

WEDNESDAY, 3 AUGUST 1994

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. J. Fouras, Ashgrove) read prayers and took the chair at 2.30 p.m.

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

Aborigines Welfare Fund Board of Trustees

From **Mr Perrett** (9 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take action to ensure that the Government consults with the Aboriginal community, particularly potential claimants, on the structure, constitution and establishment of the Aborigines Welfare Fund Board of Trustees and that moneys in the fund be returned to Aboriginal workers who earned it.

Marijuana

Mr Dollin (1 034 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will legislate to protect children from the sale of implements used for the smoking of marijuana.

Division 3, Mulgrave Shire

From **Mr Pitt** (1 065 signatories) praying that any recommendation by the Commissioner of Local Government to include any part of Division 3 of Mulgrave Shire in Johnstone Shire be rejected.

Sentencing Procedures

From **Mr Healy** (5 082 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take immediate steps to introduce "truth in sentencing" legislation to enable judges to impose full gaol sentences for convicted criminals with no time off for good behaviour and that compensation provisions be made compulsory to assist victims of crime.

Sentencing Procedures

From **Mr Campbell** (4 674 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will ensure that a more effective deterrent against crime is implemented by enforcing sentences imposed by judges and magistrates and that harsher penalties be introduced for repeat offenders.

Petitions received.

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

In accordance with the schedule circulated by the Clerk to members in the Chamber, the following documents were tabled—

Corrective Services Act—

Corrective Services Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1994, No. 262

Credit Act—

Credit (Employee Motor Vehicle Lease Exemption) Order 1994, No. 268

Dairy Industry Act—

Dairy Industry (Milk Prices) Order 1994, No. 282

Dental Act—

Dental Amendment By-law (No. 1) 1994, No. 265

Fauna Conservation Act—

Fauna Conservation Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 1994, No. 284

Financial Institutions (Queensland) Act—

Financial Institutions (Queensland—Savings and Transitional Provisions) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1994, No. 258

Fishing Industry Organisation and Marketing Act—

Fishing Industry Organisation and Marketing Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 1994, No. 269

Fishing Industry Organisation and Marketing (Closure of Waters) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1994, No. 261

Gas Act—

Gas Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 1994, No. 272

Health Legislation Amendment Act—

Proclamation—sections 16 and 17 of the Act commence 11 July 1994, No. 264

Law Courts and State Buildings Protective Security Act—

Law Courts and State Buildings Protective Security (Heritage Hotel) Regulation 1994, No. 285

Local Government (Planning and Environment) Act—

Local Government Court Rules Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 1994, No. 279

Local Government Superannuation Act—

Local Government Superannuation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 1994, No. 278

Medical Acts and Other Acts (Administration) Act—

Medical Acts and Other Acts (Administration) Regulation 1994, No. 271

- Motor Vehicle Driving Instruction School Act—
Motor Vehicle Driving Instruction School
Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1994,
No. 276
- National Parks and Wildlife Act—
National Park 7 Counties of Gregory,
Morstone and Mueller (Extension) Order
1994, No. 281
- Podiatrists Act—
Podiatrists Amendment By-law (No. 1)
1994, No. 270
- Racing and Betting Act—
Proclamation—section 6 of the Act
commences 8 July 1994, No. 259
- Stamp Act—
Stamp Duties Amendment Regulation
(No. 1) 1994, No. 274
- Statute Law (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act
1992—
Proclamation—amendment 1 of the Health
Act 1937, in Schedule 1 to the Statute Law
(Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1992,
commences 1 August 1994, No. 283
- Statute Law (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act
(No. 2) 1993—
Proclamation—amendments 1 to 6 of the
Workplace Health and Safety Act 1989, in
Schedule 1 to the Statute Law
(Miscellaneous Provisions) Act (No. 2)
1993, commence 8 July 1994, No. 263
- Traffic Act—
Traffic Amendment Regulation (No. 4)
1994, No. 260
Traffic Amendment Regulation (No. 5)
1994, No. 275
- Water Resources Act—
Water Resources (Ensham Joint Venture)
Regulation 1994, No. 277
- Workers' Compensation Act—
Workers' Compensation Amendment
Regulation (No. 3) 1994, No. 280
- Workplace Health and Safety Act—
Workplace Health and Safety Amendment
Regulation (No. 2) 1994, No. 266
Workplace Health and Safety Amendment
Regulation (No. 3) 1994, No. 273
Workplace Health and Safety (Certificates)
Exemption Notice 1994, No. 267.

SELECT COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Appointment of Mr R. J. Quinn

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH
(Chatsworth—Leader of the House) (2.32 p.m.),
by leave, without notice: I move—

"That Dr Watson be replaced by Mr
Quinn on the Privileges Committee for the
purpose of its inquiry into the alleged
contempt by the Chairman of the Criminal
Justice Commission.

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Office of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs

Hon. A. M. WARNER (South
Brisbane—Minister for Family Services and
Aboriginal and Islander Affairs) (2.33 p.m.), by
leave: I wish to inform the House of the future
arrangements for the administration of Aboriginal
and Torres Strait Islander affairs within my
department.

Honourable members would be aware that
on 23 June I tabled a report of an investigation
into the Division of Aboriginal and Islander Affairs
by the Public Sector Management Commission.
After consideration of the recommendations of
that report, the Government has endorsed the
creation of an Office of Aboriginal and Torres
Strait Islander Affairs within the Department of
Family Services and Aboriginal and Islander
Affairs.

The office will report to the director-general
of my department. It will comprise a central office,
which will focus primarily on the development of
policy, supported by regional offices in strategic
locations. Its activities will centre on a lead
agency role within the Government to improve
planning and coordination of existing
Government policies and services. Responsibility
for the administration of those
parts of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander
Land Acts currently held by the Department of
Family Services and Aboriginal and Islander
Affairs will be transferred to the Department of
Lands.

In making this decision, the Government has
set broad parameters for the new organisational
structure, but further work will be required in
developing the detail of that structure. I
anticipate that these details will be finalised by
mid-September of this year.

A task force to oversee the development of
the new organisational structure will begin that
work today. Several functions that are presently
being carried out by the division will continue
while new arrangements are being determined.
For instance, the retail stores in communities will
remain under departmental management until
they are transferred to Aboriginal control.
Similarly, the Office of Aboriginal and Torres
Strait Islander Affairs will continue to fund
programs for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander

councils and with the associated administration of the Community Services Acts. These new arrangements are the next stage of the development of an effective whole-of-Government response to the complex issues raised by the administration of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander affairs.

Over the past five years, this Government has moved away from the concept of a stand-alone, all-embracing department which attempted to cater for all the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. By transferring responsibilities for service delivery to the relevant Government department or agency we are ensuring that Aboriginal and Islander people receive the same level of services and expertise as any other Queenslanders.

The Office of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs will oversee broad policy development and will perform an important role of liaison, support and facilitation within the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community organisations and with State and Federal Government departments and agencies. I commend this latest reform to the Parliament.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Regional Open Space System

Hon. G. N. SMITH (Townsville—Minister for Lands) (2.36 p.m.), by leave: I would like to report to the House on the progress of the State Government's \$20m Regional Open Space System which was announced in the 1994-95 Budget. The program, known as ROSS, is aimed at stopping a Los Angeles-type sprawl happening in the south-east corner as the region continues to expand by setting aside almost 455 000 hectares of green, open space to enhance the environment and lifestyle of residents and the community.

A key plank to the ROSS system is consultation with local authorities to make it a bipartisan-driven process between State and local government. I am pleased to announce that Lands officers have already visited six councils, including Albert, Boonah, Caloundra, Laidley, Logan and Redcliffe, and invitations have been received from another four councils, including Toowoomba, Gold Coast, Kilcoy and Maroochydore. Of the six already visited, negotiations are now proceeding with five of the councils—Albert, Caloundra, Laidley, Logan and Redcliffe—to incorporate ROSS systems into their strategic planning schemes or to negotiate the future of specific properties.

At this stage, the likely breakdown of the 455 000 hectares, which accounts for 21 per cent of south-east Queensland, will probably be

60 per cent for national parks, environmental parks and State forests; 40 per cent of freehold land covered by voluntary agreements with land-holders; and 10 per cent of land purchased on the open market.

Lands Department staff report that the system has been well received because of two aspects: firstly, local authorities, like State Governments, must confront urban sprawl and they view ROSS as a mechanism to achieve this; and, secondly, the State Government has made an up-front financial commitment over five years, with this year's budget being \$6,857,000.

