

NOTE: There could be differences between this document and the official printed *Hansard*, Vol. 315

TUESDAY, 5 JUNE 1990

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

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY GROUP MEETING

Mr SPEAKER: I wish to remind honourable members about the Amnesty International Parliamentary Group Meeting on Wednesday, 6 June at 12 noon in Function Room A, Level 4 of the Parliamentary Annexe.

REPORT ON GAMING MACHINE CONCERNS AND REGULATIONS; REFORMS IN LAWS RELATING TO HOMOSEXUALITY

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to advise the House that on Friday, 1 June, I received two reports from the Criminal Justice Commission as follows—

*Report on Gaming Machine Concerns and Regulations, and
Reforms in Laws Relating to Homosexuality.*

Ordered to be printed.

PRIVILEGE

Caspalp Donation; Comments by Minister for Primary Industries

Mr COOPER (Roma—Leader of the Opposition) (10.02 a.m.): I rise on a matter of privilege.

I refer to comments made in the House on 27 March wherein the Minister for Primary Industries said in relation to the Caspalp donation that—

"All moneys that were paid into any funds that were under my control were accounted for."

I refer also to the CJC report into gaming machines released last Friday, which found that some \$21,722.99 of the Caspalp fund, which he administered, was still unaccounted for.

I therefore request, Mr Speaker, that you refer this matter to the Privileges Committee so that it can determine whether, in view of the CJC report, the Minister has misled the Parliament.

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have listened to the statement by the Leader of the Opposition. I will give a decision at a future time.

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

River Terrace, Kangaroo Point

From **Mr Burns** (101 signatories) praying that River Terrace at Kangaroo Point be changed to a one-way street and that a pedestrian crossing with lights be erected between Paton and Llewellyn Streets.

Task Force on Traffic, East Brisbane

From **Mr Hamill** (123 signatories) praying for the establishment of a joint Brisbane City Council/State Government task force to investigate the elimination of heavy traffic in residential areas of East Brisbane.

Licensing of Firearms

From **Mrs McCauley** (949 signatories) praying that a licensing system for firearms be not introduced until public debate and alternative courses of action are investigated.

A similar petition was received from **Mr Randell** (162 signatories).

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table—

Proclamation under the Legal Aid Act Amendment Act 1990

Regulations under the Criminal Investigation (Extra-territorial Offences) Act 1985.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT**Change in Designation of Ministerial Portfolio**

Hon. W. K. GOSS (Logan—Premier, Minister for Economic and Trade Development and Minister for the Arts) (10.04 a.m.), by leave: I desire to inform the House that on 4 June 1990 His Excellency the Governor—

(a) Accepted the resignation of the Honourable Geoffrey Norman Smith as Minister for Manufacturing and Commerce of Queensland; and

(b) Appointed the Honourable Geoffrey Norman Smith to be Minister for Manufacturing, Commerce and Small Business of Queensland.

I lay upon the table of the House a copy of the *Queensland Government Gazette Extraordinary* of 4 June 1990 containing the relevant notifications.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT**Kingston Toxic Waste**

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth—Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (10.05 a.m.), by leave: One of the heaviest responsibilities inherited by this Government when it came to office last December was the appalling and lingering situation faced by residents at Kingston in Logan City, who discovered several years ago that they were living on and around land contaminated by hazardous materials.

The exhaustive process put in train by my office to assess the extent and real nature of the ongoing problem has, however, allowed us to make an informed decision after the years of inaction and prevarication by the previous Government, and today I can announce an end to the fracas that has been Kingston.

After months of independent review, what we find is the following—

that there is overwhelming evidence of cyanide and/or heavy metal contamination from goldmining and industrial dumping throughout the Mount Taylor area;

that previous investigations have been inept, ill-considered and politically motivated;

that the previous National Party Government engineered a massive cover-up of the real circumstances surrounding the Kingston problem;

that the Kingston Task Force, as set up by the Nationals, was media-driven, had no overall scientific design, and was, according to independent reports, so closely aligned to its political mentor that it was difficult to distinguish between its investigative and political agenda—

Mr COOPER: I rise to a point of order. As I was at that time involved as part of the Government, I find the remarks made by the Minister to be personally offensive and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I was listening to the Minister. He did not mention any individual member of the Government. Therefore, I cannot rule that the honourable member's point of order is valid.

Mr COOPER: Mr Speaker, by way of explanation, I point out that I was the responsible Minister at the time.

Mr MACKENROTH: I say quite openly that the Leader of the Opposition was the political mentor. I withdraw the section in relation to that. It will be contained in the report that I will table and have printed, anyway.

Mr COOPER: Mr Speaker, I refer to the part in which the Minister regarded my actions and those of the Government at the time as being a cover-up and politically driven. That is completely untrue. It is false. I ask that those remarks be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition cannot seek a withdrawal of a criticism of the previous Government. The comments have to relate to the member specifically. I will listen very carefully to the Minister. If the Minister refers to the member personally, I will then be in a position to ask him to withdraw. However, I think that we have wasted enough time. I call the Minister.

Mr MACKENROTH: As I said, according to those independent reports, the task force was so closely aligned to its political mentor that it was difficult to distinguish between its investigative and political agenda, and that its coordinator exercised exceptional power and access at ministerial level; that there was no systematic health study; that previous health surveys were biased and inadequate and overemphasised the stress and anxiety factors; that environmental testing had been limited and misleading—

Mr Cooper interjected.

Mr MACKENROTH: Yes, I will. Every time that the honourable member has a go at me about toxic waste, I will belt him around the ears with it.

The reports stated further that the proposal left by the previous Government to remove some amount of material to a safe land fill was unscientific and inadequate and failed to address the major points of contamination and the concerns of the residents in the area.

These are serious allegations indeed. They may well have been left unanswered had the previous Government's plans been enacted and had it not been for the resilience of the Kingston people themselves.

The Kingston community has lived for too long under this shadow when the answer has been within reach since the question was first posed. The problem at Kingston can be solved, and in the immediate future. This statement will outline how that can and will be done, but against a background of prolonged ineptitude, deficiency and cover-ups by the former National Party Government which, I find, politicised the entire issue at the expense of the Kingston people.

As it has unfolded since April 1987 when residents first found black sludge oozing from the ground in their yards, the story of Kingston has been one of political expediency. It has been a story of unmitigated error—from incomplete and misleading medical and scientific testing to attempts not only to intimidate officials and local residents but also to politically manipulate the media to ensure that a particular public perception was gained. Over three years, it has been a story of ordinary Queenslanders, who ask only that their lives return to normal, being thrown into a limbo of uncertainty and unease.

That is a fairly simple request. Unfortunately, however, over those three years Kingston became so heavily complicated by assorted reports, studies, opinions and arguments that the issue remained unresolved. The situation was fuelled by the actions of a so-called independent consultant whose \$700-a-day employment arrangement was terminated by this Government. Although the former Government employed a \$700-a-day expert, no resolution of the problem at Kingston was found. That is extraordinary.

When I assumed office, it became fairly clear that a truly independent assessment was needed of all the available scientific and medical evidence concerning Kingston so that a firm plan of action could be instituted. In February, in conjunction with Griffith University, an environmental scientist, Mr Greg Miller from Envirotest, was commissioned to critically review that evidence. His final report is now in my hands. I intend to table that review, together with all available documents pertaining to Kingston. As well, I intend to have printed a summary of the review.

Mr Miller's exhaustive analyses allowed us to make a firm and informed decision which, unlike the plans of the previous Government, is driven neither by media concerns nor a hidden political agenda. I believe that some words of clarification are necessary.

Earlier this century, the Mount Taylor area of Kingston was extensively mined for gold and was used concurrently for cyanide treatment of crushed ore. After mining ceased in 1955, petroleum-based sludges were dumped in the Diamond Street pit. The main open cut with its underground shafts and drives was used as an authorised refuse tip. Large quantities of cyanide wastes and tailings of unknown composition were disposed in a third site, namely, the upper and lower tailings dams.

According to Envirotest, significant soil and groundwater contamination existed. However, despite all the investigations, serious and unanswered questions remained about the state of that contamination. Subdivision of Mount Taylor occurred during the 1960s, but not until March and April of 1987 did complaints emerge about black sludge oozing into backyards, prompting a long series of investigations and public actions. Eventually, in January 1989, the former National Party Government established the Kingston task force as a means of dealing with the problem.

One has only to look at the events of 1989 to realise how far that task force progressed with its brief to solve the problem at Kingston. In effect, the operations of the task force became an elaborate public relations exercise that was aimed at dominating, and even controlling, the media agenda, convincing Kingston residents that their problems were all in their heads and achieving a politically and media-driven solution to the chemical hazards problem.

According to Mr Miller, the Kingston task force had no overall scientific design. He said that its close alignment with its political mentor Mr Cooper, the then Minister for Administrative and Emergency Services, "made it difficult to distinguish between its investigative role and the political agenda". Clearly, the welfare of the residents of Kingston was not high on that agenda. What happened was the opposite of that.

Evidence exists that task force members attempted to intimidate residents and to isolate and victimise its critics, and that State facilities and resources were used to pursue those objectives. However, in the meantime, several alleged scientific investigations continued. Those included environmental testing, which was described by Miller as "ad hoc and somewhat convoluted"; seriously limited air-quality tests; soil-contamination tests taken outside the areas believed to be severely contaminated; and tests taken of fill that was transported into the area during subdivision and not of the original soil itself.

As well, health surveys were conducted, but they omitted many residents from high-risk areas. There was overemphasised counselling and stress management and the inconclusive means of collecting voluntary data. Evidence exists also of blood samples being flushed down sinks before testing occurred, and of soil samples which sat for months, unrecognised and untested, on the floor of Government laboratories. In fact, evidence exists that the previous Government attempted to create a smokescreen around

the Kingston issue, lulling journalists and the public into a perception that the Government was right, the people were wrong, and that chemical hazards were a product of one's mind.

That brings me to the solution that was proposed by the previous Government of this State. That solution was also media driven. It was a cosmetic—a pretty picture masquerading as science. If honourable members thought that there have already been charades aplenty, I ask them to leave room for what is quaintly labelled the "Current Proposal—1989".

I ask honourable members to imagine a hill oozing toxic sludge, hordes of angry residents, a contingent of diligent media representatives and several bulldozers and tip-trucks. Imagine footage of the sludge being bulldozed up onto the trucks and trundled away to a safe place out of sight and away from Kingston, therefore removing not only the danger but also the visible manifestation of its evil potential. That is certainly a cameraman's dream. It is certainly a visual winner for a Government under pressure to provide a palatable and financially viable solution to a nagging problem.

I ask honourable members to consider this: the volume of waste proposed for removal—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr MACKENROTH: Members opposite should wait until I get to my next ministerial statement.

As I was saying, the volume of waste proposed for removal was about 5 000 cubic metres. Certainly, it had a lot of visual impact, but unfortunately it would not have scratched the surface of the actual hazardous material which would need to be removed to rehabilitate the area. Miller estimates that amount at more like 100 000 cubic metres. The option, more importantly, did not address the dangers of disturbing unknown types of wastes in the area nor the potentially toxic cocktail of chemicals which may have brewed subsurface in old mine shafts after unsupervised dumping had compacted various substances metres under the ground.

No-one—not the residents nor anyone who has been connected with the Mount Taylor site—knows exactly what is buried beneath those homes. Because of the release of gases in this manner, there are risks for the surrounding residents and much higher risks for workmen employed in drilling or bulldozing.

Most pertinently, this option does not solve the Kingston hazardous waste problem at all; it deals with the Diamond Street sludge pit but ignores the cyanide and other probable contamination in the two other sites on Mount Taylor. In short, this option would have done nothing to allay the anxieties of residents who fear much more extensive contamination than that small Diamond Street area—and with good cause.

We will not attempt to move the acid sludge now visible in areas of Diamond Street, nor will we attempt to move other possibly contaminated soil from that area. This could be likened to physically moving a couple of full-sized football fields, and would be farcical. It would be financially viable, certainly, but in the long run this is no solution for the residents of Kingston.

I have promised these people an answer—an answer satisfactory to them and to the community—and they shall have it. The contaminated material and soil at Mount Taylor will not be moved but will be left in situ, undisturbed. Those residents living in close proximity to the site will be relocated, their houses resumed or removed to a new site. A comprehensive draining system and venting system will be installed. The surface of Diamond Street and the main open-cut pit areas will be sealed to form an impervious layer. The entire area would be fenced and restricted while rehabilitation occurred and extensive landscaping undertaken. The process of rehabilitation will take upwards of 12 months, after which public access will be restored. People will be free to safely walk or jog around the area. An ongoing environmental monitoring program will continue, including air, soil and ground water sampling. The approximate cost of this plan is \$8m.

We have arrived at this point only after long and detailed consideration of every option and of all available literature. In the national context, the plan is a trail-blazing one and Kingston is set to become an Australian yardstick among scientists who in the future are likely to be faced with more and varied versions of Kingston. Internationally, a growing body of evidence suggests that the line of action we are taking is the only appropriate one. But in the context of our own State and our own backyard, the safe option is the only option.

Another of the initiatives of this Government was the comprehensive medical assessment of Kingston residents begun recently by an eminent specialist, Professor Barry Smithhurst. He is near to completing the pilot study of the first 50 residents, and this assessment will continue. So will the veterinary study just begun by Dr Alan Seawright of the University of Queensland. The results of both these studies will add to knowledge we now have of the Mount Taylor area and will help to unravel the mystery of Mount Taylor.

This Government has been scrupulous in its inquiries into this matter and in addressing all possible ways of restoring order to the lives of those residents most affected.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Lockyer!

Mr MACKENROTH: Kingston residents can be assured absolutely that there is no hidden political or media agenda here. Every step in this process has been open and accountable and, in keeping with that, I intend to table all documents relating to investigations into the possible causes of the Kingston hazardous waste problem, as well as the full and summarised report from Envirotech and Griffith University. I table the summary report and move that it be printed.

Whereupon the report was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Allegations against Mr M. McMillan by Leader of Opposition

Hon. R. J. GIBBS (Wolston—Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing) (10.20 a.m.), by leave: I refer to a dishonest, disgraceful and defamatory attack made in the *Sunday Mail* last weekend by the Opposition Leader, Mr Cooper, upon one of my departmental officers, Mr McMillan. In his statement to the *Sunday Mail*, Mr Cooper got it wrong, wrong and wrong.

Mr McMillan was not a former ALP official. He was a Premier's Department public servant, just as Peter Anemaat was a public servant when he was private secretary to Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen and then as private secretary to Mr Cooper as a Minister and once again when Mr Cooper was Premier.

Mr Cooper made accusations that Mr McMillan had been appointed to the position of Deputy Director-General without that position being advertised. The simple fact of the matter is that the position was advertised in the *Government Gazette* on 17 March and in the national press on 31 March. I will table the two documents so that it is not a case of my telling Mr Cooper but a case of my showing him.

If Mr Cooper understood the machinery of government in Queensland, he would realise that all poker machine developmental work is carried out exclusively by the Casino Control Division of the Treasury Department. Because of these circumstances, my departmental officer, Mr McMillan, has not been to even one meeting or had any discussions with anyone whatsoever concerning the introduction of poker machines. Mr Cooper got it wrong again.

Mr Cooper: A funny connection, though.

Mr GIBBS: The honourable member should sit patiently and I shall describe to him what he thinks is a funny connection.

Mr McMillan has advised me that the Leader of the Opposition's former private secretary, Mr Anemaat, had told Mr McMillan, both when he worked in the Department of Administrative Services and in talks that Mr Anemaat has had with Mr McMillan since the election, that the honourable member regarded Mr McMillan as a very competent and professional public servant in his department.

Let me refer to a document, the title of which is *Huntley Publishing: Your Money Weekly*. Honourable members should compare Mr McMillan's position in the public service with that of somebody who once worked for the present Opposition Leader. Under the heading "Politics", the document states—

"John Howard, like a frontline soldier shooting his comrade in the foot, rather than shooting the enemy, ie showing more fire Vs Joh than Vs Bob Hawke. Should subscribers wish to make campaign donations, as I do, (and I don't wear white shoes!) to Joh the address is:-"—

and wait for it—

"KALDEAL PTY LTD"—

and all honourable members know what Kaldeal was; it was the corruption fund for the National Party—

"ATTN: P ANEMAAT

C/- PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT, FL 15,

PO BOX 185, BRISBANE QLD 4000."

That is the very same Mr Peter Anemaat who worked for the Leader of the Opposition as his private secretary. What a disgraceful situation! Now all the Leader of the Opposition can do is attempt to give Mr McMillan a king-size kick in the groin.

Prior to talking about the Caspalp fund, I simply want to say that had the proper consultative processes between the CJC and Mr McMillan been carried out, this whole uncalled for incident would not have occurred. To me, this is an extraordinary way of doing business and is certainly far less than an excellent start for the CJC.

I am advised that the fund was used to pay wages for four separate people: in particular, Simon Davies, for a brief period; a Mary-Ann Bosnic, who was a clerk-typist; Mr Pat Wagner, who performed research duties; and Mr Frank Campbell, who performed messenger-type services.

Mr Elliott interjected.

Mr GIBBS: Does the honourable member have his little fox terrier suit on this morning? I just hope that he does not think that he has a gatepost next to him.

In addition, the fund had to be used to meet costs that the Government of the day would not pay. I might add that this Government does pay for those facilities that are provided to members of Mr Cooper's Opposition. Back in 1980-1981, the fund had to be used to pay for the following—

- (1) advertisement for the position of press secretary to the Leader of the Opposition in the *Australian* newspaper, because the Bjelke-Petersen Government refused to do so;
- (2) accommodation at the Zebra Motel in Brisbane for the new press secretary whilst he found residential accommodation;
- (3) hiring rent-a-cars for the leader;
- (4) printing at the printing office; and
- (5) economic services of that very distinguished economist, the late Dr Jeff Jackson.

It is an understatement to say that the Opposition operated during those times in the most extraordinary, difficult and undemocratic circumstances. It is very apparent

that money was used from this fund to meet legitimate operational expenses that in any democratic institution would be paid for by the Government of the day.

I intend to table as much detail about the accounts as is possible, and I invite the CJC to do now what it should have done in the first place——

Opposition members interjected.

Mr GIBBS: No. I am not being critical. I am simply saying that the commission should canvass from the appropriate people precisely what the money in the account was used for.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr GIBBS: I have got all day. Opposition members are wasting question-time.

In addition to this information, I am advised that there was an additional debit of \$646.97 on 30 November 1981, apparently payable to Avis for rent-a-cars. A small bank credit of approximately \$30 was paid to that account, with the balance of \$1,415.09 being sent to the ALP office on 17 March 1982.

Since 33 classified positions were created in my department, people on secondment from various departments have been acting in positions. Since 15 March 1990, Mr McMillan has been acting as the deputy director-general and has discharged his duties in a very competent manner. He will continue to act in that position until he is either confirmed in the position or someone else is appointed on the basis of merit.

When Mr Cooper has an opportunity to peruse the full documentation relating to this matter, I hope that he will do the right and honourable thing and offer an apology to Mr McMillan.

In light of the continued and most disgraceful accusations against my party and individuals in it, and particularly in light of the hideous and cowardly attack that the Leader of the Opposition has launched on an officer of my department in Mr McMillan, I table forthwith, along with the other two documents, a fully documented account with dates, cheque numbers and every other piece of information relevant to the entirety of the Caspall funds.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the documents on the table.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Political Donation by Poker Machine Company

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth—Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (10.28 a.m.), by leave: This morning, I want to place into context the police inquiries concerning a political donation from a certain poker machine company in 1980. In 1982, those inquiries were undertaken following a raid on the premises of Ainsworth Industries at Penrith in New South Wales.

Mr Elliott interjected.

Mr MACKENROTH: Yes, I can.

This raid, carried out by task force two——

Mr Elliott interjected.

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

Mr MACKENROTH: —netted New South Wales police many documents, a number of which were passed on to the Queensland police. Many matters were raised in those documents. Details about political donations from Ainsworth Industries to the three major political parties in Queensland were contained in those documents.

This is not surprising. However, what is interesting about those documents and about the subsequent public controversy surrounding this issue is what the Queensland police, under the former commissioner, Terry Lewis, and at the direction of the former Premier, Joh Bjelke-Petersen, did with this information.

The only line of inquiry pursued by the former Government was directed against the then leader of the Labor Opposition, the member for Mackay, Mr Casey. This was despite the fact that the documents contained details about donations to both the Liberal and National Parties, and despite the fact that that set of documents contained a detailed, confidential brief from a former Liberal politician—a former back bencher in the National/Liberal coalition Government of the day—about how the poker machine lobby was going to help the Liberals.

In his report, Mr Colin Lamont told Ainsworth Industries that the Liberals thought the Liberals were the key to the success of the poker machine lobby. This was because the Labor Party could not win, and the National Party was not worth dealing with. In his report, Mr Lamont says that Vibert promised assistance for the Liberals in the seats of Murrumba, South Brisbane, Everton, Chatsworth, Maryborough, Woodridge, Salisbury, Windsor, Stafford, South Coast and Fassifern. It is worth noting that the cover note to Mr Lamont's confidential report—a note from Mr Vibert to Mr Ainsworth—says that it should be read and destroyed.

This document is interesting when read in conjunction with an interview between Andrew Barton and Mr Vibert on *Today Tonight* in May 1982. In that interview, Mr Vibert had this to say—

"The reason I gave the money to the Liberal Party and the National Party was because I knew, very well, that I was dealing with probably the most hypocritical people that I've ever dealt with in Government that's the National Party and the Liberal Party, so I made sure, that my position was quite clearly covered."

That is what was said in 1982.

I hope that my comments this morning put this into some sort of context.

I lay on the table of the House both documents to which I have referred—the transcript and the document written by Mr Colin Lamont which were taken from Ainsworth's office at the same time as the document relating to the then Leader of the Opposition, and the Queensland police and the Queensland Government took no action.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the documents on the table.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Multifunction Polis

Hon. D. J. HAMILL (Ipswich—Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development) (10.32 a.m.), by leave: Mr Speaker—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr HAMILL: Are they trying to undermine the Government's bid for a multifunction polis?
Honourable members will, I think—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am told that the fishing is quite good today and, if members continue to create a lot of havoc in this House, I will make sure some of them go fishing.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition. He will cease interjecting.

Mr HAMILL: Honourable members will, I think, agree that, while much of the public discussion about the multifunction polis concept has been confused, the project has at least provoked debate in Australia about issues facing us as a nation and as an economy in the future.

Mr BOOTH: I rise to a point of order. It has been regarded in this House, going back over the years, that ministerial statements should concern a matter of urgency. The matter posed by the Minister has been dealt with for a long time. In fact, the Premier himself has spoken on the matter. If we are to lose all question-time every morning on such irrelevant statements—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Gympie will resume his seat.

Mr STEPHAN: I rise to a point of order. I was not on my feet.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I meant the honourable member for Warwick. There is nothing in the Standing Orders about ministerial statements and whether Ministers can make one or two of them. Ministers should be speaking on matters that are related to their portfolios. I hope that they will be as brief as possible to get their message across. That is all I can say. I do not intend to take points of order on it.

Mr BORBIDGE: I rise to a point of order. The multifunction polis falls within the ministerial responsibilities of the Honourable the Premier, not the Minister for Transport. Therefore, based on the ruling that you have just given, Mr Speaker, the ministerial statement by the Minister for Transport on the multifunction polis is out of order.

Mr HAMILL: As you would be aware, Mr Speaker, I am also the Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development.

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

Mr HAMILL: The project, like the members of the Opposition, is obviously somewhat confused. I hope to elicit more information this morning.

It will come as no surprise to honourable members that transport, an industry fundamental to Australia's future, is one area that has received great attention through the MFP feasibility processes. I am pleased to be able to draw the attention of honourable members to Queensland's particular transport initiatives in relation to the multifunction polis, namely, the proposal for the creation of an Advanced Transport Corridor Corporation (ATCC). The ATCC has the prime objective of becoming recognised as the pre-eminent centre of excellence in transport education, planning and research round the world.

The services of the Advanced Transport Corridor Corporation would be made available to both private and public sector organisations for the development, testing and demonstration of key advanced transport technologies, such as propulsion systems, control and tracking systems, and electronic transit. In summary, the proposal has two major transportation functions—

1. To encourage and carry out advanced courses in transportation leading to higher degrees. This feature is expected to attract leading figures in transportation from round the world.
2. Applied transportation research with emphasis on issues such as—
 - high-speed ground transport;
 - automation of transport control systems;
 - transport/environment interaction issues; and
 - alternative fuels.

The Advanced Transport Corridor Corporation will make use of the natural linear Brisbane-Gold Coast corridor to both operate advanced technology, road and rail services,

and intermodal terminals connecting these centres, and create a fully cabled, instrumented and technology and services rich development testing corridor. This technology-rich advanced transport corridor could be made available on a commercial basis to both private and public sector organisations in Australia and overseas for development, testing and demonstration of key transport technologies. These key technologies could include—

corridor testing of high-speed propulsion systems, for example, monorail, light rail, magnetic levitation, Very Fast Train;
automated pricing, network management and freight tracking technologies;
new rail and road surface materials; and
road and track design.

In addition, the Corridor Corporation could have a charter which specifically includes research into the environmental and social impacts of transportation corridors and systems.

There are a number of other matters contained in this ministerial statement, which I will seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard*. May I conclude by making this point: the Advanced Transport Corridor Corporation concept has to be taken further. It is proposed that this further work will be carried out in the immediate future—

1. Identify and communicate with all domestic and international parties who would be interested in this centre. It is felt that the internationalisation of this concept is vital to ensure that the best expertise and resources from round the world are involved. It would also allow northern hemisphere transportation groups to avail themselves of all-year test facility.
2. The concept needs to be refined along the lines of a commercial business plan. This must go beyond the initial concept and firm up the target markets, the benefits to participants, the future development, the costs and cash flow predictions. Estimation of the implementation cost and the benefits would be a key feature.

This would also include the demonstration of an effective management capability and also demonstrate how investors and participants benefit financially and technically from their participation.

In the immediate future, it is proposed to encourage the expansion of the working group and to service and manage this ongoing activity by a senior officer from my policy and planning unit in close association with the Department of the Premier, Economic and Trade Development. Thus, the pre-feasibility work will be supported directly by my policy and planning unit. This working group will report its progress and findings to me on a ongoing basis.

It is an important initiative, and one which involves both the public and private sectors. I am sure that all members of the House who wish to see Queensland's technology base advance will be more than delighted to see this particular project come to fruition. I table the body of the ministerial statement and seek leave to have the remainder of my statement incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

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

Undertaking these research functions in the Brisbane-Gold Coast corridor makes sense for a number of reasons. First, this natural linear corridor produces an excellent technical and operational environment for developing and applying technologies in an operational scale laboratory. Second, the Brisbane-Gold Coast region has already enjoyed the highest growth rate of any region in Australia over the last ten years. Honourable Members should be aware that this rate of growth will not only be sustained but is expected to accelerate with the addition of some 460,000 new residents between Brisbane and the Gold Coast through to the year 2001. The advanced technology services which the Corridor Corporation could promote will be of substantial direct benefit to the many new residents expected to come into this growth region.

PROGRESS TO DATE

The working party (convened by my senior officer) consisted of the Queensland Managers of Siemens, TNT and Transfields, Consultants Maunsell and Partners and Arthur Andersen and Co. and officers of the Premier's Department. Subsequently, the proposal has been discussed with Mitsubishi, VFT and BHP. Considerable interest has been shown by all parties to date.

A preliminary concept proposal has been produced which examines industry trends and the concepts opportunities. It reviews both the Buyers and Suppliers in the world marketplace and demonstrates how this Advanced Transportation proposal neatly fits in with Queensland's MFP proposal and other MFP projects. Copies of the concept are available on request. I must add that we would welcome any comment on the proposal.

At this juncture, it is fair to say that a good preliminary concept has been described. I am especially keen to explore this matter further and to this end, have met with the MFP task force Chairman, Professor Don Nicklin and his support consultant, Arthur Andersen and Co.

NEXT STEPS

To examine this Advanced Transport Corridor Corporation concept further, it is proposed to carry out the following work in the immediate future.

1. Identify and communicate with all domestic and international parties who would be interested in this centre. It is felt that the internationalisation of this concept is vital to ensure that the best expertise and resources from around the world are involved. It would also allow northern hemisphere transportation groups to avail themselves of all year test facility.
2. The concept needs to be refined along the lines of a commercial "Business Plan". This must go beyond the initial concept and firm up the target markets, the benefits to participants, the future development, the costs and cash flow predictions. Estimation of the implementation cost and the benefits would be a key feature.

This would also include the demonstration of an effective management capability and also demonstrate how investors and participants benefit financially and technically from their participation.

In the immediate future, it is proposed to encourage the expansion of the working group and to service and manage this ongoing activity by a senior officer from my Policy and Planning unit in close association with the Department of the Premier, Economic and Trade Development. Thus the pre-feasibility work will be directly supported by my Policy and Planning Unit. This working group will report its progress and findings to me on a progressive basis.

This Government will be seen by all Queenslanders as taking transport in this State further, faster than has been done since the beginning of this century. We are currently pursuing a number of transport initiatives which will not only enhance the attractiveness of the chosen MFP site, but will also underpin the practical application of transportation research to be carried out by the Advanced Transport Corridor Corporation (ATCC).

Some of these include :-

- restoration of the rail link between Brisbane and Robina, on the Gold Coast
- actively exploring the scope for bringing the Very Fast Train from Melbourne and Sydney through to Brisbane
- upgrading and providing new road links in the Brisbane-Gold Coast corridor
- accelerating the development of Brisbane's International Airport and ensuring that the airport is fully integrated with new road and rail services
- new rail links to the Port of Brisbane, including advanced rail terminals.

Mr Speaker, this initiative typifies the new direction in which this Government wishes to take Queensland. Enough of short term thinking, enough of a lack of planning for the future, enough of providing only basic infrastructure and services using yesterday's technologies. Initiatives such as the Advanced Transport Corridor Corporation will contribute to creating a smarter Queensland, a Queensland equipped to deal with the future, to trade competitively, to develop new industries and achieve critical mass in areas of research and development fundamental to our economy. I look forward to

providing progress reports on the concepts development to Honourable Members.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Criminal Justice Commission Report on Gaming Machines

Hon. E. D. CASEY (Mackay—Minister for Primary Industries) (10.38 a.m.), by leave: On Friday, 1 June 1990, the Criminal Justice Commission released a report on gaming machines in Queensland. Included in Appendix 2 of that report are a number of comments regarding donations to a company known as Caspalp.

The report contains nothing new regarding Caspalp Promotion Fund, which was used by me as the then leader of the parliamentary Labor Party from 27 March 1979 to 17 March 1982. The purpose of this fund was to support the finances needed by the leader, the parliamentary Labor Party and the Labor Party itself in the conduct of its affairs, including additional staff support and research assistance, the equivalent of which is now provided by this Government to the current Leader of the Opposition. However, the major proportion of these funds went to advertising on behalf of the party during the 1980 election campaign.

I must express my deep disappointment that, on its own admission, the report by the Criminal Justice Commission in its foreword states—

"This report does not represent what will be the normal format of Reports by the Commission."

