They are being told to find another job. These are the men and women who have come up through the school of hard knocks. There are plenty of members on the Government benches who should be rising in anger at what is happening.

The police force comprises men and women who have made their way through their ability. They are not academics, but they have more practical ability than the great majority of academics. They are the men and the women who have gone to scenes of murders, who have risked their lives, who have had to drag people out of accidents and who, over the years, along with their families, have had to put up with the trauma that results from taking part in the community service that requires them to attend those scenes and take part in the frays. They have a community role. They deserve the respect—they have earned the respect—of every man, woman and child in Queensland.

The member for Brisbane Central referred to the police youth citizens clubs. The police who run them are the very people, particularly in the country areas, who give of their own time, voluntarily, to advance, to help and to build society into a better place.

Mr Beattie: Hear, hear!

Mr HARPER: I appreciate that the honourable member agrees.

This Bill really rubbishes those people. It tells them that there is no place for them. As I say, they are men and women who, to a large degree, have come through the school of hard knocks.

That philosophy does not stop with the senior officers. Keen young police officers and senior constables are told that they can forget about gaining even the rank of sergeant unless they study for tertiary degrees. Police officers who have studied at TAFE colleges and have completed the core subjects that were introduced during the Whitrod era—men and women who have earned their promotions or promotional opportunities—now find that this new curriculum which is to be introduced effectively renders useless all that effort.

Academic qualifications and education are to be applauded. I do not believe that there is a police officer who would not agree that further education, continuing education, is important. Every day we learn. But we do not have to go to a university. In fact, I have a very strong point of view that schools and tertiary institutions really only teach people how to learn out in the field. It is a big help to have that background, but it is not the be-all and end-all of success in a practical sense.

Why should equal opportunity be denied to tried and tested officers of proven ability? That is what this Bill does. Those men and women should be given job satisfaction, incentives to look ahead to well-earned promotion, goals to achieve and, above all, equal opportunity. One of the promises of the present Government is that it will introduce an equal opportunity Bill. As I have said before in this House: aren't I looking forward to reading that equal opportunity Bill, when I see what this Government has done over the last three months to the public servants of Queensland.

Mr Booth: It will be equal opportunity for Left Wingers.

Mr HARPER: It will be equal opportunity for anyone with an ALP ticket.

Earlier during the debate, I heard the honourable member for Somerset enunciate a number of appointments. I have said in this House before, "Good luck to the appointees", but this Government should not deceive Queenslanders into thinking that promotion is simply on merit, unless merit does include political points of view.

At the present time—and I will get back to the Bill without you even asking me to, Mr Deputy Speaker—promotion in the police force is not automatic. Examinations are held and assessments of ability are made, but at the present time the opportunity is there for all. The goal is there. I ask the member for Brisbane Central: why take it away? Where are those traditional Labor values which acknowledge practical experience? These men and women are not young students who are wet behind the ears. They are serving officers of the police force who have been well trained at the police academy. They have been taught to learn. That is the benefit of education, being taught how to learn. One learns when one gets out into the field. The Minister knows that and I know it—these academics might not.

Those police officers have the values and the maturity which only practical experience can teach, but what is this Labor Government telling them? It does not matter about one's practical ability, one's experience, one's years of dedicated service that has given one that practical experience. This Goss Government, this academic Government, is telling those serving officers to forget all about any advancement. They have got no future. This Government has a bunch of kids coming up who will know it all before they even hit the deck. This Government has no place for the older, experienced employees.

I suggest that this Government's brand of Labor is a farce, an absurdity. This Government should be called the Goss academic Government, not the Goss Labor Government.

Opposition members who look at the Bill will see that under clause 4.8 the commissioner has the right to hire and fire. The commissioner has a number of

responsibilities, but he has this sole right to hire and fire. I have already mentioned that one device for bringing about a dismissal is his right to transfer without objection. It will be a simple matter. I have indicated that that process has been used in the past to do much the same thing. The Minister will transfer an officer to somewhere he knows that officer will not fit in and that officer will resign. Over the last three months members have seen that happening in the public service. Government members cannot say, "That won't happen." It will happen; it has happened; it is still happening today and will happen next week.

Mr Welford: It is subject to review.

Mr HARPER: Subject to review?

Mr Welford: That is right.

Mr HARPER: Caesar unto Caesar. That is the very thing that has happened in the public service over the last three months, and now this Government is going to give that right to the police force—Caesar unto Caesar.

This Bill is not just for today or for the present commissioner. I do not know him well, although I have met him. He seems a reasonable sort of bloke. This Bill is not just for him. This Bill, when it becomes an Act of Parliament, should set the guidelines for decades to come so that people of ability can look at it and say, "If I join the police force, that is my future. These are the guidelines. They have been well thought through and I know where I am going. I know what the opportunities are."

Earlier in the debate the suggestion was, "Don't worry. There will be a review in two years' time." In those two years hundreds of officers will have lost out and an unknown number of young people will say, "That is not for us." They should be able to look at the Act when it finally passes through this Parliament and accept it as a guideline for their terms of employment for decades to come. The Bill should be framed to give satisfaction to both the employee and the employer for decades and to give employees stability in their occupation.

Implementation units have been going around the countryside and, from what I have heard of them, they appear to be simply window-dressing for decisions that have already been taken. Indeed, some of the officers who are effecting the implementation—setting out the goals—seem to be at a loss themselves. As I say, it is window-dressing for decisions already taken.

How can the people of Queensland expect the best potential police officers to come forward when the rules are being continually changed and when legitimate appeals against decisions go forward unto Caesar. Honourable members have seen it. The examples are there. We have seen retrenchments and terminations of contracts. Members have seen the deceit and manipulation to take away the contractual rights of the employees. Honourable members have seen this Government's response when appeals lie from Caesar unto Caesar. That simply is not good enough for any of our public servants, including police officers.

No-one is up in the press gallery; perhaps they are watching television. I will bet my socks that nothing will appear in the media tomorrow or the next day about the treatment being offered to police officers, whom members on this side of the House respect and to whom the people of Queensland owe so much. It is time that the members of the press gallery recognised what this Goss Labor Government is doing in the field of employment and in the field of industrial relations.

Why should review procedures deny an officer's right to legal representation? Why should a member of the police force, who wishes to appeal against a decision, be denied the right to have legal representation? Perhaps—this is just being kind—the Government is saying, "Look, we really want to save you the cost of getting legal advice because the result is cut and dried anyway. You would just be wasting your money." Perhaps that is why it is happening; perhaps it is a foregone conclusion, so perhaps Mr Mackenroth and Mr Goss and his Cabinet are saying, "We want to save you the cost of legal

representation because the result is a foregone conclusion." That, too, is historical fact. It has happened and the Minister for Land Management knows very well that it has happened.

Clause 5.11 of the Bill sets out the conditions of employment of police recruits. Let me warn recruits who are looking at employment in the police force that this Goss Government cannot be trusted when it comes to contracts of employment. It will manipulate, deceive, duck and dive and Government members and Ministers—not many of them are in the Chamber—know that what I am saying is dead true. So recruits should be careful when they are offered a contract of employment because it will not be worth the paper it is written on, not when it comes to interpretation by this Government.

Inevitably, we come back to the appeals process, a matter on which a Government member was kind enough to interject earlier—Caesar unto Caesar.

Mr Welford: Leave it off.

Mr HARPER: Have a look at the Bill. It is called, "Result of review." That appears in clause 9.5 under which the Commissioner of the Police Service can take the action that he and he alone considers to be just and fair. That is the final result. Why cannot this Parliament lead the way in demonstrating pride in our force? Why cannot we all on both sides of the House give our policewomen and our policemen, those good apples who have built their careers as honest police officers in a very harsh environment, the recognition that they deserve and the incentive to continue in our police force? A review of the Act in two years' time, as was suggested by a previous speaker, will be too late for hundreds of officers and, of course, delays during that time will only create further uncertainty.

In short, I call on this so-called Labor Government to demonstrate that it is big enough to admit a mistake. It is a pity that the Minister for Police is not in the Chamber to take part in the debate. Let us see Wayne Goss come out in his true colours, if they are true, and admit that he has made a mistake. Let him say to his Minister for Police, "We have made a mistake", and amend this Bill to acknowledge the truth, the facts, the words of wisdom that have been put by the Opposition tonight and that have been put by policemen and policewomen, and will be put increasingly as they become aware of the Bill, which they have been unable to do because of the shortness of its availability to the public. One week has been allowed. Give the public more time and let the Government listen to the words of wisdom of practical, mature, experienced police officers, so that we will continue to have their experience available to our community. Let us take advantage of those years of dedicated service for at least a few more years.