Two matters of concern to come out of the consultation process include the resumption of rural land for the ROSS system and possible restrictions on land-holders' rights to subdivide. Concerning the first, it is intended that most of the new land to be included in ROSS will remain in private ownership with voluntary agreements in place. This will be achieved through a combination of non-purchase agreements between land-holders, local authorities and the State Government which set particular properties aside as private land with no requirements for public access.

Concerning the right to subdivide, ROSS will not interfere with the rights of land-holders to use their land in accordance with normal planning requirements, State policies and legislation. Already, though, some shire plans have incorporated guidelines that restrict subdivisions of productive, agricultural land, and ROSS will merely follow those guidelines.

In summary, I believe that this type of regional planning is a visionary but practical approach to the increasing urbanisation of south-east Queensland and it will be embraced by local authorities in the community after the consultation process has taken place.

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

Death of Mr A. J. Inch

Hon. W. K. GOSS (Logan—Premier and Minister for Economic and Trade Development) (2.39 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

- "1. That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the services rendered to this State by the late Alexander James Inch, a former Member of the Parliament of Queensland.
2. That Mr Speaker be requested to convey to the family of the deceased gentleman the above resolution, together with an expression of the sympathy and sorrow of the members

of the Parliament of Queensland, in the loss they have sustained."

Alexander James Inch, better known as Alec Inch, was born in 1915 in Charters Towers. Alec was educated at St Columba's and Mount Carmel Christian Brothers, and State high schools in Charters Towers. He was employed as a wool scourer in shearing sheds in both Charters Towers and Cloncurry.

During the Great Depression, Alec Inch followed in his father's footsteps and entered Queensland Railways as a railway maintenance worker. In 1938, he married Rita Morgans, also from Charters Towers. In the early 1940s, Alec had moved up to become a first-class engine driver working in the sugar industry around Innisfail. He was unable to join the forces during the war because his sugar industry work was deemed essential for the war effort, but he managed to find time in the off-season to work on construction projects for the military.

Alec Inch left the coast in the late 1940s but continued his work in the rail industry as a first-class electrical and general winding-engine driver for Mount Isa Mines between 1950 and 1960. Alec Inch became involved in the trade union movement in 1945 when he became the representative of the Federated Engine Drivers and Firemen's Association while working at the Mourilyan sugar mill in Innisfail. This involvement continued throughout the 1950s when Alec became the president and secretary of the Mount Isa sub-branch of the Federated Engine Drivers and Firemen's Association. As a result of his trade union involvement, Alec Inch was also involved in the 1951 lead bonus case at Mount Isa.

From 1955 to 1960, Mr Inch was the president of the Mount Isa branch of the Australian Labor Party. In May 1960, Mr Inch became the member for Burke. He remained as a member of this House from 1960 until 1974, first as the member for Burke and then from 1972 as the member for Mount Isa. After retirement, Alec moved to Queen's Beach near Bowen. On behalf of the Parliament, I extend my sympathy and that of this House to his widow, son and grandchildren.

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise—Leader of the Opposition) (2.41 p.m.): On behalf of the Opposition, I second the Premier's motion of condolence for the former member for both Burke and Mount Isa, Alexander James Inch.

Alec Inch was well aware of the broad-ranging needs of his constituency, not only as they pertained to his time in this place but also how they should stand as priorities in the present day. His understanding of a wide cross-section of

community concerns stemmed from his direct involvement in various industries throughout the northern and western reaches of the State, leading up to his election as the far-western Queensland political representative.

As a wool scourer and engine driver for the sugar industry, he was aware of the increasingly diverse aspects of Queensland's all important primary export industries. His continuing involvement in rail transport for Mount Isa Mines and his coinciding ascendancy through the ranks of the union movement gave him plenty of exposure to the representative requirements of employees in the north and far-west corners of the State.

His consistent involvement in the ever-changing face of industrial relations from the Depression to the end of the 1950s proved to be a cornerstone of his career aspirations in politics. He was elected on the strength of his implicit understanding and active promotion of industry and individuals alike. He seemed both an aggressive and gracious proponent of far-western Queensland development. His foresight has not been rendered irrelevant by the passage of years. On the contrary, his proposals for the expansion of infrastructure and employment opportunities that would have far-reaching consequences for economic development of the State are still being replicated by economic theorists and politicians alike.

Better roads, education, housing, and health facilities and the lack thereof in the north west featured in his maiden speech in this Chamber and filtered through his actions and words as a politician and advocate of Queensland's long-term viability in the national and international arenas. In fact, it could be argued that the fundamental change of perspective about the north west that he yearned for to facilitate such development from Commonwealth administrations has still yet to be realised.

He was a staunch advocate of the untapped potential of the north and western reaches of Queensland. The continued push for increased recognition of the north west and its abundance of natural and human resource potential is testimony to the resilience of the man and his ideas. On behalf of the Opposition, I extend our sincere condolences to his family.

Mrs SHELDON (Caloundra—Leader of the Liberal Party) (2.44 p.m.): I also rise to express sympathy to the family of Alexander James Inch. On behalf of the Liberal Party and as Deputy Leader of the Coalition, I offer condolence to the family and the friends of Alexander James Inch.

Mr Inch was a strong advocate for the seats of Burke and Mount Isa between 1960 and 1974 and he had a strong Labor background in the shearing and railway industries. He was a figure who grew up in the days when the Labor Party had a certain status among the working people of outback Queensland. Through his duties as an MLA and unionist, he sought to maintain that tradition. His loss will be felt by workers in the west, especially those facing difficulties, such as those employed by Queensland Rail.

Mr Inch was the product of a Charters Towers education and was also a graduate of the school of hard knocks, having worked as a wool scourer and as a railway worker during the Great Depression. His dedication to the union movement took him to prominence within the Federated Engine Drivers and Firemen's Association while he served in the sugar industry and in Mount Isa during the fifties. Mr Inch was dedicated to the development of the great north west of our State, where he saw great potential for Australia's future.

In his maiden speech in 1960, he referred to the revenue being generated for the State's coffers by Mount Isa Mines. He estimated that Mount Isa in those days was worth three hundred thousand pounds a month. He would be proud to see the extent of development planned today in the Carpentaria minerals province. I support the motion.

Hon. T. McGRADY (Mount Isa—Minister for Minerals and Energy) (2.46 p.m.): I wish to support this motion of condolence for the late Alec Inch, who represented the electorates of Burke and then Mount Isa from 1960 to 1974. As the Premier stated, Alec was born in Charters Towers some 78 years ago, and he certainly did not receive what we today would call a good education, although he was determined that he would study and do all he could to give his wife and son, John, a good standard of living and a good way of life.

In 1950, he came to live in Mount Isa. He secured a job with Mount Isa Mines, received a home from the company and then sent for his wife and John, who soon joined him. Alec started as a labourer at Mount Isa Mines. However, as a result of those studies that I mentioned previously, he secured a ticket to become a winder driver. His job was to take the miners and the equipment underground and to bring them back up. It was certainly a very important job then, as it is today.

With Alec's personal philosophy of trying to help his fellow workers and their families, he joined the executive of the FED&FA and soon rose to a prominent position in that union and

also in the Australian Labor Party. In the 1957 split, the then Labor Party member for Burke, Norm Smith, joined the QLP and Alec, ever faithful to the Labor Party, stood as the ALP candidate in the 1957 election. At that election, he was defeated, although in 1960 he stood again as the ALP candidate against the sitting QLP member and won with a very clear majority.

In the 1963 election, Alec was returned unopposed, which I think says something for the man. In the five subsequent elections, in every single election he increased his personal majority, which again indicates the support he had in the north west. In the 1972 election, which was the last one he contested, he received 72 per cent of the vote. Of course, in 1974 the Labor Party lost the seat of Mount Isa to the Nationals, which again, I think, says something for the calibre of the man whom we are referring to today, although it is also fair to say that there was a massive swing against our party at that election.

In 1974, he left Mount Isa and went to live in Bowen with his wife, Rita. His son, John, had previously left and had set up a very successful business in the City of Townsville. I think it is also fair to say that, if Alec Inch had contested the 1974 election, even with the massive swing against our party, he would have been successful in that election.

In my opinion, Alec Inch was one of the good, old-time Labor politicians. Of course, in those days he did not have all of the facilities that we, as members of Parliament today, enjoy. In an electorate of some 240 000 square kilometres, he did not have the bitumen roads that we enjoy today, so his campaigning and representations were from the old school of hard slogging and hard knocks.

I believe that Alec Inch was a great representative of working people. I first got to know Alec and Rita when I arrived in Mount Isa in the early 1960s, when I joined the Australian Labor Party. Our friendship blossomed from then on; although I think it is fair to say that we did not always see eye to eye on all issues—unlike the Labor Party of today.