It states also—

"The Commission has not sought to carry out the consultation process which will be a part of the preparation of its normal reports."

It is also unfortunate that the chairman of the commission did not seek my comments regarding this matter as there are several very simple explanations to some of the comments contained in the report, along with the documentary evidence to answer any questions raised.

Meanwhile, for the information of this Parliament, I wish to provide point by point answers to the comments made by the Criminal Justice Commission in its report. Details of the Ainsworth donations of three cheques, each of \$10,000, paid into the Caspalp Promotions Fund on 3 July, 28 October and 25 November 1980 were made known publicly—via the Queensland media—by me as the then Opposition Leader around May 1982. At that time, photocopies of the relevant bank statements were also released. The Caspalp Promotion Fund was established on 27 March 1979 at the suggestion of supportive business people. They wanted to assist the Labor Party with additional resources to help overcome the politically motivated Scrooge mentality of the then State Government and to enable me, as leader, to have access to additional staff, particularly in the research area and to assist the parliamentary Labor Party. By the time the first so-called poker machine lobby support was received, \$7,225 had already been deposited in the fund, and \$6,135.06 had already been expended on staff and research assistants' wages and other costs associated with the running of my office.

At its conference in Rockhampton in February 1979, the Australian Labor Party adopted in principle the decision to introduce poker machines in Queensland when it came to Government. It had been mentioned previously in party policy in several forms since 1968. The State parliamentary Labor Party subsequently appointed long-serving members, Jack Houston and Ray Jones, to investigate the method of poker machine introduction with the need for a casino policy in Queensland. During the next five months, they conducted their investigations and reported back to the parliamentary Labor Party. Labor's casino policy was adopted first and, at a State council meeting at the party's Breakfast Creek headquarters on 9 December 1979, the party also approved the introduction of poker machines in Queensland, and the method of their implementation by a State Labor Government.

At that stage, I had never met either Mr Ainsworth or Mr Vibert, nor was I aware of their existence. Neither individual had any input into the formulation of ALP policy.

May I remind members at this point that the Caspalp Promotion Fund was around for some 15 months before the so-called poker machine lobby made its first donation to the party. The comment on page 83 of the CJC report is, therefore, without foundation.

The initial approaches to me regarding supportive donations from the Australian Club Development Association—as the Vibert-led organisation was known to me—occurred in early 1980, when the Labor Party was in administrative turmoil. The party fielded two administrative organisations which spent most of their time in court at each other's throats, while the parliamentary Labor Party also had to deal with an election later that year. Of course, these are historical matters of some importance to me and, had the CJC actually approached me to assist its inquiries, I could have easily cleared up the question raised as comment on page 85.

As with all party political donations—at least connected with this side of the House—Mr Vibert was told in plain language that there would be no strings attached. He was also advised that the ALP's in-house communications network was available for advertising.

At this point I come to an important aspect of the CJC report. I reject totally the CJC report's suggestion that I was in any way involved in a scheme to assist Ainsworth Consolidated Industries with an avenue to claim a fraudulent taxation benefit. The suggestion that the \$10,000 of the Ainsworth donation was unaccounted for is entirely wrong. The CJC report refers to the recurring amount of \$470.38 and the figure of \$1,019. These were all cash cheques to pay for the wages and services of the extra staff previously referred to in this statement, and as per the figures tabled by the Honourable Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing this morning. In addition, on 25 July 1980 a cheque in the sum of \$2,000.30 was used to pay the salary of a journalist in Townsville for services rendered during the election campaign.

During the period from 27 March 1979 to 31 December 1980, the total costs incurred in these matters were as follows—

EXPENDITURE CASPALP PROMOTIONS
27 MARCH 1979 31 DECEMBER 1980

Wages reception/stenographer	\$6,445.12
Wages research staff and research fees and payment	\$6,853.75
Casual messenger/office assistant	\$1,260.00
Casual press assistant for northern electorates	\$2,000.00
Travel/accommodation costs for above and sundries	<u>\$1,016.43</u>
TOTAL	\$17,575.30

This is well in excess of the first \$10,000 Ainsworth donation and was carefully explained to Queensland police inspectors Bradbury and Ingham during their interview with me in the presence of my solicitor on 24 August 1982—as were all the other transactions, including the \$33,000 that was paid directly to the party for advertising purposes.

This event, and the record of it, discredits the CJC's findings that I was never interviewed comprehensively by Queensland police. Again, it is a great shame that the CJC did not come to me in the course of its inquiries. At the time of this investigation, the accusation that the moneys not traced straight into the Labor Party's account may have been used personally by me was addressed by these police officers. The investigating officers said that they would conduct an interview with the former secretary of the party, Mr Peter Beattie now the member for Brisbane Central and the chairman of the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice. That interview was to determine whether or not these moneys had been used in accordance with the wishes and authorisation of the ALP.

Mr Elliott: Who are you going to cheat tomorrow?

Mr CASEY: It might be the honourable member, so he should look out.

Mr FitzGerald: Why didn't you do this in the Matters of Public Interest debate?

Mr CASEY: The Opposition wanted a statement.

If these moneys had been so used, those police officers made it clear there could be no illegalities in relation to section 436 of the Criminal Code. I understand that this interview took place, and such an assurance was provided, thereby putting the matter to rest.

As there is no mention of these interviews in the CJC report, I can only assume that——

Mr Lingard interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. I have just heard the member for Fassifern say quite audibly across the Chamber that members on the Government side organised the speakers and that they have done so again today. I find that remark extremely objectionable and demeaning to the Chair. I seek an apology and withdrawal from the honourable member. I warn the honourable member under Standing Order 124. He will go fishing for a week soon, if he keeps that up.

Mr LINGARD: I apologise.

Mr CASEY: As I was saying, as there is no mention of these interviews in the CJC report, I can only assume that either the transcripts no longer exist in the police files examined by the commission, the commission did not seek to view those files, or the commission did not properly examine them. Once again, I refute the commission's statement that moneys remain unaccounted for.

I have no knowledge of conversations that took place between Ainsworth, Vibert and Grevsmuhl—the latter being completely unknown to me—or the actions of Bradbury and Ingham, or their discussions in Sydney, or their instructions from then Queensland Police Commissioner Lewis. However, I am now fully aware from the findings of the Fitzgerald commission of inquiry that there was a connection between these activities. It emerged that, at the time, Lewis was alleged to be receiving moneys from another gambling machine manufacturer to write a report for former Premier Bjelke-Petersen criticising poker machines.

In a conversation with Vibert early in 1981, I indicated that I was about to leave for a trip to the United States. I point out that this was well after the 1980 election, and Labor was still in Opposition. Vibert offered to contact the Aristocrat representative in the United States to see if he could be of any assistance. However, contact was never made; nor did I go near the city of Reno, where I understand the representative was located. Thus my answer to the Opposition Leader in the Parliament on 20 February 1990 was correct.

My passing reference in subsequent correspondence to Vibert was no different from an indication given to my local Holden dealer that I had spotted Commodores on my recent visit to Asia. At no time did I ever act improperly or illegally in relation to my dealings with Caspalp or in my handling of any donations. This matter is quite clearly shown in the CJC report which, in its concluding remarks in Appendix 2, states that the complaint lodged with the commission does not constitute official misconduct.

I am currently seeking a meeting with the chairman of the commission at which I am prepared to go through the papers with him, cheque by cheque, and explain every expenditure from the Caspalp fund, if he so requires. Hopefully, he will then be principled enough to make a public apology for the way in which his report has reflected on me.

It is also most unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition has sought to besmirch the name of Malcolm MacMillan, a very capable and efficient public servant who proved his ability to the Leader of the Opposition whilst working for him, as the deputy manager of the State Stores Board, when the Leader of the Opposition was a Minister. Mr

MacMillan was my private secretary during the period of existence of the Caspalp Promotion Fund. In accordance with his role of fully administering my office, he was given the responsibility of overseeing the additional staff to whom I have previously referred, their requirements and their costs, for which the Government would not supply finance.

He was not a signatory to any cheque at any stage during the period from 3 July 1980 until 25 November 1980, when the donations from the poker machine lobby were made to the Australian Labor Party in Queensland. He should never in any way be named or involved in this matter. Quite appropriately, the Criminal Justice Commission does not do so in its report and it is only the Leader of the Opposition who is trying deliberately to besmirch Mr MacMillan.

As I am covering so much old ground today, I will repeat, if I may, a challenge issued to the National Party Leader some eight years ago. Of course, I would be quite willing to provide copies—to him, to this House, or to anyone—of all Caspalp transactions on the day that the National Party furnishes similar information about the activities of the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

World Environment Day

Hon. P. COMBEN (Windsor—Minister for Environment and Heritage) (10.50 a.m.): In the interests of time and for the convenience of the House, I seek leave to table and have incorporated in *Hansard* a Ministerial Statement.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr COMBEN: Do members of the Opposition want it read? Mr Speaker, I repeat that I seek leave to table and have incorporated in *Hansard* a Ministerial Statement on world environment day.

Leave granted.

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

Today is World Environment Day—a day celebrated throughout the world in an effort to increase love, understanding, care, concern and action for our local and global environment.

It is appropriate that I rise on this day, to outline to the House the action the Goss Labor Government has taken on environmental protection in our first six months of Government and our plans for the future—between today and World Environment Day next year.

It is also a happy coincidence that today is the day we resume debate on Queensland's first heritage legislation which I introduced to Parliament earlier this year. Indeed, the likely passing of our Heritage Buildings Protection Bill will be a historic occasion for Queenslanders—finally, our built heritage will be protected.

Since gaining power on December 2nd 1989 only a short six months have elapsed but the environmental wins have been impressive. The debilitating and costly World Heritage legal battle has been won. And now we have agreement with the Federal Government over the basic structure of a management authority to look after the wet tropics.

The Redbank Radioactive Dump has been stopped, the Wolffdene dam has been stopped; the National Parks and Wildlife Service has been restored; Queensland's first proper heritage legislation has been introduced into this House; we have adopted the ozone protection strategy and joined the rest of Australia in doing so; almost 60,000 hectares of national parks have been declared and we have up to half-million hectares of new national park in the pipeline; the Recreation Areas Management Act has been amended and real moves towards a recycling strategy have been introduced.

On Sunday, I announced that our Government would ensure that recycling becomes a part of everyday Government life by showing our support for recycled products. Next week I begin opening a series of recycling seminars and expos, called Enviro-Link, throughout Queensland.

I have reinstated the research branch within the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service. The branch was given a slow death by the previous National Party Government. Now

I am trying to quickly resuscitate the branch so that we can improve our knowledge particularly on Queensland's endangered species so we can work to protect these species.

This has been the first six months, our next year will be more exciting as during this time I and my department will be working on issues including coastal protection, community nature conservation, Queensland's first conservation strategy, and updating of all the Acts which govern our environment.

Many of these statutes, written by the previous conservative administration, are completely inadequate and leave Queensland way behind the rest of Australia.

One of our most exciting and important tasks during the next year is to prepare a green paper on the changes urgently needed to the State's pollution control laws. Our air, noise and water legislation is totally inadequate for not only the present but the future. These Acts will be overhauled.

I will be releasing a discussion paper within a few months on our coastal protection strategy. I have already created a Coastal Protection Unit in my department, based on the Beach Protection Authority. This unit forms the framework for the implementation of our coastal protection strategy.

This brings me to today's World Environment Day theme—"do we love our sunburnt country?"

I hope the answer is "yes" and covers not only the country but the ecosystems it supports. What needs to be debated today is not "do we love our sunburnt country?" but 'how do we express this love'.

We show care for our country in two ways—through Land Care programs and community nature conservation programs.

My colleague, the Honourable Ed Casey, Minister for Primary Industries is responsible for overseeing the land care programme for Queensland and much good work has been done by the Land Care Committee.

However, my Department of Environment and Heritage has a special role to play in community nature conservation across our vast State. It is with considerable pride that I indicate to the House today that the policies of this Government will see proper protection for the State's wildlife in all its thirteen distinct biogeographic regions from Birdsville to Bundaberg and from Burke to Brisbane.

Over the next six months a state-wide strategy will be developed to ensure the conservation of our State's unique flora and fauna wherever it is found. Our national parks system will always be the jewel in the crown and the heart of a proper conservation strategy but these national parks must be supplemented by conservation measures on freehold and leasehold land and planning over the ninety-five percent of Queensland which will not be national park.

To this end, my Department will shortly release two important green papers.

The first will be a discussion paper on the directions of a Queensland Conservation Strategy. We are the only State that does not have a conservation strategy which is followed in terms of the State planning measures.

Earlier this year I released the State of the Environment Report which will act as a base line to show the difficulties faced by the environment in Queensland after thirty-two years of neglect.

From this base line we have developed a discussion paper which highlights the areas of greatest need and seeks suggestions as to what action Government should be taking to remedy the situation. From the discussion paper will come the Queensland State Conservation strategy another first for the Goss Labor Government. Secondly, in the second half of the year I will be releasing a Green Paper on community nature conservation.

The Green Paper on community nature conservation will detail how the community and private landholders can cooperate to ensure that there is an adequate system of nature corridors and natural areas remaining to protect animal and plant communities.

The Queensland Conservation Strategy and the Green Paper on community nature conservation will together ensure that the Queensland environment is properly protected.

As today is World Environment Day, I hope that everyone in some way gives a thought to what they as individuals can do. Land care and community nature conservation might not be everybody's interest. But there are other ways of celebrating the day—by trying out recycling, using public transport instead of a car and conserving energy.

We must all try to live as lightly as possible on the planet, learn to think globally and act locally.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

1. Toll Collection Plazas, Sunshine Motorway

Mr KING asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

“What are the costs of building the two toll collection plazas on the southern end of the Sunshine Motorway, and the projected usage figures and toll charge figures, to justify the claim that the total cost of the motorway will be repaid by such charges?”

Mr HAMILL: The State Government has entered into an agreement with the Sunshine Motorway Company for the construction and operation of the Sunshine Motorway's toll facility.

The Sunshine Motorway Company is a non-listed public company that is subject to normal cooperative reporting procedures, which are lodged annually with the Corporate Affairs Commissioner's Office and available to the honourable member and any member of the public.

As the honourable member is well aware, the toll on the Sunshine Motorway will range from 40c for motor-cyclists to \$3.60 for an eight-axle semi-trailer, and it will be 60c for motor vehicles. It means that motorists using the full length of the Sunshine Motorway will pay 60c, compared with the toll of \$1 that was inequitably placed on the Maroochy River bridge by the previous National Party administration. The honourable member was a prominent figure in that party when the toll was originally imposed.

2. Mount Isa Mines; Collinsville Power Station; Gas Pipeline; Railways

Mr KATTER asked the Minister for Resource Industries—

“(1) Is he aware of proposals put to the Government by Mount Isa Mines requesting a gas pipeline from South West Queensland to Mount Isa and the related offer to reopen and operate the Collinsville Power Station?”

(2) Will he and his department be providing the same advice to Treasury and the Premier's Department as was provided in 1989 by myself and the Department of Mines, i.e. that pending agreement on a reasonable price for Collinsville electricity of MIM (and that that price was as good as finalised as far as I was concerned), that the proposal be proceeded with as fast as possible?

(3) Is he aware that MIM and Western Mining Corporation claim the pipeline is a pre condition for development of the long overdue phosphate fertiliser plant for North Queensland and that it, plus MIM's request for access to surrounding areas by way of authorities to prospect, should be acquiesced to?

(4) Is he aware that the Collinsville Power Station will provide a source of secure base load power in North Queensland itself, power without the high transmission losses which result from the present long distance transfer of electricity?

(5) Will he seek assurances, as were given to us, that (whilst loss of volume will obviously occur) there will be no diminution of volume of traffic i.e. number of trains on the Mount Isa railway line?”

Mr VAUGHAN: (1) Yes, I am fully aware of the proposals.

(2) On a number of occasions, discussions on this project have been held between representatives of Mount Isa Mines and Government officers. At this stage, the negotiations are treated as confidential between MIM and the Government. However, let me assure the honourable member that negotiations are continuing with the interests of the State and MIM very firmly in mind.

(3) Queensland Phosphate Ltd, a subsidiary of the Western Mining Company, has stated that supply of natural gas is a precondition for the establishment of the phosphate fertiliser plant at Duchess. At present, discussions are taking place with representatives of Queensland Phosphate Ltd regarding conditions attached to the authority to prospect and special lease which secure areas for the treatment plant.

(4) At present, the electricity needs of north Queensland are being met more reliably and at lower cost from sources other than the Collinsville Power Station. My advice is that any losses associated with the long transmission lines are more than offset by the savings achieved by closing the power station.

(5) The honourable member would be aware that there is every likelihood that, should the pipeline go ahead, not only will there be no reduction in the number of trains on the Mount Isa railway line, but there will be an increase as production expands at MIM Ltd.

3. **Australian Horticultural Council**

Mr SLACK asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

“(1) Is he aware of the concerns of Queensland citrus growers regarding the structure and operation of the Australian Horticultural Council?”

(2) Does he share those concerns and has he approached the Federal Minister to have the boards restructured to ensure Queensland representation?

(3) If not, will he assure citrus growers that he will insist that the board restructure in order to protect the interests of the citrus growers of this State, who, I might add, are being required to pay increasingly high levies to promote inferior fruit from the southern States?”

Mr CASEY: (1) I thank the honourable member for Burnett for his question. I advise him that there is no such organisation as the Australian Horticultural Council.

(2 and 3) See (1).

4. **Sugar Industry Expansion**

Mr ROWELL asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

“With reference to the various times that he has told the sugar industry organisations that he will always listen to and take notice of what the industry wants and in view of the industry's unanimous concern reported in the print media throughout the State regarding his media release suggesting an unlimited unassigned expansion for about two years —

(1) Whose advice did he seek in relation to the content of his media release just prior to his departure overseas on 21 May?

(2) Will he in future adhere to his own assurances that he will listen to the proper voice of the industry; or are we to see more of the "Maverick" style of sugar industry administration where someone from the Government who thinks he knows best, dictates what he thinks is best for the industry, when in fact that "someone" has demonstrated an appalling lack of understanding of the sugar industry?”

Mr CASEY: (1 and 2) The media release referred to by the honourable member is a statement of my views on the future direction of the Queensland sugar industry. It emphasises the need for the industry to respond more swiftly to market opportunities than it has in the past.

In relation to the process of industry consultation—I will stress again that my door is, and always has been, open to industry organisations for consultation. I am also concerned with the fact that the sugar industry does not speak with a single voice.

Later today, I hope to receive the sugar industry working party report. After I have had the opportunity to study its contents and recommendations, I will have further consultations with the industry regarding the implementation of the recommendations.

5. Sugar Industry Expansion

Mr ROWELL asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

“Has the Minister, and his chosen advisers taken time to read and understand the clear and precise wording of the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act which sets out, in Section 32H, a clear path for the expansion of assigned areas and, if so, why is a Minister of the Crown now proposing that people should go out and flagrantly disregard the provisions of that Act when the industry and, in particular, the cane growers most definitely want the integrity of the assignment system administered by the Cane Prices Board to remain, and, moreover, all he has to do to achieve the expansion which he and the industry want, is to simply issue the necessary directions to the Cane Prices Board to expand by 8 percent?”

Mr CASEY: I am well aware of the provisions of the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act. I am also well aware that only half of the 5 per cent expansion in cane assignments approved in 1988 has actually been taken up by the growers. That is disappointing when, at a time of relatively high international prices, the industry has missed out on the opportunity of more than \$300m in potential sugar sales.

I have accepted the recommendation of the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board for a further 8 per cent increase in assignments. I am hoping that that increase will be taken up as soon as possible to the benefit of growers, millers and the State economy. I certainly do not suggest that growers disregard the legislation. There is no need for them to do so. I intend to introduce amendments that will enable those growers who currently hold assignments and who wish to expand production to do so quickly.

Only yesterday afternoon, I met with the members of the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board. I have had full discussions and reached agreements with them to set into place the assignment increase in Queensland, with returns to be back to the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board by 30 June. In accordance with this Government's policy, there will also be provision for new assignments and assignments to young farmers. I hope that they will all be in the same allocation and that, by 16 July, their applications can be in the hands of the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board.

6. Forestry Department Nursery, Walkamin

Mr STEPHAN asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

“With reference to the move by the Queensland Forestry Department to construct a nursery in Walkamin on the Atherton Tablelands with the view to growing a wide range of species of trees for distribution to local landholders—

- (1) Did he personally instruct the Department to construct the nursery?
- (2) When did planning begin?
- (3) Has a cost benefit analysis been carried out, what funding is being used and what is the estimated cost?
- (4) Did the Department consult with the local nursery industry before the decision was made?
- (5) Has the Department considered purchasing the trees from local nurseries?
- (6) What is the estimated cost of each tree produced?
- (7) How many trees will be produced on an annual basis?
- (8) Will he give an absolute assurance that this nursery will at no time compete with local nurseries in the market place?”

Mr CASEY: I note the inference in the honourable member's question that I might be intending to take away the livelihood of Atherton Tableland nurseries by the decision of the Queensland Forest Service to build a new nursery at Walkamin. However, the answer to the member's specific questions are as follows—

- (1) No.

(2) In 1987, the honourable member's own Government commenced planning for the upgrading of nursery facilities in north Queensland.

(3) In March 1988, an internal Queensland Forest Service proposal was prepared specifically addressing the need and impact of upgraded nursery facilities to replace the obsolete existing nursery at Danbulla. The proposed new nursery at Walkamin is designed to produce plants for specialist research purposes, plantation re-establishment, land-care plantings and Federal Government sponsored trials as well as to provide holding facilities for plants despatched from other Queensland Forest Service nurseries.

Funds have been allocated from the Queensland Forest Service Landcare Program. The allocated funding for the construction of the Walkamin nursery is \$109,000. Ancillary facilities comprising an interpretative office cost \$40,000, and a seed-drying shed, to cost \$30,000, will also be constructed. I would point out that forest services throughout Australia and throughout the world operate forest nurseries to service their programs.

(4) During initial planning and in the preparation of the Queensland Forest Service proposal, the impact of the proposed nursery on other private and public nurseries in the region was considered.

(5) The Queensland Forest Service has purchased, and will continue to purchase, trees from private nurseries.

(6) Average direct propagation cost of seedlings produced in the Queensland Forest Service nurseries for the financial year to date is 43c per seedling.

(7) Initial annual production from the Walkamin nursery will be 40 000-60 000 trees per annum. This replaces the production of 45 000 trees by the former Danbulla nursery in 1986-87.

The nursery at Walkamin is an integral part of the Queensland Forest Service nursery network designed to support the requirements of the service and land-holders in the land-care program.

(8) The Queensland Forest Service has raised plants in nurseries on the Atherton Tableland since before World War I and operated tree planting assistance schemes for the provision of trees to land-holders since before World War II.

The policy of the Queensland Forest Service has always been to produce seedling tube stock to service its own needs and those of rural land-holders. The Queensland Forest Service in no way intends to produce for sale advanced stock in large pot sizes, which is regarded as the traditional preserve of private nurseries.

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

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Caspalp Donation; Comments by Minister for Primary Industries

Mr COOPER (Roma—Leader of the Opposition) (11 a.m.): While the member for Mackay was making a ministerial statement, I took notes. This small piece of paper in my hand is the result! When the member for Mackay spoke, honourable members heard nothing about accountability—nothing at all. They heard no answers to the questions that have been asked of the member for Mackay for 10 solid years. Honourable members still hear nothing.

I am getting heartily sick and tired of the continued attempts by members of the Government to wave bits of paper around here and elsewhere, claiming that this time—finally—the member for Mackay has been totally and absolutely exonerated. What rot!

Members of the Government have been waving more bits of paper around today, as they were last night. What is contained in those bits of papers is just as flawed as what is contained in all of the other bits of paper. Honourable members have received

no answers—and including in the documents that have been tabled by the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing.

I want to deal with the facts in relation to the standing of the member for Mackay. Two letters have been written passing some form of judgment on Mr Casey. The first total "exoneration" was a letter from the Solicitor-General. At the time it was tabled in the House it was not, by any stretch of the imagination, an exoneration. The advice of the Solicitor-General was loaded with qualifications. It was full of phrases such as "it would seem" and "on the material supplied". Most pointed of all is the crunch paragraph, which begins "In view of the very inconclusive nature of the presently available material". I emphasise those words.

There were always question marks over the quality of the investigation. Weeks ago in this House the Opposition raised suggestions that Mr Casey was never properly interviewed by Queensland police and that he had refused an interview on the topic of Caspalp. Now the Criminal Justice Commission has agreed that not only does it appear Mr Casey was never properly interviewed by Queensland police but also its report on poker machines indicates—

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition is obviously endeavouring to mislead the House. I find it offensive that he is trying to cast aspersions on me. Only a few moments ago, in my ministerial statement, I clearly gave details of my discussions with the investigating officers of the Queensland police force on 24 August 1982.

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

Mr COOPER: As I was saying, it appears from the report that Mr Casey was never properly interviewed by Queensland police, and the Criminal Justice Commission report on poker machines indicates that the police investigation was potentially flawed simply because of the personnel assigned to the case.

Who oversaw this investigation? Whose is the first name on the list of investigators? Who sent the covering letter with the pitiful document that passed for the investigation, along with some other comments? It was none other than Tony Murphy. I ask honourable members: is the name Tony Murphy not familiar? Tony Murphy is the man who, amongst other things, is pinpointed in the report as having connections with the illegal gaming industry in Queensland. What a referee for Mr Casey. What a guardian angel to have looking after him. He was one of the most crooked cops in the business. What a referee for the ALP and its slush fund. What an ally. What a platform for the Solicitor-General to base his "exoneration" on.

The other officers were Detective Inspector Bradbury and B. Ingham. Bradbury served in the Licensing Branch with Jack Herbert and Tony Murphy. The commission said—

"In the view of this Commission this choice of investigators may have compromised the investigation."

So much for the purported complete exoneration in the Solicitor-General's letter, which was waved around by members of the Government. It does not even get near the nub of the matter, which is contained in the report on page 86, where the CJC discusses the invoices for advertising costs that were the tool that Casey used to launder his slush fund out of the eyes of his factional enemies. The report states—

"This Commission does not accept that the invoices sent to Ainsworth were 'drafts' of any document. These invoices are false and may have given Ainsworth Consolidated Industries the means to claim a fraudulent taxation benefit. From previous correspondence and in terms of Ainsworth practice in Victoria, the instigation for these false invoices is most likely to have come from Vibert. Two of the invoices were backdated and there was, in the period in question, no Labor Party newspaper."

So that is where Mr Casey is far from out of the woods. If Ainsworth Consolidated Industries did commit a tax offence by falsely claiming the Caspalp donations as an advertising tax deduction, Mr Casey is also guilty of a crime. He has not been cleared of what is potentially an offence; neither has he been cleared in relation to matters raised on page 87 of the report where the disposition of the \$30,000 of Ainsworth funds in the Caspalp account is discussed.

The amount of \$20,000 is accounted for in two cash cheques to the ALP. Of the remaining \$10,000 of Ainsworth money, the commission says that it was "retained in account until withdrawn in series of cash cheques to the benefit of persons or organisations unknown". The report makes the following comment—

"This Commission is of the view that the investigations conducted by the police and the material referred to the Solicitor-General did not adequately determine the application of funds in the Caspalp promotion fund account. In particular, the application of some \$10,000 of the Ainsworth donations totalling \$30,000 is unknown."

Further, the report states that, of a total of \$46,949.74 that went through the Caspalp account, some \$21,722.99 remained unaccounted for at the time the report was handed down last Friday. The Minister therefore clearly misled the House on 27 March when he said—

"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."

That is clearly not the case, and the Premier's lame excuse for his Minister last night that he had accounted for the money to the then ALP State Secretary, Peter Beattie, was wrong. Peter Beattie was not even State Secretary at the time. The Premier was so keen to dump on Peter Beattie that he got it wrong.

The major issue, however, is that this Goss Government has, by approving the introduction of poker machines, decided to introduce further criminal activity into this State. That decision was made by a Premier who rode to office on a false promise of honesty and accountability. That decision was made against the considered advice of the Criminal Justice Commission and a host of other studies and investigations cited in the Criminal Justice Commission report, which made clear the simple fact that, whatever the controls, crime cannot be controlled.

That was the second commission of inquiry report that was bagged by the Government within a week. Last week, it was the Cooke inquiry report. The common denominator is that both reports bagged senior members of the ALP. It seems that our reform commissioners will have to watch out for this Labor Government. They will either have to come down with findings that are in line with what the ALP wants or face a public bagging and humiliation. Who will be next? Will it be Tom Sherman and the EARC?

Where is this Government's commitment to reform now that the issues of reform have reached deep into the heart and soul of the ALP? It has gone right out the window. Why? Only one reason exists, namely, that the ALP is in the process of inventing and entrenching a money trail to finance elections through political donations to be made if, or when, poker machines are in operation in Queensland. Honourable members should make no mistake: once the machines are introduced, the poker machine lobby will become a major source of donations to the ALP.

I reiterate that, on at least two counts, the member for Mackay has misled the Parliament. Firstly, he has often repeated that unaccounted-for funds have been accounted for. They have not. Secondly, he denied in this House that he had never noted the poker machine Aristocrat while he was in Las Vegas. He wrote a letter to Vibert saying that he had noted those machines. On at least two occasions, the honourable member has deliberately misled this House. The other most important, major consideration is that Ainsworth, according to the report, may have gained a fraudulent tax benefit from false advertising invoices issued by Caspalp, which was, as honourable members know, under the control of the member for Mackay.

I call for an investigation into this matter. It is a serious consequence that, if Ainsworth did obtain a fraudulent tax benefit and is found guilty then, by association, so too is the member for Mackay and he has no right to sit in this place.

According to the report, the police investigation of Casey and material supplied to the Solicitor-General did not adequately determine the application of funds into Caspals's promotion account. Examples exist of the so-called police investigation that was carried out by police with suspect backgrounds. Tony Murphy—I ask honourable members not to forget that name—was one of the people who were involved in the investigation of this entire matter.

Time expired.

Report on Gaming Machine Concerns and Regulations

Hon. R. J. GIBBS (Wolston—Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing) (11.10 a.m.): The *Report on Gaming Machine Concerns and Regulations*, which was submitted by the Criminal Justice Commission of Queensland, has been studied with great interest. The report presents a fairly broad picture of the poker machine industry as it has existed over recent years. Much of the material included in the report has been presented previously in the reports of former commissions, particularly the Moffitt, Connor and Wilcox reports of 1974 through to 1983. That information is well known to the Government.

As honourable colleagues would be aware, the industry has a record of illegal practices which any Government seeking to introduce machine gaming facilities would be ill advised to ignore. As indicated in the commission's report at pages 94 and 95, it is the policy of the Government to establish a gaming authority or commission to determine and advise on overall gaming application policies and to exercise control over all forms of gambling in this State.

The establishment of that authority has already been discussed with the Public Sector Management Commission. However, because of its proposed breadth of influence, prior to its implementation it demands a separate and detailed appraisal of its functions. In the meantime, it is the Government's intention to proceed with the introduction of machine gaming to clubs and hotels under the most stringent legislation and procedures ever enforced anywhere in the world.