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Condamine) (10.41 p.m.): I am aware that many of the points I intended to raise have been covered partially by other members. There seems to be unanimity in the debate that there is a great need to make sure that the Queensland police force is put into proper shape.

Last Friday, and again on Monday morning before returning to Brisbane, I took the trouble to consult with representatives of the Queensland police force in my electorate. They raised some matters that I want to canvass tonight. They spoke of lack of consultation. I inform the Minister that, when they speak about consultation, they mean speaking not only to the Minister but also to senior officers who have been going round the State. An honourable member referred to them earlier as implementation committees. The opinion was expressed to me that police officers find it very difficult to fully understand this Bill and its implications when they do not really understand the new police force structure that will be established under the Bill. That being the case, they consider that other matters in the Bill need definition and explanation. I am pleased to see the Minister return to the Chamber so that he might reply to some of the matters I raise.

The next matter of concern is the contract for recruitment which was referred to by the honourable members for Brisbane Central and Auburn. One aspect not raised

was that, when recruits actually go out assisting, watching or observing police officers on duty, it could happen that those recruits would be asked to perform some sort of duty. They have expressed concern that, while they are not members of the union, they are not protected by the legal fund. The police officers to whom I spoke acknowledge that there is a need for a contract system for recruits. As has been mentioned, it is a time when those who should be weeded out need to be identified. They may be qualified academically but, out on the job, it is the character of the person and not his qualifications that has to be judged. It is similar to an indenture so that unsatisfactory recruits can be identified. I agree with the comment that they should be given an explanation of why they are not suitable, but certainly they should be removed before they become an impediment to the force.

The next matter raised with me was appeals against the decision of the commissioner. This matter has been canvassed by the honourable member for Auburn, but I have some additional comments to make. It seems to me that, under this Bill, the police force should have at its disposal, for a certain time, the ability to weed out existing officers who are not up to the standard required for the well-being of the force.

This Bill should contain a sunset clause so that, after this cleansing process has been gone through, the rights of police officers can then be compared with the rights of other public servants. I am making a comparison with the rights contained in the Public Sector Management Commission Bill that is also currently before the House. I believe that the appeal system mentioned in the Public Sector Management Commission Bill is a little bit over the fence and must be amended. There is also a deficiency in this legislation and police officers should not be expected to forgo the civil rights enjoyed by a normal citizen. I hope that the Minister will consider the matter and comment on it in his reply.

The word "merit" was also raised in relation to appeals against promotion and appointment. The word also crops up in the Public Sector Management Commission Bill. The police force would like a greater definition of the word "merit", because it is open to a very broad interpretation. The honourable member for Auburn referred to enlarged bureaucracies and how easy it is to identify people's qualifications through the academic studies that they undertook prior to applying for the job. It is probably more important to make an evaluation of their value to the service when they are doing the job. That is one of the deficiencies of a large bureaucracy such as the police force. This matter is of particular concern to me, having worked as the Minister for Education with 25 000 employees. It is still relevant in the police force. Police officers must be told a bit more about what "merit" is. I agree with my colleague when he said that the record of the Goss Government since it came to power three months ago is not good when it comes to the criteria it uses to make appointments. The same concern was expressed to me by the police officers whom I met on Friday and Monday.

In his second-reading speech the Minister referred to the flattening of ranks. I wish to make a valid point here. A non-commissioned officer can rise only three ranks in the first 14 years of service. There are small incremental increases in salary, but that police officer can rise only three ranks. If the Minister intends to flatten ranks, I appeal to him to include some more ranks, because the bulk of the police force comprises constables and senior constables. They have expressed the opinion to me that when they are part of the staff of a station and go out on a job, the most senior officer is the responsible officer. When the hard-heads with eight or nine years' experience go out with a couple of newly graduated recruits, they must give the lead and take the responsibility. They believe that something should be built into their salary scales to give them recognition for the responsibilities that they accept and the way in which they captain the ship. Very often the senior sergeant and commissioned officers hold administrative positions back in the office and these constables and senior constables are the ones who are actually up front doing the police work. Greater recognition should be given to those officers who have the capacity to do that work.

Police officers could not find reference anywhere in this Bill of it being an offence to assault an officer. They said that under section 59 of the Police Act, it is an offence to assault a police officer. Such a definition has not been found in this Bill.

Much mention has been made of community policing. This is a new style for the cities, but it is the style that country officers have adopted for many years. Any officer serving in a country station who did not apply that sort of policing found that he or she was not very effective. I commend the new Minister for the initiatives contained in this Bill that are designed to introduce this sort of policing into the metropolitan areas and I back up the comments made by the honourable member for Peak Downs about the initiatives of the Neighbourhood Watch and Rural Watch schemes. When he referred to the Rural Watch scheme there seemed to be some sniggers of derision from across the other side of the Chamber, but theft is a big problem in country areas. Today's society is more mobile and huge losses can occur. Now it is possible to drive a utility up to a farm shed, put anything up to \$5,000 or \$6,000-worth of items into the back of it and drive away in a matter of two or three minutes. Losses can occur with farm chemicals, welding equipment, tools, etc., many of which are very hard to trace. Chemicals costing up to \$400 can be kept in a bottle the size of an Omo bottle, and one can imagine what a carton of those bottles are worth and how easy it is to take them away. I commend those initiatives.

Mention was also made of management training. The honourable member for Auburn stated that some of this training was not relevant. It was put to me that the sorts of training that our officers should undergo should be staged. When an officer is moving from senior constable to sergeant, he should perhaps be released for three or four weeks' block training for the next level of responsibility. Similarly, when an officer moves from sergeant to senior sergeant, he should once again be specifically trained in the management skills necessary for the next level of administration. The comments made to me seem to indicate that at present a senior constable can undergo six years of part-time training, during which time he will learn the total administration skills for all levels. That is rather irrelevant.

The opinion was also expressed to me—and I agree with it—that, having done a full day's work as a policeman, it is difficult to get in the right frame of mind to concentrate on study. Many police officers opt out because they have had enough by the time they finish a day's work. Police officers expressed an interest in being released for block in-service training and in undergoing the training in stages. They would find it more appropriate.

I have been asked to get more clarification concerning optional retirements. The Minister may be able to give a simple explanation, but the Bill states that officers will retire at 60 years of age. The National Party Government made provision for police officers and officers in other sectors of the public service to retire at 55 years of age. I would like the Minister to confirm that. When it was in power the National Party Government amended the Act so that senior officers who were in an administrative role and not a serving role were able to continue their service past 60 years of age, because of the expertise they possessed and because the sorts of demands that were placed upon them were managerial rather than operational.

Once again, police officers have found that the use of civilian personnel, which was started by the National Party Government, is now being continued by the new Minister. That is to be applauded. In fact, police officers applaud many provisions contained in this legislation, but they are concerned about the various matters that I have mentioned so far.

It is regrettable that legislation as important as this Bill will be debated and passed by Parliament so quickly. Members of the police force have expressed the opinion that they would have preferred the legislation to lay on the table of the House for a longer period. They would have liked senior officers go out into police districts and take more to heart the opinions of serving police officers in country areas. They expressed the opinion that, at various times when officers were told, "There is no rank at this

meeting. We want you to be very open and frank.", it was disgusting that senior officers responded to open and frank disclosure by saying, "Boy, you've said something that you should not have said. You are blackballed from now on." If that is correct, that is a matter for regret because those officers were speaking out from the heart. For a number of years they have bottled up their feelings. They take a great deal of pride in performing their role. Being very close to police action, they identify with what is right and what is wrong.

I know from personal experience that a consultative process can be pretty long and painful. For two years, I went through a similar process with education legislation that was forced upon this State by the Federal Minister, Mr Dawkins. Nevertheless, the consultative process has to be undertaken. The Minister will have to rely on senior police officers to conduct these meetings and carry part of the load. I make a plea to the Minister to ensure that police officers who are invited to speak freely and who have commented in an open and frank manner are not blackballed by senior officers.

In conclusion, I endorse many of the comments made by previous speakers in regard to the police force. Since before the forties, a certain amount of corruption has been endemic in the police force. It seems that most officers start off being highly idealistic. However, some become caught up in a network of corruption. They are lured firstly by a sprat—the small taint—gradually become caught up in the web, and become increasingly entangled. In that way, corruption grew and grew. Eventually it became necessary to set up the Fitzgerald inquiry.