Alec Inch was a Labor Party member of Parliament during two major industrial disputes in Mount Isa. The first one was in 1961, and the second one was the 1964 dispute, which captured the headlines not only here in Queensland but, indeed, around the world. I believe that it was very difficult for a Labor politician to represent the constituency in those days. I think it is fair to say—and history records this—that the Labor movement was split from top to bottom, yet Alec Inch was able to represent the people in the true sense of the word. That

dispute left many scars on our community, some of which still have not healed.

I do not believe that Alec Inch ever wanted to be Premier of this State; I do not believe that he ever wanted to strut the international stage; all Alec Inch wanted to do was represent the people with whom he lived and whom he represented in this Parliament in the best way he could. I attended his funeral in Charters Towers on 6 July, representing our Government and this Parliament. I was pleased to see some former Labor members of Parliament. In particular, I refer to Ray Jones, the former member for Cairns, and Alec Wilson, the former member for Townsville South. They were the breed of Labor politicians who worked hard and paved the way for us today. Indeed, they paved the way for the Labor Party to eventually succeed to the Treasury benches of this Parliament. I personally owe a great deal of gratitude to Alec for the advice and assistance he gave me as I started my work in the Labor movement.

One seldom mentions the name of Alec Inch without referring to his wife, Rita. It was always Alec and Rita. Today, Rita lives in Townsville. She is a lady of great charm and great wisdom, and a lady dedicated to the principles of the Labor movement, which Alec served most of his life. If ever there was a case that verified the saying that behind every great man is a great woman, it is certainly that of Alec and Rita Inch.

Queensland is a poorer place without Alec Inch, and I join with other members of the Parliament in offering my condolences to his wife, Rita, his son, John, and their grandchildren. Every one of us who knew and worked with him is richer for the experience. He was basically a very humble man who rose from primary school at Charters Towers—as the Premier mentioned—to represent one of the great Labor electorates in this State. He had the respect of every person who knew him. I know that it is often said but, truly, I have never heard anybody say a bad word about Alec Inch. Regardless of one's political beliefs, Alec Inch was universally respected and admired.

I have been asked by Peter Beard, a former member for Mount Isa, to include in my remarks a comment from him. Peter wishes to have recorded in this House that Alec Inch was one of the finest men to enter the Queensland Parliament and was admired and respected by people of all political persuasions in the electorate he represented so well for over 12 years. I join with all members of this House, his friends and his former constituents in recording our debt, our admiration and our appreciation to a man who served us all so well.

Whilst it is a sad occasion to record the death of a former colleague, it is with a great sense of pride that I have had the opportunity today to place on record for future generations the life and services to the people of Queensland of Alec Inch.

Hon. E. D. CASEY (Mackay—Minister for Primary Industries) (2.54 p.m.): I wish to join in this contribution to the late Alec Inch. I served with him for just over five years in this place. I can assure members—and there are not too many here who did serve with Alec—that all those things that Tony McGrady, especially, has just said so sincerely about Alec are correct.

I met Alec on a few occasions prior to my entering Parliament. When I came here, he was one of the older members who befriended me. He was a great friend of the former member for Mackay whose place I took, namely, Fred Graham. Naturally, he was keen to help "young Edmund" through—as he used to call me. He really did befriend me and we got on very well together. Maybe that was because of his background in the north and his earlier connections with the sugar industry. We both shared a great love of north Queensland and the sugar industry, and quite a number of other things, including the Labor Party.

Alec was a bloke who was prepared to share things with others. He was prepared to help. He was prepared to accept advice. He was prepared to give advice. In the earlier days, it was rather humorous how we were crowded in downstairs in our little offices—the only offices that we had here. There was Ted Harris, who was a short bloke. Alec was a very tall fellow. Freddy Newton was a little on the rotund side. We had the long and the short and the extra bit in there as well. They all finished up on the same committee, and I was tucked into the committee with them. Naturally, we would meet in their room. We used to have some very funny meetings between us.

I think the strengths of Alec Inch came through quite clearly during the mid-1960s when Mount Isa was racked by what was probably the greatest industrial dispute that any of us has seen or experienced. One really has to understand what can happen to an isolated community such as Mount Isa when a dispute such as that occurs. It split the city from top to bottom; it split the company away from its workers. People who had wholly and solely committed themselves to living in Mount Isa had nowhere else to go, so they stayed there and hung in, ready to blame anybody whom they could for what was happening to them all. Alec Inch stood amongst them. He was there to help those who were destitute; he was there to help those who had problems; he was there to

counsel them in the way in which they should handle the dispute. At the same time, because of his attitude and the way in which he followed his profession as their elected member, he never lost the respect of the company in that deal, either. That showed the real strength of the man.

Following his retirement, when I was in the Bowen area, he and Rita never missed an opportunity to come and see me and spend a bit of time together to talk about days gone by and those times that we shared and that I am referring to now.

I also join with other members in expressing my sympathies to Rita and John. Unfortunately, because of ministerial commitments, I was unable to attend his funeral. It was nice to see him go back to Charters Towers for his burial—to the old place from whence he came.

Mr D'ARCY (Woodridge) (2.58 p.m.): I would like to place on record some remarks about Alec Inch. He was also a friend of mine. I served with him in this House. As Mr Casey pointed out, Alec was a gentle giant. He did exude a lot of confidence in the House, particularly when arguing for his constituents. Usually Tom Burns gets up and says all these things. It was very well known that Alec had a hearing impediment. In the big rooms that we had in the early days, it was quite easy for Alec to turn off. Quite a bit could go on around him, and he would know what was going on. But if he did not want to answer someone, he used the hearing impediment to great advantage.

Alec certainly was a great character in this House. He was one of the politicians whose sincerity one could gauge. He spent a lot of time away from home, particularly in those early years in the House. As has been pointed out, he went through some pretty horrendous times both during the split in the Labor Party and the dispute in Mount Isa. He had the courage and the confidence to cope with that. I place on record my condolences to his family.

Motion agreed to, honourable members standing in silence.

QUESTION UPON NOTICE

Queensland Industry Development Corporation

Mr LINGARD: I am sure that this is not the question that I asked, but I ask Question No. 1.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Can I suggest to the member for Beaudesert that, as a Speaker of this Chamber at another time, he ought to realise that the Table Office has the right to edit questions upon notice. I think that that is proper. The way the question is worded now is possibly

the way that the member should have asked his question in the first place, instead of making a speech.

Mr LINGARD asked the Deputy Premier, Minister for Emergency Services and Minister for Rural Communities and Consumer Affairs—

"In view of the financial hardship which is occurring in rural areas, will the Government consider reinstating Queensland Industry Development Corporation as a lending institute so that rural farmers and businesses can have access to lower interest loans and some real confidence in the future?"

Mr BURNS: I inform the House, and particularly the honourable member for Beaudesert—who as a former Speaker would know—that this question should be referred to the Treasurer, who has the portfolio responsibility for the QIDC.

Despite his shadow ministerial responsibilities and his participation in the recent Estimates committee procedures, the honourable member for Beaudesert, as a member of the "seaside" party, consistently misrepresents and refuses to understand the role of the Office of Rural Communities and my role as the Minister. That role is to monitor, review and coordinate the provision of Government services to rural communities; to identify issues of particular relevance to rural communities; and to ensure that their perspective is considered in the formulation of Government policy at all levels and across all departments. If the honourable member has difficulty in understanding these roles, then I suggest that he seek assistance from the leaders of the peak rural bodies who have no such difficulty and are happy to be involved.

I understand that the Table Office sought the member's permission to refer this question to the Treasurer so that he could obtain an answer. Obviously, he did not want an answer, as he refused. It is apparent that the member for Beaudesert is more interested in some schoolboy form of parliamentary tactics than in the plight of people in droughted areas, and that is to be deplored. However, I have sought advice from the Treasurer, who has provided the following information. Mr Lingard should be aware that, since the Polichronis report into the operations of QIDC in 1990, the delivery of concessional assistance to rural producers has been kept separate from commercial lending operations of QIDC. QIDC's role is that of an industrial financier for the primary, secondary and tertiary industries of Queensland, with particular emphasis on primary industry. It therefore operates as a commercial entity in a commercial

environment and has performed well, playing an important role in the development of Queensland industry.

From 1990 until the imminent corporatisation of QIDC, the delivery of concessional assistance to rural producers has been administered by the QIDC as an agent for the Government through the Government Schemes Division of QIDC. The role of this division is to administer both the RAS scheme and the various State schemes such as the Primary Industry Productivity Enhancement Scheme. With the corporatisation of QIDC, the schemes will be administered by an entity separate to QIDC to further emphasise the distinction between the commercial focus of QIDC and the administration of Government schemes of assistance.