Because the draft legislative instructions have only just been completed, a copy thereof was delivered to the Criminal Justice Commission only in the past fortnight. Unfortunately, that preceded the submission of the report by just a few days. Consequently, the commission did not have the opportunity to examine the draft provisions prior to the compilation of the report. I am confident that, had that occurred, the content of the report would have been different. As indicated later in this speech, the majority of the concerns expressed by the commission have been adequately addressed in the proposed legislation.

As has already been announced, it is the Government's intention to acquire by outright purchase all devices for installation in clubs and hotels, to maintain full ownership thereof and to allocate and rent them without preference to the sites. Our proposals cover the following steps—

- call for expressions of interest;
- stringently evaluate the devices and game programs;
- investigate the antecedents of the manufacturer and supplier and their principal officers;
- call tenders for machines that pass the evaluation;
- approve a selection of companies and machines;
- purchase the devices outright; and
- rent the machines without preference to clubs and hotels.

Because of the activities in other jurisdictions over many years, the gaming machine industry is renowned for its suspect personalities and dubious business practices by machine companies. Numerous serious allegations may be directed towards most manufacturers and suppliers. However, to deny all such companies the opportunity to supply the Queensland market would virtually eliminate all major suppliers, including those that currently provide more than 90 per cent of the machine population in both of Queensland's casinos. The Government's proposal to purchase the machines outright—provision for which is included in the draft legislation—will overcome these difficulties.

Other inclusions in the proposed legislation are—

- licensing of the premises where machine gaming will be conducted;
- thorough investigation of all applicants for gaming machine licences;
- an approved schedule of the number, type, game and coin denomination of all devices;
- cancellation or suspension of a gaming machine licence for any irregular practice;
- licensing of all repair and maintenance personnel;
- licensing of all onsite personnel who deal with machine gaming operations, namely, machine-managers;
- stringent requirements on applicants for repairers' or machine-managers' licences, including fingerprinting, photographing and police checks of antecedents;
- licensing of all service contractors who employ repair personnel;
- cancellation or suspension of repairers' or machine-managers' licences for irregular practices;
- thorough evaluation of machines and game microprocessor functions;
- detailed inventory of all devices in the State;
- strict controls over machine access and operation;
- protection and restricted access to sensitive parts of the device, including the microprocessor;
- existence of both mechanical and electronic meter readings and comparison by Government inspectors;
- maintenance of detailed machine performance records and accounting information;
- thorough reporting requirements to the division on machine operations and financial recording;
- detailed machine performance analysis and cash flow determination by the division for each machine on each site; and
- onsite Government inspection, including meter verification at regular intervals.

I will expand on two of those points. Firstly, according to the report of the Criminal Justice Commission, the revelations exposed in both the Moffitt royal commission and the Wilcox royal commission identified two areas which should be of concern to any Government, including, for example, the provision of illegal devices in either clubs or hotels. That is not a difficult problem to overcome.

By registering and denominating all machines in the State when they are allocated to either hotel or club premises, the club or hotel will then be required to display publicly how many machines it has been licensed to actually carry on the premises. That will account centrally with the control that the Casino Control Division has over the machines. In other words, if at any time an inspector goes to premises to carry out an inspection and he finds there more machines than they are licensed to carry, it will be obvious that an illegal supplier is in the marketplace, and those machines will then be immediately removed and remedial action taken.

But more importantly, both Wilcox and Moffitt spoke about the ability to tamper with machines and the use of devices such as false coins on the end of wires. I ask

members of the Opposition, particularly the Leader of the Opposition, to listen to my next point and they will learn something productive.

I now display to the House the bowels of a poker machine. I am holding the bowels and the working component of a poker machine. It is the microprocessor chip which is fitted into the machine——

Mr Veivers: Who gave you that?

Mr GIBBS: I will tell the honourable member. As I said, it is fitted into the machine and it controls the whole device. It came from the Casino Control Division.

The simple fact is that when both royal commissions into the poker machine industry were held, the present technology did not exist and there was not a machine in operation at that time that had this high-tech capacity. It is by using this high-tech capacity that the Casino Control Division installs the microchip into the back of the machine where it is housed in a tamper-proof box which is then sealed with the official seal of the Casino Control Division.

Only a handful of people are given the right or authorisation to break the seal and to have access to the microchip. Those people who are given that right can only break the seal—and I stress this point—in the presence of a licensed inspector from the Casino Control Division. The case history simply is that the necessity to enter the box in which the microchip processor is housed approximates one case in every 1 200 machines, such is its the accuracy.

I stress that the only way in which a machine can be interfered with is through this microprocessor chip. In other words, somebody would have to illegally break the machine, break the security device—the box—break the seal of the Casino Control Division and then, in order to remove the program which is currently in existence within the microprocessor chip and insert a new program, use an infra-red device of some nature to go over the clear glass section in the middle of this device. That is something that is impossible to achieve in either a club or a hotel.

I am saying—and I stand by what I say—that we can guarantee an industry in this State that is virtually free of any criminal involvement. Nobody can guarantee that at some time somebody in a club is not going to dip in and grab a handful of coins. I have never said anything other than that. Because hotels and clubs will be taxed on turn-over and not on profits, believe me, it will not take long for club management to realise that, if such a practice is happening, somebody is tickling the peter in the club and club management itself will find out. If club management does not find out about the practice, it will be detected within a matter of days because of the constant checking of the two coin devices contained within the machine.

Time expired.

Government's Commitment to Parliamentary Reform; Introduction of Poker Machines

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11.20 a.m.): This morning we have seen the incredible sight of the Government of this State not prepared to have question-time but to run away from all the commitments of accountability and parliamentary reform that it made its platform during the State election campaign and after the election.

More importantly, over the last 24 hours we have seen the despatch to the morgue of the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice. This Government has pre-empted that select committee of this House. It has embarked on a course of action designed to denigrate the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice. It has embarked on a course of action to attack the credibility of Sir Max Bingham and the Criminal Justice Commission.

For the benefit of honourable members, I will table a notice from the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice calling for public submissions on gaming machines, concerns and regulation. That notice states—

"The Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee is a bi-partisan Select Committee of the Parliament . . . The main functions of the Committee are to review and monitor the discharge of the functions of the Criminal Justice Commission and to report to the Legislative Assembly on reports submitted by the Commission."

I table that document.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

Mr BORBIDGE: Having tabled that document, I ask: why does the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice now need to report? Why need it now meet? We have witnessed the incredible situation in which the Minister in charge of the introduction of poker machines has just announced that the legislation is being prepared; the decisions have been taken; the Cabinet has decided; and the caucus has decided. The Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice is now rendered totally irrelevant.

If there is anything more disgraceful than a Government running away from question-time, surely it is a Government that has today and yesterday effectively torpedoed one of the principal recommendations of the Fitzgerald commission of inquiry. What this House has seen emerge is the double standards of the Premier of this State. It has seen the most comprehensive dumping on the CJC and the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice of this House for all time. I feel sorry for the honourable member for Brisbane Central, who has been sitting on the other side, having to cop all that he has had to cop from this Government over the last 24 hours.

Whatever happened to the Government's alleged commitment to accountability and propriety? Here is the child of Fitzgerald on page 86 of its report raising very legitimate questions about possible fraudulent tax claims involving a Minister of the Government. On page 87 the commission says—

"This Commission is of the view that the investigations conducted by the police and the material referred to the Solicitor-General did not adequately determine the application of funds in the CASPALP Promotion Fund Account."

I now read from page 90—

"In the view of this Commission this choice of investigators may have compromised the investigation. On the day of the above notation in LEWIS's diary is another, relating to another sensitive investigation being conducted by INGHAM and BRADBURY."

They are the two police officers concerned. The report continues—

"A study of the records held by this Commission indicates that INGHAM and BRADBURY jointly performed a number of sensitive investigations on behalf of the then police administration. BRADBURY served in the Licensing Branch with Jack Reginald HERBERT and Anthony MURPHY in the period 1968-70. INGHAM and BRADBURY are included in a list of police officers and others which was included in the report of the Commission of Inquiry as Appendices 22 and 23."

Apparently this is okay; this does not breach the Premier's standards for behaviour and conduct of his Ministers.

This matter is all about the blatant hypocrisy of the Premier of Queensland, who today sits in this place by fraudulent means. Whilst the Premier permits to remain in his Cabinet Ministers who have been the subject of very serious accusations by the Criminal Justice Commission, one of the sons of the Fitzgerald inquiry, it is his credibility that is on the line. Surely, today, the obligation is on the Premier to answer these accusations

What about the Premier's code of ministerial conduct? Where is it? Is it still secret? Is it still being finetuned so that the Premier can adjust it every time some damaging

report is released and so that he can fiddle the books? This Government's standards of accountability and its ministerial code of conduct are not worth a cold crumpet.

I further quote from the report of the CJC—

"The introduction of gaming machines concerns this Commission in two respects. Firstly there are long established and well documented links between the legal and illegal gaming machine industry and organised criminal interests. Secondly the establishment of a gaming machine industry dealing in high cash turnovers in numerous locations can be expected to contribute to an increase in general criminal activity."

Why then are this Government, this Premier and this Cabinet so hell-bent on introducing poker machines into the State of Queensland? What the CJC is saying is that poker machines equate to organised crime.

Mr Littleproud: General organised crime.

Mr BORBIDGE: Yes, general organised crime. Introduce poker machines and crime increases.

On page 8 the report repeats the conclusion reached by Murray Wilcox, QC, in Victoria in 1983 when he said—

" . . . beneficial factors are outweighed by three major objections (including) the certainty of increased criminal activities in Victoria as a direct result of the introduction of poker machines. The extent of the likely increase depends directly upon two factors: the number of premises in which machines are permitted and the stringency of the controls imposed. Depending on those factors crime will increase to a degree ranging from significant to serious. There is not merely a risk of increased crime. Under any scenario crime will increase."

The report further states—

"Historically, both in Australia and overseas, some manufacturers of gaming machines have often been shown to be linked with syndicated or organised criminal interests."

The report is a damning indictment of the manner in which the Government and the Labor Party, which allegedly are so committed to the principles of accountability, have handled this matter.

Recently, this House saw the Minister for Tourism talking about the new wave of poker machines that have been introduced. In very recent years, supposedly sophisticated poker machines have been made which accept the wrong coin, which respond to a coin on a piece of string, which can be manipulated by a bit of jiggling, and which can be foiled by a piece of wire and an alligator clip.

The report states—

"It would be folly to anticipate, as some in the industry would have us believe"—

and, following the effort of the Minister for Tourism this morning, as some in the Government would have us believe—

"that poker machines installed in Queensland would be immune to either manipulation or the attentions of professional cheats."

Honourable members should look at some of the people associated with the poker machine industry who the Labor Party wants involved in this business in the State of Queensland. One is Graeme Fullerton, whose name and history are interesting because he was at the 1979 meeting that led to the establishment of the Australian Club Development Fund, of which Ted Vibert became executive director, and which was the agency through which Vibert paid the \$30,000 Caspalp donation. At the same time, Fullerton had 19 convictions ranging from felonious possession of a pistol, possession of implements for house-breaking, false pretences, larceny, shop-breaking and stealing. Later, he had business dealings with Abe Saffron.

At one time, Ainsworth also employed a Kevin James O'Brien as an accountant to restructure the Ainsworth group for tax purposes. O'Brien had several fraud related offences against him in Victoria. Ainsworth was later assessed as having tax and penalty liabilities of more than \$20m.

This morning, it was very interesting to read that the tax office is interested in whether there has been some fraudulent arrangement between the Labor Party in the State of Queensland and Ainsworth Consolidated Industries. The tax office is interested, despite the fact that the Premier is not. I can only reiterate that this Government was elected on a policy of the highest standards of accountability and propriety and a commitment to the democratic processes of this Parliament. It has dinged out at the first available opportunity. People need to be asking, "In light of all this overwhelming evidence from the Criminal Justice Commission, why is it that the Labor Party in this State is so determined to go ahead with the introduction of poker machines?"

Kindergarten, Gordonvale

Mr PITT (Mulgrave) (11.30 a.m): I rise to speak on a matter of concern to the people of Gordonvale, a township within the electorate of Mulgrave. The construction of a new double-unit preschool within the grounds of the Gordonvale primary school has seen the old preschool facility situated in Moller Street become vacant.

Since my election, I have had brought to my attention the interest held by the Gordonvale Community Kindergarten Association Inc. to utilise this valuable public facility. This organisation has a moral right to be given favourable consideration in this respect, and I now acquaint honourable members with some historical details which support its claim.

In 1969, members of the Gordonvale community saw a need to establish a kindergarten in the area and began to gather information on how to achieve it. A committee was formed with full public support. A grant of land was given in trust to the community by the State Government. It was to be used for kindergarten purposes. Two other blocks were surveyed for future use. The community was then asked to raise finance to support the construction of a new building. The funds raised included: a Mulgrave Shire Council grant of \$1,000; an Education Department grant of \$1,000, and a Lions/Rotary grant of \$1,000.

Local people gave freely of their time and effort to build the Moller Street centre at minimal cost, and, on 31 August 1971, the kindergarten was officially opened by the then Governor of Queensland, the Honourable Sir Alan Mansfield.

In 1973, it became known that the State Government proposed to build a preschool in Gordonvale. As the number of children under five years of age in the community was declining, it was decided to study the viability of keeping the kindergarten running. A public meeting was held and those present decided that the greatest benefit to the community would be gained by offering the State Government the use of the building and equipment. Negotiations began and the building was handed over to the State Government for the amount still outstanding on the \$4,000 loan initially taken out by the kindergarten to erect the building.

This was a very generous agreement on the part of the community and, to further support the view that the community wanted the best possible care and education for their children, all money on the kindergarten's books at the time of the change-over was given to the preschool p. and c. association. This proved to be in excess of \$4,000, which more than nullified the debt paid out by the State Government for the building.

The new preschool adequately served local needs for several years. However, some eight years later, another group of community-minded people saw the need for establishing a kindergarten for three to four year olds and, with considerable effort on their part, the Gordonvale Community Kindergarten was re-formed and began operating in the Gordonvale Community Hall.

The town's under-five population began to increase and, in 1989, the State Government preschool could not cater for the number of children needing the service. Again the members of the Gordonvale Community Kindergarten looked to increasing their service to the community. Not only did the kindergarten provide kindergarten sessions but it also established a preschool group to cater for the children who could not be serviced by the State Government preschool.

Now, in 1990, the wheel has turned full circle. The State Government preschool has moved into a new building attached to the primary school in Sheppards Street. This building can service twice the number of children than has been possible to date.

Although the association has been fortunate in having been able to operate the service in the community hall since 1985, the hall is unsuitable for the following reasons—

- Beside the hall are two large gas tanks which give cause for concern for the safety of the children should there be a leak or explosion at any time.
- There is no fenced area at the front of the building and entry is directly off a major street in the town.
- The hall area is not really adequate to accommodate a group of 20 children for the number and variety of activities they need to experience.
- The facility is used by other community groups, which means that, almost daily, all equipment must be locked away and furniture moved to a lock-up area. This is very time-consuming for staff, who are paid on an hourly basis. Their time could be better used creating activities and programs for the children.

It is important to understand that the Moller Street centre was originally built for kindergarten purposes to meet Creche and Kindergarten Association standards. It could, therefore, be used to provide not only kindergarten sessions but also other services to the community, such as occasional care, which also comes under the strict guidelines of the Creche and Kindergarten Association. In the future, the extra two blocks of land adjoining the centre could be utilised to extend the building and, therefore, community services.

Occasional care and vacation care for the children of the community are to be established as soon as possible, should relocation to the Moller Street centre be realised. At present, no such care is available within the community. In the future, the organisation proposes that a new building or extension to the existing building be erected on the adjoining land. It is intended that this be used for purposes which include day care, another service not available to the people of Gordonvale at present.

The Gordonvale Community Kindergarten Association Inc. has requested that the Department of Administrative Services gazette the land now known as Education Reserve 1623 and the building known as the Gordonvale preschool to the Mulgrave Shire Council. That council will, in turn, lease the abovementioned land and building to the Gordonvale Community Kindergarten Association Inc. at no real cost to that organisation.

Councillor Stan Marsh of the Mulgrave Shire Council attended the public meeting held on 24 April. At that time, he indicated that the Mulgrave Shire Council was prepared to hold the land and building in trust and then lease it back to the kindergarten at a token rental. A precedent has already been set in the Mulgrave Shire with regard to a similar situation at Yorkeys Knob.

All present at the meeting were most appreciative of the Mulgrave Shire Council's support for the Gordonvale Community Kindergarten, and its recognition of the need for the kindergarten to move to its own premises. The Mulgrave Shire Council would, I believe, be supportive of future expansion which is planned to include vacation care, occasional care and, possibly, day care.

I thank the Minister for the interest that he has shown in this matter and I feel confident that, now he has been apprised of the full facts, he will give favourable

consideration to the requests made by the Gordonvale Community Kindergarten Association Inc.

Firearms Control

Mr LINGARD (Fassifern) (11.37 a.m.): Today, it gives me great pleasure to hand, to the Clerk of the Parliament, another petition containing approximately 350 names of people who are opposed to the ALP proposals for gun laws. This follows similar petitions presented today, and I believe that they are the start of an avalanche of petitions and massive opposition to what the Government plans to do in controlling the owners of guns. The opposition to gun laws in Queensland will, I believe, match the demonstrations against the ALP Government in Victoria and which were partly responsible for the fall of the Unsworth Government in New South Wales.

Here is another typical example of the Labor Party's grab for centralised power. It has already happened in the ambulance and fire services and the public service. Here is another typical example of putting everyone's name on a list. Once again, it shows what the ALP thinks of personal liberties. It is another typical example of the intention of the ID card. If ever you wanted another example of all these things, then have a look at the ALP's policy towards gun laws. Honourable members, let us have a look at what Police Minister Mackenroth said last June—

Mr WELLS: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member keeps addressing honourable members. He should address his remarks through the Chair.

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

Mr LINGARD: Let us have a look at what the Police Minister said last June when he attended the Firearms Dealers Association meeting. What did he want? He said that the Labor Party's policy on firearms control was that—

- (a) all owners should be licensed;
- (b) every firearm should be registered;
- (c) a shooter's licence should be produced to purchase ammunition; and
- (d) a cooling-off period of four weeks should be instituted before any purchase is concluded.

The Minister said that ALP policies were non-negotiable. However, later when he saw the turmoil that his counterparts in Victoria got themselves into, he made the following announcement—

"After discussions with the Sporting Shooters' Association and the Firearms Dealers' Association, the ALP has acceded that the provision for registration of individual firearms is to be dropped from the party's policy. I have examined the situation as it operated in Victoria and believe that registration of individual firearms is a bureaucratic nightmare that would never work."

The bureaucratic nightmare of licensing will not work for firearms and it will not work for owners.

At the start of this year, the ALP decided to set up its own committee to investigate the problem. First of all, let us look at the Minister's attitude to committees. Recently, when addressing ambulance workers he said that he knew there would be a minority report from the parliamentary ambulance committee, but that the ALP has the numbers on the committee and that they would push it through Parliament. That is his attitude to parliamentary committees. In the last few days, the same attitude has been shown towards the CJC. We now have the Firearms Legislative Review Committee. One would think that surely this committee would have been given a free rein, but that was not the case. It was told to investigate ways of introducing licences for all owners of firearms. This investigative committee was told that it could not decide whether licences were necessary. It was told that licences were necessary, and it was to investigate how licensing should be implemented.

I turn now to look at how the ALP organised this committee. The new committee was established to review the Government's intended legislation, but it did not properly take shooting interests into account. It comprises only representatives from the Sporting Shooters Association of Australia, the Firearms Dealers Association, the Commonwealth Bank Officers Association, the Australian Bank Employees Union, the Farmers Federation of Queensland, and the Domestic Violence Association. The bank unions have numerical strength of representation on this committee. Many other organisations which have particular expertise in the use of firearms and whose members will be directly affected by the new legislation in their day-to-day lives are not represented on this committee. I would expect the bank group to favour very restrictive legislation.

I turn now to the appointment of Christine Nolan, who represents groups such as the Domestic Violence Association. The committee had met eight times, but another lady was appointed to it. I wonder where the pressure to appoint Christine Nolan came from? Did it come from the Premier's wife to the Premier, and then to the Minister?

During 1988-89 the previous National Party Government held extensive hearings through the Firearms Advisory Council. Membership of that group comprised representatives from various shooting organisations, the medical profession, bank unions, primary producers' organisations and Government departments. Delegates to this group approached their work in a very professional, non-political manner. Their work was very thorough and, in fact, some of the recommendations of the Government of the day were strenuously opposed by the Firearms Advisory Council and, in some cases, rejected. Some of the major recommendations which this early council suggested included the following—

- (1) Any police officer should be able to issue a temporary prohibition order against any person where circumstances warranted, for example, in situations of threatened domestic violence;
- (2) The council was unequivocally opposed to the introduction of a permit-to-purchase system or a cooling-off period;
- (3) Persons convicted of an indictable offence involving the use of a firearm should be subject to a sentence of not less than five years, in addition to any other sentences imposed, and these gaol terms should be served consecutively, not concurrently;
- (4) A list of prohibited persons should be regularly updated and distributed to all licensed firearms dealers by the Police Service;
- (5) A permanent advisory body should be established to inform the Queensland Government on firearms legislation and all associated matters; and
- (6) There should be no change in existing legislation regarding long arms.

The National Party believes that the ALP will introduce legislation on gun laws which will impose licensing restrictions on owners of all firearms, whether they be concealable weapons or long arms. Previously, the ALP has stated its intention of registering all firearms. If it does not do so now under the present legislation, it will do so in the future. The National Party wants to make its intentions on gun laws very clear. The National Party is against any ban on or licence for rifles or long arms. It believes that there should be enforced penalty provisions on offenders in the use of firearms and stricter provisions for the storage of weapons. The National Party will continue to support the present licensing for concealable weapons. However, the licence should be for the owner and not for the concealable firearm. Owners should obtain a licence for five years rather than the present two years, and an owner's licence should list the concealable weapons which he owns. The National Party believes that there should be no licence necessary for possession of a long arm and there should be no cooling-off period or need for a permit to purchase.

The National Party believes that the legislation should be extended and be referred to as a weapons Bill. It should include weapons which, when used offensively against any person, are likely to cause bodily harm, and those weapons would include firearms. The National Party recognises the importance of a firearms safety education in the wider

community and the good work that has already been done by shooting organisations in developing education programs.

A firearms safety education manual should be compiled by the Government. As part of any safety education program, the Government should give suitable assistance to recognised shooting organisations by the provision of appropriate land designated for use as shooting ranges. The emotional issue regarding gun laws is generated by those who say that people are able to obtain a rifle and shoot indiscriminately. The National Party believes that people who are prepared to act in that way must be prevented from doing so by, first of all, stricter supervision and care of all guns by both dealers and owners. This supervision, especially in gun shops, must be supervised and inspected regularly. Police must have the ability to prohibit people from owning a gun and must be able to withdraw guns from use.

The purchase of guns from dealers must be strictly supervised and recorded correctly. Careful checking of the identity of those people who are buying the guns also must be carried out. The identity of the purchaser must be matched against a list of prohibited persons who will not be able to purchase guns. Any type of concealable weapon must be identified on an owner's licence and all automatic weapons must be banned. A Schedule to legislation should contain an offensive weapons list, which may be changed by Order in Council. Those weapons should be defined as anything which, when used offensively, is likely to cause bodily harm.

Time expired.

Rosslyn Bay Marina Development

Mr PEARCE (Broadsound) (11.47 a.m.): I rise in this House to bring the people of Queensland up to date with the development of a marina at Rosslyn Bay on the Capricorn Coast. Rosslyn Bay is the only boat harbour for some 500 kilometres between Gladstone and Mackay.

From talking with local residents, I understand that the harbour has offered very little or no protection from the northern weather influences that frequent that part of the central coast.

Sand movement from east to west has meant that the harbour has needed to be continually dredged, which is an expensive exercise for both the Government and the environment. Following the identification of a need for tourist facilities incorporating a marina, in association with the proposed sea defence walls on the north west sides of the harbour, Keppel Gateway made an application, and was granted a permit to occupy by the Harbours Corporation.

On completion of a feasibility study, a lease was issued to Keppel Gateway by the Marine and Ports Division to permit work on Stage I of the project, which involved the construction of seawalls, reclamation and development of services to the site. The estimated cost for the first stage of the development is \$9.2m. Of this amount, the Marine and Ports Division has contributed \$4.6m that, on a work-complete basis, will be paid direct to Leightons Contractors which is constructing the development. The lease known as "the development lease" commits Keppel Gateway to an ongoing program of development of marina and onshore facilities.

Work on Stage I commenced in March 1989. Since that date, the Capricorn Coast has had a rock wall some 1 046 metres long, slowly edging its way out to sea to form the outer seawall. One thousand metres of revetment rock wall, bounding the 14.3 hectare harbour, have also been built. Stage I has also involved the reclaiming of 12.5 hectares of land between the outer wall and the inner revetment wall. This has been achieved by pumping more than 550 thousand cubic metres of dredged material from the harbour. Landscaping and services to the reclamation boundary have been carried out, and 360 metres of roadworks have also been completed.

There is a feeling of excitement building up along the coast as locals see these first completed stages of a project that they hope will complement the Capricorn Coast. Stage

II of the development will mean the construction of a main access road, drainage, sewerage, a marina car park, hard stand and boat-ramp, together with a marina control building and 100 floating berths with fuelling facilities. This second stage of development, at an estimated cost of \$5m, should be completed in 18 months to two years.

As Stage II develops, construction of commercial and residential facilities will also commence. However, due to unreliable factors such as the weather, a date for the overall completion of the project, which will cost more than \$90m, cannot be accurately set. When the marina development is completed, the Capricorn Coast will boast a 350-berth marina, a yacht club, a heliport, a public picnic and recreation area, a 120-room three-star hotel, a tavern restaurant and commercial centre, a backpackers' hostel, a ferry and bus terminal, as well as 300 strata title units.

I compliment the developers, Keppel Gateway, for what has been achieved so far with this project and I wish the company well as it struggles towards completion of the marina. It would be unrealistic to suggest that this marina development will be the answer for the business and tourist industry people of the Capricorn Coast who are currently experiencing difficult times, but I do hope that the marina operations will contribute significantly to the future prospects of the area.

However, there is a side issue to this marina development which disturbs me, and I raise it in this House today to draw attention to the previous State Government's commitment of taxpayers' money to the project.

I have already stated that the Marine and Ports Division has contributed \$4.6m to Stage I of the marina construction—a fact with which I have learnt to live. However, my blood still boils when I hear that it will cost taxpayers an estimated \$1m for reconstruction and upgrading of a road that has been damaged as a result of work at the harbour. Known as the Scenic Highway, this road has been used to carry more than 600 000 tonnes of rock fill between Kinka quarry and the marina development at Rosslyn Bay.

The constant movement of heavily laden trucks between the harbour and the quarry has caused enormous damage to the road, and indeed, this was a hot issue during the election campaign last year. In an article in the *Capricorn Coast Mirror* on 19 October last year under the headline "Government OK's \$1 million for Scenic Highway repair", the former member, whose name appears to have slipped my mind, said—

"The Scenic Highway between Kinka Beach and the Harbour turnoff would be rebuilt at a cost of one million dollars".

At the time, my concern was that the taxpayers of this State would be subsidising developers to the tune of \$1m for roadworks damaged by them during their construction of the marina. I have said previously—and I will say it again—that developers should be prepared to accept their responsibilities and pay for the rebuilding process, and any damage or destruction they cause to roads and the environment.

My disgust for this misuse of public money does not end there. I am aware that Leighton's construction company, which is to receive \$4.6m from the State Government, has contributed \$32,000 for roadworks. Of that, \$13,000 was allocated for the strengthening and straightening of a bridge across the Causeway Lake, while \$19,000 was offered to improve the turn-off from the scenic highway to Rosslyn Bay. That is a pitiful \$32,000 from an overall State commitment of \$4.6m. In another twist to the deal, the Department of Harbours and Marine also contributed \$100,000 for roadwork maintenance.

Let me state that there was no doubt in the minds of the people of the Capricorn Coast that the previous State Government—the remainder of its members are now sitting on the other side of the House—had committed \$1m for the reconstruction of the road. In an attempt to be fair, I have combined the amounts contributed by both the construction company and the Department of Harbours and Marine, a total of \$132,000, and deducted that from the promised \$1m for road repairs. That still leaves a figure of \$868,000 outstanding. You may well be asking yourself, Mr Speaker, from where the other \$868,000 is coming. It is certainly not a committed figure, one especially earmarked

for the road, as the former member had stated in the media and would have us believe. The funds required to get the road back to the state it was in before harbour construction commenced are to come out of already allocated regional funds.

I find it most unacceptable that regional fund allocations were committed to prop up developers and used on roadworks that should have been their responsibility. The people of the Capricorn Coast were conned. The taxpayers were ripped off, and roads in need of urgent funding will miss out because a State Government neglected to look after those who matter most, the people.

I make a promise today to my constituents that this will not happen again in the Broadsound electorate while I am member. Developers will continue to be encouraged but, if they wish to develop in this area, they will do so with their own funds. Most importantly, they must first be made to realise that there must be something in it for the people of the area.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Yeronga.

Mr FITZGERALD: Mr Speaker—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I called the member for Yeronga.

Mr FITZGERALD: It is our turn, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Every day, the member to whom the call is given is always a member of the Opposition. Members opposite have had 30 minutes and members on the Government side have only had 24 minutes. I think that it is only fair that I call the member for Yeronga.

I call the member for Yeronga.

State of the Queensland Judicature; Permanent Court of Appeal

Mr FOLEY (Yeronga) (11.55 a.m.): On the evening of last Thursday, 31 May, the Chief Justice of Queensland, the Honourable J. M. Macrossan, delivered an important address on the *State of the Queensland Judicature* on the occasion of the graduation of certain students-at-law from the Bar Practice Centre. The Chief Justice's address has rekindled the debate on whether Queensland should follow the example of Britain and New South Wales and establish a permanent court of appeal.

At present, appeals lie to the Full Court of the Supreme Court in civil matters and to the Court of Criminal Appeal in criminal matters. Those courts are usually constituted by three justices of the Supreme Court to hear and determine appeals from inferior courts and from decisions of their brother justices of the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice, although favouring a continuation of the current arrangements, did note "some shift . . . towards an increasing occupation by the Court with appeal work." It is clear that the appellate workload involves a full-time commitment of an appeal bench. The Chief Justice observed—

"The Appeal Bench which sits as both Full Court and Court of Criminal Appeal is now continuously in session in term times on a four-day-a-week basis. Each separate sittings is of three weeks' duration. In the near future, probably from the beginning of next year, it is proposed that there will be some change in this. Each sittings will return to being two weeks in length, as they once were, and they will be organised on a five-day-a-week basis. The panels of judges will therefore change more frequently but, with an extra day being allocated each week, sitting time over all will increase by a quarter."

For the great preponderance of cases, the appeal jurisdiction of the Supreme Court constitutes the final court of appeal. It is thus important that its judgments be characterised by the highest quality and consistency.

That consideration has gained extra force in recent years as a result of amendments to the Commonwealth Judiciary Act which have abolished appeal to the High Court as

of right. Now appeal is available to the High Court only by special leave. Appeal to the Privy Council was abolished some time ago. The upshot of those developments is that the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court is of increased significance in defining the law of Queensland.