An analogy can be drawn between National Party members on the Opposition side of the House and the majority of members of the police force. It just so happens that some people who have been placed in positions of responsibility—either in Government, personal dealings or in the police force—did not do what they should have done. As a result, they brought great discredit to many people who do not deserve a bad reputation.

The previous National Party Government that was voted out of office deserves some credit for having had the courage to bring out into the open what had been occurring in Queensland's police force. The present Minister for Police is carrying on a process that was begun by previous Ministers of Police in the National Party Government. I hope that the present Minister will set procedures in train to ensure that Queensland's Police Service will be worthy and properly equipped to go into the future.

I am mindful of the re-enactment of the Winchester assassination, which was telecast last week. It looked pretty closely at another police force in Australia. It seems to me that, if the Governments of two States in Australia had had enough courage to go ahead with an inquiry of the type undertaken by the Queensland National Party Government, they might also have found that they had to undergo a very painful process which, in the long term, may have been best for the well-being of society as a whole.

I support comments that indicate the need for this legislation. However, the Bill requires amendment. I thank honourable members for their attention.

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (10.56 p.m.): The attitude of the Liberal Party has been outlined by the member for Merthyr. Tonight, many members have made many relevant comments during debate on this historic piece of legislation. As other members have said, this legislation is part of the package of reforms created and recommended by the Fitzgerald inquiry. The first matter that should be remembered is that the Fitzgerald inquiry was an extraordinary and exceptional event in the life of any State or jurisdiction. It arose out of exceptional circumstances and, therefore, exceptional remedies can be expected. We find them in the form of the EARC and the CJC. Considering the time devoted to police malpractice, police maladministration and police negligence, it is not at all unexpected that the members of this Parliament find themselves debating a police Bill.

I have heard some impassioned pleas made in support of the old order. If the old order had worked, Queensland would not have had a Fitzgerald inquiry. It is as simple

as that. The old order did not work and, therefore, it is worth while trying something new.

It is clear that the new Commissioner of the Police Service has been given exceptional powers. In view of some of the history of former commissioners and because Commissioners of Police do not have an unblemished reputation in this State, I can well understand people raising some disquiet about the powers given to the commissioner. However, Queensland now has a Commissioner of the Police Service who is accepted by all political parties as a man of integrity, a man whose character is without blemish and a man who is not locked into any power structures that developed in the police force and that have been documented in the Fitzgerald inquiry's report. He is neither a member of the green mafia nor of the Masons. He does not have any compromising links, or links that can be suggested by other people to be compromising of him within the establishment of the Queensland police system.

In the past, I have mentioned in this House that when I first came to Queensland from the Northern Territory, I could never work out which side of the police force contained the goodies. One side of the police force accused the other side of being the baddies. The problem has been massive; it is not unusual when problems of those dimensions occur that exceptional powers and proposals are put forward. These exceptional powers are proposed to be vested in a commissioner who, on this occasion, has been accepted by all political parties as a cleanskin and as a person of integrity.

The Fitzgerald report states that the inquiry did not locate all the bad or affected apples in the barrel. It is hoped that the report has identified the worst. Mr Newnham has said that some bad apples remain in the barrel, and I have no doubt that that is so. It is difficult to nail some people. From personal experience in the law, I could name a couple of people who are still in the barrel. People who were named by the Lucas inquiry and who were found guilty of perjury, perversion of the course of justice and conspiracy to pervert the course of justice are still in the police force. They were promoted and have been untouched by the Fitzgerald inquiry.

Mr Randell: That is not only in the police force. That happens in every facet of society.

Mr INNES: I hear the impassioned pleas that are made in an attempt to minimise the effects of the Fitzgerald inquiry and spread the blame. However, this legislation deals with the Queensland police force and with the affairs of this State. The members of this Parliament have to address a specific problem. Resolution of the problem involves winking out to the fullest extent possible the remaining bad apples in the police barrel. There are far fewer bad apples than when the Fitzgerald inquiry started. As the member for Mirani rightly suggested, it is not unique to the Queensland police force, but there are still some there and, if possible, we must address that.

It is a continuing process from the National Party Government through to the Labor Government that people such as Fitzgerald, the people who were working on the implementation committee, and the new commissioner, Sir Max Bingham, are entitled to make recommendations to the Government and to propose novel powers. There may be a time when people will have to back the information they might have been given confidentially, information that might be something less than the amount of evidence necessary for a conviction or prosecution in the courts. Time is needed to make key transfers, key promotions, key reallocations of responsibilities or key movements of people out from sensitive positions until they have proven themselves worthy of continuing trust and can be moved back into more sensitive positions. It is reasonable to offer to the new administration a flexibility that is not reviewable by minute legal proceedings and appeal processes and that allows full flexibility of man and woman management and delegation to achieve the new order. That is what the process is all about.

Although I say that the provisions of the Bill are justifiable and supportable at this stage, I join with the concerns of the police union that those powers have at times in

the past been found to have been misused. The safeguard on this occasion is that now we have a Criminal Justice Commission and a parliamentary committee that have specific obligations. There are half a dozen specific recommendations outlining that the Criminal Justice Commission must oversee police reforms, the efficiency of police administration and details of the police force. An inbuilt check and balance exists.

We believe that the legislation should be reviewed at least within two years, and in this Parliament. We believe and expect that the Criminal Justice Committee, on recommendation by and with consultation with the Criminal Justice Commission, will report to the Parliament within that period on a number of occasions and, if necessary, long before two years with regard to any hint that those powers have been misused.

In the first instance, we can, and do, support the allocation of powers which we would not have supported had everything been proceeding on an even keel and had we not had the trauma of the Fitzgerald inquiry. In saying that, on examination of some provisions of the Bill, I add that some matters cause us a bit of concern. With the time limits we had, I am sure that the Minister will appreciate that it was not possible to make the in-depth examination which could have led to offering legislative solutions at an earlier point in time. However, dealing with the part that refers to internal command discipline, let me share some of the experience that I gained from my service in the air force reserve.

I am still an active reserve of the Royal Australian Air Force. I was far more active a period of years ago and occupied the position of judge advocate. I was in the air force reserve throughout the period of the implementation of the new uniform military code for the Australian services. Years of debate occurred over whether the new military tri-service code should be introduced and what it should contain.

One of the misgivings that was overridden by the Government in imposing a new military code was that whenever one deals with a disciplined organisation, one has two conflicting positions. One has that behaviour which can rightly find its parallel within the criminal law and which should be dealt with by criminal law standards where the penalty is sufficiently serious to warrant a finding according to the criminal balance of proof and in which legal representation is desirable or necessary. Then there is a lower order of behaviour which deals essentially with man management. If somebody is scruffy or negligent on duty, or drunk and incapable of performing duty, that has to do with the quality of man management. That is the sort of thing that occurs in a factory or workplace where a person could sack, reprimand or submit a person to some form of informal penalty that does not carry a permanent consequence. There is that constant conflict. I am afraid that the conflict was resolved in favour of criminal-type proceedings. That was not necessarily a good thing.

As one of the officers commanding an airfield construction squadron said in submissions, "Look, when I've got the fellows out there in the far north west or north of Australia building an airfield, the most severe penalty I can impose on a person, and the one that does the most good, is to deprive him of his ration of beer for a fortnight. That ration is the thing that he looks forward to. That is the most savage punishment. It is the one that has the most practical effect, and often the problems arise out of booze in the first place." That punishment is simple; it does not appear in the books; it is effective and it does not carry any permanent blot on the aircraftman. Because he was caught doing something that he should not be doing in the first place, he feels that it is a fair thing.

However, once we move the whole criminal justice system in, everything has to be recorded, right of legal representation must be accorded, the reserve legal officers get in on the act and the whole thing gets out of control. It is all done as if it is a court martial. Let me suggest that some of the same confusion is found within this legislation. Under the section dealing with internal command and discipline, what is clearly intended to be a man-management type of provision—where I think no legal representation is acceptable and reasonable, where a failure to carry out orders is something which is an internal offence which should be visited by some sort of sanction, and where an occurrence

amounts to misconduct as opposed to breaking the law—can be dealt with. What we did recognise—even with a defective military code—is that there are certain things that the commanding officer can deal with. He can only go up to a certain level of punishment. He can give so many days CB, loss of a day's pay or some minor penalty, but when one gets on to the big penalties, one has to go to court martial, where one is entitled to legal representation and the trappings of the full-blown criminal law, with findings based on the criminal onus of proof.