In relation to Government assistance, it should be recognised that the level of assistance provided to the rural sector during this drought through Government schemes and through other programs has been significant. A total of \$75m has been provided by the State and Commonwealth Governments in the last two financial years through drought-related schemes, while a further \$25m has been provided over the same period through non-drought related RAS. As part of this, in the most recent financial year, 2 700 producers across the State received RAS interest subsidy assistance of \$34m, subsidising a debt level of \$476m.

In the particular area to which the member refers, it should be noted that a considerable number of farmers are currently receiving assistance through RAS. Throughout the Shires of Emerald, Peak Downs, Belyando and Bowen, the total number of farmers receiving assistance is 150, with assistance amounting to \$2.7m in 1993-94, subsidising a debt level of \$33m.

The Government's objective is to deliver the limited resource of taxpayers' funds in a cost-effective and accountable way to assist producers who will be able to return to viability in a reasonable period of time. The Government cannot return to the good old days when National Party membership rather than long-term viability was a prerequisite for obtaining Government assistance.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Sentencing Provisions in Queensland

Mr BORBIDGE: In directing a question to the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, I refer to comments by Judge Byrne of the Supreme Court on the fate of three men before him last week for sentencing in relation to a large marijuana plantation when he adjourned the

matter to determine sentencing provisions interstate. I refer the Attorney to the comments of Justice Byrne when he said—

"It would be unfortunate if those who are minded to commit offences of this sort are attracted to commit them in Queensland because, if detected, their punishment would be less than in other places."

I ask: will the Attorney-General immediately review sentencing provisions?

Mr WELLS: I am aware of the remarks of Mr Justice Byrne, as the honourable Leader of the Opposition should learn to correctly address him, and I am aware of the practice which he adopted in this particular case to ensure that people who are involved in crime of a kind which is capable of transcending State boundaries should be dealt with in a way which will ensure that there is no attraction to people who are involved in that kind of crime to carry on their activities in one area rather than another. However, what lies behind the honourable Leader of the Opposition's question is an entirely spurious claim to the effect that there is some leniency in sentences in Queensland. In fact, that is absolutely not the case.

Mr Borbidge: I didn't make the comments; the judge did.

Mr WELLS: No, that was not what the judge said. The judge said what you quoted him as saying, not what you are now saying that he said. The proposition that sentences are lenient in Queensland is entirely incorrect, and I draw the honourable member's attention to a number of comments which were made in the Court of Appeal in recent times. In those comments, judges have indicated that the sentences which they were handing down were strong sentences, and if the honourable member looks at interstate comparisons, he will see very clearly that the sentences that are handed down in Queensland are strong sentences.

As a matter of routine, I am advised by the Director of Prosecutions to appeal in certain cases. I think over the last four and a half years I have done that in something close to 100 cases, and that is absolutely necessary in order to ensure that the law remains constant and appropriate. However, the honourable member's proposition about lenient sentences is just not sustainable. I have here some remarks from the Court of Appeal which the honourable member might be interested in, if he will just bear with me for a moment. I would like to quote those remarks to the honourable member.

One of the propositions which the honourable member is constantly asserting is the proposition that in the Penalties and Sentences

Act there is a provision which says that gaol should be the last resort. Not very long ago in the Court of Appeal, the Chief Justice held that that provision merely reflected what was the law of Queensland long before the enactment of that legislation; in other words, that that legislation simply declared the law on that occasion.

Another proposition—and I cannot find the exact piece of paper, but I will table it later, and I will just relate it from memory—which the honourable member is constantly asserting is that the Penalties and Sentences Act does not give judges flexibility to hand down sufficiently stern sentences. Mr Justice Macrossan, the Chief Justice of Queensland, indicated in a judgment in the Court of Appeal recently that the Penalties and Sentences Act encouraged judges to exercise a degree of flexibility.

Another thing for which members opposite criticise the judiciary is that—

Mr Cooper: You ought to hear what they call you.

Mr WELLS: In making that remark, the honourable member is casting an imputation not upon me but upon the judiciary. For him to suggest that he has had private conversations with judges in which they cast aspersions on the Attorney-General is a declaration of his own naivety. Judges do not do that. For the member to suggest that they do is to generally smear them.

Another proposition which the honourable Leader of the Opposition has falsely put on numerous occasions is that the Penalties and Sentences Act goes harder on older rather than younger offenders. In fact, again, the Court of Appeal has held very clearly that that is a system which has applied for a very long period. I refer the honourable member to the remarks of Mr Justice Connolly—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the Attorney that he is—

Mr Cooper interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Crows Nest under Standing Order 123A. I suggest to the Attorney that he is starting to debate the answer. I suggest that he conclude quickly.

Mr WELLS: In conclusion, may I say that the judicial remarks in the court are all testimony to the proposition that the Penalties and Sentences Act is not, as the honourable member has said, an Act which allows softer penalties in Queensland, but rather is a stern, tough Act. It is an Act which has served Queensland well by providing a great deal of judicial flexibility and providing for tough sentences where they are needed. The

indefinite sentence provisions in the Penalties and Sentences Act have been copied in other jurisdictions, and everybody is well aware of that fact. In asking the question that he asked, the honourable the Leader of the Opposition is merely indicating his own ignorance of the law.

Juvenile Justice Act

Mr BORBIDGE: In directing a question to the Minister for Family Services, I refer to the recent comments of Judge McGuire of the Children's Court in sentencing a youth on multiple charges of illegal use of a motor vehicle under the Juvenile Justice Act, when he said—

"I must say I did have in mind a period of detention in excess of two years, but my hands are tied."

I refer also to the recent comments of Judge White of the Supreme Court in sentencing a 17-year-old in relation to the unlawful killing of a Murgon publican, when she said—

"It seems to me that Juvenile Justice Act principles require me to pass no further custodial sentence."

I ask the Minister: will she immediately review the Juvenile Justice Act?

Ms WARNER: I have to point out to the honourable member that the second part of his question is sub judice, because the matter is still before the courts. I do not intend to discuss that case for fear of jeopardising the case further than the member already has, not only by his statements in this House but also by his statements elsewhere.

Mr Borbidge: Have you handed in your resignation yet?

Ms WARNER: Does the member want to hear an answer, or does he just want to sit there and ask questions which have no answer, because—

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

Ms WARNER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. In his comments on the sentencing of a young offender on 26 July 1994, Judge McGuire expressed some concern at the limitations that were placed on his sentencing power under the Juvenile Justice Act, and he said that he would be tendering advice to the responsible Ministers, who are the Attorney-General and me. To date, that advice has not arrived, but I anticipate having a meeting with Judge McGuire in the near future. At the same time that he made those comments, he also commented that, in his opinion, generally the juvenile justice legislation contains commendable measures to combat juvenile crime. He said—

"In my opinion, generally the sentencing powers are adequate."

The circumstances of that case were unusual. The youth pleaded guilty on indictment to 14 offences and asked for a further 69 to be taken into account. Most children appear in court on three to four offences. None of the offences was of a serious nature, and that is why the penalty was pegged at two years, which is the sentence that the judge imposed.

The Opposition has suggested continuously that tougher sentencing will result in a reduction in crime. It has been proved in a number of jurisdictions and by a number of commentators that tougher sentencing does not necessarily by itself reduce crime. Many other measures have to be taken into account. I urge members opposite to lift the tenor of their debate, because they mislead the public, they mislead themselves and they reduce this debate to the sort of slanging match and idiocy that we have seen from the member for Keppel about whether or not we should flog offenders and what does or does not go on in Saudi Arabia.

The whole debate on crime and juvenile justice has been reduced to an abysmal level by members of the Opposition, which does nothing either to enhance their reputation or to deal with the substantive issue of what a decent, civilised society does about criminal offences, how we rectify those offences and how we stop people from committing them. Members opposite refuse to take part in the debate in any intelligent fashion. I think that the electorate will condemn them for their idiocy on this issue.

Native Title Legislation

Mr PITT: In directing a question to the Premier, I refer him to comments by the Federal Liberal Leader, Mr Downer, and the State Opposition Leader asserting that native title legislation should be repealed, and I ask: can the Premier inform the House if he is aware of any widespread support for this approach?

Mr FITZGERALD: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that I believe there is a notice of motion before the House.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. If the member for Lockyer suggests that, by placing a notice of motion on the business sheet he can stop debate in this House, he is misguided.

Mr W. K. GOSS: That is the sort of tactic that has got members opposite where they are today!