One further consideration in favour of the establishment of a permanent court of appeal is that the quality of its judgments is likely to be higher, having regard to the opportunity of judges in a permanent court of appeal to focus their time exclusively on the hearing of appeals instead of, as at present, hearing appeals as merely one duty along with the conduct of trials and the hearing of chamber applications.

The English Court of Appeal, for example, has made a profound contribution to twentieth century jurisprudence. One wonders whether such contribution might have been possible had Lord Denning, the Master of the Rolls and Presiding Officer of the court for many years, had to squeeze appeals in between hearing trials.

The establishment of a permanent court of appeal would, moreover, tend to allow for the development of specialist areas of law and to facilitate the hearing of urgent cases.

The separation of functions between justices who hear trials and justices who hear appeals from decisions on those trials has been argued by the various protagonists in the debate to be an advantage or disadvantage depending on their point of view. Those who argue for the maintenance of the status quo urge that it would be disadvantageous to have members of the judiciary deciding appeals without an active current involvement in the conduct of trial work, particularly in the criminal jurisdiction. Those, on the other hand, who support the change to a permanent court of appeal argue in contrast that that separation would add to the desirable degree of independence so that the appellate judges could not be seen to have any vested interest in the maintenance of decisions at first instance.

It is important that this debate be a serious public debate. To that end, I urge the Attorney-General to make available any research or reports which may have been obtained on the question so that there can be informed public debate on the matter.

The recent increase in civil jurisdiction of the District Court will act, in the short term, to reduce the trial workload on the Supreme Court; however, in the long term, the appellate role of the Supreme Court will no doubt become of greater significance.

If, indeed, the Supreme Court in its appellate role will, in the words of the Chief Justice, "more and more feel (its) authority" and adopt "an increasingly creative approach", then the arguments in favour of a permanent court of appeal become more compelling in view of the heightened consistency and quality of judgments which a permanent court of appeal may offer.

The positive experience of Britain and New South Wales in establishing permanent courts of appeal demonstrates that there is much benefit in considering this path.

Queensland has been finely served by its Supreme Court both at nisi prius and in its appellate role; however, we must look to the future and plan to ensure that the justice administered in our courts continues to be of the highest quality.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Will the Clerk read the Order of the Day?

Mr LINGARD: In the allocation of speakers in the Matters of Public Interest debate, the Opposition was given—

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Lingard interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Fassifern has already spoken. The Standing Orders state that a member may speak for 10 minutes. The honourable member has spoken for 10 minutes. I can call on another member. However, the member for Fassifern cannot get the call twice.

Mr FITZGERALD: I think it is ridiculous——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The time allotted for the debate on Matters of Public Interest has expired.

HERITAGE BUILDINGS PROTECTION BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 31 May (see p. 2123).

Mr LINGARD (Fassifern) (12 noon): It seems ridiculous that, last week, the Opposition was told that it was supposed to provide a speaker during the Matters of Public Interest debate, yet this morning Mr Speaker organised the member for Archerfield to go and get the member for Yeronga to speak during the Matters of Public Interest debate.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have already warned the member for Fassifern under Standing Order 124 for being disrespectful to the Chair. The honourable member has risen to speak to the Heritage Buildings Protection Bill, but he has used the opportunity to suggest—quite wrongly—that I organised the member for Archerfield to get somebody to speak. That is not true. It is certainly disrespectful to the Chair to make such a suggestion. I ask that the honourable member withdraw the comment and apologise. If he does not, I will take action under Standing Order 124.

Mr LINGARD: I apologise, Mr Speaker.

It is my pleasure to support this legislation. Although members of the Opposition have reservations about this heritage legislation, they realise that it is the Minister's intention that it be interim legislation until the actual final legislation is introduced.

Over the last five or six years, I have enjoyed being a member of committees working on heritage legislation. I have personally restored historical homes. I have restored the homes of a former ALP Speaker and a former ALP Premier. I took a great deal of joy in helping to protect Collins Place and the former Government Printing Office.

I listened with disdain to the comments by some of the Government backbenchers about the Bellevue Hotel and Cloudland. They criticised what happened in relation to those buildings but they are prepared to quickly gloss over what happened to the Commonwealth Bank building and the Trades Hall building. I am also amazed when members of the Government generalise and say what a great job has been done in restoring Parliament House. They do not realise that there are parts of Parliament House that will need to be restored in the future.

I remind honourable members of the Providore's house—a little house that actually fits on the grass lawn to the right as one walks into the entrance to Parliament House—which is still in its sandstone form, with all sandstones prepared. The building is able to be relocated. I believe that at present the building is held at Kangaroo Point. It is a beautiful little building which, as I have said, fits on the grassed area on the right-hand side as one walks into Parliament House. At some future time the Government should consider restoring the old Providore's building, which is a parliamentary building.

Obviously the Opposition has concerns about this interim legislation. The Opposition offers suggestions because it believes that many things should be done before the final legislation is introduced. The Opposition believes that in the Schedules there is not enough reference to local government and that requests should be made to local authorities for consideration of other historical places in areas such as Beaudesert Shire and Boonah Shire.

In Beaudesert Shire, only Nindooibah Homestead, which everyone knows is a magnificent old building, the RSL hall, which was supposedly used at one time as an old post office and obviously is not an historical building, and All Saints Memorial Church

are under consideration. The Minister himself was very keen to say what a terrible thing it would be if the Wolffdene dam went ahead and places such as Mount Tamborine House, Mundoolun House and Mundoolun Church went under water. Yet the Minister has not even included Mount Tamborine House, Mundoolun House or Mundoolun Church in the legislation. It makes a mockery of the whole thing.

Mr Comben: Are they on the National Trust list?

Mr LINGARD: The Minister is talking about historical homes.

I can remember members of the ALP saying how horrible it would be if the magnificent and historic Mount Tamborine House was lost because of the Wolffdene dam. The Minister has all these fellows on site, yet he has not even included that building in the legislation.

The only buildings in the Boonah Shire that are listed in the Schedule are Coochin Coochin Homestead and the War Memorial. To be quite honest, that makes a mockery of this legislation, regardless of whether it has been drafted quickly, whether it is interim legislation or anything else.

Mr Comben interjected.

Mr LINGARD: It is not a matter of whether the buildings are on those lists. The Minister knows as well as I do that he has gone to the local authorities and asked them for recommendations, and he has not put all of those recommendations on the list. The Minister has quickly prepared interim legislation, and he has upset local authorities. He has upset the owners of homes.

Who went out to see the owner of Coochin Coochin Homestead and ask him whether he was prepared to have his property listed? Who actually told him that it was going to be on the list? Who even discussed it with him?

Mr Ardill interjected.

Mr LINGARD: I know the person. Not enough negotiation was engaged in with these people.

I ask the Minister to give serious consideration to liaising much more closely with the local authorities and the owners themselves. If the Minister is going to prove that this legislation is historical legislation, he must consider Mount Tamborine House and all the other buildings that he himself has spoken about in the past.

My only other comment at this stage is that if the Minister is not going to offer land tax incentives or other tax incentives to people such as myself who can afford to restore one historical home at a time—and take a long time doing it—and who restore more colonial and historical homes than does the Government, people will be financially unable to carry out the necessary renovations.

I disagree with the bureaucracy and with the position taken by Government members. I wonder why the Minister mentioned the Trades and Labor Council. The former Government would hardly have appointed a person associated with the National Party and said that he was associated with that party. Why the Minister has to make reference to the Trades and Labor Council, I do not know. Surely he could be a bit more subtle than to include a Trades and Labor Council representative on an eight-member committee. I certainly believe that, if committees are to be established to review these decisions and if those decisions will finally be referred to the Minister, the Government must be very careful about people's value judgments of what is historical.

I do not like to drop names, but recently I visited Greece and saw the Acropolis. It amazed me that massive cranes are being used to lift massive pieces of sandstone and marble with which to restore the Parthenon. My value judgment is that it should not be restored with modern material lifted in by cranes. In about five or 10 years, the Parthenon will be restored, supposedly, to its former glory. However, because it will have been done up with modern marble, it will not be restored to its former glory. My

value judgment is that, even if the Turks did knock it over, the historical value of the Parthenon is to see it as it is now. If pieces of marble that have been knocked down are lifted back into place, that is okay. However, a whole lot of new, modern building materials should not be brought in to restore the Parthenon.

That is my value judgment. I am sure that members of the committee, including the Minister, will make value judgments. I envisage great concern being expressed if these people and the Government are going to review their decisions. People who restore historic homes place different values on whether or not to use Besser blocks for certain areas of decoration at the front of those homes. That is a value judgment which I ask the Government to consider.

The Opposition supports the interim legislation and appreciates the reason for its introduction. We offer our suggestions because we realise that the legislation will be reviewed. I certainly ask the Government especially to consider informing the owners of the listing of those properties, to work with local government and to offer some sort of incentive for people who are restoring historic and colonial homes.

Mr HEATH (Nundah) (12.09 p.m.): I support this Bill. As well, I am pleased that the Opposition supports it and has belatedly adopted a reasonable stance on heritage issues.

I am not a believer in, or a supporter of, the unfettered development that has occurred in Queensland in the past. The rush of uncontrolled development in the past, which was supported by the free marketeers in previous Governments, has caused Queenslanders many heartaches. The financial benefits accruing to the State through such development were never allowed to filter through to deserving and needy Queenslanders, and never will be allowed to under any National Party or National/Liberal coalition Government.

An oversupply of new buildings exists, except in the vital field of housing. For the petty reason that it did not want to have to admit on the relevant literature that the funding came from the Federal Government, and despite the housing shortage, the former National Party Government delayed for months the Commonwealth/State Housing Agreement.

The Queensland style of uncontrolled development of commercial properties has led to a glut of new buildings. Office space in the central business district is unfilled; retail shops along Lutwyche and Gympie Roads, for example, still stand empty three years after their completion; and expensive hotel rooms in tourist areas are not being booked.

Many Queenslanders who invested in projects of that nature have discovered that the glut of new buildings and the paucity of tenants has meant that their investments have not paid dividends. However, any concerns for such ordinary Queensland investors never clouded the rosy, misguided and misleading visions of the National Party. For many years, residents who have any concern for their future and that of their children have been outraged by the destruction of too much of the State's history and its beautiful natural environment. For far too long, those concerned residents have been ignored.

The honourable member for Fassifern will be pleased to know that the public outcry over the plans to demolish Cloudland was ignored and then callously bypassed by the former National Party Government, which encouraged the demolition of the building in the middle of the night. The ballroom carried an enormous emotional attachment for the entire World War II generation of people, including my parents, for whom Cloudland was the entertainment venue of its time. In this case, the unbelievable carelessness of the previous Government is illustrated by the fact that the headlong destruction of the building has led to its replacement by nothing. It is still a vacant block of land on top of the hill.

According to one of the greatest of modern historians, Arnold Toynbee, in macro terms history does repeat. Its progress can be tracked and predicted in long cycles. However, what can never be repeated or recaptured is the smaller physical and concrete

evidence of our heritage—and I point out for the benefit of the Minister that I am referring to concrete in only one sense of the word—if that heritage, which encapsulates a part of history for future generations, is destroyed.

History is more than books and theories—even accurate and brilliant theses such as Arnold Toynbee's. A part of our responsibility as adults is to preserve for our children and all future generations significant and relevant features of our history, including buildings and sites with heritage value. We are irresponsible when we sever important links between the past and the future for short-sighted reasons that address only the present.

The electorate of Nundah, which I am proud to represent in this House, has strong links with Queensland's history. Within the electorate is the site of the first free, non-penal settlement in Queensland. In 1838, a group of German missionaries settled on a hill top in the area. Indeed, the original name given to the suburb was German Station. Many streets nearby still carry the German names of the first settlers. The link with those first settlers is retained in Nundah through the German/Australian Pioneer Week Organisation, which each year arranges a week of festivities to highlight the historical basis of the suburb. The major local organisations that provide the area with a concept of its own history are the Nundah and Districts Historical Society and the Nundah Historic Cemetery Preservation Association.

In the diverse and rapidly changing suburban environment of 1990, those two dedicated and hard-working community organisations provide a stable backbone for the suburb. Indeed, they have created an awareness of the relevance and history of the Nundah area which seems unmatched by organisations in other areas—even by the hard-working Fassifern Historical Society.

The two Nundah associations are very pleased that included in the Schedule to this Bill are six historic sites within the boundaries of the Nundah electorate, including the historic Nundah cemetery itself. The interim nature of this Bill—it is to expire on 10 March 1992 or sooner—and the commitment from the Minister that in the time until the long-term legislation is complete other sites may be submitted for consideration for inclusion in the final Schedule, allows the two Nundah associations and their counterparts all over the State, including those in Fassifern, to ensure that important parts of Queensland's history and heritage are preserved.

The discussion papers and Green Paper, which will allow input into the long-term legislation, will also be welcomed by interested and concerned associations, individuals and local authorities throughout Queensland. Such consultation is a recognisable and commendable characteristic of this Labor Government.

I take great pleasure, both personally and on behalf of the people of Nundah, in supporting this Bill. It is overdue in Queensland and, indeed, is historic in itself.

Mr PERRETT (Barambah) (12.16 p.m.): It gives me a great deal of pleasure to take part in this debate. In doing so, I support this legislation. However, I do have problems with a couple of aspects of it, which no doubt have been canvassed by previous Opposition speakers.

I want to make a couple of points about the legislation, mainly because I believe, as the member for Fassifern pointed out, that many owners of the structures that are listed for protection are being kept in the dark. They are not sure what this legislation involves. I refer to some of the homesteads which have been maintained in very good order.

Mr Elliott interjected.

Mr PERRETT: No doubt the member for Cunningham can speak from first-hand experience, because he lives in a particularly beautiful old homestead.

Mr Comben: I thought he lived in the woolshed.

Mr PERRETT: That is how much the Minister knows. Obviously the Minister has not been out there.

Mr Comben: He has never invited me.

Mr PERRETT: The Minister would have come back shorn.

Mr Prest: Shorn or crutched?

Mr PERRETT: Maybe it should have been crutched.

Tribute should be paid to the owners of the homesteads for the maintenance which they have carried out on them, for the money that they have spent in doing so and for the excellent condition in which many of them have been kept. Recently, one of the owners of a homestead in my electorate pointed out to me that, once a homestead is listed and it becomes public knowledge, an ever-increasing number of people come to look at it. Homesteads are private structures. Sometimes, without prior notice bus loads of people turn up at any hour of the day to view the homesteads, and this creates a problem.

In my electorate, ten structures have been listed. I want to bring some of them to the notice of the House. Seven homesteads have been listed, as well as the Mount Clara copper mine smelter chimney, the Goomeri Hall of Memory and the war memorial clock. Many of the homesteads were built in the 1840s. In 1840, the Leslie brothers settled on the Darling Downs. In about 1841, settlers then moved north into the Brisbane Valley and, by about 1842, into the South Burnett area. Consequently, following the settling of the land, homesteads were constructed.

Originally, the settlers built slab huts for temporary accommodation, but as the selections were developed, homesteads were built. In those days, the settlers did not have many tools or materials to use in the construction of the homesteads; they had to use the materials that were most readily available. Consequently, some magnificent structures were erected. For instance, the Boondooma homestead in the Wondai Shire was constructed of rocks cemented together with ant bed, which were the only materials that were readily available at that time. That structure still stands. It is a credit to its builder, a Mr Brill, I understand. This homestead is about to be restored. It will go down in history as a monument to the tradesman who constructed it.

Other materials such as wide chamfer boards, which were common at that time, were used in constructions. Many timber slabs were used. From personal experience, I can speak of the skill of the tradesmen who used nothing more than a broad axe to carve the slabs from the trees. On the property which has been in our family for more than 100 years, we have maintained some of the slabs that my grandfather carved from the ironbark trees that were used in the construction of the original hut and sheds on that selection.

Heritage is very close to our hearts. Although the National Party has received a lot of backlash from people who say that it is disinterested in these things, nothing could be further from the truth. The fact of the matter is that Australia is a very young country; it has only recently celebrated its two hundredth birthday. It is only now that many of its former landmarks, as they were, are starting to gain recognition and significance. It is great that this legislation will enshrine those landmarks so that they will be retained indefinitely.

Also listed among the structures in the Barambah electorate is the war memorial clock in Goomeri. This was constructed in 1940. Although that clock is only 50 years old, this legislation recognises that it has the potential to become a landmark in the future. We have to be aware that recognition should be given to anything that has heritage potential, thereby ensuring that such structures are preserved, and preserved in a good state of repair.

I refer to the cost that is involved to private owners of homesteads that are virtually just the home on the property. Those people do not always have the resources necessary

to maintain those homesteads in a proper state of repair or in the way that they should be maintained. Perhaps at some future stage this Government would be wise to introduce a system of grants for the owners of those beautiful old buildings, which deserve to be maintained as closely as possible to their original state.

Many of those buildings have now lost their original shingle roofs, which have been replaced with corrugated iron. The restoration of these shingle roofs would be a financial burden on the owners. Some years ago, when I was in England looking at properties, I visited a farm which had a beautiful old barn that was over 1 000 years old and was classified under England's heritage legislation. The owners of that barn had been told that they should carry out repairs to it. Those repairs would cost a very large sum of money—far beyond the owners' financial resources. I would not like to see a similar situation arise in Queensland, with owners being forced to carry out restoration work when they do not possess the resources to do so. Perhaps this Government at some future time could look at introducing a grants scheme for the maintenance of such historic buildings.

I am very pleased to be able to support this legislation. Although I believe that there are a few defects in it, particularly in the area of restoration of buildings and communication with their owners, it is certainly a step in the right direction and no doubt will go a long way towards preserving this State's magnificent old buildings.

Mr PEARCE (Broadsound) (12.25 p.m.) I rise to support the Heritage Buildings Protection Bill.

This Bill provides for urgent interim protection of significant items of Queensland's built heritage environment until the introduction of comprehensive built heritage legislation later this year, after full consultation with the community, as covered by clause 4.

I congratulate the Minister for the urgency that he placed on bringing about an immediate stop to the knocking down and bulldozing of buildings that are not only significant but an important link between the history of Queensland and the generations of the future.

I have the greatest admiration for the men and women who struggled, under conditions of extreme hardship, to lay the foundations for the development of this State of Queensland. Because of their unselfish contributions many magnificent buildings were constructed, sometimes with simple designs and limited materials.

Early Queenslanders gave so much to this State. Today's Queenslanders will not experience the hardships that they experienced, but they can respect those efforts by retaining and protecting that real connection with them, the buildings that they constructed.

I draw attention to a building of historical significance in the Broadsound electorate, the Raspberry Creek homestead in Livingstone Shire. Raspberry Creek homestead was built by the Huttons, an early pioneering family who established a reputation for themselves in pastoral and professional circles throughout central Queensland in the later stages of last century.

In 1861, James Hutton formed a partnership with James Ross. Together they acquired the Raspberry Creek pastoral run, located in the Byfield/Shoalwater Bay area. The partnership dissolved two years later, and the Huttons became the sole owners. When the Hutton family first arrived from New South Wales, they stayed in the area known as Cawarral until a bark and slab hut was erected at Raspberry Creek.

Built around 1861, this original slab hut was located some three miles from the site finally selected for the homestead and was eventually moved piecemeal to the new site. The present homestead was built in the 1860s, using pit-sawn timber for walls and shingles for the roof.

When the family grew larger, weatherboards for extensions were brought in by boat along Shoalwater Creek. In the early 1900s, a third portion was added to the original

homestead building. Other outbuildings were erected on the homestead site but, with the passage of time, they have since disappeared.

Raspberry Creek homestead was often the focal point for social activities in the area. A race meeting was held annually at Raspberry Creek and many visitors often stayed at the homestead. The homestead finally passed from the Hutton family in 1914, when the pastoral run was sold to William Naughton.

In 1965, the homestead came under the control of the Australian Army when it acquired the Shoalwater Bay area for training and weapons-testing purposes. It stayed in a state of disrepair until Christmas 1987, when the newly formed Byfield and District Historical Society, as part of the Bicentenary celebrations, began negotiations with the army to have the homestead moved in order to ensure its preservation. Both the homestead and the original slab hut were moved more than 40 kilometres to their present resting site in Byfield.

The Byfield and District Historical Society, with its plans to renovate and restore Raspberry Creek homestead, is carefully preserving a piece of Byfield's past. The society has planned that part of the homestead will serve as a branch of the Livingstone Shire library and that the building will be used by the community for social gatherings. It is presently being used as the society's headquarters.

Further to the south of the Broadsound electorate, at Nerimbora near Rockhampton, is situated a more recent building, St Christopher's Chapel. It is also listed in the Schedule to the Heritage Buildings Protection Bill. St Christopher's Chapel is a unique and historic reminder of the presence of American troops in Australia during World War II. Situated on the north bank of the Fitzroy River, about seven miles from Rockhampton, the chapel was built in 1943 by American troops stationed in the area.

Whilst it was common practice for American troops to build temporary chapels while stationed on the islands in the Pacific, it is considered most unusual that troops built a chapel in Australia.

It is said that St Christophers Chapel is probably the only one of its kind left in existence in the world. At the peak of the American occupation of Australia, more than 70 000 American troops were stationed in Rockhampton and its surrounding districts. I point out that the present population of Rockhampton is approximately 65 000.

During this time, the area known as Nerimbera was largely a convalescent camp for these American troops and troops from other American units that had been sent back to Rockhampton for a rest period after combat operations in the Pacific. Seeing the need for a chapel, several chaplains of various denominations joined forces and approached the corps commander with the idea for a denominational church to be built for the troops.

Construction of the chapel was considered an ideal project for keeping the troops busy during a non-combatant period. The 542 Engineers Ship and Shore Battalion was delegated as the unit to build the chapel. The battalion was considered the obvious choice as its expertise lay in the area of construction.

After the American troops departed, there was a gradual deterioration of the chapel. Several organisations endeavoured to maintain it but, after a time, their efforts lapsed. In February 1959, vandals destroyed a number of historic articles which had been kept in the chapel. As a result, delegates from the American 41st Division Association joined with members of the RSSAILA to form a committee to maintain the chapel. The committee continued to care for St Christophers until 1989, when the chapel passed into the care of the Livingstone Shire Council.

Still in use today, St Christophers Chapel is often hired out for wedding services. A commemoration service is also held annually at the chapel on the Sunday nearest the Fourth of July, which is American Independence Day. This service is frequently attended by a representative from the American Consulate.

The two buildings that I have mentioned in this House today are important in the link between yesteryear and modern times and will stand as a reminder to future generations of what life used to be like. They are just two of the many listed buildings in the Schedule to the Heritage Buildings Protection Bill and are among the most important historical buildings in Queensland.

There will be no more secretly planned midnight raids on the old buildings of Queensland. There will be no more shameful acts of knocking down old buildings such as the Bellevue Hotel and the Cloudland Ballroom. Members on this side of the House do not have to be reminded that these buildings met the fate of the midnight raiders who had the total support of the National Party. Another example is the Queen Street Mall, where the facades of many historic buildings are all that remain, and that is indicative of the previous Government's policy in respect of historic buildings. A facade—that is what the policy of the National Party was.

There is no intent to freeze development in Queensland on every old site but the Bill will stop the unnecessary destruction of buildings and places that have real heritage value to the community. Previous National Party and National/Liberal Party Governments showed the people of Queensland that they were not interested in preserving one of our only real connections with early Australians, that is, the buildings they left behind. We must respect and protect our history, and this Bill is the first step in the right direction.

I recommend this Bill to the House.

Mr FITZGERALD (Lockyer) (12.34 p.m.): It is with pleasure that I enter the debate on the Heritage Buildings Protection Bill. Basically, I support the legislation. It is excellent that such legislation has been introduced. However, I have some misgivings about some of the provisions of the legislation.

A Government member: You would.

Mr FITZGERALD: Yes, and I will give some details and note how the honourable member votes on the various matters I will raise.

Government members think that, by bringing in legislation, they will preserve all the past, that they can act as the custodians of our heritage and that they can be fair to the present owners of the buildings listed. An indication of the shallowness of the remarks of some honourable members opposite is the speech of the honourable member for Barron River. That honourable member said that the Bill made no reference to paint. I interjected at the time—

Dr Clark: That is not what I said.

Mr FITZGERALD: I interjected that a person could not even paint a building without going to the committee. The honourable member's speech appears in *Hansard*. Clause 8 (1) reads—

"Subject to section 6, an owner of a heritage building who intends to demolish, develop or subdivide that building must apply in writing to the presiding officer of the committee for a heritage certificate authorizing that demolition, development of subdivision."

Clause 3 provides that "develop" means, among other things—

"(c) paint or plaster (other than to maintain or essentially repair consistent with the relevant period of construction)".

It is excellent that a person cannot paint a building whatever colour he likes. So it is provided for in the legislation, and no-one should be mistaken about this Parliament placing a responsibility upon the owners of historical buildings.

I looked with interest at the buildings in my electorate that have been listed. I imagine that most honourable members have done so in their electorates. The list

contains a large number of war memorials and tombs in cemeteries. While that increases the size of the list, I could not imagine anybody removing a memorial from a cemetery, such as the Andrews Monument in the Ma Ma church graveyard. It has been there for a long time and I do not think that this legislation will give it any extra protection. It is pretty safe where it is. Anybody who touched that memorial would find himself in a lot of strife. Two memorials in the Gatton Shire are included in the list.

One building of particular interest to the people of Toowoomba and me is the Church of Christ at 133 Margaret Street, Toowoomba. It has a rather interesting history. In about 1901, construction was started by some Congregationalists. Its construction was not completed because of a shortage of funds and the building was sold. My information is that there were insufficient funds to complete the bell tower. I understand that the citation states that it is a fine example of Romanesque church architecture. It is a fine-looking brick building in Margaret Street.

In addition, the citation mentions the street and the streetscape. I am puzzled by this because on one side of it was an old building owned by Fitzpatrick's plumbing which has been extensively changed with the result that no-one would now pick it as being of historic significance. On the other side of the church was the old Greyhound depot, which is now known as the Pacific West bus depot. It is merely a transport terminal. That citation is now quite inaccurate. I sometimes question how these buildings get on the list, how they are checked and whether or not all the citations are accurate.

I return to the history of the church at 133 Margaret Street. It was built in 1901 by the Congregationalists and for a period of 10 years after that it was owned by Trades Hall, which is rather interesting. That is one way to get the Trades Hall people to go to church.

Mr Booth interjected.

Mr FITZGERALD: I understand that the people at Trades Hall did not look after the building very well, as indicated by the member for Warwick, but they occupied it for 10 years. In 1929 the Church of Christ then became the owners of that building.

When the Minister foreshadowed this legislation he certainly let the penalties under the legislation be known, but he did not let the fine print be known. The owners of this building—the Church of Christ in Toowoomba—offered it for sale because the building was not adequate for needs of the congregation. I have been inside that church to attend funerals of former colleagues and it is a very nice little church. However, it has only approximately 240 seats and a congregation of about 600 attend services on Sundays. As a result, three services are held on Sunday and the church is filled for each one. In addition, a large number of young people use the church and its facilities every week. I understand approximately 400 young people in Toowoomba are looked after by that church's pastor, so the church has outgrown the site. As a result, the Church of Christ decided to buy more land out along Hume Street near K mart where it could erect a building with a 1 000-seat capacity. The Church of Christ is very active in Toowoomba and it wants to sell the building at 133 Margaret Street in order to pay for the building that is to be constructed out near K mart. The building was put up for auction, but the Minister stepped in and said that it was listed.

Mr Comben: There's no problem selling it.

Mr FITZGERALD: There is no problem in selling it? Will the Minister give an assurance that under this legislation he would have no problem with the church selling the building to a developer who has offered to buy the site? Negotiations were taking place between the church and a developer. I will not mention prices here, but I suggest that the value of the property is somewhere in the range of \$700,000 to \$900,000, or a fraction more. The Church of Christ wants to sell the building and the developers who wanted to buy the site have backed straight off. It can be sold on application to the committee.

Mr Comben: It can be sold. You don't have to apologise.

Mr FITZGERALD: But it cannot be used for any other purpose.

Mr Comben: Yes it can—with its heritage value.

Mr FITZGERALD: Yes, but with limitations; with its heritage value.

The present value of that property rests in its site value, and I suggest to the Minister that the Church of Christ will suffer a monetary loss because it owns a listed building. This happens only with some buildings. There are very few buildings on the list to which this would apply. I know that most old homes and buildings are enhanced in value as a result of being listed. However, there are examples, such as the Church of Christ in Toowoomba, where the owners will suffer monetary loss. Anyone using a Romanesque church in Toowoomba will not be allowed to substantially alter it, but that is the wish of the community. I will not disagree with that, but I do not believe that the Church of Christ should suffer monetary loss. If the community wants something to be preserved and it costs money, surely the community must bear that cost, not the present owner. Very few of the present owners of the buildings listed in this legislation will suffer, but the owners of this church will suffer severely. The church will have to be used for something that is compatible. Possibly it could be turned into an art gallery or something like that, which would be a very fitting use for it, but what is the value of an art gallery in the heart of Toowoomba?

Mr Comben: A funeral parlour.

Mr FITZGERALD: Yes, a funeral parlour. What is the value of that in the middle of Toowoomba? The owners will not receive the true value of the building.

Because negotiations were taking place with buyers for this listed building, it can be clearly demonstrated that there is a disadvantage to its present owners. What will the Church of Christ do now? What is this building worth if some of the suggestions put forward by the Minister are implemented? If the Minister wishes that this building be preserved under this legislation—and I do not disagree with that—I do not believe that the parishioners of the Church of Christ in Toowoomba should suffer as a result. They need that money in order to build a church with a 1 000-seat capacity on the site near K mart. They had planned and budgeted on that and they are now forced to either keep the building or sell it for a much lower price than its actual value. That is a great disadvantage to those people. If it is in the public interest that this building be preserved, the Government has the right to preserve it, but those people who are disadvantaged by that should be considered. I question the way in which the list has been drawn up. I believe it needs public scrutiny. No doubt the present practice will continue whereby some buildings will be taken off the list and other buildings will be placed on it.

Mr Comben: What has happened is that the latest legislation means that they will be put on and taken off, etc. That list is a National Trust list and an Australian Heritage Commission list, which is set for now. If there is a problem with what the Bill states, the committee will make the decision whether or not to retain the listing.

Mr FITZGERALD: All right. I appeal to the Minister to look at some form of compensation for the small number of owners who will be disadvantaged by the fact that their buildings appear on the list. I point out that many people in Toowoomba believe that the Church of Christ has been severely disadvantaged by this legislation. In the first place, the penalties were advertised before the list was even circulated. In the second place, the parishioners of the Church of Christ did not even know that the church was listed in the Schedule, but they were told that if the building was touched from the date specified in the legislation onwards, they would cop it. If ever an injustice is being done by this legislation, that would have to be it. The parishioners were told what the penalties were and were told that they could be thrown in gaol if they breached of the legislation. They were also told that if a corporation knocked down a building overnight, it could be fined \$1m, yet the provisions of the legislation were not even flagged.

Mr Comben: Mr Fitzgerald—

Mr FITZGERALD: The Minister can mention this in his reply later, if he wishes.