This legislation provides for disciplinary action in relation to something which a prescribed officer may consider to be misconduct—not "find" but "consider", which it seems to me is something less than the normal criminal wording that would be used for a finding of an offence. Following that finding, he can impose dismissal or demotion in rank, which can carry thousands of dollars worth of consequential penalty. If one loses rank, one continues to lose money at a certain rate, per week, per year. The prescribed officer can impose a reprimand; that is, a more minor penalty. He can impose a reduction in the officer's level of salary, which can amount to thousands of dollars. He can impose the forfeiture or deferment of a salary increment or increase. Again, that could involve thousands of dollars. He can impose a deduction from an officer's salary of a sum equivalent to a fine of two penalty units. That again deals with a minor non-continuing level of offence.

I think that something has gone wrong there. I think that that lower-order reprimand or the imposition of a fine of a couple of penalty units is all right for proceedings of a summary nature. However, when one is talking about dismissal, demotion in rank or a reduction in an officer's level of salary, one is talking about massive financial consequences both to pay and superannuation which, in the services, one would not be allowed to impose except with a more formal type of proceedings and finding.

Having examined this in some detail, I think that we have gone off the rails there and that we should find some balance between the severity of punishment for those things which are related to man management and those things which carry very severe consequences. For instance, even in a court martial, the military require a document to be produced by the paymaster showing the financial consequences of the penalty. That is a recognition that a court martial tribunal cannot impose, if you like, what it thinks is just a reduction in rank without thinking through the effect of that reduction in rank over a year's salary or even consequentially through an entire career.

I offer the Minister and the powers that be a little bit of experience from a different area, but one with very similar problems. I do think that there is a problem in relation to the severity of punishment which can follow what appears to be a quite informal and summary proceeding. We do not yet know what the misconduct is because it is not prescribed by regulation, and we have the following use of unusual wording in clause 7.4 (2)—

"An officer is liable to disciplinary action in respect of the officer's conduct, which the prescribed officer considers to be misconduct . . .".

"Considers" is a more gentle word than "find" or "adjudge". Frankly, if one is going to dismiss somebody or demote him in rank, one should not just be considering it, one should be making a positive finding of some serious misconduct.

I cannot rewrite the whole Bill by way of proposing multiple amendments. Because the consequences are so severe, I will propose a small amendment to that provision by saying that those more serious findings should not be made except after the right of legal representation. However, I really think that at some time the legislation probably needs a recasting to take into account these twin concepts—man management and minor misconduct—which will not amount necessarily to criminal offences and misconduct so serious that it warrants these very severe remedies, which have enormous financial consequences.

The police union has raised some grievances, and I think that some of them might be found to have more substance than at first thought. When one gets this acrimonious

business that honourable members have seen in the paper, this toing-and-froing, perhaps one gets an environment in which one does not give full consideration to people whose language gets a little bit vitriolic and over the fence.

While I am talking about the police union, let me say this: all of us in this House bear some responsibility for what went on over the years; as do the police administration and the police union. If we are all to be involved in the reform era, I think that the police union has to undergo some reforms. Certainly its president, John O'Gorman, has been impressive in the attitude that he has adopted through very difficult times over the course of the Fitzgerald inquiry. However, the police union is perhaps the only public service union that, with great regularity, has moved motions of no confidence in its Ministers. We know that Fitzgerald himself found that the police union had been used by the forces of corruption. This practice of going straight to the public and straight to the media and moving motions of no confidence does not lead to sensible and responsive administration.

A new trust and a new sense of responsibility has to be forged among the police union, the Government, the Criminal Justice Commission and its parliamentary committee. If we are to break down the police culture, it requires all parts to come together. Perhaps the fact that we have a Criminal Justice Commission and a Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee that has a responsibility on an all-party basis to come to grips with the working conditions of policemen, their deployment and their efficiencies, and has some personal contact with the operations, will lead to a successful reculturing of the police force and a reculturing of the Parliament which can lead to genuine reform. However, the police union has to get rid of its motion-of-no-confidence mentality. It has to understand its responsibility in the order of things—as we have—to recast the culture of the police force and to make it something in which the men can be proud to serve and which the public can be proud to have and to call on in times of need.

Mr FITZGERALD (Lockyer) (11.15 p.m.): While it is with pleasure that I join in this debate, I do not welcome the fact that the Bill is being debated this evening. I would have liked to debate it after another couple of days of this sitting, as has been mentioned by other speakers from this side of the Chamber.

The Government is paying lip-service to the issue of discussing legislation in full. The Minister stated that, because this matter has been discussed for some time, because the Fitzgerald report was released some time ago and because of the need for reform, the Bill was introduced last Tuesday and it is being debated tonight. That is not consultation.

The unions, police officers and the general public wanted at least some time to peruse the legislation. They did not actually want to discuss the need for reform but merely to examine what is contained in the legislation and be able to comment on it. The Government has paid only lip-service to that. It has not done that, and from this day forth it can be judged as a Government that wishes to ram through its legislation as soon as possible.

I understand that the Minister for Police might be very uncomfortable that somebody might be able to make a constructive criticism. As well, I can understand his annoyance that some organisations make destructive criticism. There is a lot of that going around. Those forces that wish to maintain the status quo in the police force and do not accept that this Parliament will impose a new Act upon them must be filtered out. As I said, the legislation is before the House has my support, but not the method in which it has been introduced.

The need for additional police has been well documented. That was recognised by the previous Government, and the present Government has committed itself to an expansion of the police force at a rather rapid rate. There is no doubt in my mind that, no matter which party came to power, the Fitzgerald report and its recommendations would cause a complete overhaul of the police force, the introduction of a new Act and a completely new concept of what the public can expect from a police force. Quite

frankly, members of the public must have confidence in the police force. If they do not have confidence in the police force, there is no police force. Young children are taught to always trust a policeman. At present in the community a public relations exercise is being undertaken with the police force. I welcome the fact that that very necessary exercise will continue.

The commission of inquiry that was conducted by Tony Fitzgerald, QC, highlighted some very sad events. It is regrettable that public confidence in the police force has been shaken. However, because of the revelations of that inquiry, it is no wonder that that has occurred. After reading the Fitzgerald report and newspaper reports and watching television news broadcasts about charges that have been laid against former police officers as a result of the Fitzgerald inquiry, it is no wonder that public confidence in the police force has been absolutely shattered. It is necessary for the community to rebuild the confidence of the police force, to help it boost its morale and to make policemen realise that, without an adequately and properly trained police force and without the proper people in the police force, our society will not have a very happy future. The police force must be looked up to by members of the general community.

I have always had an interest in the community's acceptance of local police. It is very important that police officers are very skilled and understand the law, and that those who are in responsible positions are well trained and have a very firm and polite way of handling difficulties during their day-to-day work.

Often when talking to members of the legal profession it is regrettable that, with smirks on their faces they say, "It is only a police officer. He will be easy enough to beat in court anyway." Many members of the legal profession are very critical, particularly of police prosecutors in the courts. Much of that is brought about because of the problems faced by those prosecutors. They have a tremendous workload and often have insufficient time to properly research a matter. As well, they may not be as highly skilled and trained as some defence counsel against whom they appear in court. It is no wonder that that criticism is levelled at them from time to time. I accept that on occasions it may be valid. In the interests of justice, police prosecutors should be adequately equipped and should be able to press home prosecutions with the full weight of the law behind them. They should have sufficient experience to ensure that the guilt or innocence of a person is adequately tested in a court of law. All honourable members want that and, on occasions, they all regret that a police prosecutor who is overworked does not have the necessary time to devote to a particular problem at hand.

I refer now to some of the items in the Fitzgerald report. Some members of this House have mentioned the numbers of police and how the police force is understaffed in terms of what Mr Fitzgerald recommended. I draw the attention of all honourable members to the fact that Mr Fitzgerald did not formulate those as hard recommendations. The figures that are included on pages 225 and 226 of what is known as the Fitzgerald report are not recommendations. Page 225 states—

"One basis recognized widely by other policing studies for determining police to population ratios is the Eric St Johnston ratio. Applying the ratio to the establishment of the Queensland Police Force reveals that police districts and regions display a wide range of variance from the staff numbers determined by means of this ratio."

It then refers to figure 8.8 of the report and provides the projected police numbers that are required based on the Eric St Johnston ratios. For a population over 20 000, the ratio is given as 1 to 350; from 5 000 to 20 000 it is 1 to 530; and under 5 000 is one police officer per thousand. Whether or not that is the correct ratio is debatable, but it is a formula that has been used in other parts of the world to assess what police numbers should be in certain areas.