As a matter of fact, I am not aware of widespread support for that fairly unfortunate

and desperate suggestion from the Federal Leader of the Liberal Party. I believe that the only significant political figure—if one could call him a significant political figure—to give any support for this proposition is the Leader of the Opposition in Queensland.

Mr De Lacy: Significant?

Mr W. K. GOSS: There is some significance that attaches to his position, if not the person.

The reaction of people from a broad cross-section of the community around the country has been to distance themselves as fast as they can from this suggestion. We had the comments over the last 24 hours of the chief executive of the Queensland Mining Council, Mr Pinnock. He said, among other things—

"Frankly, the last thing we want to see is Acts in, Acts out and I mean no one will know where they stand."

Mr Pinnock went on to refer to the importance—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr W. K. GOSS: I have more for members opposite. They should just wait! Mr Pinnock went on to talk about the problems that exist with the Act and the importance of trying to make it work.

Yesterday on an ABC current affairs program, another industry leader, Mr Kerry Martin from the Cattlemen's Union, was quoted as saying that he is less than comfortable with the idea of scrapping the legislation. He said further—

"We have worked hand in hand with the National Farmers Federation who have worked with the Government to try to put something in place which has been workable. The Cattlemen's Union has of course taken that one step further, we have in fact set up an Aboriginal liaison committee."

Mr Martin went on to say—

"We believe that if the Act is to work then we need to do it. We need to sit down and talk about it to discuss all the problems associated with it and hopefully come to a satisfactory conclusion."

They are two industry leaders. What was the petulant response from the Leader of the Opposition? He heaped personal abuse on the head of the Cattlemen's Union; he heaped personal abuse on the chief executive of the Queensland Mining Council. On the radio this morning we heard him sneering at them and calling them sycophants. If that is how he regards the Cattlemen's Union, the Farmers Federation and the Mining Council, they should not worry,

because we are happy to talk to them in a rational way.

If we go beyond the petulant criticism and personal abuse of industry leaders such as the head of the Cattlemen's Union by the Leader of the Opposition, then we go to other Premiers, such as Mr Fahey, the Leader of the Liberal/National Party Government in New South Wales. On the early *PM* program he spoke about the problems with the Act. He said that he certainly agreed that there needed to be amendments. He was pressed on whether the Act should be repealed and he moved away from that. He did not say that the Act needed to be repealed. He said that it needed to be tidied up. He went on to say, ". . . but I'm not about to say that there is no such thing as native title". We can go to another conservative leader, Mr Brown in South Australia. He said that he accepted that it was correct for the Federal Government to recognise and protect native title through legislation. He went on to talk about the need to make it work. I could mention Mr Farley and others.

The point is that what responsible Governments are doing, what responsible industry bodies such as the Cattlemen's Union, the Farmers Federation and the Mining Council are doing is trying to address the problems; however, they accept that the problems are there, they accept the finding of the High Court in relation to native title and they are trying to get on with business rather than taking the low road of low principles. All that the Leader of the Opposition does by his desperate attempts to evoke division in our community on the basis of race is to highlight the divisions within the conservative political forces within this State. If he is so concerned about this issue, he would have the courage to ask a question of me or the Government about the matter. He sits there quietly and hides during question time after question time. That is the calibre of his leadership, both in this place and outside when it comes to significant issues.

In conclusion, what is needed is the sort of leadership—

Mr BORBIDGE: I rise to a point of order. Seeing that the Parliament has no business on today, I would be quite happy for the Premier to bring on a debate at any time convenient to him.

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

Mr W. K. GOSS: One of these days he will ask me a question.

In conclusion, what this country needs, at the Government level, the Opposition level and the industry level on these difficult and complex

issues is serious leadership with an intellectual and substantive content. Australia is getting it from just about every conservative leader in the country, except Mr Downer. We are getting it from industry bodies, such as the Farmers Federation, the Cattlemen's Union and the Mining Council. The only place we are not getting it is from members opposite.

Stamp Duty on Off-the-plan Property Deals

Mr PITT: In directing this question to the Treasurer, I refer him to a report in the *Sunday Mail* of 17 July in which the Deputy Leader of the Coalition was quoted as saying that the State Government has introduced a sneaky rip-off tax by requiring early payment of stamp duty for off-the-plan property deals.

Mr Borbidge: You take a while to read the paper.

Mr PITT: Can the Treasurer inform the House of the accuracy or otherwise of this claim?

Mr De LACY: The answer to the interjection is that I do not read the paper; I have better things to do on Sunday. When Parliament is convened, I get briefing notes to find out what was in the *Sunday Mail*. Yes, I am aware of what the Leader of the Liberal Party said. She is wrong again. As I said yesterday, she has once again been the victim of shonky journalism—the Saturday afternoon tabloid journalism. "Is that you Mrs Sheldon? The Government has an early home buyers' stamp duty slug. Would you be prepared to say that it is a sneaky tax rip-off?" "Yes, Mr Ruddy. I would be prepared to say that. I would be prepared to go on record and say that it is 'a sneaky tax rip-off.'"

Mr Veivers: Were you ever on the stage?

Mr De LACY: The fact is that it is wrong. There is no new tax. There is no new interpretation of any tax. There has been no change to any tax at all. The situation now is, as it has always been, that early home buyers—as they refer to them, or people who buy off the plan—do not have to pay stamp duty until such time as all of the conditions of the contract have been met. Of course, the conditions of the contract are that the building is finished and that the title has been transferred.

I might say that that is an administrative arrangement. I see no reason to change that administrative arrangement until somebody decides that they can use it as a way of dodging their tax obligations; however, I have no evidence that that is the case. It is different from the situation that applies in New South Wales. The Liberal/National Party Government in New South Wales requires buyers to pay stamp duty

up front, as Mr Ruddy claims is going to be the case in Queensland. It is not the case in Queensland; it is the case in New South Wales.

I make the point that if people do live in New South Wales under the Liberal/National Party Government, not only would they have to pay it up front but also they would have to pay, on a \$250,000 unit, \$7,240—as opposed to \$2,500 in Queensland. If they were lucky enough to live under a Liberal Premier in Victoria—or unlucky enough—they would pay \$11,200.

Once again, I make the point that the *Sunday Mail* ran a whole series of articles, week after week, purporting somehow to show that Queensland was either introducing new taxes or was a big tax State. It was trying to prove the unprovable, but it was wrong. It does nothing for journalism, and it does nothing for people who are trying to buy a home to put out stories that are wrong—dead wrong. It says a lot more about the *Sunday Mail* and a lot more about Mrs Sheldon than it says about this Government.

Workers' Compensation

Mrs SHELDON: In directing my question to the Minister for Industrial Relations, I refer him to a meeting being held today at the TLC building in Brisbane.

Mr De Lacy: Why don't you ask me a question?

Mrs SHELDON: Yesterday, I got a 123A for interjecting on someone who was asking a question.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs SHELDON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I said, my first question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Relations. I refer him to a meeting being held today at the TLC building in Brisbane in which the Workers Health Action Group proposes to establish a union-operated medical centre to cater for workers' compensation cases for union members. I also draw the Minister's attention to the comments on ABC radio this week by union organiser Craig Buckley in which he said that the new centre would help "workers who are on workers' comp and had trouble trying to convince doctors that their injuries are real". I ask: is the Minister's Government in favour of offering unionists preferable and possibly fraudulent treatment in claiming workers' compensation payments? What other interest groups will be allowed to establish their own medical check system for workers' compensation claims?

Mr FOLEY: The Government is not in favour of allowing anyone to make fraudulent claims for workers' compensation. There is in

place a Workers' Compensation Act, which is administered fairly and even-handedly and which sets out the circumstances in which injured workers may be entitled to receive compensation and rehabilitation. Indeed, it is something of which Queenslanders should be proud because not only do Queensland workers retain unlimited access to common law—this being the only jurisdiction to do so—but also Queensland employers enjoy the lowest average rate of workers' compensation premiums of any Australian State.

As to the activities of various trade unions that act to represent the interests of their members—I am delighted that the honourable Leader of the Liberal Party has at long last learned that it is one of the functions of the trade union movement to represent its members. The fact that a group of people is interested in workers' health is something that should not come as a surprise.

As to whether we will let them—which I think was the question—represent workers who may have workers' compensation claims, the laws of this land do not run so far as to prevent parties from seeking help where they will. Indeed, it is part of the proud tradition of the trade union movement to show solidarity with its fellow workers when they are injured and to seek to help them.

Mr Hamill interjected.