This building has been on the heritage list since approximately 1967. It has always been accepted that the building has some historical significance, and I do not wish to debate that issue. However, I point out that the real question is: should this group of parishioners of the Church of Christ in Toowoomba be disadvantaged because of the implementation of this legislation?

Judgments in relation to the value of historic buildings and decisions on which buildings should be placed on the list are always open to debate. I can remember the Cloudland issue. Quite frankly, although the building may have had some significance for those people who carried out some of their early mating rituals on the hill at Cloudland, the historical value of the building is debatable.

Mr Comben interjected.

Mr FITZGERALD: I had been to Cloudland on a number of occasions. I have always enjoyed dancing and I had some very enjoyable evenings there. However, I must say that the building had very little significance, except for its site. It was a very poor plastered building, although it had quite a good floor. At this stage, a very active debate would take place on whether or not that particular building should be preserved. I do not believe that everyone would agree that it should be preserved. When the discussion on whether to demolish the building took place, I could not see any significance in it. If it were the subject of this legislation, I believe that a very interesting public debate would take place on that issue.

There is nothing further I wish to add to the debate, except to once again appeal to the Minister to consider the matters I have raised.

Mr BEATTIE (Brisbane Central) (12.48 p.m.): I rise to support the Bill. In doing so, I acknowledge that in my electorate of Brisbane Central there exists a large percentage of the heritage buildings that have been listed in the Schedule to the Bill. As honourable members would appreciate, I have received a great deal of correspondence and submissions from constituents in my electorate in relation to the future of the buildings.

Mr Comben: And you forwarded them all on.

Mr BEATTIE: Indeed, as the Minister has pointed out, I have forwarded them all on for his attention, and I have no doubt that they will receive his usual efficient and prompt reply.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: Obviously, the honourable member does not put those letters into correct English.

Mr FitzGerald: I was going to say that some of the other Ministers are shocking. I have not had any problems with this Minister, but some of the other Ministers!

Mr BEATTIE: As the member would understand, I have no criticism of any of the Ministers.

It must be said that this legislation provides interim protection for a number of significant items of Queensland's heritage. It is important that members support this legislation to ensure that Queensland's heritage is preserved. A number of countries and cities around the world have lost their heart and soul. Anyone who has travelled to places such as Dallas, Texas, would know about all its shiny and glistening buildings, and would agree that that city has no soul and no character. In 1985, when I visited Dallas, I noted that the only old building that had been retained was the building from which the shot which killed Kennedy was fired. It is the only building that has any sort of heritage value that that city has managed to keep. Other than that place, the buildings all reach towards the sky. No building height limits apply. The city contains these shiny,

empty, soulless buildings that dominate the landscape. While there needs to be an element of modern and new architecture in our cities, the Government must ensure that the heritage and the soul of the past is preserved for future generations.

I am pleased to note that, after full public consultation and comment, comprehensive heritage legislation will be introduced later this year. I say to people who are concerned about the current legislation and its implications, or who are concerned about buildings they own, that they will have an opportunity, through that public consultation process, to make representations and overcome some of the concerns they have. It must be understood that as soon as this interim protective legislation is in place, there will be an opportunity later in the year for full public consultation and comment. After that, appropriate legislation will be introduced.

Anyone who opposes the need to protect the character, history and culture of the past of this State is adopting a prehistoric approach. That is why honourable members should be pleased that the Minister has brought forward this legislation. All honourable members would know that the process of bringing this legislation to the House has had its ups and downs. I see that the Minister has a very wide grin on his face, but I am sure that he would agree that this legislation has been worth the effort. Sometimes, achievements that are worth the effort are not always easy to accomplish.

The Queensland Government should avoid the mistakes that have been made in the past. I am pleased to note that clause 10 (2) provides that a local authority or other person or body must not approve an application for demolition unless a heritage certificate in respect of the application is produced to the local authority or other person or body. The clause is quite appropriate because, as all honourable members would appreciate, the Brisbane City Council was recently responsible for the demolition of the historic Commonwealth Bank building in Queensland.

Mr Livingstone: Disgraceful!

Mr BEATTIE: I take the interjection from my learned colleague from Ipswich West. Similar disgraceful acts in the future will be prevented because clause 10 provides with absolute certainty that a certificate has to be issued before the Brisbane City Council rushes off and makes a private arrangement with developers, resulting in destruction of a key part of Brisbane's heritage. Everyone knows the very sad track record of demolition of heritage buildings in this State. Demolitions range from the Bellevue to Cloudland, and now the Commonwealth Bank, which is why the legislation that is before the House is so important.

We need to look at the substance of the heritage buildings, not merely the facades. When I walk down Queen Street, which is not only the heart of Brisbane but also the heart of my electorate, I worry when I see that the Brisbane City Council, through the Lord Mayor, has only protected facades. The substance of those buildings has gone. Between Queen Street and Albert Street, the facades are on the Myer Centre and other places, but the substance of the buildings has gone. One might say that the Brisbane City Council is headed by people who are obsessed with facades. Without being too unkind—I try not to be unkind to people these days—because of what the Lord Mayor has done, she could perhaps be described as Lady "Facade".

Mr Santoro interjected.

Mr J. N. Goss: You are trying to upset me.

Mr BEATTIE: I acknowledge the rapid defence from the member for Merthyr and the member for Aspley, who always rush to her defence. On this occasion, of course, they are a little too late.

However, we have ended up with too many facades and not enough substance. What we need to protect buildings and the environment is not rhetoric but substance. If honourable members consider what has occurred in Queen Street, I rest my case.

At present, we are seeing a more enlightened approach by developers, who are looking at protecting the heritage of the past, but are proceeding in a very sensible and constructive way. I instance the barracks development at Petrie Terrace in my electorate. The developers have preserved that old barracks building, which was used by the Police Department for some time. Initially, it was a gaol. Some of the first hangings that took place in the last century were carried out at that building. By incorporating the stables in the office development, the developer is protecting them. They are being internally refurbished and used for office space, but there is no destruction to the structure of the building or to its heritage value. The same can be said of the fence itself—a very historic fence. At the back of the building, a 13-storey building is being erected for office space. It is being used to fund the retention of the heritage aspects of the barracks at the front.

If honourable members look at that site, they will see that a 13-storey building is not ugly, nor is it out of place. It is built over the railway line that runs between Roma Street and Milton. We have a very sensible developer who has not only moved to protect the very important heritage building which has been a significant landmark in this city for a long time, but he is doing it in a way that will mean that the retention of that building will go on indefinitely.

I express my appreciation to the Minister, who inspected that building with me and had discussions with the developer. When this legislation was initiated, the developer was keen to talk to the Minister. The Minister was pleased to assure him that his plans were in accordance with the legislation and that he had nothing to be concerned about.

This is not an anti-development Bill; it is a sensible Bill to protect the heritage of this State and to encourage people who are involved in development to do the right and sensible thing. I have placed on public record my support for that heritage building. A car park is being built underneath the back of the project—not underneath the barracks building. That will provide a service to the restaurants in the locality of Caxton Street and Petrie Terrace. As many honourable members who go to restaurants such as Gambaros would know, parking difficulties are encountered at present.

Mr FitzGerald: A free plug.

Mr BEATTIE: I point out to the honourable member for Lockyer that Mr Gambaro does not need a plug from me. I think that he advertises his restaurant well enough on his own.

However, a parking problem exists. The strength of that sensible development is that it will have space for 395 cars. The people who park underneath the building will be able to frequent that whole precinct and visit the restaurants nearby. As the local member, that is important to me. It will remove the problem that exists when people attending the restaurants park in nearby residential streets.

Mr Santoro: He's a good man—Gambaro.

Mr BEATTIE: I am happy to accept the interjection from the honourable member for Merthyr. Of course he is a good man, and a very honourable man. I am not talking about the member for Merthyr; I am talking about Mr Gambaro. Of course, the honourable member for Merthyr is one, too.

We must appreciate that sensible developers are getting it right. However, that must be contrasted with the story that appeared last week in the *Courier-Mail* under the headline "Jail for midnight demolition". That article outlined circumstances in which a court was required to penalise someone who deliberately ignored a court order. That person was not genuinely concerned about protecting buildings. Unfortunately, that reveals the other side of the spectrum. That is why the Bill needs sanctions and penalties.

In this debate, concern has been expressed about sanctions and penalties. However, unless a specific and significant penalty is provided, people such as those mentioned in that newspaper report will continue to disregard orders. That part of the legislation is important.

Sitting suspended from 12.59 to 2.30 p.m.

Mr BEATTIE: Mr Deputy Speaker—

Mr BORBIDGE: I rise to a point of order. Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

Quorum formed.

Mr BEATTIE: I can understand the exhilaration of listening to me speak, so I am delighted that everyone has now arrived. I include in those remarks the honourable member for Condamine, who I know put himself in peril to ensure that he would be in the Chamber to hear my valuable words.

Before the luncheon recess, I made some comments about the barracks development on Petrie Terrace. I indicated that there had been considerable support from the Government—in particular the Minister and me—for that project, and that the Minister had inspected it. Unfortunately, after we had been there, a statement was issued by an alderman of the Brisbane City Council, Gail Chiconi, who is involved in the heritage issue and who is a member of the heritage committee at that level of government.

An attempt was made to score some cheap political points in relation to the barracks development. Some criticism was made of its heritage value and what was being done there. I am delighted to see that that was eventually—

Mr Elliott: Which place are you talking about now?

Mr BEATTIE: I am talking about the barracks on Petrie Terrace.

I am delighted to be able to say that after some consultation between the developers, the alderman and her committee, that was rectified, and at the appropriate time that committee—including the alderman—was able to issue a very supportive statement on that barracks development.

I think that from time to time a bit too much politics is brought into the heritage issue. This Bill will clarify in people's minds exactly where the State stands on that issue. That is why clause 10 of the Heritage Buildings Protection Bill, to which I have alluded, is so important in the preservation of our heritage and, to some extent, to taking the politics out of issues such as the barracks development.

Some confusion arose about what buildings were listed. There was confusion in my area in regard to Hale Street and the Boot Factory. I commend the Minister for clarifying that issue to the satisfaction of my constituents. The Schedule to the Bill should publicly set on the record for everybody's edification exactly what buildings are protected by this legislation. As I mentioned before the luncheon recess, this legislation is an interim protection. At the end of the year, after full public consultation, permanent legislation will be introduced.

Another concern of mine that is shared by those living in the inner city is the protection of buildings such as workers' cottages and old Queenslanders. I know that they are not specifically covered in the Bill. However, clearly they are worth protecting. They provide a quality of life and, indeed, a richness to those who live in the inner suburbs. I hope that, over a period of time, those who are involved in the development industry in this State will appreciate that we simply do not want the six-packs and ugly brick buildings throughout Brisbane. Our buildings need to have some character. I do not mean simply that these very distinguished old Queenslanders and workers' cottages should be relocated to some other part of the city or State.

I know that recently in Ipswich a number of historical houses were moved from their original sites to acreage. That has happened in the inner-city area and in the electorate of Brisbane Central. I realise that that does at least mean that those houses will be preserved. However, it is sad that they are being moved to an acreage position. We need to provide a cross-section of heritage in the city, not only those buildings

specifically outlined in this Bill. I hope that developers appreciate that redeveloping some of these houses has a quality and a richness inherent in itself.

I think that we have had a sad history in relation to heritage. I understand that in the vicinity of 970 buildings were at risk prior to the introduction of this legislation—

Mr Comben: Everybody else has talked about 1 500. You are the first person who has counted them.

Mr BEATTIE: I thank the Minister. I did count them a little earlier today.

I am delighted that those 970 buildings, which were at risk, are going to be protected by this interim legislation. There is a need to remove the fear in the mind of the public of the Deen brothers moving in and in a very selfish way, I suppose, removing buildings that have a very important role to play, not only from the past but also in the future.

I sound this note of warning: there is no doubt that the colour of the Governments elected to this House in the future—if not in the past—will be extremely dependent on the attitude adopted by the various political parties towards environmental and heritage issues. Unless parties come to terms with the fact that heritage and environmental issues change votes, they are being not only insensitive but also politically foolish.

The Brisbane City Council put a bulldozer through the Bailey Ana trees in the Brady Bushland Park at Runcorn. Those trees were destroyed. That sort of thing causes a great deal of concern in the community, as does the destruction of heritage buildings. I have no doubt that, at the appropriate time, people will have an opportunity to express their views about the council's action on that occasion.

In terms of other heritage and conservation issues—I think it is a credit to the Brisbane City Council that it is pursuing the conservation atlas. I might say that that was an initiative of the Labor administration at City Hall. However, I am pleased that the council is continuing it.

Liberal members interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: I am getting support from my liberal colleagues on the other side. I must say that I find it a little difficult to tolerate and understand, but I acknowledge that they are reasonably intelligent and can appreciate an intelligent point of view.

Mr Santoro interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: I thank the honourable member for Merthyr for supporting me on this point. I am sure that he, too, supports the conservation atlas that is being pursued by the Brisbane City Council.

Some of the land set out in that atlas has been damaged and allowed to be subdivided. I call on the Brisbane City Council to ensure that that valuable conservation atlas is in fact implemented and protected, thus avoiding the sort of subdivisions that have gone on in that area.

Mrs Edmond: There is a lot more under threat.

Mr BEATTIE: As the honourable member for Mount Coot-tha said, more land is under threat.

That reminds me of Toohey forest. The Lord Mayor was the only person who supported the construction of a pipeline through Toohey forest. That issue was discussed by the former National Party Government. I find it appalling—and I am sure that the Lord Mayor does, too—that Ian Henderson, the former National Party member for that area, moved to stop that pipeline going through Toohey forest. That gives honourable members some indication of the state of affairs in that area.

If political parties in this House believe that they can ignore environmental and heritage issues, they do so at their own peril. This legislation is historic. It paves the way to protect valuable buildings that are an essential part of the culture and history of

this State. I commend the Honourable the Minister for his courage in introducing this legislation. I know that he has experienced some difficulties along the way. However, with his usual courage he has come through with flying colours. I support the Bill.

Mr SANTORO (Merthyr) (2.38 p.m.): It is with pleasure that I join in this debate. I support the comments made by the Leader of the Liberal Party in the early stages of this debate.

At the outset, I remind honourable members that the Liberal Party went to the last election with the most comprehensive conservation and environment policy that it has ever gone to an election with. I hold it up for honourable members to see. If honourable members wish to have a copy of it, I would be very happy to supply them with one.

In the lead-up to the last election, something strange happened. The Liberal Party challenged the environmental people, particularly the organising environmental groups, to compare its conservation and environment policy with those on offer by the other parties. I remember that we sat down and went through that policy. Much of the credit for that work must go to the previous honourable member for Stafford, Terry Gygar, who went through the Liberal Party policy and compared it point by point with those policies on offer by the National and Labor Parties. We then wrote back to the conservation and environmental groups, including those that are concerned with the urban environment, which is the major issue of discussion in this House today. We said, "This is where we feel the policies of the other parties are deficient. This is where we feel improvements can be made. We ask you: do you agree with us? If not, tell us why not. If you feel that our policy needs to come up to scratch—from your point of view—will you please let us know?"

The Liberal Party was not afforded the courtesy of a documented reply to match its very documented submission to those people. In the end, the Liberal Party feels that, rather unjustly, the organised conservation and environmental groups quite dishonestly misrepresented the quality and substance of its submissions. That is a matter of public record. If honourable members wish to see this policy and can inform the Liberal Party where the policy is deficient—in their view—I would be genuinely interested in hearing their views.

The Liberal Party comes into this House with a definite policy on the issues of the environment and conservation. It was fair dinkum in that a lot of work was put into the development of this policy, particularly by the former member for Stafford. He did an enormous amount of work and consulted widely in a very genuine way. The Liberal Party sought the feedback of the organised environmental, heritage and conservation groups within the community in Queensland. Under the circumstances that I have described, the Liberal Party could not be accused of being too cynical when it suggests that those groups were inevitably biased towards a particular political point of view which certainly was not that of the Liberal Party.

I believe that the Liberal Party stands in this House with a good policy with which it went to the people. Liberal Party members in this House have a very genuine commitment to the conservation of the natural and man-made environment. The Liberal Party is pleased to have that record.

I am particularly pleased to represent the electorate of Merthyr. A perusal of the Schedule at the back of the Bill reveals that many fine buildings of great heritage value are listed there. The electorate of Merthyr is inhabited by citizens who have a great appreciation for buildings, structures and precincts of great heritage value. They go to enormous personal sacrifice and expense to maintain the various and many fine structures that reflect very well on the great heritage that we are seeking to protect in this House today—admittedly from different perspectives and points of view.

Members on both sides of the House would appreciate that the electorate of Merthyr contains suburbs such as Ascot, Clayfield and Hamilton. One of the real, distinguishing features of those suburbs is that when the children of long-term residence leave their homes, they invariably return. That is an indication of the true nature of the area. When

they return, those children inevitably buy or acquire from their parents or relatives old homes. Many of those homes, which are well over 50, 60 or 70 years of age, are of true heritage and historical value. Those children do what their parents and other relatives did, namely, preserve. Anybody who drives through the streets of Hamilton, Ascot, Clayfield and other suburbs of Merthyr appreciates that those people do not need the coercive power of legislation such as this to make them take great pride in their built-up environment and, particularly, in that part of the environment that reflects the rich heritage of those suburbs and Brisbane as a whole.

Within the electorate of Merthyr, the heart and the soul, which the honourable member for Brisbane Central said are essential to be maintained within areas of rich heritage value, are in fact maintained, and people do so without the necessity of coercive legislation. People in Ascot, Hamilton, Clayfield, Teneriffe and New Farm appreciate the efforts that their ancestors put into the building-up of an urban environment upon which these days we are proud to look as being very rich in terms of its heritage value.

I take this opportunity to place on record my appreciation and that of others in this House of organisations and individuals in the Merthyr electorate who look after many and beautiful historic buildings. As an example, I refer to the Palma Rosa in Queens Road, Hamilton. For many years, the English Speaking Union has spent on that building enormous amounts of money, which it has raised through very hard work and many tedious activities. Nevertheless, those good people are committed to that beautiful building. They appreciate its essential value, not just to the suburb of Hamilton within which it stands but also to the many thousands of people who every year hold in it functions, weddings, card games and many other activities that bring enjoyment within very beautiful and historic surroundings.

I take this opportunity to inform the Minister that the Palma Rosa is very much in need of repair. Only very recently, the good people of the English Speaking Union made representations to me and said, "Santo, as our local member, would you please bring to the attention of Government the state of the building?" Unfortunately, some of the substantial blocks of sandstone that make up that building are decaying. Money is needed urgently to carry out not only those restorations but also other very much needed restorations. I hope that the Government's commitment to the preservation of buildings and items that are of great heritage importance such as Palma Rosa is demonstrably shown and proven when a request from that organisation—and such request will be supported by me—is made to it.

Another beautiful building is Newstead House, which is run by the Newstead House Trust Committee. That committee comprises representatives from all levels of government, including the Brisbane City Council, the State Government and others. Those people are to be truly complimented for overseeing the maintenance and functioning of that building. It is of enormous historical significance. The committee runs that building in a discrete, commercial manner so that the public derives full enjoyment from it by visiting it and by viewing it.

Some churches and religious organisations within my electorate possess many historical buildings. I refer to the Holy Trinity Parish Hall and the various complexes that make up that precinct in Fortitude Valley. One can only congratulate the Anglican Church and the various committees that maintain those buildings. St Patrick's Church in Fortitude Valley is run, maintained and owned by the Catholic Church. I refer also to Stanley Hall at St Rita's in Clayfield. All of them are buildings that have been lovingly maintained and for which enormous amounts of money have been raised in order to restore and maintain them according to their original designs and conditions.

I will not dwell too long on referring to individuals, but I refer to the good people who have been involved in the restoration and maintenance of Tarranalma in Tarranalma Street, Woollahra, and Cremorne in Mullins Street. They are all buildings deserving of National Trust listing. Those people are proud to be able to claim an association with the National Trust in that manner.

Liberal Party members appreciate heritage. We have policies that seek to maintain and restore buildings of heritage value. We take umbrage at accusations made by members opposite that we are environmental and heritage vandals. It is quite the opposite. We have a policy. In Government, hopefully one day in the not-too-distant future, we will demonstrate a more effective and a more sensitive commitment than that displayed by members opposite.

Basically, I support the comments that were made by the Leader of the Liberal Party when he listed our major objections to the Bill. I will not dwell on them at length because many of them have been covered adequately by members on this side of the House who have spoken before me. But one must seriously question the lack of appeal mechanisms within the legislation. Appeal mechanisms against listings just do not exist in any effective manner. Surely, that is the deprivation of a very basic right of individuals.

Under the legislation, the Minister is given discretion in relation to non-dealing orders. For example, for a period of 10 years or at the discretion of the Minister, people cannot deal with their property. Therefore, they are unable to realise capital gains from properties that have been faithfully restored to original specifications and conditions with full appreciation of their heritage value. Yet, unless the Minister exercises reasonable discretion, the owner, although he may be willing and able to sell his property to a person whom he knows will respect it, is unable to do so and as a result is unable to realise genuine and needed capital gains.

Various prohibitions exist within the Bill. It contains prohibitions on refurbishing and basic renovating, including painting. One can be forgiven for being opposed to the Bill and its contents.

The honourable member for Brisbane Central, rightly so, spoke about the fear of the Deen brothers moving in on old valuable heritage buildings. In drawing a comparison, the members of the Liberal Party would say that these days the fear of the Deen brothers moving in would simply be replaced by a fear of the Government moving in.

In summary, the best one can say about this Bill is that it is an interim Bill. The members of the Liberal Party sincerely hope that later this year, when the Minister brings in the substantial legislation, he is in fact able to give the members of this House something worth voting for with great ease.

Mr Comben: Are you inviting?

Mr SANTORO: I invite the Minister to give this House legislation that is workable and that is fair to those individuals who are being affected in that it meets their needs and circumstances.

Mr Welford interjected.

Mr SANTORO: The honourable member for Stafford should keep listening. He will hear an honourable member talking about an electorate that in fact contains buildings of heritage value. I have visited many of them and, indeed, I know what I am talking about.

I have received representations from electors, who have told me that they live on large properties, in terms of the area of the land upon which the buildings listed within the Schedule at the back of the Bill stand. Those people have stated that they have made arrangements to subdivide their properties. The plans have gone through the various council committees and through the council as a whole, and yet for several months those plans have been frozen. They acknowledge that whenever they ring the Minister's department the people who answer their queries are courteous but that they are not able to give any guidelines or indication as to when those plans—for the want of a better expression—will be unfrozen. That is certainly causing some confusion and anguish to those people who basically want to get on with their lives. In some cases, subdivisions are involved and, in effect, those subdivisions do not touch upon the structures that are listed in the Schedule.

I urge the Minister to consider the various petitions that have been presented and the representations that have been made by those people whose properties have been frozen by this legislation. They want to get on with their lives and, once this legislation is passed, provided it is in accordance with the provisions of the Bill, they want to use their buildings as they see fit.

I turn now to the ALP's record on the conservation and preservation of old buildings.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr SANTORO: I hear members opposite say, "Hear, hear!" Obviously, they claim by that very powerful interjection to be the people who protect old buildings and who have a fine appreciation of those buildings.

Mr Elliott: They did a good job with Trades Hall.

Mr SANTORO: I was just going to say that those Government members did not have very much conscience when they sold their beloved Trades Hall.

Mr Elliott: When it is all said and done, they like a dollar better.

Mr SANTORO: I accept that interjection from the honourable member for Cunningham, because it contains a lot of substance and truth. The members of the ALP did not have any problems with selling Trades Hall. I would like to see the documents that the Labor Party tendered to the parties that wanted to redevelop that site.

If that example is too distant in the memory of Government members, I will talk about the Commonwealth Bank building that they have mentioned and have in fact rejected as being of little heritage significance.

I quote extensively from an article in the *Courier-Mail* of 3 January, which reports what architect Noel Robinson said. It states—

"Premier Goss' contention that there was no legal way to stop the destruction did not hold up."

The article is speaking about the Commonwealth Bank building—

"Mr Robinson is spokesman for a group of architects opposed to the ongoing destruction.

Yesterday he pleaded with the Premier not to allow closure of Arcade Lane, an action which is vital to construction of Kern Corporation's MacArthur Centre, until the issue could be publicly debated.

At the same time he tried to seek help from Environment and Heritage Minister Pat Comben, and a stay of execution from Kern Corporation to study options in which at least the facades of the buildings might be saved."

The article further states—

"He received no replies"—

presumably from the Minister. It continues—

"Ten years down the track from the BelleVue the will of our political leaders is still not there, and political will is all that is needed."

In saying that, in no way do I wish to launch myself into a vitriol against members opposite; but when they talk about a commitment to the preservation of buildings with heritage value, they should remember their recent actions and inactions. Any unbiased and fair observer of those events will conclude that the will and the action of those members opposite have not in fact been forthcoming.

Did members opposite consider that the Commonwealth Bank building, was in fact Commonwealth Government property? What representations did members opposite, including the Honourable the Minister, make to the Federal Labor Government in terms of the conditions that they would have liked the Federal Government to impose on the

sale of that building? I suggest that no conditions were imposed. If they were, I would like members opposite if not to table the documents detailing those conditions, at least to inform other members of this House of them. Before Government members cast stones at members on this side of the House, they should make sure that they are not in fact standing outside a glasshouse, because I suggest that their own record in terms of preserving buildings such as the Commonwealth Bank building and their beloved and old Trades Hall has shortcomings.

During the debate, mention has been made of facades and how honourable members on this side of the House are not serious when they support development to maintain facades while allowing the gutting of the interior of historical buildings. I ask the Minister, in his summing up, to explain how he will overcome this problem. Obviously the Minister is not interested in listening to this point. Hopefully, one of his officers or members will let him know what I am asking him to clarify.

Consideration must be given to what happens once a classification changes, say, from office to retail use. It means that modern-day requirements or standards need to apply. If the interior is not gutted and rebuilt according to council specifications or modern fire specifications, what will happen to the interior? Will the Minister introduce legislation to relax the fire regulations or will he let happen what has been happening in many cases, that is, the ornate timber and other structures that are not fireproof according to modern specifications being covered up with a fire-rated material such as sheet plaster? What is the Minister's view on the preservation of the substantial part of buildings that stand behind the facade and what will happen with the modern fire regulations? I am genuinely interested in hearing the Minister's response.

Much has been said about the Brisbane City Council and its attitude to heritage. I place on record that council's efforts in protecting the rich heritage of our city. For example, the Brisbane City Hall has been maintained and in fact restored by the Brisbane City Council including, I am happy to acknowledge, previous administrations. From reading various reports in the media, it would seem that one of the strongest critics against the restoration of certain parts of City Hall is Alderman Hinchliffe. Examples are the Wickham Terrace windmill, the Wickham Terrace reservoir, the School of Arts in Ann Street, the Windsor Town Council Chambers, the Nundah Shire Hall, the Botanic Gardens——

Mr Comben interjected.

Mr SANTORO: I am happy to acknowledge that that is in the Minister's electorate. The Petrie Terrace Mall is another one. All honourable members should give credit where credit is due. The Brisbane City Council, run by Lord Mayor Sallyanne Atkinson and the Liberal administration, has achieved much in preserving the rich heritage that Brisbane is able to boast about and show off to the people of Brisbane and visitors from interstate and overseas.

I join my leader, the honourable member for Toowong, when he says that we are opposed to this legislation because of its draconian aspects, because it gives too much discretion to the Minister, and because it unnecessarily and unfairly freezes the modus operandi of people who own properties and have taken enormous care at enormous expense to restore them to their original standard. We look forward to supporting future legislation that the Minister may be thinking of introducing which will be fair and look after the interests of all concerned. I again take this opportunity to say that we look forward to hearing his reply relative to fire ratings and fire regulations.

Mr BREDHAUER (Cook) (3.05 p.m.): One of the principal criticisms of the Bill that I have heard during the debate has been the actual decision on the buildings or sites that are or are not included in the Schedule. I commend the Minister for tackling this difficult task because it is important, to make the legislation practical and workable, that there be a Schedule listing the buildings to which the legislation applies. Of course, it is interim legislation so there will be an opportunity in the interim to deal with this issue. The Minister has grappled well with this difficult task and I applaud the Schedule which is

based on the assessments of the National Trust of Queensland and the Australian Heritage Commission and those buildings that are included in the National Estate Register.

Not all things that are old or historical are worthy of preservation, and I draw attention to an article in today's *Sun* headed "MPs told put God in charge". The first paragraph reads—

"State Government corruption would be reduced if MPs realised they were answerable to God . . ."

It comes from no less a luminary than the former National Party heavyweight Rona Joyner. Relic she may be and part of the dark political history of this State she undoubtedly is, but, in spite of the efforts of the journalist on this occasion, I can assure the House that not even the facade of this spent political force will be retained by this Government.

The Heritage Buildings Protection Bill is of some significance to me as the a member who represents part of Queensland which is steeped in the history of this State and country. Within the Schedules are 32 sites which fall within the Cook electorate. They are located in various areas, including Burke, Cook, Croyden, Carpentaria, Etheridge and Torres Shires. These sites chronicle the development and, in some cases, the demise of industry and services as people have striven to eke out an existence from some of the remotest and harshest regions in Queensland.

For example, I could talk at length about the history of Queensland's once-great railway system. Whilst the railways are still in good condition, I believe that there has been some decline. I refer with pride to the Normanton railway terminus and to the Normanton- Croydon railway line, which survives to this day, on which the weekly Gullfander service operates. I can also picture the stationmasters' residences at Einasleigh and Forsayth. These will merely be names to many honourable members, but I assure them that if they had been to these places and actually seen—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Johnson): Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr BREDHAUER: If honourable members had actually been to these places and seen the residences, they would know that they are imposing and beautiful structures. All these facilities are part of the railway services which are very important and symbolic to the small communities that they serve. All honourable members know the disgraceful performance of the former Government, particularly in recent years, in its running down and closing down of Queensland's country rail services. Actions have been taken without regard to the consequences for those communities in terms of the services and employment which those rail services provide. The buildings listed in the schedule are symbols of those services. The former Government made those decisions in typically short-sighted fashion without regard to such factors as the environment, road safety, road maintenance and other issues. People living in towns such as Mount Surprise, Forsayth, Einasleigh and other centres have been concerned for some time about the future of their rail services under the National Party Government. The Goss Government is committed to protecting Queensland's heritage, through the introduction of Bills such as the Heritage Buildings Protection Bill, and I commit myself to doing everything I can to keep those services available.

The Schedule to the Bill hints at the significance of gold-mining to the early economy of the far north. Listed in the Schedule are the Kidston Gold Battery, the Wild Irish Girl Ore Stamper and the Alexandra Stamp, which are both at Laura. They seem romantic names, but if honourable members had been to those places and seen the conditions under which the people who operated those industries worked, they would realise that they were actually far from romantic. Nevertheless, they are an important part of our history and heritage and as such these sites, buildings and structures are worthy of support. The gold fields of the far north were undoubtedly among the toughest in Australia and many pioneers perished in the effort to run that industry. The little that presently remains of this chapter in our history is worthy of the efforts of this Government to ensure the protection of such heritage.