Earlier in the debate one member spoke about the police numbers at, I think it was, Charleville. It may be asked whether the sheep are counted out there. It might be important how many sheep and cattle are in the area, because they are the

responsibility of the Stock Squad and its members may have to travel extra distances. Because of the extra distances involved, more police may be needed at some of the stations in that area. If a person happens to live in a very sparsely populated area, or if it takes an officer a long time to visit a community, it may be necessary to have extra police officers serve a set population.

It is different when the populations are in smaller, compact areas. Where the population is small, it may be possible to serve it with one police officer. In larger areas, a number of police officers may be needed to provide the same service. I will not refer to other matters such as the tyranny of distance, but it is a fact that sometimes sparsely settled areas do need a higher level of police manning to provide the same service as is provided elsewhere.

Some people in the Toowoomba district in particular have commented upon what they say is an inaccurate recommendation from Fitzgerald. According to the Fitzgerald report, Toowoomba presently has 116 police for a district population of 117 563. The report states that, according to the Eric St Johnston ratio, the adjusted police number should be 336. That means that Toowoomba would have an extra 220 police officers. Anybody who lives in Toowoomba realises that, from time to time, problems can arise. However, if that city's 116 police officers were increased by 220 to 336, the level of policing would be such that even the most conscientious, law-abiding citizen would be terrified to jaywalk across the street, as some officer would certainly have to justify his existence.

I saw this sort of thing when, under Commissioner Whitrod, regionalisation took place throughout Queensland and the township of Gatton became what I think was called a police district headquarters, which covered the area from Harrisville, right around Ipswich and back up to the bottom of the range. At that time I think 39 police officers were based in Gatton. People in the district were certainly on their toes because 39 police officers were going to work from, and coming home to, the small township of Gatton, which had a population of approximately 5 000. That caused some problems. I can assure honourable members that that is one of the problems that arise when so many police officers are stationed in the one small town at the one time.

A matter that has arisen from time to time with regard to the training of police officers is that not only are highly skilled officers needed but also a mixture of men and women with varying skills. That is why I am so pleased that the Minister has recognised this factor in the Bill by the provision for lateral entry into the police force. I agree wholeheartedly with that concept. I believe that a number of administrative organisations need to make a similar provision. In his second-reading speech, the Minister said that "the new legislation also allows for lateral entry of other police . . . on the basis of merit, integrity and special skills" into the Queensland police force. The Minister is to be commended for that. As Australia now has a very mobile population, it is important that people with the necessary skills can move into the police force. I think that nothing but good can come of it.

I am totally opposed to the closed-shop concept that some people favour. I do not believe it is in the best interests of policing. Page 232 of the Fitzgerald report refers to community policing programs. I recognise that that is so very, very necessary. Those of us who have lived in a community for some time, particularly in small towns where everybody knows the local police officer and the police officer knows all the young lads around town and knows those who are likely to get into a bit of mischief, know what community policing is all about. Those officers gave a cautionary word to a young offending lad and maybe a rather swift planting of a toe of a shoe into the rear part of his anatomy, which probably did him a lot more good than going through a legal process. Provided that it is handed out without any malice, young people know exactly where they stand.

I know that in this day and age that is not possible. Times have changed. In my day, if a person misbehaved at school, he was given the cane. He was used to a little bit of physical pressure being applied to him from time to time and he accepted it as part of his day-to-day living. However, in this day and age, it is important that police

officers get to know the trouble spots in their area and the people who are likely to get into trouble.

The people to whom I am about to refer were not involved in any incident, but recently the *Gatton Star*, which is the Lockyer valley's community paper, printed an article in which the local community commended a young police officer. He had moved around the local caravan park, which houses 60 students from the Queensland Agricultural College, which is now a part of the University of Queensland, and became acquainted with the young girls and boys just so that he knew them. We know that, from time to time, such a group of young people can misbehave. They might decide to have a bit of a party and in the process cause a bit of a nuisance. They are a potential threat to the peace and quiet of any caravan park. It is great that, when somebody makes a complaint about the behaviour of young people, that officer has already met them so that when he goes to investigate the complaint it is not the first time that he meets them. That is the type of policing that is needed. I know that many examples can be given of other cases in which this is so necessary and in which police have gone out of their way. That is to be commended.

Previous speakers have mentioned that the Police Complaints Tribunal no longer exists; it is now the responsibility of the CJC. I welcome that. The Police Complaints Tribunal has always been a thorn in any Government's side, because from time to time complaints are made about the behaviour of police officers. Anybody making a complaint needs to be satisfied that the matter has been fully investigated and dealt with. Although an offence has been committed, from time to time police officers cannot get proof of that.

Earlier, the Leader of the Opposition referred to the Toowoomba police footballers incident. At the time, I went to Toowoomba and made an inspection with the Minister for Police. We went from the Lakes Hotel to the Shamrock Hotel. After listening to the stories by the hoteliers, I realised straight away that it was going to be extremely difficult to satisfy the degree of proof necessary to support the charges in a court of law and that it would be difficult to obtain a conviction. I have no doubt that a series of serious incidents occurred in Toowoomba on that weekend. I was also convinced that it was going to be very difficult to get reliable witnesses to testify that they identified certain people at 2 o'clock in the morning in a crowded bar where a lot of alcohol had been consumed and that those people were guilty beyond all reasonable doubt.

Another issue of concern to me is the reason that motivates young men and women to join the police force. The police force is very concerned that it attracts the right type of people to its ranks. That is why I am keen to see that more emphasis is put on employing the right type of people in the police force.

The worst experience that I have had is seeing a young police officer just out of the academy wearing his six gun on his hip, walking around with a strut becoming of somebody who had come out of Europe in the 1940s, just trying to attract attention to the fact that he was a law enforcement officer and that what he said does go. I have seen that type of character around. It makes me go absolutely cold in the stomach. That is not the type of person this State needs as a police officer.

Mr Mackenroth: I agree with you. As a matter of fact, I said that last year and the then Police Minister or Premier went out west and told people out there that I was saying that police officers should not wear guns.

Mr FITZGERALD: I will give the Minister plenty of time to sum up.

Mr Mackenroth interjected.

Mr FITZGERALD: The Minister should wait until I have finished. He can sum up if he likes.

This happened quite some time ago. If police officers need to wear guns, I do not mind. I am referring to that young probationary guy who is just out of the academy and who walks around with a six gun among a crowd of people when there is no need.

whatsoever to wear that gun. I am certainly not saying that police officers should not wear weapons. I did not say that and I will not say that. The guy I was talking about was a young, inexperienced officer on his own with a six gun. He was walking around the place, strutting around as if he was doing a goosestep. I do not appreciate that. I believe that motivation is an issue that needs to be addressed.

As the morale, the training and the skills of the police force improve, the pay obviously has to increase. Some of the workload has been transferred to secretarial and office staff. It is a process that needs to be ongoing. Better accommodation is required for the police officers in this State.

The community really has to get behind the police force. The occupation of police officer needs to become a desirable one in the eyes of the general public. Until that is achieved, the police force will not be attracting the best recruits. The police force requires the best type of applicants that it can employ.

Members of the Opposition would like to see an improvement in the social standing of police officers. Over the last couple of years, some police officers and their spouses have been feeling very poorly. Let me say that some politicians have been feeling very poorly because of what has been revealed in the Fitzgerald report. Those facts are there for everyone to see. It is up to the honourable members in this House from this time forward to ensure that this State moves forward.

As police officers are coming up against more educated criminals, they need to be highly skilled. Crimes involving computers and high technology are upon us. Unless police officers have the skills to match those of the criminals, society will fall victim to those criminals and will suffer accordingly. Members of the Opposition believe that it is very important for members of the police force to have sophisticated methods of detection.

Not only is it important to educate the recruits being taken into the police force, but the right type of person must be attracted into it. An ongoing process of re-evaluation needs to be in place, particularly in the early stages, to assess whether a police officer is suitable to remain in the police force. It has been mentioned before that most of the corrupt police probably entered the force with high ideals. Eventually those corrupt officers went on the take very slowly and were dealt into the deals that were taking place. From that time, those officers became bent, as they say in the police force.

One can train, educate and equip recruits with as many skills as one likes, but unless they have the right attitude to their responsibilities and are people of integrity who are highly motivated, basically honest and have ingrained in their character and make-up a desire to be absolutely honest at all times and to enforce the laws of this land in an honest way, this Government will have achieved nothing. It does not matter whether this Government recruits those officers on skill, whether they can pass their exams, whether they can learn everything they are taught in the academy and whether they can pick up the methods of prosecuting and catching criminals, unless they themselves are basically honest, the people of Queensland will have lost all. It would be regrettable if that were to happen.