Mr FOLEY: As always, the Honourable the Minister for Transport has made an incisive interjection. May I say that part of the progress that we are making in the area of workers' compensation involves an attack on fraudulent claims. Indeed, Queensland leads the way in the Commonwealth in mounting such an attack. However, the secret of success in this area, the reason why the Queensland Chamber of Commerce and Industry waxed in its praise of the Queensland workers' compensation system in its submission to the Industry Commission, is that it is based on cooperation. It is based on a tripartite board, which includes the representatives of workers on the board as well as representatives of industries. It is this simple, basic concept that is so misunderstood by members of the Liberal Party, and that prevents them from understanding why we in Queensland lead the way in workers' compensation in Australia.

Government Owned Corporations

Mrs SHELDON: I refer the Treasurer to the Government Owned Corporations—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! If members stop interjecting, I might be able to hear.

Mrs SHELDON: I refer the Treasurer to the Government Owned Corporations (Ports) Regulation 1994 tabled yesterday and in particular to section 21 (1) of that regulation which states that ports will be in debt to the shareholding Minister to the extent of their net assets, and I ask: what assurances will the Treasurer give that the corporations will be free to manage their newly acquired debt to the shareholding Ministers in a manner appropriate to their business operations without fear of intervention from the Government? Will any or all other Government owned corporations also be indebted to the extent of their net assets?

Mr De LACY: I think the honourable Leader of the Liberal Party has missed the intent of the regulations which were tabled. They are interim regulations; they are to cover the period between when entities are first listed as candidates and full corporatisation.

Yes, I can give all of those assurances. That is what corporatisation is all about: enabling independent, competent private-sector orientated boards to go about the business of running operations in a commercial way. We are putting them on that basis so that we can receive all the benefits of that type of commercially oriented operation. If the honourable member understood corporatisation, she would understand that. However, we need to go through quite a few processes until we reach the stage at which such entities are fully corporatised.

The honourable member also needs to understand that the shareholding Ministers are the people who own those assets on behalf of the people of Queensland. We own the assets; the board manages those assets on our behalf and on behalf of the people of Queensland. Which other way would the honourable member have it?

Century Mine

Mr LIVINGSTONE: The Premier would be aware of the economic importance to Queensland of the zinc, lead and copper mine at Century, north of Mount Isa. I now ask: can he inform the House of what the State Government is doing to promote this project and to assist the developers?

Mr W. K. GOSS: The Carpentaria/Mount Isa Minerals Province, about which members would be aware, is a major research and development project being pursued by the State Government in cooperation with the private sector and other Governments. One of the most significant prospects in the province is the CRA Century zinc project. Members would be aware

that CRA has announced a \$40m final feasibility study, which will proceed later this year and which will be concluded by the end of this year or early next year.

However, on repeated occasions in this House the Leader of the Opposition—and there has been media speculation about this—has raised the prospect of the project being threatened by native title. The Government has been doing all that it can to ensure that the question as to whether or not the project proceeds is purely a commercial one for the company and that any doubts or impediments that should not be there are removed.

In relation to the issue of native title—as I indicated previously in this place, it was our preliminary advice that the mine was established on a former pastoral lease, and that that would have extinguished native title. Since that time, detailed title tenure research has been carried out by the Government, which was commissioned for and paid for by the company. That research indicates that what the Government said was clearly the case.

However, it became more complicated by the prospect that viability for the mine would require the development of a slurry pipeline to the gulf. I can inform members that the project, which is 240 kilometres north east of Mount Isa, is on a site comprising a camping and water reserve known as the Ten Mile Waterhole and a pastoral lease. Originally, the waterhole was part of the 1883 Bauhiniavale West No. 1 pastoral run. Subsequently, in 1907 it was surrendered from the Lawn Hill pastoral lease. The likely pipeline corridor traverses 15 pastoral leaseholds and one grazing homestead perpetual lease. The relevant land within the town of Karumba is freehold.

On 24 June this year, local Aboriginal people lodged a claimant application with the national Native Title Tribunal over the waterhole on the ground that a pastoral run was not a tenure extinguishing native title. Currently, the tribunal is considering whether or not to accept that claim. I indicate to the House and to the public that Crown law advice is that any native title that may have been in existence in the past will be extinguished by the valid grant of a pastoral lease, which includes a pastoral run.

This detailed tenure research has been carried out. The Government believes that, in the interests of both the developer and Aboriginal people in the area, it is information that should be placed on the public record so that they know the situation in relation to any prospect of native title. We have discussed the issue with the company and it has agreed to provide details of the research to the Aboriginal community so that

they can satisfy themselves. We have also encouraged the company to undertake talks with the Aboriginal community to try to reach a reasonable and amicable resolution to the differences of opinion. Those talks have been under way for some time, and we are optimistic that they will proceed to a satisfactory outcome.

Drought

Mr LIVINGSTONE: I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: will he inform the House of measures being taken to deal with the continuing severe drought over many areas of Queensland?

Mr CASEY: Every member of this House would be most concerned about what is happening in our State at the moment, the forecasts for the next two or three months and what may happen to our primary industries sector. This Government recognises the problem and shares the concern. More than a month ago the Government addressed the problem and that culminated in a submission by me to State Cabinet approximately two weeks ago at its meeting in Mount Isa. From that, the Government determined to set in place a strategy to ensure that not only would it continue to provide those additional relief measures for people experiencing problems resulting from the severe drought and to help them manage those problems but also that it would see what else had to be done. The problems of 1994 are different from and much harder than those of 1993, 1992, and 1991, when this drought first began.

Mr Stephan: Did you tell the Prime Minister?

Mr CASEY: I would suggest that the honourable member for Gympie sit back and listen to some of the things that the Government is doing, rather than think back to the old days and about what his Government used to do, which is now being criticised by industry. The industry itself has accepted that the best drought relief deal it has ever received has come from this Goss Labor Government. It is the best deal that has ever been put in place. The Government is prepared to continue to talk with the industry in order to ensure that things work out a way down the track. This was the strategy that was put into place.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr CASEY: Listen to the honourable members opposite squealing now. They should listen to what is happening. They are showing their lack of concern for the drought-affected producers of Queensland. All they want to do is create political uproar.

The Government has now put in place a strategy that will culminate this week with the Federal Minister for Primary Industry, Senator Collins, and I going into some of the areas of Queensland where perhaps the worst problems are occurring. We will also be looking at some of the areas where there is work being done for the long-term future—for example, property management and planning, and what we are doing through the south-western strategy—to really turn around for the long term the drought problems in our primary sector.

Since this drought began, about \$100m worth of support and assistance has been contributed from the State and Federal Governments. Two-thirds of that total has been contributed by the Queensland Government. The Government will continue with its commitment—and this was reaffirmed at Mount Isa two and a half weeks ago—to help the primary sector of this State through this bad and troublesome period for as long as the Government is able to and capable of doing so. The State Government will continue to do that work together with the Federal Government.

Police Service Funding

Mr COOPER: I direct a question to the Minister for Police. Police sources have informed me that for budgetary reasons some police cars are being equipped only one bullet-proof vest instead of the required two. Those sources also inform me that, if more than one vest is requested by police officers, they are told to purchase it themselves from their own funds. I ask: what action is the Minister prepared to take to ensure that in these circumstances adequate protection is provided to police officers?

Mr BRADY: This question was asked by the honourable the shadow Minister, who does not have a lot of credibility. His information about these matters is often inadequate and often garbled.

Mr Elliott interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Cunningham!

Mr BRADY: One thing we can say for certain is that the police have \$200m more a year to spend now than they did when the member for Crows Nest was the Minister for Police. They spend it very wisely and without interference from the Government of the day, unlike when the member opposite and his Government were in office. In relation to the details concerning the bullet-proof vests, as I say, although I receive the question with a great deal of scepticism, I will check it out.

Community Based Health Care

Mrs EDMOND: I ask the Minister for Health: can the Minister inform the House what measures have been taken to address community based health services in Queensland, and what progress has been made to provide appropriate resource support to groups involved in the provision of community based care in this State?

Mr HAYWARD: I thank the honourable member for the question. I am happy to inform all honourable members that community based health services in Queensland have received a significant boost with the purchase of land at Toowong for the establishment of a community health services centre. Coincidentally, it is in the electorate of the member for Mount Coot-tha.

The new centre will provide accommodation and administrative support for a range of community health services which are currently paying rent at a diverse range of locations throughout Brisbane. The centre will be built on a block of land purchased from St Columban's Mission in Patrick Lane, Toowong, which is close to the main centre of Brisbane.

A number of groups have indicated their intention to locate to that centre when it is completed. Organisations such as the Queensland Council of Carers, the Older Person's Advocacy Centre, Headway Queensland, Meals on Wheels, and the Home and Community Care Resource Unit have indicated their interest in locating to that centre when it is completed. The centre will also make way for a day respite centre and a new location for the Brisbane's Women's Health Centre, which currently rents rather run-down premises at Spring Hill.