Further, I will refer to the multiculturalism of the early far north which is evidenced by the inclusion in the Schedule of the Chinese shrine at the Cooktown cemetery—and everyone would be aware of the important role that the Chinese community played in

the early history of Queensland, particularly in the gold-mining era—and the Japanese cemetery on Thursday Island.

Mr Prest: Is the Lion's Den a heritage building?

Mr BREDHAUER: No, I do not believe that the Lion's Den is listed. It is a wonderful building. I do not know if the honourable member has been there and enjoyed the hospitality of the Moores who presently own the Lion's Den. It is a wonderful place, but it is not listed.

Thursday Island was host to many Japanese pearl divers when that industry was at its peak, and the Japanese cemetery is a fascinating testimony to the many young lives lost in pursuit of the pearl.

I will go on to mention the James Cook Historical Museum at Cooktown. Recently, the Honourable the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing and I were guests of the McKennas, who currently run that establishment. This museum not only contains James Cook memorabilia but also historical materials from the gold and timber industries and from the early times of the Cooktown district.

This Bill is not really concerned with the preservation of the heritage of buildings and sites which exist in the Cook electorate. Important though they may be and listed as they should be, they are not the ones which are presently under threat. This Bill provides interim protection for those buildings which have been under the constant threat of demolition because when they were in Government almost to a person the members opposite were afflicted by the cultural cringe. Stories have often been told about the Bellevue Hotel, Cloudland, the National Hotel and many other places. In environment and heritage matters, the axiom of members of the National Party was, "If it moves, shoot it; if it doesn't, knock it down."

This Bill is important to the preservation of our heritage buildings against the constant threat of demolition and redevelopment caused by the previous Government's inaction. If one needed further testimony of that, one could look at the instance that was referred to earlier by the honourable member for Brisbane Central. Last week in the press, it was stated that another building—although not a heritage building—was knocked down, apparently in spite of the fact that a court order had been obtained to prevent the building being bowled over. One might ask who was responsible for knocking the building down. If one replied, "The Deen Brothers," one would be right.

This Bill is an interim measure and I look forward to the time in the near future when a comprehensive review of it will give Queensland's heritage and buildings lasting security. In addition, I look forward to the time in the not-too-distant future when this Government will address that other important heritage issue, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island heritage of Queensland and Australia. I support the Bill before the House.

Hon. R. C. KATTER (Flinders) (3.13 p.m.): Today this House is taking a giant step away from anything that has previously been done in the State of Queensland in the last two decades.

A premier example of restoration and preservation in the State of Queensland is the main street of Charters Towers. On almost every second day for the last 15 years I have looked with a great deal of pride at that street. My office was established in the Stock Exchange Building in order to help provide income for the National Trust. It was not particularly convenient, but it was my way of expressing assistance for the wonderful work that the trust is doing. All that has taken place without legislation.

The socialists sitting opposite might be really surprised at how decent people can be if they are approached in a reasonable and sincere manner. It might be surprising for Government members to find out that people will do the right thing as long as their lives are not interfered with. This Bill gives a hell of a lot of permission to interfere in the rights of private property. Approximately three years ago, when the first heritage legislation was considered and subsequently introduced, we held very deep discussions which cut to the quick the philosophy of what this Parliament is about today with this

legislation. The honourable member for Cunningham would probably very well remember some of the arguments and discussions we had.

The whole question is whether or not Government should interfere with private property. Undoubtedly, as legislators, members of this Parliament have interfered with private property. When a dam was built or when highways were constructed, land was taken away from people, but I, for one, have been very regretful, reluctant and foot-dragging when the Government has walked right over the top of the rights that had been established over long and protracted periods.

If there is any distinguishing feature between the success of Anglo-Saxon countries and those countries that are not Anglo-Saxon, it is the hallmark institution of the rights of private property. If the English have given nothing else to mankind, they have most certainly given the human race the concept of a man's home being his castle. The principle is enshrined over and over again in British law. The bulwark of freedom and liberty that has withstood almost a millennium of attacks on rights, freedoms and privileges is England. In fact, England established most of those principles and its hallmark has been the institution of the rights associated with private property.

In spite of that, today the Government flings away with gay abandon rights of private property and introduces another concept whereby a group of people in Brisbane can decide that buildings and land are of some significance, and can seize control of that property completely. When that happens, the owners of the property effectively cease to control and own their buildings and land. The member for Cook, Mr Bredhauer, would be an expert in the field of Aboriginal lore. I can ask him how the people of Aboriginal descent at Yarrabah feel about World Heritage impositions that have effectively stripped them of ownership of 90 per cent of their land.

Mr Bredhauer: They didn't like your scheme; I can tell you that much.

Mr KATTER: I take the interjection made by the honourable member for Cook. I point out that the previous National Party Government handed over 3.5 million hectares to the black people of this State; yet his party, within two years, took back a significant proportion of the land that had been handed over. Is it any wonder that people of Aboriginal descent in this State regard Labor Party people as insincere in the extreme? There was no better example of that insincerity than the theft from the people of Yarrabah—people who have lived in the area, according to some anthropologists, for 20 000 or 30 000 years—of that land. The member for Cook bears the stigma of being associated with a political group that was responsible for that theft, which was the only act of dispossession perpetrated on black people that has occurred in the last decade. The member for Cook should hear what is being said about him and some of his colleagues and their hypocrisy. The people of Yarrabah regard them as prime examples of hypocrisy.

One has to look no further than at the Minister sitting opposite me for an example of hypocrisy. Today, the Minister sat in his place with his mouth shut while Cabinet decided to impose diesel generators on the people of Torres Strait islands; yet he is the Minister for Environment.

A Government member: What has that got to do with heritage?

Mr KATTER: Honourable members are talking about the environment, and this Bill relates to the environment. However, I will take the interjection and agree that I should be concentrating on historic buildings.

This Bill will be instrumental in providing future generations with the freedom to create Queensland's heritage without being shackled by the past. I do not wish to have imposed on my children too many shackles. Although some honourable members' forbears may have come to this country in chains, I have no desire to see my children chained to a prospect of virtually no future simply because their ability to make decisions and create society in the way it should be created, thereby meeting the needs and requirements of the next century, will be shackled by decisions made by this Parliament.

This legislation cuts a huge swathe through the principle of private property. I feel no shame or shyness about stating that I represent one of the poorest areas in the State of Queensland. The people who live in my electorate of Flinders are not rich and they strongly resent their taxes being used for the self-indulgence of the rich. In many cases, the preoccupation with beautiful buildings is the pastime of rich people and is not generally a preoccupation of working-class people. The people of the Flinders electorate have to pay for the preservation of heritage in this State's capital, and very little of their heritage will receive financial support. All my life I have stood by while country music has not received a cent in Government financial assistance whereas opera receives a fortune; ballet receives Government subsidies but, effectively, football does not receive much in the way of financial assistance. The Government imposes a tax burden on the people who live in my electorate but provides no assistance at all for those who live in bondwood huts in railway camps. Those dwellings should have been air-conditioned years ago, and I freely and frankly admit that.

Mr Sullivan: Why didn't you do it?

Mr Bredhauer: You were the Government for years. Why didn't you do something about it?

Mr KATTER: I take the interjections. It is being done right now. The air-conditioning of every public service home in my electorate is almost complete. It is an achievement of which I am very proud. I am hopeful that in the near future a program for air-conditioning railway dwellings will commence. In the space of 15 years, I think that I have done a pretty good job.

The point I make is that Government financial assistance that should be going to areas such as my electorate is being syphoned off. I have no hesitation in saying that that is being done to satisfy the self-indulgence of the rich and it is being imposed by the present-day champagne socialists.

Having made some general observations, I hasten to point out that politicians should be judged by their performance. The Federal Labor Government has been in office for approximately seven years, and in that time-frame it has not clocked up a bad record. The last speaker mentioned the preservation of Aboriginal heritage, with which I totally agree. Let me examine how well the Federal Labor Government has carried out that responsibility.

The most famous Australian paintings are the Wanjina paintings that can be found in the Northern Territory and the top of Western Australia. They are very complex and architecturally attractive paintings, and they are of great religious and historical significance to people of Aboriginal descent. Most of those paintings have been repainted by people who are totally unskilled and who are ignorant of the significance of those paintings. A group of teenagers from Darwin were paid by the Federal Government and they repainted these Aboriginal paintings with Berger Breeze. The paintings were utterly destroyed. The front page of the *Australian* featured a weeping elder of the tribe. The headline was, "The elders wept". That is an example of the way in which the Federal Labor Government has looked after the most important piece of heritage that existed in this nation at that time. The whole front page of the *Australian* was taken up with that story.

Not only were the Wanjina paintings utterly destroyed but, in the third year of the Hawke Government, the Stahlow collection, which was the most important collection of Aboriginal artefacts that existed in Australia, was taken to Europe. To my knowledge, no part of that collection has returned. Its loss has made press headlines throughout Australia.

In Queensland, also in the term of the Hawke Government, we had the most incredible occurrence in which the Cape Bowling Green lighthouse, one of the most important heritage buildings in all of north Queensland, was taken down piece by piece, wrecked and utterly destroyed, put in tea boxes and taken to Sydney and stored.

The Government has been in office for six months. In the two years prior that, the previous Government faced two major heritage issues. The first issue concerned Shafston House, which is, arguably, the oldest house in Queensland. In 1850, work started on Shafston House. It also has, arguably, the biggest tree in Queensland in its backyard. One day, people driving to work past that beautiful piece of our heritage—arguably one of our most beautiful pieces of heritage—saw a sign which read "To be auctioned for development". I cannot remember who the auctioneers were. That sign was erected in the yard of that building which was owned by the Federal Government. At that time, it was only after protracted and acrimonious debate and fighting by the National Party that it was able to convince the Federal Government to take down the sign and to preserve the building.

The other issue of importance related to the Commonwealth Bank building. The present Government did a "marvellous" job with that; it was torn to the ground and is a heap of rubble. The previous Government successfully preserved Shafston House, yet the Labor Government allowed the Commonwealth Bank building to be razed. We can judge people by their actions.

We have heard wonderful things about world heritage and the rainforests. The people who have lived all their lives in those localities know what preservation of the rainforest means under a Labor Government. It means that we all get kicked out and the hippies with the blue tarpaulins and the second-hand car seats move in. Honourable members who do not believe me should read recent articles in the press about the Franklin River area in Tasmania, which is a disgrace. No ordinary person would dare walk through there; they would not be game, because so much marijuana is growing there. As well, there is the abomination of blue tarpaulins and second-hand car seats.

Government members interjected.

Mr KATTER: I hear howls of interjection coming from Government members. The last national park that I can remember being established before we achieved office was at the bay south of Wujal Wujal Mission, as it then was, at which all the marijuana controversy raged.

I feel proud that the former Government preserved the cliffs at Kangaroo Point. I sincerely hope that the Minister retains the present members of the Heritage Committee. It has some real talent in the form of Ann Garms and Richard Allen. I recommend strongly to the Government—

Mr Comben: You are a bit hopeful there.

Mr KATTER: That is the voice of open and reasonable government. I am staggered to hear that the suggestion of that person's name, who was synonymous with the preservation of beautiful buildings throughout Queensland, would cause mirth in this place. It appals me.

I hope that we did not do such things when we were in office. If honourable members examine the departments that were under my control, they will discover that a number of prominent ALP people were employed in them. They did an excellent job and I pay them the highest praise. Their political affiliations did not count with me; I hope they do not count with the Minister. The important thing is to get the best person for the job. If the Minister does that, he will be successful and be lauded; if he does not, he will be treated in the same way as a number of failures have already been treated.

I have grave worries that the old Supreme Court building in Townsville really fits into the category of building that we should be preserving. To preserve that building would cost approximately \$2.5m. At least three or four vastly superior buildings to it remain in Charters Towers. If there is any fairness, approximately \$5m or \$6m would be coming to Charters Towers. In two towns that I know of, an amount of \$7.5m needs to be spent. I hope that this is a very wealthy Government and that things go well for

it in the coal industry, because it will need huge amounts of money to preserve the heritage of Queensland.

I have listened on the television in my office to every speaker in this debate. They all had a wish list of about 30 or 40 buildings that they wanted preserved. I do not know from where the money will come. If the Government preserves the Townsville Supreme Court building as a site that should be preserved, the Government has put its feet clearly on the sticky paper. It is therefore its responsibility to see that the building is preserved, which will take an awful lot of money.

In sharp contrast to the Cape Bowling Green lighthouse, which is smashed up and in tea chests in Sydney; the Wanjina paintings, which were painted over with Berger Breeze paint; the Stahlow collection, which is at present being enjoyed by the Europeans in Switzerland; the blue tarps and the old car seats in the Franklin River area; and the Commonwealth Bank building, which does not exist any more, we can look out over the Kangaroo Point cliffs, which the previous Government had a tremendous battle to preserve, we still have Shafston House, Customs House, the old printery building, all of George Street and the old Supreme Court building in Townsville, even though I regard it as a very marginal case.

I will conclude the way that I started by saying that, when it talked about the environment, the previous Government talked about "landscapes" in its legislation. It was attempting to establish a total concept.

In a debate about heritage buildings, I do not think that it is out of place to talk about dirty, filthy, greasy, smelly, oil pollution on tiny little islands that are paradise.

Mr Comben interjected.

Mr KATTER: The Minister can throw his hands in the air. It means nothing to him. People in conservation circles in Queensland move very quickly. It is up to the Minister to face up to them at some future time.

It was the Labor Brisbane City Council that introduced diesel buses into this city. At the time that was thought not to be an environmental issue. I think that, today, very few people would argue that it is not one of the most important environmental issues facing the city. One of the things that is tearing to pieces a lot of the old buildings is the excessive fumes from the diesel buses that were introduced by the Labor-controlled council.

This legislation cuts a great swathe through the rights, freedoms and privileges of the individual, which centre so much around the institution of private property. The cost burdens that will be imposed on the people of Queensland will be horrific—and I use the word "horrific" with forethought.

In conclusion, I hope that future generations of Queenslanders will not be shackled by the past so that they are free to create a wonderful future, which was enjoyed by our generation, but that will depend upon the administration of the legislation.

Hon. P. COMBEN (Windsor—Minister for Environment and Heritage) (3.31 p.m.), in reply: I will commence by making a few general comments. One is that honourable members have seen in this debate the great complexity that heritage legislation brings to any Parliament at any time. The Queensland Parliament is the last Parliament in Australia to introduce real heritage legislation. In four other Legislatures there is now proper heritage legislation. The heritage legislation introduced in the Tasmanian Parliament is likely to be passed within the next few days. The heritage legislation introduced in Western Australia is now stalled in the Upper House, because of the complexities and the philosophical differences in approach between members of Government and members of the Opposition. At present, there is a Labor Government in every State in Australia, except New South Wales. In States in which there is an Upper House, there is an ability to stall legislation, and suddenly this sort of legislation is stalled. However, it works well in South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales. In those States, the heritage of Australians is preserved. It is the way that Queensland needs to go.

I am proud of the legislation that I have introduced and that, hopefully, will be passed in a few minutes' time. It is legislation that is long overdue. It is legislation that will shackle the future, because it will mean that our heritage is preserved. It will mean that our history will be able to be seen by future generations.

I notice that the honourable member for Flinders is escaping from the Chamber. Some five years ago now, he introduced what was supposed heritage legislation. I refer to the Cultural Record (Landscapes Queensland and Queensland Estate) Act. That was heritage legislation which did not use the terms "heritage" or "Aboriginal" and which has been unable to be used by me, because the Government has legal advice that the legislation is so vague, so uncommitted and so uncertain that the Supreme Court of Queensland would almost certainly throw out any charge that was brought under it.

I want to comment on some of the general remarks made by members opposite, put what I think are the correct interpretations on the provisions of this interim legislation and then deal with specific comments by members who have spoken in the debate. Firstly, the members of the committee that is named in the Bill are coming from seven diverse backgrounds. That was deliberate in order to provide a balance. The Builders, Owners and Managers Association and the Institute of Engineers are weighed against the National Trust and the Real Estate Institute of Queensland. The Government sought to achieve a balance. I have not—as I have been slated for doing by members of the Opposition—gone out and said, "This is a piece of legislation which the socialists in Government today have introduced. The legislation takes away private property rights. The Minister will interpret, on appeal, what you can and cannot do." There is a balanced committee. As soon as this legislation is passed, I will appoint Richard Allom as chairperson—someone who the member for Flinders has just said is a good person and should be kept on. He also mentioned Mrs Ann Garms. Mrs Ann Garms will not be a member of my Heritage Committee. I think it is the same Ann Garms who ran for a seat called Windsor in 1983. However, that had no relevance to my decision.

The committee will bring balance to its decision-making. If a person seeks to change or paint a heritage building, the Government is not going to say, "That building is frozen. Thou shalt not do. Thou shalt not do anything with it." The Government will be bringing to bear in terms of applications for alteration an ability to recycle, to use. Our heritage is a living thing. The Government understands that some people may have difficulty accepting that the use of their building may have to be limited in some way, that is, it may not be knocked down. The Government accepts that. If it is heritage listed, then it should be able to be preserved.

The list itself is a combination of the National Trust list and the Australian Heritage National Estates list. They are the only two lists that the Government had available to it. It must be remembered that this is interim legislation. It is legislation that is designed to be in place for about six months. It is designed to protect a certain number of buildings, most of which are in the central business district of Brisbane, in regard to which the Government could not guarantee protection. They are buildings that the Government believes were in danger of demolition. Action had to be taken.

One member said that the National Trust was pleased to do everything in a voluntary capacity and did not need legislative force. The reality is that two months before I made the announcement on 11 March that the Government would introduce legislation, the National Trust had said to the Government, "You have got to bring in retrospective legislation." In the interests of public certainty, the Government had not said that it was planning it and had not even canvassed the matter. I repeat that the National Trust said that it wanted retrospective legislation.

Mr Elliott: You should have put it through the House in all stages.

Mr COMBEN: And who would have voted against it at every turn?

Mr Elliott: You should have approached us.

Mr COMBEN: Shortly, I will deal with the contribution by the member for Cunningham, and I will make a suggestion in regard to cooperation. The Government did not believe that that option was open. Even though the legislation will operate from the date when the announcement was made, public consultation has taken place during the last two months. We have been able to discuss the issue with a whole range of interest groups from both sides of the heritage debate. The legislation has been well honed, and I have no problem with it.

As to whether or not the Government can add to or subtract from the list—at this stage the list exists for six months in interim legislation. However, if it is found that a particular building has been listed inappropriately—perhaps because a mistake has been made at the Australian Heritage Commission or the National Trust—when an application is made to the Heritage Committee by anyone who wants to do something, it will consider the building and will certainly say, "Hang on. I am not sure that this building should be here. This building clearly is not of heritage standards." In that case the application for alteration or for whatever reason will be approved. A protection mechanism exists. If a building is inappropriately listed and a person makes application for alteration of that building, that application will be granted. That is the view that I would take on appeal, too.

As to compensation—it is good to see the honourable member for Toowong in the House again. Last Thursday night, he stood in this House and waved around two Acts. I think they were the South Australian and Victorian legislation. He said, "We want to see financial compensation as in these Acts." When I said to him, "Tell me which sections", he said, "I will tell you later." I wait for Mr Beanland to tell me that. Neither of those Acts contains provision for compensation. Whenever the member is challenged—that is, if he will take an interjection—he says, "I will tell you later." That is the last refuge of a scoundrel who has not been briefed properly, has not read the legislation and is not on top of the subject. He has been destroyed.

During the discussion phase on the Green Paper and on future legislation, the Government will be considering all options. It will consider the financial implications of heritage legislation. As well, it will consider what has occurred in other States and will distil from that the best possible legislation.

As to penalties—fines of up to \$1m are necessary. The legislation refers to 17 000 penalty units. During early discussions on this legislation, I made comments in the media about sending people to gaol. Because this is interim legislation, because it has not been discussed with the Opposition and because it was introduced quickly, penal provisions have not been included in it.

Mr Borbidge: What is wrong with stamp duty and land tax rebates as an incentive?

Mr COMBEN: I invite Mr Borbidge to speak to my Heritage Committee and to put forward those submissions. The committee will be considering those issues. If people give it the options, it will consider them. The committee has no problem with that.

Mr Borbidge: You haven't replied to Mr Elliott's speech.

Mr COMBEN: I will get to that later. I am making some initial general comments. If the honourable member had been in the House five minutes earlier, he would have heard what I intend to do. I am not sure if Mr Elliott wants me to come back to him, but I will.

As to the penalties—provision exists for a fine of \$1m, which is appropriate. Recently on the radio, I heard the former Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr Angus Innes, speak about the \$1m penalty. He said that that penalty would apply if an old pensioner knocks down the front porch of his worker's dwelling. The reality is that the courts will decide the penalties. The \$1m penalty is stated in the legislation as a maximum penalty. The courts will impose appropriate penalties for smaller offences such as that. I am not a judge of the Supreme Court or the District Court of Queensland. I cannot judge that. It is not my calling. However, the former Leader of the Liberal Party said that this

Government will impose a fine of \$1m on such people. This Government will not be doing that. To suggest that the Supreme Court would be so harsh is to hold oneself in contempt of that court.

I cite the example of a major building proposal that is worth \$1 billion. If developers were to clear a site such as the Customs House, the Treasury building or another of the historical and unique buildings of Queensland, the only penalty that could be imposed as a real deterrent to such people is \$1m. However, what is \$1m in a development that is worth \$1 billion? It is only one-tenth of one per cent—just another construction cost. A large penalty is the only way to ensure that there is not contempt of the legislation and contempt of the courts such as that contained in the press cuttings that were tabled today in this House by Mr Beattie. If necessary, future legislation can contain penal provisions to put directors in gaol. Under this legislation, a \$1m fine is warranted in some circumstances.

As to the appeals provisions—at present, a person who wishes to lodge an appeal must make application to the Heritage Committee, which will consider it. If that person is not happy with the committee's decision, the matter can be reviewed. I am standing well and truly at arm's length from that committee. If an applicant is not happy, he can appeal to me. I have already indicated my view of the matter.

This is interim legislation relating to the preservation of heritage values. However, at this stage, because heritage values are not articulated and spelt out in this legislation, at times it has been taking fine points at someone's cost. We must ensure that we will not in any way detract from heritage values and will ensure that a liberal system exists. If people have real concerns, I suggest that they refer them to the Heritage Committee.

Last week in this House, Mr Elliott indicated general support for the concept of heritage legislation. I welcome that support. He expressed concerns about a number of clauses. I understand that some divisions may be called on those clauses. However, I welcome the Opposition's general support of the legislation. I appreciate the concerns about some of the conditions, provisions and clauses of the Bill. However, this is interim legislation. Value judgments have been made, but let us get on with fully discussing the future legislation.

The honourable member for Pine Rivers, Mrs Woodgate, supports the legislation and expressed her support for all historical and environmental issues. She certainly showed her support for her local area.

The member for Toowong, Mr Beanland, also spoke in the debate. We heard from him and other members of his party the normal diatribe that we hear from that handful of people at the back of the Chamber who all look the same and who do not even have in their number anyone who is experienced in Government. To him it was so easy—"Why don't you do this overnight? Why don't you introduce full heritage legislation? Why don't you give massive compensation?" They are the questions of Opposition. They are the comments of an opposition party that has never been in Government and that does not understand that Government is a hard task. Government is enjoyable but it is pretty hard. It is not easy.

Mr Hamill: You should listen to the Liberal Party. They are part of the heritage of this State.

Mr COMBEN: As my colleague the member for Ipswich said, the only thing that would have saved the Liberal Party from destruction at the last election would have been a heritage preservation order.

The member for Barron River, Dr Lesley Clark, expressed her concerns about Flagstaff Hill. They have been heard. Some concerns have been expressed by the local authority involved and they have been taken on board. With the proposed amendments that were circulated on the last sitting day, Flagstaff Hill will be removed from the Schedule to take into account the concerns of the Mulgrave Shire Council.

The member for Fassifern expressed his support. I was pleased with that, because he lives in the house of a former Premier of Queensland, Mr McCormack. The honourable member has done a good job restoring that house. A number of places in the Fassifern Valley are not on the National Trust list but they could easily be placed on it when the resources are put into the National Trust, something which the Government will be moving to do over the next few months. The places that the honourable member mentioned are worthy of consideration for listing.

The support of the member for Nundah for the Nundah Historical Society was again evident. On many occasions I have seen that support in the media. He referred to the German origins. The honourable member lives further down Kedron Brook than I do. That brook, which is named after the Brook of Kedron from the Book of Genesis in the Bible, links our two electorates. At some stage, the Government will be considering what support it can give to the Nundah Historical Society and to the great restoration job that it is carrying out.

The member for Barambah expressed support and also expressed some local concerns. I will certainly be looking at those local concerns. The member for Broadsound, Mr Pearce, showed his concern for the beautiful areas and the heritage values of his electorate. I know that many of the areas about which he spoke, especially the chapel at Lakes Creek, are worthy of preservation. This legislation will ensure their continuance.

The member for Lockyer, Mr FitzGerald, expressed many concerns about the Church of Christ. He said that people should be able to say whether or not they want their buildings on the preservation list. Such a list would be a Claytons list. If a property-owner has the right to say, "I will have my property on the heritage list", or, "No, I won't", it will be found that the goodies will list their properties, which will become subject to the Heritage Buildings Protection Act, as it will be. That is fine, but they would have intended preserving their property, anyway. The baddies will just say, "No, I don't want it on the list, so I am not subject to the Heritage Buildings Protection Act." They will then be able to knock it down. What point is that? That would be a Claytons list.

Mr Booth: Are you suggesting that the people of that church are baddies?

Mr COMBEN: No, I am not, but I am saying that the honourable member's suggestions would result in a Claytons list.

I am very conscious of the amount of heritage in Mr Beattie's electorate of Brisbane Central. We had a great deal of difficulty with a street which I think is called Hale Street. Unfortunately, certain buildings were not encompassed within the National Trust list. I have been very appreciative of the amount of support given to me by Mr Beattie and local people. We certainly take on board what he said about workers' cottages and old Queenslanders.

Mr Santoro said that at the last election the Liberal Party had a good environmental policy. It is my recollection that, to the 120 claims in the log of claims put forward by the green challenge, the Liberal Party said "Yes" to 30 and my party said "Yes" to 108. That is why the Labor Party won the election; that is why the honourable member's party lost. If at some stage the honourable member is serious about finding out where his party should be going on the environment, I invite him to have a cup of coffee with me or I will give him a list of volunteer workers in the green movement who can tell him where the Liberal Party's policy was deficient.

Mr Santoro: We asked them.

Mr COMBEN: People did not vote for the Liberal Party, so what is the point?

There was an obvious pride in Mr Santoro's Cook's tour of Merthyr. I say that in no derogatory sense. It is the same pride as I have for my electorate, which borders on Merthyr. I can look at the historic and heritage buildings of my area. I refer to Kirkston on top of the hill, looking down on the Windsor council chambers. That is a beautiful precinct which overlooks Merthyr. On the next hill is Wilston House. They are an

example of the great Brisbane manor houses of the 1880s. They are scattered throughout the inner-city area. In those days, on each hill was built one a stately homes.

I note what the honourable member said about Palma Rosa. If he would care to make representations, we will look at them as well. He spoke about voting for good legislation in the future. He can vote for good legislation this afternoon. However, I certainly take on board what he has said.

The member for Cook, Mr Bredhauer, did a great job to bring to my attention the various mining sites in that area such as the Palmer River gold fields, and he used those great romantic names. The honourable member took my own line when he spoke about the wild Irish girl, the stamper and various others.

Mr Hamill: What is that?

Mr COMBEN: It is a piece of metal. It is what the honourable member and I saw when we went to Chillagoe some time ago.

The various other things about which Mr Bredhauer spoke are certainly areas which are worthy of preservation. The department is looking at those areas. How Mr Bredhauer looks after an area which is 100 000 times larger than mine and which contains some 15 endemic birds—"endemic" meaning that they are found nowhere else—amazes me. It is amazing to me, but the honourable member has some wonderful heritage areas and I can assure him that I will do everything I can to declare all of Cape York as national park or heritage areas.

The honourable member said, in conclusion, that he would like to see the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander heritage legislation introduced soon. The Government has sought to split the Aboriginal heritage legislation from the built heritage legislation because it is quite evident that a considerably longer period is needed to properly discuss this issue with the constituents of the honourable member for Cook, and this Government will be doing precisely that.

In the first week of July, both the honourable member and I will be in the central part of Cape York to start that process of dialogue with his constituents. My department will be employing a well-known anthropologist to continue that dialogue so that Queensland will get the best possible Aboriginal heritage legislation.

I acknowledge that the honourable member for Cook is going interstate to see what is being done elsewhere with Aboriginal heritage legislation.

Mr Stephan: You won't find much Torres Strait legislation there.

Mr COMBEN: No, the honourable member will not find any in Victoria.

Mr Katter said that this Government this afternoon was taking one giant step, and he spoke about the main street of Charters Towers. I have already cited what Mr Katter has done to Queensland in legislative terms—that the Cultural Record (Landscapes Queensland and Queensland Estate) Act is his legacy. After eight drafts in six years, the former Minister brought down legislation that is so uncertain and so unworkable that this Government has had to move with this interim legislation.

Had the former Minister introduced workable legislation, this Government would have used it and would not now be introducing interim legislation. There was nothing workable in the Act and Opposition members cannot cry wolf. In fact, that legislation is totally unworkable.

In my concluding remarks, I make an offer to the spokespersons for both of the Opposition parties—the Leader of the Liberal Party and the spokesperson for Environment and Heritage, Mr Elliott—that should they wish to come and talk to my professional officers about the directions that my department is taking and about submissions that they have received, I throw open my office for them to do that. They can come and talk to my department's advisory committee. It is an expanded advisory committee, not the one referred to in the Bill. My department has included a far wider range of people.

They can take part in the discussion of some 13 papers about future legislation that will be the best in Australia. One cannot get a better process than that through which my department is going. It is talking to all the players, it is finding the common ground, and it is proceeding apace. If those honourable members wish to be part of that process, I invite them to be briefed by the members of that committee and by my departmental officers. In terms of dialogue I can do no better than that. I appreciate the concerns that those honourable members have expressed about this interim legislation, but it is interim legislation. The next piece of heritage legislation should be non-political. It should be legislation that is aimed at preserving the history of this State. It is for all the people of Queensland. I look forward to the cooperation of those honourable members. I can do no more than throw open my door to those members. I hope that my offer is taken up in the spirit in which it is given—fulsomely and with an open heart.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 51

NOES, 32

DIVISION

Resolved in the affirmative.

Committee

Hon. P. Comben (Windsor—Minister for Environment and Heritage) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—

Mr ELLIOTT (4.03 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

"At page 2, omit lines 9 and 10."

The purpose of the amendment is to remove the retrospectivity of this legislation. Had there been consultation of all parties earlier, the Bill could have been introduced in March, so there is no excuse to say now that it should apply retrospectively.

I know why this happened—because a Federal election was looming and the Government did not have the courage to do anything about the Commonwealth Bank building. It did not suit the Government's political purposes to do anything at that time. Immediately that problem disappeared, the Government decided that the announcement

about this legislation would be good for a few votes. It is Government's political right to do that, but it should not expect us to agree.