I support totally the concept of the Bill. Members of the Opposition are not happy with some of its provisions. The Leader of the Opposition has raised those objections before and they will be repeated later in the debate this evening.

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth—Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (11.36 p.m.): I move—

"That the debate be now adjourned."

Mr LINGARD: I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. When there is a motion for the adjournment of the debate, the honourable member cannot debate it.

Debate interrupted.

PRIVILEGE**Adjournment of Debate**

Mr LINGARD (Fassifern) (11.37 p.m.): I rise on a matter of privilege. I ask Mr Speaker and also the Leader of the House to think very seriously. Standing Order 133 does not allow the Leader of the House to move such a motion because he is the man who has presented the Bill. Mr Speaker should not technically allow him to do that.

The Minister can begin his reply and, during it, move the adjournment of the debate. However, if the Minister for Police wishes to allow the Attorney-General to move the adjournment of the debate, I will accept it. The reason I do not accept the motion that has been moved is that if the Minister for Police does it that way, he goes straight into his reply and that stops further speakers from this side of the House. If the Attorney-General is prepared to move the adjournment of the debate, I will accept it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I accept the point of privilege.

POLICE SERVICE ADMINISTRATION BILL
Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Debate, on motion of Mr Wells, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth—Leader of the House) (11.39 p.m.): I move—
"That the House do now adjourn."

Timber-logging

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (11.40 p.m.): This evening I wish to highlight a large and very important problem that is developing in coastal areas concerning the forestry industry, particularly the cutting of hardwood timber and reforestation. At present there is controversy about where the Government is going with the Great Sandy Region inquiry and what will come out of it. I note some of the comments made by Mr Casey, who has ministerial responsibility for forestry matters. Considering some of the different comments on logging in some of these areas, I wonder who should be believed.

Mr Casey said that the annual volume of hardwood mill logs which sawmillers were permitted to remove from Fraser Island was strictly controlled. An allocation system applies to all log timber removed from Crown lands. Under this allocation system, the two sawmillers operating on Fraser Island are entitled to remove 23 500 cubic metres per year. The allocation period runs from 1 October to 30 September, with the volume removed in this particular period being registered each fortnight. A Queensland Forest Service officer marks the trees to be logged and the sawmillers are not permitted to remove any unmarked trees. Logging is only undertaken in accordance with a logging plan, which is completed prior to the sawmillers commencing operations in a particular area.

They are Mr Casey's comments and they highlight the difference between the logging on Fraser Island and the logging next door in the Cooloola area. The doughnut area at Cooloola has been logged as long as Fraser Island has been logged, and it has been logged in a very responsible way. I suggest to the Minister and the Government that there is no difference between the logging in those two areas and there is no difference between the reasons why the logging should continue. Apparently a decision has been made that logging in the doughnut area at Cooloola is to be phased out in the next 15

months. At least, that was the comment made by the Minister for Environment before the Minister for Forestry took full control of his portfolio.

The Government should bear in mind the problems that this move will create. It should bear in mind that long-time timber workers have expressed dismay over the Government's plan to shut out logging from about 10 000 hectares of land adjoining the Cooloola national park near Rainbow Beach. Cessation of logging would make a big difference to the enormous number of people employed there, to the quantity of timber available there and the quantity of hardwood there that is not available in any other area of Queensland. It should also bear in mind that Queensland is importing vast quantities of timber because of the great need in this country for such products.

I wonder whether sufficient time and thought have been given to what the environmentalists have suggested and are achieving. They have lobbied for the forests to be locked up by saying that the result would be a stagnant forest. Popular opinion suggests that a forest becomes healthy if it is locked up and no further logging is allowed. The reverse is in fact the case. The forest grows to a certain level and then cannot expand, and eventually stagnates. At that time, and without the opportunity to selectively log matured timber, oxygen production ceases. Older trees tend to produce as much carbon dioxide as they absorb when they start to decay, which means they are static in greenhouse terms.

One of our millers has made the comment that the areas on the Cooloola coast, which have been logged for more than 100 years, are now in a healthier state than ever before. This belief is held by those who have been working in the industry. Selective rotation logging every 30 years or so takes out mature trees and allows younger trees room to grow. The forest is a renewable resource, unlike minerals that are mined. The Queensland Forest Service monitors every stage of harvesting and ensures that regenerated timber is there for the next rotation.

Time expired.

Roadside and Travelling Vending Licences

Dr FLYNN (Toowoomba North) (11.44 p.m.): I would like to talk briefly about a rather sticky problem involving ice cream and local government and an undesirable interaction between the two. Last Thursday, I asked the Deputy Premier, Minister for Housing and Local Government, the Honourable Tom Burns, what progress was being made in fairly regulating the itinerant vending industry.

He referred me to a Green Paper, which was prepared by the former Government and released in February 1989. I have now read this document. It provides a very useful starting point for discussions on a lot of complex issues that arise concerning both roadside and itinerant vending. The Minister also advised me that, at this stage, no concrete proposals for legislation have been developed. I am very pleased that this is the case, because there is still a need for a lot more thought on this proposed legislation.

Tonight I wish to raise this matter again to highlight the unfair treatment meted out to one of my constituents under the present inadequate method of regulation. Mr Reisinger, managing director of Pixie Ice Cream Pty Ltd in Toowoomba, has manufactured ice-cream in my electorate for a number of years. His processing plant is a welcome addition to my electorate and altogether he has an investment worth approximately \$700,000. He makes his product from scratch and sells it through a number of vendors in the Ipswich, Brisbane and Caboolture areas, as well as Toowoomba. Being an enterprising businessman with an eye for expansion, on a number of occasions he has tried unsuccessfully to obtain a vending licence in the Gold Coast region, which, along with Brisbane, is acknowledged as the world's largest consumer of ice-cream, registering 26 litres per head per annum. Mr Reisinger's firm was refused a licence because his application did not conform with local authority guidelines in that he does not operate from a retail outlet in the shire or was not a manufacturer within the shire.

In my maiden speech I alluded to the fact that at times Queenslanders have taken a narrow, parochial view of this State. Now, when it comes to local authorities, this view is even worse. It seems to me to be an excessively parochial view that Mr Reisinger's firm cannot sell ice-cream on the Gold Coast because he does not make it there. He is not a parasite. He has a manufacturing plant in Queensland and produces a value-added product. He employs people and has made an investment, yet he has been denied this lucrative market because of narrow sectional interests. This parochial view ignores the millions of dollars poured into the Gold Coast economy annually by Toowoomba residents going there on holidays.

Up to this point, Pixie Ice Cream has reason to be aggrieved, but not outraged. However, subsequent developments have inflamed the situation even further. I refer to an article appearing in the *Gold Coast Business Magazine* in February/March this year, which, under the heading "New Business opportunities!", states—

"A strikingly successful franchise business concept developed in Europe over 20 years ago and which has expanded rapidly into the USA, has now been introduced on the Gold Coast by a Danish business group now living in Australia."

The Gold Coast has rejected Mr Reisinger's application, but has granted 10 licences for the vending of this new ice-cream. This firm called Scandee's has a small boutique outlet on the Gold Coast, but basically most of its ice-cream is imported from New South Wales. The Gold Coast City Council has quickly approved 10 licences, which are now being sold as franchises. Obviously the franchise would not exist without the vending licence, which I gather are currently up for sale at a cost of \$100,000 each—a quick \$1m for someone down there.

On the facts available to me, it seems that Pixie Ice Cream has been given a raw deal by the Gold Coast City Council. In fact, it has been given the big raspberry. I support the principal recommendation of the Green Paper which suggests that full control of vending licences be given to local authorities, rather than overburdening police with unnecessary regulations, as is currently the case. However, any such Act should include a clear set of guidelines on the issue of vending licences to prevent the disparate treatment I have described.

Time expired.

EARC Review of Local Authority Electoral System

Mr HOBBS (Warrego) (11.49 p.m.): There is a need to draw the attention of the House to the obvious haste with which this Labor Government is attempting to thrust electoral reform on Queensland's local authorities.

The crux of this issue is, firstly, to determine whether this fast-tracking is warranted—particularly in view of Labor's previously stated concerns about the urgent need for a review of the State's electoral system—and, secondly, whether it represents a brazen attempt to install a system that is likely to be more favourable for the Labor Party in time for next year's local authority elections.