Importantly, a facility such as this allows service providers to be housed in a single development and enables them to achieve a greater service provision within their budgets through economies of scale and through shared resources. Also, I propose that the centre should provide a secretariat to assist individuals and small community groups who have ideas for beneficial health projects but who lack the necessary resources to prepare submissions for Government funding. I am confident that that feature will be received warmly. I had the opportunity yesterday to receive a delegation from the member for Clayfield. As the member would be aware, that group would find great use for a centre such as this. It would provide them with the opportunity to get that essential and necessary secretarial service and would ensure that any grant applications are properly and carefully undertaken.

This new centre will fill gaps in services and will cater for clients who are among the most disadvantaged in our society. I am sure that such a centre will be of considerable interest and use to a number of community groups that have regular contact with all members of this Parliament.

Vocational Education and Training for Women

Mrs EDMOND: I direct a question to the Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Relations. One of the keys to women improving their employment opportunities and breaking the so-called glass ceiling to promotion is access to education and training. I ask: what new plans does the Goss Government have for 1994-95 to improve access to training for Queensland women.

Mr FOLEY: I thank the honourable member for the question, because it is extremely important that we provide access to education and training for women so that they can break through the glass ceiling that has in the past prevented far too many women from having a fair go in the labour market. One of the initiatives that is being undertaken is addressing the need for child-care facilities at TAFE colleges and institutes. To that end, new child-care facilities are now provided at eight colleges and institutes. That helps women—and, indeed, it helps men—with family responsibilities to get the opportunity to carry out vocational education and training.

As well, new centres are being established at the Gold Coast Institute of TAFE and at the South Bank Institute of TAFE in its new industrial sciences building. The existing centre at South Bank's Annerley campus is to be expanded, which will benefit students undertaking the adult migrant English program.

One project that was expanded significantly in the 1994-95 Budget was that of women's support officers. These officers provide a program of support and assistance to female TAFE students on academic, personal and career matters to ensure successful participation of women students in TAFE courses, and to develop links between the TAFE college or institute, schools, employers and local communities. Last year, the State Government provided some \$36,000 to women's support officers. For 1994-95, that has increased to \$140,000. The plan is to provide access to part-time women's support officers around the State. I would expect the first ones to be hired under the expanded program to be in place by the end of the year.

As well as the social justice aspects of that project, frankly, our economy cannot afford to deny to itself the abilities, resources and energies of women, who have been kept down too often in the past by a lack of proper access to vocational education and training.

Currumbin Valley State School Principal

Mr QUINN: In directing a question to the Minister for Education, I refer him to the recent appointment by relocation of a permanent principal to the Currumbin Valley State School, and I ask: why did the Minister interfere with the due process being followed by the Education Department and overturn this appointment on or about Monday, 4 July, and why was it necessary for the Minister and the member for Currumbin to hold a special meeting with some Currumbin Valley parents on Friday, 8 July.

Mr COMBEN: I interfered in no due processes. As the member quite correctly states, it was a relocation. We had a principal who was available for relocation. We relocated her and then immediately received criticism from parents. We then spoke to her. She chose to return to the regional office. We then heard from the P & C. I said, "I do not like what I am hearing here. I will meet with you." I went down there. Both factions of the P & C were there. I listened to the arguments from both sides. We had a very constructive hour or so of discussion.

As to the faction that had not wanted that principal there—even if their arguments had been totally accepted, that was insufficient to have a principal removed. So I said to the other parents, "If you are willing to accept this principal, then we are willing to listen to you. We will reinstate that principal." We did. It was done properly and for the right reasons. We listened to the parents and the teaching staff of that community.

Relocation of School Principal

Mr QUINN: I direct a second question to the Minister for Education. Is the Minister saying that the principal agreed to be relocated into the regional office for four days, or did the Minister order her into that regional office for four days?

Mr COMBEN: Let me put this on the public record so that it is quite clear. I went to the regional director and asked, "Have you made the right decision? I think we need to be talking to parents. If necessary, we will move that principal out of the school." I do not know whether or not the principal agreed to be relocated. But quite openly and up front, without interfering with any

due process, I said, "We want to be listening to parents in this matter." We listened to them.

HOME Assist Program

Mr BEATTIE: I direct a question to the Minister for Housing, Local Government and Planning. In 1993, the State Government allocated funding for the establishment of the HOME Assist program. Could the Minister please outline to the House the funding allocations for the HOME Assist services program for this financial year and how effective the HOME Assist program has been?

Mr MACKENROTH: Last year, the Government allocated \$1.1m for the HOME Assist program. That was to start the program off. Throughout the 1993-94 financial year, we started 20 programs throughout Queensland. They are all up and running. This financial year, we have allocated \$2.1m for the program. Those 20 programs are pilot programs, and they will be assessed at the end of this financial year as to their total success. To this stage, they are proving to be very successful indeed.

Over 2 000 low-income earners have received assistance through the HOME Assist program, which is available to people over the age of 60 and people with disabilities who own their own homes. The idea of HOME Assist is to enable those people to obtain assistance to stay in their homes longer so that the local HOME Assist project officer can go out and make an assessment of any maintenance that needs to be done on those homes and to provide people with the necessary information about how to fix up their homes or how to get the necessary maintenance done and, in some instances, to do that maintenance for them.

We have also distributed 15 000 booklets throughout Queensland so that people can use that booklet to do a simple maintenance check of their own homes. From all reports we have received, that has also been successful. We will now wait for the rest of this year before we make a full assessment of the program and about the continuance and expansion of the program into other areas of Queensland.

Mr Littleproud: Are you developing a plan for people with disabilities?

Mr MACKENROTH: This particular program is for people with disabilities as well as people over the age of 60. Within the Department of Housing we also have a disability services section, which does look after people with disabilities when they go into rental programs.

Penalties and Sentences Act

Mr BEATTIE: I ask the Attorney-General: is the Opposition's understanding of the Penalties and Sentences Act accurate according to members of the legal profession?

Mr WELLS: Let me begin by quoting the words of Terry O'Gorman, who is perhaps one of the most frequent critics of the Government. He said—

"I . . . have read the greater bulk of all of the Court of Appeal decisions on sentencing in criminal matters since the new Penalties and Sentences Act came in and it is my contention that sentences are harder. The court has announced in sex cases that it is upping the (tariff), it has announced in property cases . . . it is about to up the charge.

...

The opposition can claim that there is something in the Act that says under 25 year olds can't be sent to jail. Just on the weekend I read two or three cases where under 25 year olds were sent to jail. We've got to cut out the rhetoric and get to the facts."

He concluded by saying—

"The fact is, if the Penalties and Sentences Act has caused the courts to go soft, why is it that 10 days ago, it was announced that the rate of imprisonment under Labor has gone up . . ."

One other matter that needs to be drawn to the attention of the Opposition is the proposition that is consonant with what the member for Crows Nest says, but not with what the Leader of the Opposition says. A proposition was stated in the Court of Appeal by the Chief Justice in Brown's case. He said—

"The Act has brought some significant changes in sentencing practice and as part of those changes has expressly conferred discretions in areas where they did not previously exist . . . The deliberate legislative policy discernible behind this should not be impeded by over rigid rules or restrictive approaches drawn from the experience of an era (when) the discretions did not exist."

In other words, the Chief Justice was saying that the Act frees up judges' capacity to apply the quite severe sanctions that exist in the Criminal Code. This is entirely consistent with what the honourable member for Crows Nest said recently on Townsville radio. He was asked—

"Do you think the penalties and sentences for crimes are adequate?"

The honourable member for Crows Nest answered—

"Well, I think maybe they are there. The sentences are there. It's just the way they are imposed, you see."

So the honourable member for Crows Nest is saying that the sentences are available in the Criminal Code, and the Chief Justice is saying that, under the Penalties and Sentences Act, judges have more discretion to apply those sentences. Let us have another look at some of the spurious claims that are made by—

Mr Foley: Do Terry O'Gorman and Russell Cooper agree on a point?

Mr WELLS: I note the symmetry noted by the Honourable the Minister. Another of the spurious suggestions made by "Mr Justice Borbidge" is that the last resort provisions of the Penalties and Sentences Act are something new. Let us not hear the spurious dicta of "Mr Justice Borbidge". Rather, let us hear what the Court of Appeal says. The Chief Justice, Mr Justice Macrossan, in Kelleher's case, said of the last resort provisions of the Act—

"Imprisonment is to be a 'last resort' in the sense that it is to be imposed as a punishment only when nothing less will meet the case. Generally speaking the provision merely reflects the practice which the Courts followed before the Penalties and Sentences Act of 1992 was enacted."