Mr BEANLAND: I have indicated previously my concern about retrospectivity in legislation. The Minister has seen fit to introduce it in this Bill. Initially, the Minister indicated that many buildings and precincts that were contained in both the National Trust list and the Australian National Estate list would be included in the Bill. We know that precinct buildings were removed from the list. That caused concern to many people in the community and there was a lot of uncertainty about where the Government was going. I am not aware of the buildings that the Minister thought would be demolished. Certainly, it was too late for the Commonwealth Bank building. Possibly it was the Commercial Bank of Australia building, which is perhaps still standing as part of this whole redevelopment scene. In addition, the Walter Taylor bridge was on the list, as an honourable member mentioned during the debate. I am pleased that it has been removed from the list. It was nonsense to have it on the list in the first place. The list contained a number of buildings and precincts that should not have been on it. This created a great deal of uncertainty in people's minds at the time.

Usually it is only taxation Bills that have retrospectivity, and there is good reason and justification for that. The Treasurer of the day makes an announcement on taxation matters and they apply from the date of the announcement. Usually in this place legislation applies from the date it is introduced, so people are aware of the details in the Bill and there is no uncertainty, worry or concern in the community. Alternatively, the legislation applies from the date it is given royal assent. I have mentioned my concern and the concern of the community about retrospectivity, and I can well understand why the honourable member wanted to move the amendment.

Mr COMBEN: We will not accept the amendment. It stops the legislation from being effective from the date I made the announcement. It is not a retrospective clause. If it was retrospective, it would have been retrospective from the day I made the announcement. The Government was conscious to make sure that if people had done anything to enable them to demolish, subdivide or substantially alter a property on the day I made my announcement, that was okay, but we said, "From henceforth, thou shalt not." That is not retrospectivity, and the Government will not support the amendment.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the clause—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 50

NOES, 32

DIVISION

Resolved in the affirmative.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Honourable members will note that for any further divisions the division bells will ring for only two minutes.

Clause 2, as read, agreed to.

Clause 3—

Mr BEANLAND (4.15 p.m.): Clause 3 is the definition clause, and I speak on it because of its far-reaching effects. During the debate, one speaker clearly indicated that there was no problem when it comes to painting a heritage building. That is not quite the case. Clause 3 (1) (c) states—

" . . . paint or plaster (other than to maintain or essentially repair consistent with the relevant period of construction) . . ."

One will encounter problems if one tries to paint a building other than in keeping with the relevant period of construction. For example, the Lord Mayor might want to paint City Hall a totally different colour from the one it has been painted. That would fall under this clause and an appeal would have to be made to the Minister. It could be that many private property owners, and residential owners in particular, might want to paint either the inside or the outside of their homes a radically different colour. This will not always happen, but I know of a number of cases over the years where people, for their own personal reasons, have chosen totally different colour schemes. When this occurs and the painting is not consistent with the relevant period of construction, the approval of the Heritage Committee will be required, and if that committee refuses approval, an appeal may be made to the Minister.

This is a very important clause because it relates to various sectors of the community. Subclause (2) relates to heritage buildings or boundaries. I mention, for example, the McDonnell and East building, which has a car park behind it. Although the car park is not a heritage building, it could, nevertheless, be interpreted to be part of the McDonnell and East building. I mention this matter because I trust that the Minister or the Heritage Committee would not perceive the car park as part of a heritage property. Although the car park may be an important facet of ensuring that the McDonnell and East store remains viable, surely the committee could not possibly regard the car park as a heritage building.

It will not be easy to resolve some of the questions that will be brought to the Minister for determination. The Minister will have to be careful not to create a position in which people are faced with horrendous decisions that will impinge upon continuing operations or their ability to sell off part of their property, which might be necessary to ensure the viability of the main enterprise.

I mention these matters because they are substantial issues. I feel sure that they will cause problems even within the relatively short period of the next few months.

Mr COMBEN: I note the member's comments.

Clause 3, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7—

Mr ELLIOTT (4.19 p.m.): The Committee should look at some of the powers set out in this clause and the way in which they can be exercised. During the second-reading debate, the Minister was asked questions in relation to the committee, but I do not think an answer was received. The Opposition wants to know whether the people on the Heritage Committee will be paid or unpaid members and whether the presiding officer will be paid or unpaid. When one takes into account the volume of work with which these people will have to contend, I do not think it is unreasonable to suggest that they should be a paid.

Another concept that concerns the Opposition considerably is the prospect of a member of the general public taking it into his head to suggest that a particular building

should be listed on the Schedule. The Minister indicates that that is not possible. I wanted to clarify that matter to ensure that people of malicious intent or people who simply wanted to play the fool would not be able to list properties in a vexatious manner. If that were to occur, it would waste the time of the committee and of the Minister.

The questions I pose to the Minister are: will the members of the committee will be paid or unpaid; and, can he give some indication of the size and nature of the bureaucracy that will support the Heritage Committee?

Mr BEANLAND: I mentioned some aspects of this matter during the second-reading debate. I note that the Minister implied that two or three members of the Heritage Committee who are representatives of certain organisations are also members of the National Trust. Prior to the election, it was quite clear from statements made in relation to the heritage plank of the ALP's political platform that, under a Goss Government, the National Trust would be strongly represented on a Queensland heritage commission. It is quite clear that that statement referred to representatives of the National Trust and not to people who represent some other organisation.

I point out that I am a member of the National Trust, as I am sure many other honourable members are, but that it does not mean that, as members of the Heritage Committee, we would be representing the National Trust. We might be representatives of some other organisation, which begs the question. In accordance with his ideology, the Minister has included members of the Trades and Labor Council, because he believes that they should be members of the committee; however, he has left out the Royal Australian Planning Institute. In my opinion, heritage is very much a planning matter, especially when it comes to the detail and substance of matters. In spite of that, the Minister has not included a representative of the Royal Australian Planning Institute.

Although the Minister has included representatives from BOMA, the REIQ, the Local Government Association of Queensland and the architects and engineers institutes—which is all well and good, and with which I totally agree—I still believe that a representative from the Royal Australian Planning Institute should be included. Perhaps consideration should also be given to including representation from the Royal Historical Society of Queensland so that it, too, can have a say on these matters.

Heritage buildings range across a wide spectrum. When we consider listing a building, we do not merely consider the architecture or the engineering aspects; other aspects must be taken into consideration. I trust that, when the Minister considers the final legislation later in the year, he will consider those aspects.

Mr COMBEN: In brief response to Mr Elliott's concerns about whether members of the Heritage Committee would be paid—all of them will be unpaid, including the chairperson. Should there be any expenses incurred, we would expect to pay them, although we do not anticipate expenses being incurred. It is totally voluntary. In terms of the advisory committee for the other legislation—its members are already devoting long periods to their work and, for professional people such as architects and engineers, that is a huge loss of revenue.

As to Mr Beanland's concerns—the National Trust is strongly represented on the committee by its Queensland President. As I said recently, I believe that at least two other members of the seven-person committee are members of the National Trust.

I appreciate the honourable member's suggestion about the RAIP. However, where should we draw the line? There are many historical societies. We wanted a tight representative committee. I did not know that the honourable member was going to raise the matter in this debate, but I have just replied to the RAIP saying that I hope that it will be involved in the planning of the next piece of legislation.

Clause 7, as read, agreed to.

Clause 8, as read, agreed to.

Clause 9—

Mr ELLIOTT (4.25 p.m.): Subclause (6) is of real concern to the Opposition. Honourable members might cast their minds back to the views put forward by members of the previous Opposition during the debate on amendments to the Traffic Act. This clause allows an appeal to the same committee that decides that the building should be on the list. Following that, the only appeal is to the good nature of the Minister. At times in this Chamber, I have seen him when his nature was anything but good. If one were to come across him on a bad morning, one might find the result far from one's liking, particularly if one was about to lose \$8m or \$9m, which is what some of the developers in Queen Street have at stake.

It is amazing that the Government is not consistent on this point. It has always argued in this Chamber that Caesar should not appeal to Caesar. Let all the moral reformers in the legal area note the Government's non-compliance on this point.

Mr BEANLAND: The clause contains a number of provisions that concern me. Subclause (6) states that appeals are to be informal and simple and not subject to the rules of evidence. With respect to the Minister, I point out that we could be dealing with buildings worth millions of dollars; it could be someone's home. We know already that a number of people have written to the Minister about their concern for their homes. Recently, I received a complaint from a lady at Sunnybank.

However, the important point is that there will be no legal representation. I am not one to advocate the use of the legal fraternity. However, when we are dealing with people's life-savings, we must be cognisant of the effect that this legislation could have on those people. It may be that a person's life's savings are tied up in his property and, as a result of the committee's decision and, finally, the Minister's decision, he will lose everything because he is not allowed access to a proper appeal process.

This is one of the clauses to which I referred when I spoke about draconian legislation which did not give people the ability to be heard, to have proper representation and to receive natural justice. This subclause does not allow people to achieve natural justice.

The whole clause relates to renovations and alterations and to those items covered under clause 8 (3), (b) or (c). It has nothing to do with the buildings included in the Schedule. As I understand the legislation, those buildings are there for the duration of this legislation.

If a person is refused a heritage certificate, he may appeal against that decision, first of all, to the committee. If the committee refuses that appeal, the second appeal it is just like Caesar appealing to Caesar. If it is knocked back on the first occasion, it goes to the Minister. Of course, the Minister's decision is final. Where does the appellant go from there? Nowhere. It is unfair. When a person appeals to the committee a second time, he is not entitled to legal representation or legal advice.

The Bill could have been tidied up by the insertion of better appeal provisions. When I read this clause, I was astounded that the appeal provisions were not given proper consideration.

The Minister berated me over compensation and talked about the South Australian legislation. I was talking about the New South Wales legislation which, at pages 41 to 44, refers to taxation, rates, land tax and so on. It is easy for the Minister to attack me personally. It is the old ALP tactic of attacking the man but not getting down to the issue. The Minister should take a look at the Heritage Commission in New South Wales. I again refer the Minister to pages 41, 42, 43 and 44—perhaps even a few more—covering the very points that I have raised. The Minister should be looking at these sorts of things, but he is not. He would rather abuse me with the foulest of language than do something constructive for property-owners. I know that the Minister does not give a damn about the rights of private property-owners. However, they do have rights, and consideration could have easily been given to them in this clause.

So on both counts the Minister is wrong. The Minister can berate me for raising the position in New South Wales. However, as I have already pointed out, Queensland should follow the New South Wales example. The way this clause stands is far from satisfactory. I would have hoped that some amendments would be moved to give natural justice to the people in the community who deserve it.

Mr ELLIOTT: I would like the Minister to tell the Committee whether, under that clause, one can take along a solicitor.

Mr COMBEN: I appreciate the support received from the honourable member for Cunningham, who has bothered to do his homework and has sought legal advice.

As for the bush lawyers at the back of the Chamber—there are no Sir Samuel Griffiths in the Liberal corner. It was bad enough when the member for Sherwood was around. Now none of the Liberals has legal qualifications. Subclause 6 refers to appeals that are to be informal and simple and not subject to rules of evidence. Natural justice will apply. If any rights are going to be taken away, natural justice will apply. People can be legally represented. If I had wanted to take away legal representation, I would have said, "Legal representation will not be allowed." That is a standard clause in Queensland legislation. It will be allowed.

Clause 9, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 10 to 16, as read, agreed to.

Clause 17—

Mr ELLIOTT (4.33 p.m.): On pages 7 and 8, particularly on page 8 in clause 17 (2), the Bill refers to a restoration order. Will this apply only to a building in which the Deen Brothers have been let in and have put a ball and chain through the wall? Is that the situation that is envisaged?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber. I ask honourable members to resume their seats.

Mr ELLIOTT: Does the clause refer only to the case in which someone has maliciously and purposely damaged a building, or does it cover the situation in which a building has deteriorated over the years owing to natural wear and tear? Are the owners of such buildings going to be forced to do something about them?

I might add that the Opposition believes that the penalty of 17 000 penalty units is excessive.

Mr COMBEN: In answer to the query in relation to subclause (2)—it is anticipated that that would be used only in instances in which someone has sought to start to demolish a building.

The wear and tear to which the honourable member referred is not addressed in this Bill. It is one of the complicated aspects of the longer-term legislation. What should be done if someone owns a property, cannot maintain it and it wastes away? It is one of those awkward provisions in relation to which no-one has any really clear answer. However, it will be applied only in terms of damage that is deliberately inflicted in contravention of the legislation.

Clause 17, as read, agreed to.

Clause 18—

Mr ELLIOTT (4.35 p.m.): Subclause (2) of clause 18 refers to non-dealing orders not exceeding a period of 10 years. I think honourable members need to be clear about what they are talking about. Under what sort of circumstances could a non-dealing order be imposed? Once again, is the non-dealing order being introduced to deal with the situation in which someone comes in with a ball and chain? Is it a means of ensuring, by way of penalty, that that person does not pass it on to someone else, who is going to do the same thing? Obviously, such an exercise could very easily bankrupt

a public company. It could also quite easily bankrupt an individual. It is not something that the Government should do lightly.

Mr BEANLAND: I would like the Minister to give honourable members some guidelines under which this non-dealing order will be issued because, as I read it, no guidelines have been established under this clause as to the circumstances in which a non-dealing order can be imposed on properties that are heritage listed. That is in the Schedule.

I think it is only fair that the Minister gives honourable members an indication of the circumstances in which a non-dealing order would be made. We have no idea. This is a clause that does concern a large number of people. People are not concerned about the \$1m fines. I think that they generally accept that significant fines have to be imposed on persons who do the wrong thing in this area. However, there are no guidelines, and we understand that that is a punitive measure. This could be used in any number of circumstances. I cannot find any indication of how it might be applied. It is clear that it is to be in excess of the term of this limited legislation, which will be in force for only 12 months. The clause provides for a non-dealing order not exceeding 10 years. I believe that some indication needs to be given in regard to this matter.

Mr COMBEN: I appreciate the points raised by the two honourable members. It is anticipated that it will be used only in very unlikely circumstances in which orders or court orders—penalties—have not been complied with. The Government will let it remain where it is. However, I certainly take on board the points made. I will ensure that the problems that have been raised are addressed in the final legislation. I do take on board the queries from both honourable members.

Clause 18, as read, agreed to.

Clause 19—

Mr ELLIOTT (4.37 p.m.): Under this clause, no action can be brought against the Crown, the Minister, a local authority or any other person. In other words, the Minister's ruling is final. That aspect may well be covered by what was said before. However, it reinforces an arbitrary attitude to the listing on the Schedule of a house or building. The Opposition is not happy with that.

Mr COMBEN: Whilst the honourable member might not be happy with that, the clause contains two separate subclauses. It is not proper that the Crown can be held liable. The tradition of the common law that the Crown is not held liable for its own acts is reinforced in clause 19 (a). Clause 19 (b) refers to "any decision or action taken in good faith pursuant to this Act". That standard provision protects public servants and the Crown. If they act according to the Act, no liability lies with them. This reasonable clause is contained in all heritage legislation in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. It will not prevent the Crown from exercising its discretion in regard to actions taken in good faith.

Clause 19, as read, agreed to.

Clause 20—

Mr ELLIOTT (4.39 p.m.): This clause worries the Opposition almost as much as any other clause in this Bill. It says—

"Where the Minister considers that it is necessary for the purposes of this Act that any heritage building should be inspected he may, in writing, authorise any person to enter and inspect the building at any reasonable time."

That building could be a person's home. Under the English traditions of the Westminster system, a man's home is his castle. Honourable members who have been members of this House for a long time will remember the famous chook debate during which the rights of people to enter dwellings were considered. The record of that debate is well worth reading.

This clause is totally abhorrent. The Government should consider changing the wording of this clause. Because members of the Opposition are not legal people, we do not intend to draft a Mickey Mouse clause off the top of our heads. However, it is not good enough that the Government can authorise anyone to enter a dwelling. That person should be a member of the committee. The Opposition would be quite happy to accept that, with a rider that that committee member either contacts by telephone, or writes to, the person affected, notifying that person that a member of the committee and/or one of the Minister's officers plans to inspect the house or building and makes an appointment to do so.

I realise that this might be taking things to the extreme, but it is possible that a person—just out of curiosity—might obtain authorisation to inspect a building simply because he wants to do so. That is not good enough in terms of the English tradition that we all uphold, namely, that a man's home is his castle.

Mr COMBEN: I note that English castles are all covered by very strong heritage English legislation. The honourable member would be surprised at how little he can do with an English stately home.

I give the honourable member for Cunningham an undertaking that, under this legislation, I will not authorise any person to enter a private home. I may well have to authorise someone to enter a commercial building, but I will not give such authorisation for the inspection of a private home and I have just instructed my department to that effect.

Question—That clause 20 as read stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 49

NOES, 32

DIVISION

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 21, as read, agreed to.

Schedule—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Honourable members, is it the wish of the Committee that the amendments to the Schedule that the Minister has circulated be taken en bloc?

Honourable members: Yes.

Mr COMBEN (4.47 p.m.): I move the following amendments—

"At page 10, from the words 'Chinatown Precinct' omit—
'Precinct' ";

"At page 12, omit—
'Tara House
Elizabeth Street Brisbane' ";

"At page 13, omit—
'Queensland Postal Honour Board for WW1
261 Queen Street Brisbane' ";

"At page 14, omit—
'All Saints
Wickham Tce & Ann St Brisbane' ";

"At page 15, omit—
'Sinnamon Property
Seventeen Mile Rocks Rd Jindalee' ";

"At page 16, from the words 'St Pauls Uniting Church Hall' omit—
'Uniting'

and substitute—
'Presbyterian' ";

"At page 16, from the words 'St Pauls Uniting Church' omit—
'Uniting'

and substitute—
'Presbyterian' ";

"At page 20, omit—
'Flagstaff Hill
Port Douglas' ";

"At page 22, omit—
'Uniting Church'

and substitute—
'United Welsh Church' ";

"At page 23, omit—
'Burnett Street—Baines Park
Burnett Street Ipswich' ";

"At page 23, omit—
'Browns Park
Downs Flint & Canning Sts North Ipswich' ";

"At page 36, omit—
'Portal Precinct—' ";

"At page 39, omit—
'Magazine
Army Barracks Enoggera' ";

"At page 39, after 'Kadumba St Yeronga' insert—
'Womens Prison & Factory (Archeological Ruins)
Former Brisbane Airport Site Eagle Farm

Queensland Postal Honour Board for WW1
261 Queen St Brisbane'."

Amendments agreed to.

Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, with amendments.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr Comben, by leave, read a third time.

GOLD COAST WATERWAYS AUTHORITY ACT REPEAL BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 17 May (see p.1713).

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs) (4.49 p.m.): This Bill is yet another case of the Government doing away with local knowledge. As this concerns the Opposition very greatly, it will be voting against it.

It has always been the view of the Opposition that local knowledge is absolutely paramount. I assure honourable members that, over the next little while, with the abolition of fire boards, hospital boards and various other boards throughout the State, an enormous amount of local knowledge will be lost. This is of very great concern because it is taking away the right of the public to be involved in the decision-making process.

When this legislation is considered further, one will see that it is centralising power in what is already a megadepartment. Even though departmental officers may have all the goodwill in the world, it is our view that they will not have the local knowledge to be able to implement decisions that are in the best interests of the public.

Prior to the establishment of the Gold Coast Waterways Authority, Government departments were in charge and for years tried to stabilise the Nerang River entrance, but without any success. They had not been successful in any shape or form. Every time there was a chance to achieve a solution, the issue became bogged down in normal public service difficulties.

Because of the Government's attitude, it is bringing back empire-building. Public servants are having a say on such things as the Gold Coast Waterways Authority. The public servant who has a say in such matters will then try to build under him or her a pyramid structure of other people. It is the Opposition's belief that in those circumstances the best decisions are not made. To some extent, the same thing is happening in TAFE colleges. College community councils and boards are not receiving the same input from business and the public as the Opposition would have liked.

In 1979, the Gold Coast Waterways Authority was formed, and it has played an important role in the development of the river entrance and the canals. Local knowledge was a very definite advantage in that development. Since 1979, that development was probably the key to the progress that has occurred on the Gold Coast. Queenslanders have seen many canal estates developed, and development was carried out in an orderly fashion. A boat can be driven up and down those waterways without any problems. Silting does not seem to be causing any difficulties in those canals. Unfortunately, even sharks think those canals are pretty good, because they have been found in them.

Mr Hamill: Land sharks?

Mr LESTER: No, not land sharks. I would not advise the Minister to go swimming in those canals. If he did, this House would lose a nice gentleman, and that would be terrible.

Mr Hamill: I am dumbfounded.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Even the Chair is impressed with the honourable member's concern for the Minister.

Mr LESTER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It is great to think that this Parliament is getting back to the stage at which honourable members are showing concern for one another and not talking some of the rot that seems to be spoken in this Chamber from time to time.

A comparison of the waterways development that has occurred on the Gold Coast over that time with similar developments in other parts of Australia, and in fact the world, would reveal that the Gold Coast has fared very well. Sure, I would be the first to agree that there has been the odd row from time to time, but that is healthy. I think those differences of opinion are needed. I remember the late Doug Jennings having the odd row with Keith Williams from time to time, but that was healthy and the Gold Coast was better for it. Two strong-minded people had their say, and the beneficiaries were the community at large. The Labor council has done a particularly good job.

Mr Heath interjected.

Mr LESTER: The members of the National Party believe that this legislation is a big step backwards and that it is not in the interests of the community. I know to what the honourable member is alluding. Some people who at times have walked backwards have nevertheless moved forwards very well. That need not worry the honourable member to any extent.

Today, the National Party is relying on the local knowledge of the honourable member for Surfers Paradise, Mr Borbidge, who will speak shortly, and of the member for Southport, Mr Veivers. They will introduce some local knowledge into the debate. Members of this House will listen in awe to the words spoken by those honourable members.

Mr HEATH (Nundah) (4.56 p.m.): The Gold Coast Waterways Authority, throughout its short and turbulent history, has been an example of how a quango can become such a powerful monolith that the needs and wishes of the public become secondary, if not completely unimportant in its deliberations.

The authority was of only dubious necessity when originally set up in 1979, yet was given an enormous degree of autonomy in the original Act, and subsequently allowed even more power by amendments to the Act on four occasions. Through its own autonomy and subsequent insulation from local government constraints, and through its characterisation as a protected species by the National Party Government, it became drunk with power.

The member for Peak Downs said that the repeal of the authority was taking away the right of the public to be involved in decision-making. That is an incredible statement when reference is being made to the Gold Coast Waterways Authority.

The authority was not a body elected by the people and was responsible only to the National Party Government. However, the citizens of the Gold Coast voted into power again and again Gold Coast City Councils which consistently, and yet fruitlessly, opposed the authority's plans for the development of the foreshores.

This repeal Bill recognises that the wishes of the people have been ignored for far too long by the white-shod developers who turned to the authority and to the State Government for approvals to develop, whatever the cost to the community and to the environment.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr HEATH: The honourable member will find it in a minute.

This authority, which should never have had such wide-ranging control of foreshore development, took from the people areas of open space, parklands, fish habitats, some

of the rare areas remaining on the Gold Coast consisting of natural sand dunes and caravan parks and developed the lot.

Mr Borbidge: What rubbish! Who wrote this?

Mr HEATH: In a minute, those statements will be supported by quotes from the local newspapers, in which Mr Borbidge gets a mention.

The expensive ethos of those developments precluded the local people from being able to afford to holiday on their own Gold Coast.

In what should have been its primary area of responsibility, the improvement and maintenance of the actual waterways, it can be argued that the authority has failed.

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! This is a serious debate, and I ask honourable members to treat it that way.

Mr HEATH: Today, not far north of the Grande Hotel at Labrador, there is still an area in the Broadwater in which the deep water boating channel narrows to 20 metres or so in width. Every weekend, large and small craft are ducking and weaving to avoid collisions, and some run aground and require assistance. After 11 years of the existence of the authority, this narrow channel has not been successfully dredged and widened.

Even the major positive achievement of the authority—the construction of the Gold Coast Seaway—had a major down side to its successful completion. The seaway provided an enormous improvement in safety for the many users of the Broadwater but its construction left the authority \$47.5m in debt. The developments, which were intended to provide funds for the discharge of this debt, caused enormous dissatisfaction with the authority among the residents of the Gold Coast.

The *Gold Coast Bulletin* in December 1986 reported—

"Unfortunately the Gold Coast Waterways Authority, which is responsible for the preservation of the waterways, is heavily in debt and its interests seem to be more in making money than fulfilling its obligation as guardian of the waterways."

The cosy relationships between the authority and developers also led that paper to say—

"The land along the Southport Spit is owned by the State Government, and the council and the public have had little success in stopping developers. Meanwhile the ratepayers face increased charges as sewerage must now be connected to the commercial developments and a new four-lane highway, with two lanes for parking and four roundabouts, has to be built to accommodate the increased traffic. The old road was adequate until all this development started, yet the developers contribution to these services and their ongoing main tenants is minimal."

Under this mounting public pressure, the authority's response was to deepen its relationship with the State Government and so deepen its hiding places for the true reasons behind applications for developmental rezonings. The authority knew that a ministerial rezoning was easily available in reserve. For example, the Gold Coast City Council received an application to build an environmental parkland area which it complained looked suspiciously like a golf course.

The *Courier-Mail* of 28 March 1987 reported that a Gold Coast City Council alderman had called for a meeting with a National Party Minister and local National Party back-benchers and that—

"The meeting was aimed at forcing the authority to lay its cards on the table."

Fancy having to force a quango to explain itself to local government in its own area!

The *Gold Coast Bulletin* reported in September 1987 that—

"The Gold Coast City Council has been unable to enforce its town planning policies because big developers, the Queensland Government and the Gold Coast

Waterways Authority band together and push through isolated developments. The Gold Coast Waterways Authority virtually had a free rein on the waterways regardless of council plans for the foreshore and adjoining land. It had been plagued by controversy since it was formed because of what was perceived as ruthless intrusion of the waterways."

Now, after years of this kind of roughshod neglect of the town-planning proposals and the autonomy and electoral mandate of the Gold Coast City Council, the then mayor of the council, Alderman Pie, resigned from his position on the authority. Far from being sympathetic to the frustrated feelings of the people of the Gold Coast and their mayor, the National Party, through the relevant Minister—at that time Mr Ivan Gibbs—called the resignation a stunt and the National member for Surfers Paradise, Mr Borbidge, who probably has not seen over the rim of the gutter since he got here, accused Alderman Pie of political grandstanding. But the current Mayor of the Gold Coast, Alderman Bell, at that time—September 1987—said that—

"Continual State Government intervention was rendering the city council impotent in its planning function."

A reason for all of this disquiet can be found in the powers vested in the authority by the Act. Section 21A provides that the authority—

". . . may reclaim from the Waterways land lying below high water mark for the purpose of rendering such land fit for harbour, manufacturing, industrial, residential, business purposes, and any other purposes specified".

Section 21A (1) (c) provides—

"A reclamation may be carried out under this subsection whether or not the same is carried out in conjunction with a scheme for the improvement or maintenance of the Waterways."

These powers are not contained in, for example, the Port of Brisbane Authority Act, and these were the types of powers which permitted the Gold Coast Waterways Authority to abuse the wishes of the residents of the area.

I have been unable to find a realistic justification for the insistence of the authority, given that the Harbours Corporation and harbour boards efficiently manage 11 ports and harbours along the Queensland coast and that in none of these have there been the debts, clashes with local government, public unrest and blatant, biased State Government intervention, which are all characteristic of the operations on the Gold Coast.

I am forced to conclude that the Gold Coast Waterways Authority did a good job only for developers and, further, I agree with the former member for Nundah, Sir William Knox, who led the Liberal Party into an attack on the authority in 1987 and said—

"It is a tragedy for the people when quangos go outside their charter."

I am disappointed to find today that the Liberal Party will not be supporting this repeal Bill. The party and its present leader might find that, if it took the more reasonable attitude of its former distinguished leader, Sir William Knox, it may not be in its present position of insignificance. Its stance on this Bill is a microcosm of why it has attained such paltry representation in this Parliament. It does not care about and will not support the views of the ordinary residents of the area, which is amazing when over one-third of Liberal members hold Gold Coast seats.

The major benefit to the Gold Coast of this repeal Bill will be that the Gold Coast City Council, the residents and many community, interest and environmental groups will, at last, again have a say in the development of their own city—a chance again for sensible, beneficial development of the foreshores, waterways and surrounding areas.

There are further advantages for the area and for the State as a whole which will follow from the discontinuation of the authority. There will be streamlining and cost savings through the involvement with other harbour boards throughout the State. There will be a consistency of planning, budgeting, expenditure, implementation and, of course,

development under one Government department. As a safeguard for the remaining natural environment of the Gold Coast, all construction approvals will need to be processed by the Department of Environment and Heritage before construction is commenced.

These long-overdue changes and cost savings cause me to take great pleasure today in supporting this Bill and eliminating this white elephant which, in its white shoes, has been stomping on people.

Mr COOMBER (Currumbin) (5.07 p.m.): The Gold Coast Waterways Authority, which was formed in 1979, has provided the Gold Coast community with the product that the authority was formed to create, that is, the Gold Coast Seaway. The seaway has provided a safe entrance for the international shipping world to the Gold Coast and is an unmitigated success.

The Gold Coast has a series of magnificent waterways which stretch from Moreton Bay to the border and the public use these waterways for recreation and travel and to earn their livelihood. The Gold Coast Seaway has eased the dangers encountered in negotiating the Nerang River entrance, which in the past saw numerous near tragedies and some tragedies suffered by professional and amateur fishermen alike.

The Gold Coast is growing and changing rapidly. The problems and stresses of change are felt on the Gold Coast like nowhere else in Queensland. The Gold Coast has to meet expanding needs for traffic management and in this respect management of our waterways will see them integrated into the transport system to ease the burden on the existing road infrastructure. Already a proposal to provide an effective, fast passenger service to Brisbane via the Broadwater and Moreton Bay has been presented to this Government and the local authorities. Although this service is perhaps a little before its time, but not by very much, private enterprise has tried to provide a service and during Expo 88 regular services ran between Expo, Brisbane Airport and the Gold Coast. The service has since ceased. However, the use of our waterways to reduce congestion on our roadways is certainly something for the future. A water transport passenger service could be implemented to Brisbane, which is not the only centre to which commuter services would be viable. Private enterprise is looking at introducing a very fast ferry system between Sydney and the Gold Coast. The time taken to travel would be less than travelling by road and, after recent bus crashes, would be a much safer option.

The Gold Coast Seaway has provided the tourist industry with the opportunity of a life-time. The industry has already grasped the nettle and has in place annual yacht classic events between Sydney and the Gold Coast and Port Macquarie and the Gold Coast. I would suggest that there is an industry that has not yet been explored by tourist markets, but one which would bring millions of dollars to an expanding tourist base. The Gold Coast is a major tourist destination by road and by air, but not by water. However, the interest is there for a major shipping line to call at the Gold Coast. The seaway is such that tourists ships do not enter. However, in talks that I have had with interested parties enthusiasm for the establishment of a boutique charter service which would call at the Gold Coast. The number of passengers per vessel catered for by this industry would be as few as 50 or 100. Vessels of this size would be able to negotiate the Gold Coast Seaway and anchor in the Broadwater. The Gold Coast has the facilities to attract tourists from this type of vessel.