When Labor was in Opposition, its urgent priority was electoral reform of the State boundaries, which it believed were gerrymandered in order to keep it out of office. It had never occurred to the Labor Party that in order to win office it needed to obtain more than 50 per cent of the popular vote. When this finally occurred on 2 December, it won Government. I also refer to the South Australian election, where 48 per cent of the vote put the Labor Party into power. In the recent Federal election, it appears that the Labor Government may retain office with 41.9 per cent of the vote.

Prior to that, the Labor Party's concern was State electoral reform along the lines recommended in the Fitzgerald report. On a *Newsday* program on 14 July 1989, Mr Goss said that a three-month period would be "enough time" to carry out the State electoral review and have it in place for last year's election. I wonder if he still holds the same view, or whether he will impose a similar time-frame on the EARC. I doubt it. At that time there was very little mention or concern about the need to review

local authority boundaries. Indeed, when this issue did arise after the Labor Party gained Government, both the Premier, Mr Goss, and the Deputy Premier and Minister for Housing and Local Government, Mr Burns, indicated that examining local authority boundaries was not a priority of the EARC. Now Mr Burns is moving to authorise the EARC to review the local government electoral system. Not only is he doing that, but he has the audacity to demand that in the first instance the reports of such investigations be submitted to this House by 17 August this year. This is the Burns deadline for a review of the electoral system of Queensland's 134 local authorities. The second part of the review—which examines individual local authority areas and boundaries including the prospect of amalgamation—is due to be reported on by 1 July next year. I understand that even the Chairman of the EARC, Mr Sherman, is not impressed by those time limits being placed on reviews to be conducted by his commission. Imagine the Labor Party's attitude if the previous Government had attempted to place a time limit on the Fitzgerald inquiry!

The proper course is for the Government to allow the EARC to perform its role independently, as outlined in the Fitzgerald report. One must question the Government's motives in hastening this review of local government. Obviously, it would like to see a shake-up in local government in the hope that Labor-oriented councils may fare better in the future.

Mr McGrady: Hear, hear!

Mr HOBBS: I hear "Hear, hear!" called from the Government side of the Chamber. I believe that one of the more sinister motives attached to this action is to give the Government grounds for changing the method of electing Brisbane's Lord Mayor. Obviously, Labor realises that it cannot make much headway in Queensland's capital city against a Sallyanne Atkinson Liberal-led council. It has to find an excuse to change the method of selecting the Lord Mayor. The review, which will have to be completed by mid-August, could provide the basis for such a change.

Before concluding my remarks, I mention that the George Street grapevine is sighing about the State electoral review under Labor. Apparently the word is that, since winning Government, Mr Goss and his members have realised that the EARC will not only conduct a review of the State's electoral system but also will be responsible for drawing new boundaries. Apparently there have been more than a few utterances of disillusionment to the effect that it is hardly worth while being in Government if Labor members cannot draw the lines on the electoral map. Indeed, such expressions of feeling were around as early as January this year, only a month after Labor was elected. I refer to comments attributed to the new—and temporary—member for Albert in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* of 19 January. He stated that he intended to be in Government a long time. According to him, this would be "after we get the boundaries right and get rid of pockets such as Runaway Bay and Paradise Point". If such an attitude prevails among Government members, this House will need to be extremely wary of any attempt at intervention by the Government in a State electoral review and the redistribution that will flow from it. It must be solely left to the EARC to make independent recommendations to this House.

Time expired.

National Party's Car Park in Spring Hill; Don't You Worry About That!

Mr BEATTIE (Brisbane Central) (11.55 p.m.): I would like to draw to the attention of the House and to the people of Queensland the scurrilous attitude of Sir Robert Sparkes and the National Party at Spring Hill towards local residents. For many years, a property in Isaac Street, Spring Hill, owned by the Queensland National Party has been used illegally as a car park. This surface of the property has not been sealed. When in use in dry periods, the car park creates an excessive amount of dust for local residents. Because of the composition of the unsealed surface of the car park, the dust includes

fine particles of coal. It is a nuisance for residents, who wish to keep their properties clean, and it is also injurious to their health.

The local residents have petitioned the Lord Mayor, Sallyanne Atkinson, and the Brisbane City Council to intercede on their behalf to make the National Party desist from using the car park for which it currently receives income or require it to seal the car park urgently. To date the Lord Mayor has done absolutely nothing and is more interested in swanning overseas to places such as Vancouver to inspect Expo sites—sites which should have been inspected two years ago.

In addition to the problems already mentioned, there is also the problem of noise which is generated by the large number of cars moving in and out of the site over the uneven surface and at all hours of the day—particularly last Saturday night when the Nationals lost the Federal election. No doubt Sir Robert Sparkes' gold Mercedes is one of the major sources of the problem.

The polluting dust coming from the cars contains a significant component of coal ash, which is as fine as talcum powder and infiltrates all the nearby houses. One resident is particularly concerned about emphysema, an insidious disease caused by coal dust. Once contracted, it is permanent. Members of the National Party ought to have a guilty conscience.

No-one else in Brisbane would be allowed to run an illegal car park that causes pollution. It is about time the Brisbane City Council took some action. The situation is so bad that one resident had to have a special blind made for a kitchen window to stop the glare from car windows and to keep out the dust. The cost of the blind was \$350. The National Party should reimburse the lady concerned. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* two letters. I point out that I have already conferred with you, Mr Speaker, in relation to their incorporation. The first letter is from the lady concerned and is addressed to me. The second one is from the lady to the Chief Engineer, Department of Planning, Brisbane City Council.

Leave granted.

37 Sedgebrook St
Spring Hill 4000
26.3.90
839 3653

Mr Peter Beattie, M.P.

Dear Peter,

Re our conversation last Saturday at the Polling booth in Spring Hill.

I am enclosing all correspondence relating to the car park next to my property.

I have been speaking to Mr Canning on the phone. I believe he is the engineer with the council who is seeing into the matter & was saying "it will take time".

I was standing on the footpath in Isaac St last week & the amount of dust that was rising when the cars went over the ground was unbelieveable. Peter I cannot understand why the national party or persons responsible, out of common decency don't want to seal the area.

I also had to have a special blind (solar) made for the kitchen window, as the glare from the cars made it impossible for Stafford to sit at the kitchen table which was an added expense of \$350 although this isn't the issue.

Peter thank you for your concern

Yours faithfully,
Jean Hiller

37 Sedgebrook St
Spring Hill
Brisbane 4000.
19.10.89.

Chief Engineer
Department of Planning
Brisbane City Council

Dear Sir,

Re National Party of Queensland.

Property 24 Isaac St. Spring Hill.

I am writing to you to request your office take appropriate action to stop the above Property to be used as a Public car park until properly sealed.

My interest in the matter arises from diminished amenity of my adjoining property 32 Isaac St. Specifically issues that are causing concern are

- (1) Noise generated by a large number of cars moving in & out of the site over an uneven surface at all hours of the day.
- (2) Pollution arising from cars driving over coal ash—this ash is as fine as talcum powder & infiltrates through out the houses constantly.

My main concern is the possibility of Emphysema for the residents, especially my property as it is right next door & cannot be kept clean & free from black ash dust.

As you know Emphysema is an insidious disease caused by coal dust & once contracted is permanent.

In conclusion Isaac St is currently diminished in amenity by this Public car park in a major way.

I believe this unsealed car park is illegal & formally request that the council insure this situation is corrected.

Yours sincerely,
Jean Hiller.

Mr BEATTIE: While on the subject of the National Party, Mr Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the imminent publication of a new book titled *Don't You Worry About That!* by former Premier, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen. For the information of the House, I intend to table chapter 30 of that book. I point out that the Governor of Queensland is grossly insulted in that chapter by the former Premier when he says—

"If there was one decision I made as Premier which I later regretted, it was the appointment of Wally Campbell as Chief Justice ahead of Jim Douglas in 1982.

Campbell's appointment had another important consequence: it led directly to his appointment as Governor in 1985. I have always wondered if the move which Bob Sparkes and Mike Ahern launched against me in 1987 would have succeeded had not Campbell been Governor."

The real question, of course, is whether the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues support the former Premier's comments. Further on in the book, Sir Joh says—

"My association with Wally Campbell had been a long one, and this whole affair left a very sour taste in my mouth. In all my forty years in politics, the Governor had always accepted the Premier's advice."

Sir Joh's attack on the Governor is a threat to democracy. The Queensland National Party needs to reaffirm its confidence in the Governor and the Queen, and distance itself from Sir Joh's outrageous and undemocratic remarks. But, Mr Speaker, perhaps the

most significant question for Mr Cooper and the National Party is whether they agree with the following passage from the chapter to which I have already referred, which reads—

"Year by year, I felt Sparkes was becoming determined to exert authority over me and the rest of the parliamentary party."

These are Sir Joh's words—

"I knew he was influencing my ministers against me, and I could sense a change in their behaviour towards me. Some of them began adopting a quite defiant attitude towards me, including Don Lane"—

And what did Don Lane do?

" . . . who at one Cabinet meeting stood up and threw a lump of paper at me."

The question I ask Mr Cooper is this: is Sir Robert Sparkes influencing his shadow Ministers against him? Is Sir Robert Sparkes still running that motley crew on the Opposition side of the House?

Sir Joh's book really is worth reading because it reveals exactly who ran the show. The book also contains a real doozy about Vince Lester. I strongly urge you to read it, Mr Speaker, because it describes the way in which Vince Lester paraded around like a circus clown and showed how toilet doors could open either way. He even bowed to the media who had gathered to watch him. Sir Joh sets out the incident very clearly in the book. I know that the book will be compulsory reading for all members of the National Party. I am sure that those in the National Party who cannot read will have the book read to them.

World Heritage Listing of North Queensland Rainforests

Mr ROWELL (Hinchinbrook) (12 midnight): Within the Hinchinbrook electorate, there is concern over the loss of the timber industry as a result of World Heritage listing of the wet tropical rainforests of north Queensland.

Mr Palaszczuk: Are you still on that?

Mr ROWELL: The constituents of my electorate are affected by it, and that is why I am still on about it.

The electorate is dependent upon the sugar industry and is subject to the vagaries of world markets. It should be of concern to all Australians that this nation unnecessarily imports approximately \$2 billion worth of timber products, which affects Australia's balance of payments.

An Ingham sawmill employed 72 workers, as well as people working in the timber-gathering operation. With the multiplier effect, 400 people were displaced through the loss from that area of the timber industry.

Redundancy packages for timber workers were worth \$30,000; yet waterside workers received \$100,000. It appears that a timber worker is worth a third of a waterside worker. People who have been affected by the closure of the timber industry have been offered unfair compensation.

The effects of logging on the rainforests have not been detrimental. Queensland foresters are recognised worldwide for their managerial ability. The four trees that they took out of an area the size of a football field every 40 years has not been detrimental to the forests.

Mr De Lacy: Which four trees?

Mr ROWELL: Only mature trees that would have died, fallen over and been of no benefit to anyone.

Mr De Lacy: It was hard to play while they were there.

Mr ROWELL: If he gets time, the honourable member should visit the area and have a look at them.

Logged areas retain value, which is a point that should be noted as being compatible with a World Heritage listing.

Mr Prest: This is the big punch line.

Mr ROWELL: That is the big point. They retain the value for World Heritage listing.

When trees die, they return carbon dioxide to the atmosphere. Their timber value is lost forever. In case honourable members did not know, this Chamber is adorned with timber. For more than 100 years, northern rainforests have been managed very successfully.

The State Labor Party has double standards. In Government, it is holding an inquiry into logging on Fraser Island. However, when it was in Opposition, there was no inquiry set up into logging of the wet tropical rainforests of north Queensland.

Mr Palaszczuk: But you were in Government then; we weren't.

Mr ROWELL: The honourable member was in Opposition and he did not want the northern rainforests logged.

Mr Palaszczuk: You don't know what you're talking about. You are completely lost.

Mr ROWELL: I am not lost. I know the facts.

The social and economic factors in that area must be considered. Displaced timber workers have lost opportunities for their families and themselves. I sympathise with the member for Brisbane Central, whose constituents are being forced out of their homes and are receiving only \$85,000 compensation as a result of the construction of the Hale Street ring-road! People in Ravenshoe who were affected by World Heritage listing have been offered \$40,000 for their homes. Because the town has no other industry in which they can work and which provides job prospects for their children, they had to accept that amount. They have been forced to investigate work prospects elsewhere. They are moving to urban areas in which the costs of buying homes and real estate are extremely high.

Mr Casey interjected.

Mr ROWELL: They can go wherever they like as far as the honourable member is concerned. It is an absolute disgrace.

The Wallaman Falls road is a big issue. That area has excellent prospects for tourist development in our region.

Mr Casey: Tell us what Teddy Row did for us.

Mr ROWELL: I am not concerned about Teddy Row. The honourable member is hearing about my concerns. The Premier made a pre-election promise that that road would be upgraded to an all-weather standard. Now that \$10m has been granted in the World Heritage compensation package for the wet tropical rainforests, I hope that that promise is honoured and that it will not become another broken promise.

Liberal Party Performance at Federal Election

Mr ELDER (Manly) (12.05 a.m.): I wish to address a very sad subject, that is, the abysmal performance of the Liberal Party in the State of Queensland at the Federal election on 24 March. Those bastions of free enterprise, the Robin Hoods of the rich, went around for months asking question after question and, on Saturday, the electors

of Queensland gave them the answer—the big A. The only additional seat that it could win was from its coalition partner in Fairfax—poor John Stone! What kind of coalition is that?

That occurred while the Federal Liberals were talking about a merger with the Nationals. Yet the Liberals in Queensland were knocking off their own National Party colleagues. The equivalent merger in business would be one between Skase and Bond. It would be just about as useless at the end of the day.

Mr Coomber: I wouldn't put Cain on the stock exchange.

Mr ELDER: Prior to the election on Saturday, the Liberals and the Nationals were a nice little coalition.

Mr Palaszczuk: He would be a National, too.

Mr ELDER: He would be, too.

Prior to the election, the coalition thought that it could win all the marginal Labor seats such as Hinkler, Forde, Petrie—

Mrs Woodgate: Fisher.

Mr ELDER: And Fisher, the most marginal seat. It did not win any of them. In fact, Labor members won all the seats with increased majorities.

Prior to the election, the united coalition was set to defend its marginal seats—Moreton and Kennedy. Of course, the Liberals lost Moreton; and Kennedy was close, but the National Party has just missed out.

The people of Queensland made their choice. They said that the conservative coalition in Queensland is an irrelevant force. It was an appalling result. In Hinkler, the Liberal candidate polled less than the Democrat. In Moreton, the old shining light of the Liberal Party, Don Cameron, is now just a fading glimmer. I congratulate the Labor Party campaign manager in Moreton, the member for Mansfield, for a job well done. I congratulate Garrie Gibson, the new member for Moreton. He did not need any communist preferences to get him over the line.

Down my way in Bowman, the Liberal candidate's name was Mr Trounce. He was very aptly named because, on Saturday night, my Federal colleague, Con Sciacca, trounced him with an increased majority.

Poor Mr Peacock in Canberra! Here he was, looking to the Queensland Liberals to help him win an election. Can honourable members imagine looking to them to help them win an election? That is about as bad as a National Party candidate depending on Joh for the casting vote.

Since 1983, the number of Liberals in this House has averaged about 10. The number changes occasionally when they are offered Ministries and they change sides. Nevertheless, the number has averaged about 10. The only chance the Liberals ever have of winning in Queensland is if they succeed on the Gold Coast and elsewhere. I advise them to hang in there. They have got nine members in this House, and they are still a chance because the way in which the support for the Nationals is falling, at the next election the Liberals will probably end up being the senior partner in any coalition. They have a darned good chance, so I advise them to hang in there.

The former president of the Liberal Party, Dr Herron, worked it out. He said, "If you want to get on in the Liberal Party and if you want to be assured of election to Parliament, make sure you get on a Liberal Party Senate ticket. That is the only way that you will get in." It is a very sad state of affairs. Soon the Liberal Party will learn something. Even in this environmentally conscious age, the people will not accept recycled leaders.

Mrs Edmond: They took the souffle out of the oven too early.

Mr ELDER: Yes, and it would not rise twice.

Just as the people of Queensland supported a strong, united team in this State, the people of Australia understood Bob Hawke when he said, "If you cannot govern your party, you cannot govern the country." That was said by R. J. Hawke—the Prime Minister of Australia for an unprecedented fourth term.

The Liberal Party in Queensland has consistently shown that it lacks the leadership, the policies and the courage to gain the confidence of the Queensland people. At the State election the people of Queensland did not trust the Liberal Party, and it is little wonder that the people of Australia followed Queensland's lead.

Time expired.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Wednesday).