The waterways of the Gold Coast are extensive. They extend from the northern parts of Moreton Bay through to the Broadwater and the Nerang River. Two estuaries which are often forgotten are those of Currumbin and Tallebudgera Creeks. Clause 15 of the Bill includes both the Currumbin and Tallebudgera estuaries within the area known as the Gold Coast waterways. Perhaps in his reply the Minister can confirm if the canal systems branching from rivers and estuaries are also included in this Bill for the purposes of maintenance. Currumbin and Tallebudgera Creeks are important environmental features of the Gold Coast, and community concern still exists about development of seabed lease opportunities in both of these estuaries.

This Bill does not address the concern raised by most of the public about the Gold Coast Waterways Authority, that is, its town-planning powers. This Bill does not return any town-planning powers to the local authority. I will address these and other concerns later.

It is interesting to note how intensive boat usage on the Gold Coast is both professional and recreational. Boat registration numbers show that some 12 per cent of all boat registrations in Queensland occur south of Brisbane. Nearly 40 per cent of all boat registrations come from Brisbane and the area to the border. The number of boat registrations can only increase, which will generate further revenue for the department. Offshore fishing grounds are prolific, and are the resource for the emerging game fishing industry. The Gold Coast fishing grounds for billfish may prove to be better than those in north Queensland. Already fishermen are arriving from North America and spending many dollars on the Gold Coast, hence the concern the Liberal Party has for the Bill now before the House.

This Bill abolishes the Gold Coast Waterways Authority and places all decision-making power in Brisbane. We cannot support this decision. The Bill transfers all the funds of the authority to the corresponding fund of the Harbours Corporation. Once again, the Liberal Party cannot support this decision.

The public should know that this Bill removes all local input from decisions affecting Gold Coast waterways. Members of the public who are appointed to the board, be they National Party supporters or whatever, contributed valuable local knowledge to decisions made about the Gold Coast. Three members of the authority were from the two local authorities, the Gold Coast City Council and the Albert Shire Council. As a result of this legislation, any application for seabed leases, pontoons, jetties or licences will be decided in Brisbane. The Minister said in his second-reading speech that he would welcome the input of the Gold Coast City Council in decision-making. I say that is merely paying lip service. Bureaucracy in Brisbane does not, will not and cannot understand the needs of the Gold Coast. Once again the effects of centralised Government will disadvantage the Gold Coast.

The public should also know that funds of the present authority totalling nearly \$2.5m, which are held in trust for proposed channel maintenance, will be lost from the Gold Coast. However, the authority and the Harbours Corporation will benefit from seabed leases, both current and future, to the tune of some \$3m per annum. These funds will be lost to the Gold Coast as well and will go to the general revenue of the Transport Department. The Liberal Party cannot support this attack on the Gold Coast and will not support future similar attacks to the port authorities of Brisbane, Bundaberg, Gladstone, Rockhampton, Mackay, Townsville and Cairns.

Prior to being elected to this Parliament, I supported calls to disband the Gold Coast Waterways Authority. I still believe that the authority has completed its charter and should now be disbanded. However, the purported reasons given for disbandment before the election were that the authority should not have town-planning powers, had outlived its charter and its functions were not being fulfilled. For example, the authority's budget showed a net surplus for channel maintenance and works of some \$170,000 out of a budget of close to \$2m. It was also pointed out that the responsibilities of the Gold Coast Waterways Authority could be transferred to the local authorities, namely, the Gold Coast City Council and the Albert Shire Council. The final point was that the Gold Coast City Council, not the Gold Coast Waterways Authority, should determine the future management plans for the Broadwater and the Nerang River.

The Liberal Party has targeted the Gold Coast. It is concerned about the area's future. Our plans to achieve international resort status involve being able to receive tourists by sea. The Gold Coast must have port status and customs facilities. This Bill does nothing to promote Gold Coast waterways or improve and manage its waterways. Everything that was wrong with the Gold Coast Waterways Authority is made even worse by the provisions of this Bill. Decision-making will now occur in Brisbane and people on the Gold Coast will hear of major decisions only after they have been made

behind closed doors. Previously, local objections were respected because locals were deciding matters for locals.

The Harbours Corporation, the controlling body, is a statutory corporation under the control of the Department of Transport. Its membership is not set out in the Bill, although its director, who is the permanent head of the Department of Harbours and Marine, is mentioned. Once again, the people of Queensland are dealing with a body of faceless people. The decision-making process will stagnate.

This Bill will add the waterways of the Gold Coast to the responsibilities that come under the umbrella of the Harbours Corporation, whose principal function is to act as the port authority for the ports of Maryborough, Hay Point, Bowen, Abbot Point, Lucinda, Mourilyan, Cape Flattery, Quintell Beach, Thursday Island, Weipa and Normanton—areas that have hardly anything in common with Gold Coast waterways. It also is responsible for boat harbours at Mooloolaba, Snapper Creek, Urangan, Rosslyn Bay and Bowen.

Mr Katter: It will probably take half the money that was going to the Gold Coast.

Mr COOMBER: That is true. I give notice to the port authorities of Brisbane, Bundaberg, Gladstone, Rockhampton, Mackay, Townsville and Cairns that they should be prepared to have their individual status removed because they, too, will be absorbed into the Harbours Corporation.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister stated—

"It will provide for consistency throughout Queensland in relation to the development of our waterways. The same standards will apply across-the-board. Such a step is sure to please prospective developers, who will know that the same set of procedures and standards that apply throughout the rest of the State will now apply to the Gold Coast."

Once again, the power and will of local authorities have been usurped. The Minister went on to state—

"That corporation has proven itself as an effective and efficient body for the management of ports and boat harbours in Queensland."

If one refers to financial statements supplied last year by the previous director, Mr Leech, and the accountant of the Department of Harbours and Marine, the efficiency and effectiveness of the Harbours Corporation will be obvious. This exercise is a difficult one because, although revenue totals are shown, no expenditure details are given.

The details on Harbours and Marine show that total receipts of \$77.6m were budgeted for the year 1988-89. Expenditure details show that the department budgeted to spend that allocated amount. It is a disgrace that as little as \$8m was allocated to capital works and that only 12 per cent of the budget was allocated to capital improvements. Of the \$77m, nearly \$7m was allocated to make interest and redemption payments for the Gold Coast Seaway. I congratulate the previous Government on the removal of that burden from the Gold Coast Waterways Authority and on making it an annual budget entry. However, out of that \$77m, approximately \$45m will be required to fund wages and salaries, which represents nearly 60 per cent of the total; hence the cynicism as to the purpose of this Bill. It is hardly an effective use of funds to require that 60 per cent of revenue is to meet wages and salaries. The Gold Coast is a potential revenue source and will be pillaged, with zero return for capital works. In fact, local authorities will be pressured to resume the responsibilities of the Department of Transport for channel maintenance and capital works—much to the detriment of approximately 11 000 private pleasure vessel owners on the Gold Coast.

The Department of Transport has contacted local authorities to indicate withdrawal of subsidies to Harbours and Marine property, for example, boat-ramps. Consequently, funding for maintenance will now be decided politically, in Brisbane, electorate by electorate.

One matter of concern to the local authority is the future of sand reserves in the Broadwater. Sand in Carters Basin has been earmarked by the local authority and the Beach Protection Authority of Queensland for beach replenishment and nourishment. The current Gold Coast Waterways Authority wishes to recover that resource and sell the product to the development industry. The Gold Coast City Council has objected to this action and up until now has been successful.

Mr Veivers: How would you get that sand out of the Broadwater down to the bottom end of the Gold Coast?

Mr COOMBER: That would not be done. That sand was earmarked for sand replenishment from Main Beach as far down as Broadbeach. It would not be economical to pump the sand any further south than that. After that stage had been reached, one would go off shore.

Having been Chairman of the Gold Coast City Council's Beach and Foreshores Committee and having gained some knowledge of the subject, I can foresee that the Minister will allow the extraction of sand from the Broadwater on the pretence of channel maintenance. Once again, decisions affecting the people on the Gold Coast and the future of the area will be usurped by Brisbane, purely to raise revenue in order to finance other areas of the department's responsibilities.

This Bill attacks a statutory body. It destroys the Gold Coast Waterways Authority, but fails to provide any improvement of the management of Gold Coast rivers and streams. It fails to reallocate responsibility for vital day-to-day administration to the local authorities, and it fails to address the future of the Gold Coast.

Debate, on motion of Mr Borbidge, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. D. J. HAMILL (Ipswich—Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development) (5.21 p.m.): I move—

"That the House do now adjourn."

Hughenden Dam

Hon. R. C. KATTER (Flinders) (5.21 p.m.): I rise to comment briefly on the proposal to construct the Hughenden dam. I point out that although it would ultimately cost \$135m—which seems as though it is a lot of money—\$40m a year could be earned from cotton-growing, and that should be taken into account. It is the type of investment that the Federal Government should support consistently and it is most certainly the sort of initiative that should be taken by the State Government.

The unfortunate and disparaging remarks made by the Minister for Primary Industries, Mr Casey, deeply disappointed me and the people of north Queensland. He will not be a dam-builder and he will not be a person who is responsible for progress in this State.

I would also praise very strongly George Apps and the Chamber of Commerce at Hughenden for the tremendous work that they have performed to date. I ask them not to be disappointed, because in future there will be different Governments and more enlightened Ministers who will hold down those portfolios. The time has come for that project. I also express thanks to the Franzmann brothers, Paul and Bob, from Hughenden, who worked so hard on the project.

I wish to comment on the decision by the Government to install diesel rather than solar power plants in the Torres Strait Islands. Shortly, I will table three reports, one of which was prepared by Preece Ewbank Belford Pty Limited and another of which was prepared by a senior academic figure and contained in the *Solar Progress* bulletin, that were produced for the Queensland Government. Each of those reports stated that, over a 25-year time-frame, the cheapest method of installing electricity in the Torres Strait

Islands was by solar power rather than diesel power. Yet the incompetents in this Government have decided upon the more expensive method of delivering that electricity.

In addition, the funding arrangement is that the Queensland Government and the Federal Government each contribute 50 per cent of capital costs involved; but the Queensland Government and the Torres Strait Islanders contribute 100 per cent of the running costs. With diesel generators, there is no capital cost; however, with solar power, there is an enormous capital cost. For capital costs, each Government would have paid \$10m. As a result of this Government's decision, the State Government pays virtually the whole \$20m and the Federal Government pays nothing. That decision has allowed the Federal Government to save \$7m, yet the Queensland taxpayers and the poor Torres Strait Islanders must pay an additional \$7m.

Mr Bredhauer: Go and ask the Torres Strait Islanders what they want.

Mr KATTER: I have asked. In the last week, I discussed the matter with five prominent Torres Strait Islanders. I was interested to hear their comments about this matter and about the honourable member.

The Government has imposed on the people of the Torres Strait an extremely unreliable power supply. Although Government members can be forgiven for not adding up properly—most of them cannot add up, anyway—I cannot forgive them for imposing on the people of the Torres Strait a system of power delivery which they know is totally unreliable.

At Coconut Island, a trial was conducted to gauge how the relevant systems worked. Six breakdowns occurred—five of them as a result of problems with the diesel generators. The only way to fix them is to fly a diesel fitter from Thursday Island or Cairns, or to fly parts from Cairns or places further south.

During the wet season three years ago at Edward River, a community of almost 600 people lost power for 10 days. I leave it to honourable members' imagination how the tiny islands in the Torres Strait will cope with diesel generators operating in salt spray and silicone sand with no diesel fitters to maintain them. To impose the possible environmental disaster that could occur by transporting tens of thousands of litres of diesel over shallow reefs through the strong seas that run through the Torres Strait is an act of lunacy. It is an extremely irresponsible attitude to one of the most beautiful environments in the world.

Australia was to be a clever country with a new industry. There is no new industry. Under the leadership of the present ALP Government, this is not a clever country.

I turn to a situation in Townsville in which we had the land, the buildings and the money to commence an operation which would have prevented inebriated people from being put in a steel cage. I do not believe that a human being who has consumed six beers should be put in a steel cage. Yet in Queensland that is the policy. It is policy because the responsible Minister has chosen not to proceed with the diversionary facility project in Townsville. Moreover, a decision was made to put what are called drying-out centres—whatever the hell they are—in Mount Isa and Cairns. They are probably exactly the same as the facilities that exist already in Mount Isa and at Emerald Creek in Cairns. The Minister has provided facilities in Mount Isa, where they are not needed and where there have been no deaths.

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

Time expired.

Redcliffe Electorate

Mr HOLLIS (Redcliffe) (5.27 p.m.): The City of Redcliffe has reached a stage in its development which demands a unity of purpose across the community and a level of initiative on the part of all levels of Government.

The commitment of the Federal Government in the provision of a very effective Skillshare program in attempts to reduce an extremely high unemployment level are to be applauded. The immediate response of the State Government in regard to the transportation problems are also to be applauded. Only last week, the Honourable the Minister for Transport released a statement on proposed improvements to the coordinated transport system within the Redcliffe area.

In last week's *Peninsula Post*, an article under the heading "Bay Bus. New transport initiative plans" stated—

"The South East Queensland Passenger Transport Study has taken immediate steps to upgrade passenger transport on the Redcliffe Peninsula and parts of the Caboolture and Pine Rivers Shires.

Transport Minister, David Hamill, said the passenger transport needs of the area were so urgent that it would be used as a major trial by the study."

He went on to say—

"We will be testing some new and novel approaches to passenger transport."

However, at the moment, a dead hand of inactivity is mantling that city. I refer to the local authority and the majority of aldermen who are failing to address the challenge being taken up by the State and Federal Governments and a number of other key community groups on the Redcliffe peninsula.

Recently, I was appalled to read in a metropolitan newspaper that the Mayor of Redcliffe, Alderman Alf Charlish, stated—

"Crime is the biggest business in Redcliffe."

That totally irresponsible statement denigrates the majority of our youth and citizens alike. What is worse, it cannot be supported by fact.

Mr Coomber: Are they short of police like the Gold Coast?

Mr HOLLIS: That is one of the honourable member's tory mayors.

Certainly, I am arguing for a greater police presence on the peninsula, as are a host of other communities; but to blacken the city in that fashion is conduct unbecoming of the city's first citizen. Our Chamber of Commerce is being utterly frustrated in its attempts to convince the council to implement forward-looking policies in lieu of its reactionary response to any problem that rears its head.

A year ago, the council commissioned a \$27,000 report from Pak-Poy and Kneebone Pty Ltd. That report clearly showed a deficiency in the number of parking areas in the central business district. Our council chooses to pursue adhocery and dithering rather than to address the expert findings.

Finally, an issue that has been raised repeatedly by the local ALP Municipal Executive Committee has now come to pass. A recent Land Court decision has resulted in every valuation in the central business district being reduced—some to the tune of 25 per cent. This is a massive blow to traders and residents. We now have a judicial decision which emphasises that the business heart of Redcliffe is being allowed to die by neglect. Residents will now face the prospect of large rate increases to allow for the shortfall from the CBD. It is a deplorable situation and one that is caused by an act of omission on the part of this council.

I add that at least two aldermen in Redcliffe—John Wimberly and Mike Kearney—have tried, with little support, to have a sound planning policy base implemented by the council. However, the Old Guard, the tired old stodgy older men of yesteryear, are allowing the City of Redcliffe to degenerate into a city plagued with unemployment, small-business failures and a generally apathetic attitude. I, for my part, will no longer stand idly by and allow this to happen. To this end, I have arranged for a community delegation to meet with the Local Government Minister with a view to having a program sponsored by this Government, as has been implemented successfully in New South

Wales, put in place. I am referring to the Main Street program. Its success will be very much dependent on broad community involvement.

I am determined that rather than have crime as the biggest business in Redcliffe—as suggested by our worthy Mayor—the biggest business will be small business, after a new council undoes the damage caused by the present council's neglect.

Queensland Medical Board Inquiry; Dr R. Cooke

Mrs McCAULEY (Callide) (5.32 p.m.): Tonight, I wish to speak about a case involving the Queensland Medical Board and Dr Robert Cooke—a case which has senior legal and medical people shaking their heads in disbelief.

The Queensland Medical Board has invoked its full powers of inquiry, similar to those of the Fitzgerald inquiry, and employed barristers and the major law firm Morris, Fletcher and Cross for more than five months at great public expense—estimated to be at least \$100,000—in pursuit of Dr Cooke. The big difference, however, is that those powers were given to Mr Fitzgerald to enable him to inquire into allegations of corruption and maladministration in an open inquiry.

The Queensland Medical Board has continued to meet in secret, will not tell doctors such as Cooke details of complaints, and will not normally allow legal representation for the doctors subject to complaint until after formal charges have been laid. It was only political intervention that enabled Dr Cooke to have legal representation. He has not been called to give evidence, and is regarded by the board at this stage virtually as a non-person.

A case involving another doctor, Dr Bill Orford—who I believe was the original Director of the Mater Priority Emergency Centre—was settled in secret about two weeks ago, although there is no information available to this effect. In both cases, a number of witnesses have been called to Perry Mason-style hearings. There is some suggestion that the Queensland Medical Board action may be anti-Mater Hospital, and it certainly appears to be anti-Cooke.

The case has already cost Robert Cooke many thousands of dollars in legal fees in an attempt to protect his interests, even though he has not been charged with anything and the board meets in secret. It has refused to give him details of the complaints by several doctors, at least one of whom sees the Mater Priority Emergency Centre as being in competition with a 24-hour GP centre that he plans to set up in Annerley.

There are also very significant conflicts of interest within the board which are relevant to this case. These are matters that should be raised in the public interest. The Minister should be aware of the apparent conflict of Dr Wilkie sitting on the Queensland Medical Board and at the same time advising the Minister. However, there is one far more significant conflict which, if it had been handled by Fitzgerald, would have resulted in him declaring a personal interest.

The other doctor to whom I referred, Dr Bill Orford, was summonsed to the board to give evidence "which may or may not" lead to charges against him regarding the centre's advertising. He just happens to have been the Wilkie family doctor for more than 20 years. Had Fitzgerald been chairing that inquiry, he would have declared an interest and stepped down. Yet, to our knowledge—probably because the hearing was in secret—Wilkie has not done so.

We understand that Dr Orford was found guilty of one charge only—the extraordinary charge that he accepted employment with a company that advertises—and that he was not fined but will have costs awarded against him, which the board itself will assess. Several other charges in relation to his canvassing doctors for patients have been dismissed. All of this raises questions about whether Dr Orford was able to provide information to the board about the Cooke issue and was therefore given an easier ride because of his personal association with Dr Wilkie and his earlier resignation from the centre. Whether or not that occurred, no-one knows except the board and Dr Orford.

The second conflict of interest involves the deputy chairman of the board, Dr Lee, a general surgeon and also the key adviser to the Medical Benefits Fund about issues such as the Mater Priority Emergency Centre. He has given it limited approval, after a delay of many months and only after pressure by Dr Cooke at the highest levels of the Medical Benefits Fund.

Dr Lee is generally regarded by some within the Mater hierarchy as strongly anti-Mater. However, his key conflict of interest centres around his position as Treasurer of the Medical Defence Society, which, in essence, is a fund to pay for legal representation for doctors when they are charged by the Queensland Medical Board. Even Dr Cooke would qualify for this, if the Medical Defence Society decides that the case requires representation. How can someone who sits on a board, acting as judge and jury on charges against a doctor, then sit on another board and decide whether the same doctor should or should not have legal representation on those same charges?

I believe that there are so many cloudy issues in this case, and so much waste of public money, that the Minister for Health must, in the public interest, intervene and either force the board to make a decision, so that the case can be resolved in the Supreme Court, or, at the very least, review the case and throw out the charges. He should also scrap the present board and replace it with a body that is more in touch with the medical issues of the 1990s. Victoria's Health Ombudsman system is apparently working quite well, although grave reservations are held about New South Wales' Health Tribunal System.

Dr Wilkie should be replaced as head of any new group by someone who is prepared to act in the interests of the public—not a small group within the medical establishment.

I have been to the Mater Priority Emergency Care Centre and inspected it thoroughly. I was very favourably impressed. I know that the Premier and the Minister for Health have been there. This is an issue that cannot be swept aside. It is an injustice to a doctor, and it should be rectified.

Two-up Coach-driving

Mr ARDILL (Salisbury) (5.37 p.m.): To coin a phrase—or, rather, a sentence—two-up coach-driving is Russian roulette.

The Sydney Coroner, Mr Kevin Waller, is an expert in discovering the cause of deaths and disasters but he is no expert in road safety and traffic engineering, and his criticism of the Federal Minister for Transport, Bob Brown, is unfair and wrong. It is probably the trauma of examining the horror of the Kempsey smash which has clouded his judgment in apportioning blame while clearly establishing and stating the cause. The cause was two-up driving. This blight on our transport system must be eliminated if we are to have some semblance of safety in overnight coach services.

Mr Waller correctly established that the unfortunate driver failed to correct the steering at a left curve on the highway and failed to dip his lights from high beam because he "probably dozed off" at that point. Mr Waller should be aiming his shafts at the New South Wales Government for failing to outlaw the practice of two-up driving and for failing to promote overnight rail services as an alternative to overnight coaches, which can never be safe, no matter what is done to the Pacific Highway.

The eventual goal should be to provide sufficient rail capacity to accommodate all people proposing to travel on a journey which is too long to be accomplished in daylight or before midnight. Coaches are great for daylight travel and for supplementary services to rail stations, but when they are used for overnight services they are uncomfortable and unhealthy. During the night, the Pacific Highway changes from a pleasant, scenic and reasonably safe road to a truckies' territory. Two-up driving becomes the gamble called Russian roulette.

This should not be construed as criticism of the coach company involved. I have travelled many hundreds and even thousands of kilometres with that particular company

and will not hesitate to travel with it again. Its drivers usually observe the speed limit. Unfortunately, in a deregulated system, the lowest common denominator becomes the standard.

Most small operators travel at a speed grossly in excess of the speed limit and certainly beyond a safe level. Following the Clybucca smash, the New South Wales Government enforced the 90 kilometres per hour speed limit. Those small companies clearly tried to make up lost time when they crossed the border. They were travelling on the Pacific Highway at very dangerous speeds as they proceeded from Tweed Heads to Brisbane and at great speed passed the regular bus services.

No matter what is done to the Pacific Highway, it cannot prevent a bus from leaving the road due to driver error, bad weather or mechanical failure. If the road had been a dual carriageway, it would not have prevented a head-on crash on that left curve, which resulted in loss of life. Dual carriageways reduce the risk of head-on crashes and could reduce the extent of the death toll in a crash. However, they do not prevent crashes from happening, as in the Clybucca situation, when the causal vehicle is on a left curve.

Even if a decision is made to transfer available funds from the New England Highway or many important Queensland highways, or even the many single-lane "highways" which abound in this State, it would still be a decade before the dual lanes were completed. Therefore, it is essential that the problem of unsafe coach services is considered now.

Firstly, safe and sufficient rail services must be restored between Brisbane and Sydney. Even more importantly, two-up driving must be outlawed by the New South Wales Government, as it has been in Queensland. There is no doubt that a driver who has been out of bed since breakfast-time and has then travelled for eight hours in a moving coach is in no fit state to drive that coach for eight hours in the middle of the night. Thirty per cent of serious accidents are caused by fatigue. Even a driver who has had sufficient rest has difficulty keeping his concentration and keeping awake and alert in the middle of the night. If the driver is resident at a stage stop and is on a regular shift, he has a chance of overcoming the middle-of-the-night problem. By the time a two-up driver completes the midnight shift, he has probably been out of bed for 24 hours, 16 of which have been spent aboard a coach. That must be stopped immediately. The bus companies in other States must do what Queensland has done and ban two-up driving.

Kinkuna National Park

Mr SLACK (Burnett) (5.42 p.m.): Last week in this House, I asked the Environment Minister what was the situation with the proposed Kinkuna national park. One of the reasons for asking the question was that, at a public meeting prior to the 1989 December election, the Minister stated that, should Labor gain office, the Kinkuna national park would be declared straightaway—in contrast to my statement that the then National Party Minister had given an undertaking to have everything in place within six months of the election. That recognised that various departments were involved and that certain steps had to be taken before the area could be declared. As well, there was the question of a Cabinet minute about a proposed port, sand-mining and a rifle range. Admittedly, the present Minister for Environment and Heritage acknowledged the support for the rifle range and, incredibly, dismissed the sand-mining by stating that he would override it.

I was taken to task by some of the conservation movement who expressed their disappointment in me for not having given a commitment similar to that given by the present Minister. Of course, it is different now because the Minister is in Government. However, six months have passed and nothing has happened. One is entitled to ask: where are all those promises that were made prior to the election?

I did not expect the Minister's undertakings to be honoured. The reality was that they could not be. However, I did expect some announcements to be made within the six-month period to keep within the timetable that I had given. Why have no announcements been made? Where are all the conservationists who were quick to say how disappointed they were by my stand? The simple fact is that the Government has been unable to make a decision on this. At least the former National Party Government knew where it was going, and said so.

I turn now to the proposed rifle range. Prior to the election, conservationists indicated to me that they were not opposed to the rifle range coming within the Kinkuna area. Apart from a couple of notable exceptions, the range received overwhelming support. However, it comes as some surprise that a couple of people who had indicated support now appear to have changed their minds. No doubt they have their own reasons for that.

The opposition to the rifle range is difficult to understand. The range area, which is within the 4.5 square kilometres required to be set aside by the Commonwealth Defence Department for safety purposes, is only very small. Consequently, the 4.5 square kilometres should not be of undue concern to the conservationists, as experience has shown that the wildlife has adapted quickly to a range nearby and is actually better protected because humans are denied access to the safety zone.

In the overall picture, we are discussing only a very small area in relation to the 14 100 hectares proposed for the park, and even less when one considers that the park will adjoin the Woodgate park of 5 492 hectares, which would make a total area of 19 592 hectares, or 48 500 acres. Surely, to deny the request for the establishment of the range in these circumstances would be unreasonable.

The member for Bundaberg is understood to have been in support of the range proposal, although his silence on the issue since the election has been deafening. What has happened is that a selfish, uncompromising minority group of conservationists, led by the Wide Bay conservation project officer, Pam Soper, has bombarded the conservation groups and the Minister to such an extent that he cannot make a decision. It must be remembered that back in 1976, Pam Soper is reported in the press as having been opposed to the rifle range. That was before the rifle range was ever proposed. But that does not surprise me, as Pam Soper is opposed to practically anything, now or in the future.

The question is: is the Goss Labor Government going to be the slave of the vocal minority conservationists who have very limited support within the community? The fact is that the Government has been found wanting on this issue. It is not prepared to face the radical conservation element and is looking for ways out.

There was even the suggestion that the rifle range be located in an area of forestry land, but that came unstuck when the Minister responsible for forestry declined the request and, contrary to reports in the press, it is my information that the shooting clubs saw problems with the forestry suggestion and definitely require the small area of Kinkuna land. In the meantime, while all this is going on, the sporting shooters of Bundaberg are still without a rifle range.

For the record, I consider myself to be very much conservation-minded, but the single-mindedness of some conservationists is difficult to comprehend, and the Minister's apparent willingness to submit to this group is even more difficult to comprehend.

Education for Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders; Power Supply to Torres Strait Islands

Mr BREDHAUER (Cook) (5.46 p.m.): Over the five years prior to my election to this House, I was very proud to have worked as an organiser for the Queensland Teachers Union. During this period, I developed a very close association with a small band of teachers and community members who are dedicated to raising educational standards for Queensland's young Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders.

Due in no small part to the failure of the previous National Party Government and a succession of its Ministers to come to grips with the real issues affecting Queensland's indigenous population, education services, like many others, in various communities have come under increasing pressure. Whereas education cannot be treated in isolation and debate on various reforms to Government policy affecting Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders will occur over future months, I wish to address briefly some issues which impinge on the area of education.

Undoubtedly, at a Statewide level, there is a pressing need to introduce Aborigine and Torres Strait Islander studies as part of the school curriculum. By exposing all young Queenslanders to the history and culture of our indigenous population, we will engender greater understanding of the social structure which existed prior to European settlement. By endeavouring to understand the interaction between indigenous and non-indigenous communities over the last 200 years, we can be better positioned to assess the prospects as our cultures live side by side in the future.

Through Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander studies we will also assist in raising the self-esteem with which black Australians view their own culture. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander studies should also be an integral part of the preservice education of teachers in training. Whether a student teacher intends to teach in a predominantly black community or actually works in a community during his career is secondary to the importance of ensuring that all teachers have a balanced perspective on black issues in their class rooms.

Expanded opportunities for more specialised and intensive teacher education on Aboriginal and Islander learning styles for teachers seeking positions in Aboriginal and Islander communities is essential. One debilitating factor on the effective delivery of education to Aboriginal and Islander communities in the past has been the high turn-over of teaching staff. Previous Government policy frequently led to young inexperienced teachers being transferred to remote communities, particularly in the electorates of Cook and Mount Isa. Most teachers completed their two-year stay and then transferred out.

The Goss Government has reaffirmed its commitment to a scheme which will attract and retain experienced teachers in rural and remote centres. This Government has recognised many years of effort by the Queensland Teachers Union on this issue by including QTU representatives on the working party formulating a package by the middle of his year.

Whilst discussing these important issues of teacher-training and stable staffing, I wish to pay tribute to a number of teachers in the Cook electorate. Leigh Schelks and Sally Farr have been teaching at Aurukun since 1985, and before that both taught at Woorabinda. Stan Sheppard, currently teaching at Weipa South, spent the last four years at Pormpuraaw and likewise taught at Woorabinda for a number of years before that. John Adams, presently a School of Distance Education itinerant teacher based in Cairns, taught previously at the Bamaga State School for four years.

All four will return to the James Cook University to complete their graduate diplomas in Aboriginal education in the second semester of this year. In doing so, each is committing himself or herself to further involvement in Aboriginal education. Each has also been an active member of the Queensland Teachers Union. They have contributed in their own way to Aboriginal education and also to improving conditions for other teachers involved in Aboriginal Education.

These few thoughts are not new nor a panacea for addressing issues affecting indigenous education. To secure a better future for young Aborigines and Islanders will require reform of appropriate Government policy, the ongoing support of dedicated professionals and a significant effort by the indigenous communities themselves.

In the few minutes remaining to me, I would like to address an issue that was raised by the member for Flinders earlier in this debate, namely, the new power supply system which has been approved by State Cabinet for the Torres Strait islands. I noted with interest that the member for Flinders indicated that he had spoken to five Torres

Strait Islanders about the sort of power system they wanted. I ask members opposite to consider what sort of a straw poll this is when the honourable member for Flinders speaks to five out of approximately 3 000 people on the outer islands in the Torres Strait about an issue that is central and of great importance to them.

During the last six months of last year when I was campaigning and the first five or six months of this year, I have moved extensively through the Torres Strait region. I have spoken at island coordinating council meetings with the chairpersons of all the Torres Strait island communities. I have spoken with individuals on each of their islands about the issue. The one thing that they hold in common is an abhorrence of the harebrained scheme which the honourable member for Flinders piloted on Coconut Island. The scheme that has been put in place is a good one and will be appreciated by those people.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.52 p.m.