That was said by the Chief Justice, speaking for the Court of Appeal.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney is debating the issue.

Mr WELLS: I do not wish to debate the matter. I would like to conclude by placing on record the views of the Court of Appeal with respect to one other matter about which I was asked by the honourable member who asked the question. That concerned young offenders. In respect to that provision, Mr Justice Thomas said—

"That provision gives legislative support to the view which . . . has long been the view of the courts with respect to youthful first offenders."

In another case, Breed's case, Mr Justice Connolly said—

"The well-known principle which the courts seek to apply, that one will strive to keep young offenders out of prison."

The legal profession's views, particularly the views of the Court of Appeal, are totally

inconsistent with the views that are espoused by the Opposition.

Proposed Airport Motorway

Mr T. B. SULLIVAN: I direct a question to the Minister for Transport. There has been public concern and speculation regarding a proposed airport motorway. I ask: can the Minister advise the House what procedures will be followed by the Government in examining this proposal?

Mr HAMILL: As I informed the House yesterday, to date, Cabinet has not considered any proposals regarding this matter. However, the procedures that are followed by this Government with respect to major infrastructure projects are as follows: if there is a decision by Cabinet to proceed with some investigation of the proposal, then what takes place is the appointment of independent consultants who would undertake a proper and thorough environmental and social impact assessment of the option or options which Cabinet resolved should be further investigated. What then happens is that there is extensive community consultation which takes place during that process in order to ensure that the decision making takes into consideration the legitimate concerns of and input from a wide range of people, not only the people living in the area but also others who may have an interest in relation to that particular matter. When that process is completed and the report is furnished to the Government, then a final decision can be taken by the Government in relation to that matter. That is the procedure—it is a very good procedure!

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The time allotted for questions with or without notice has now expired.

MATTER OF SPECIAL PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Transport Plans for South-east Queensland

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I advise the House that I received a proposal for a special public importance debate pursuant to the Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 5 November 1992. The proposal submitted by the honourable Leader of the Opposition is for a debate on the following matter—

"That this House notes the dishonesty and duplicity of the Goss Labor Government over its secretive transport plans for south-east Queensland."

I now call on the honourable member for Gregory to speak to this proposal.

Mr JOHNSON (Gregory) (4.02 p.m.): The proposal for discussion is that the House notes the dishonesty and duplicity of the Goss Labor Government over its secretive transport plans for south-east Queensland. Nothing could be truer than those words. I refer honourable members to the cartoon in today's *Courier-Mail*, which carries the caption, "I have a dream". That reminds me of the words of one of the world's great leaders, the late Dr Martin Luther King, the man who had a dream. Another statement by Dr Martin Luther King was, "When you reach the top of the mountain, don't forget the people in the valley below." This Minister has reached the top of the mountain, but he has definitely forgotten the people in the valley below, and I just hope that he might read the testament of love of Dr Martin Luther King. What this Minister has shown to the people of the south-east corner is not love, but hate born of misunderstanding. He has shown that he does not understand the needs of these communities, the needs of manufacturing industries or the social implications of his transport plans. Tourism is one industry affected by his plans, and the list goes on and on.

I remind the Honourable Minister of the Rankine and Hill report of January 1992 and also the Connell Wagner report prepared for the Queensland Department of Transport. It seems to me that this Minister and his department do not take any notice of the needs of the people. I will address that point by saying that on every occasion this Government's consultation process has been thrown out the door. I will talk briefly about the Pacific Highway, the Valley bypass, the airport motorway, the Yandina bypass and the Toowoomba bypass—the list goes on and on.

A Government member interjected.

Mr JOHNSON: The honourable member in the back corner might laugh, but all that I have said is fact. The fact is that the Labor Party has been in Government now for four years and eight months, but it has not made one hard-core decision addressing the transport needs of south-east Queensland. The Minister refers to the SEQ 2001 report. I say to the Minister that 2001 is almost upon us—it is only seven years to 2001. How many more reports will there be? How many more exercises and studies will there be to find out the transport needs of south-east Queensland? A Rankine and Hill recommendation of 1992 states—

"The Queensland Government should proceed to plan the progressive upgrading of the Pacific Highway to six lanes between Smith Street and the Gateway Arterial. This upgrading should be planned on the basis

that an eventual upgrading to eight lanes may be required."

This Government is not taking notice of any of these reports.

I point out that it is coalition policy to upgrade the Pacific Highway to eight lanes and to build the cross-parallel roads, those service roads that will cater for the needs of the people around Logan and Springwood and down to Redlands. We will consult with the environmentalists and with the people on the Gold Coast. At the same time, we will make sure that there are service roads to the Gold Coast. For example, Smith Street, the Nerang-Broadbeach Road and other roads further to the south were mentioned in the Rankine and Hill recommendation. The work that is to begin this year on the duplication of the road from the New South Wales border to south of Nerang is long overdue—we have now been waiting some four years for it!

We hear a lot about the Gold Coast rail link. I support the Gold Coast rail link, but I can assure honourable members it is not going to take the pressure off the Gold Coast highway. This Government needs to do something about it. As my colleague the member for Southport said yesterday, this Government has been sitting on its hands now for four and a half years. Yes, this Minister knows the story, but he does not have the guts to do anything about it. He should stand up and be counted. The whole problem is that the Left Wing faction of this Minister's Government is leaking all his information. He should stand up to them. He is the man in the box seat, he should do something about the south-east strategy. To quote the Minister for Transport in New South Wales, who released this statement on 25 July—

"The Labor Party has snubbed the motorists and left the NSW North Coast with major traffic problems"—

Mr Hamill: Who wrote this?

Mr JOHNSON: Bruce Baird wrote it.

Mr Hamill: Did you snub him?

Mr JOHNSON: You listen to it.

Mr Hamill: He's a good mate of mine.

Mr JOHNSON: He might be a good mate, but I am going to tell the Minister what he said. The media release continues—

"He said the ALP was not serious about upgrading road conditions on the North Coast."

If the truth be known, I do not think the ALP is

serious about upgrading the condition of the road between Brisbane and the Gold Coast. The media release continues—

"Mr Baird said Labor's plan to spend an additional \$300 million on the Pacific Highway was a drop in the ocean compared to the amount needed to provide a world class highway from Newcastle to the Queensland border."

That is just another example of the umming and aching of the Government over the last four years and eight months. We see the social implications on the coast, the domestic problems, the manufacturing problems, the problems with the environment and, as my colleague the member for Southport and shadow Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing said, the problems with tourism, one of the great growth industries on the coast. However, these people do not recognise the problems. I have not heard the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing say a word about this road, nor do I think he understands how important it is to have this road upgraded and to make sure that we are servicing the needs of the people on the Gold Coast.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr JOHNSON: Yes, I know that there is a mention of a bypass west of Brisbane. We totally support that concept, and the sooner that it goes through, the better.

Mr Hamill: Where do you want it?

Mr JOHNSON: We want it where the Minister has said, from Darra back into Burpengary. We support that concept.

Mr Hamill: All the way?

Mr JOHNSON: Yes, all the way. The point is that I am on record as saying it, and I stand by my convictions, which is something that the Minister never does because he has no convictions. The members of his transport committee talked about the road to the airport, and that was leaked by the Left Wing. That information was leaked in an attempt to bring down this Minister. The factions are fighting him, but he does not understand what progress could be made with problems such as the bottleneck in the Valley. I know that my colleague the member for Clayfield will address that issue, and because I have only a couple of minutes left I want to turn to the north coast and the Sunshine Motorway. Prior to the 1989 election, this Government promised that the toll on the Sunshine Motorway would be dropped. There has been no—

Mr Hamill: Where did I say that?

Mr JOHNSON: The Minister made that promise. The Government made that promise.

Prior to its election, the Government stated that there would be no toll on that road. However, it has not supported that concept.

Mr HAMILL: I rise to a point of order. The member is misleading the House. I challenge him to table any document where I said I would remove the toll on the Sunshine Motorway.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The Minister will resume his seat.

Mr JOHNSON: Mr Speaker, thank you for your protection. The truth hurts! I will place on record here and now that, after next year's election, a coalition Government will drop the toll on that road. We will make sure that the people take advantage of those good roads. This Government is putting pressure on the Maroochy Shire Council and the people of that coastal strip. Motorists use the inner roads around Mooloolaba, Maroochydore and Caloundra so that they do not have to use the toll road. That is further compounding the problem in that area.

I turn to the Yandina bypass. The decision on the Yandina bypass has been made by the Federal Government. There is no doubt about that.

Mr Hamill: They are going to pay for it.

Mr JOHNSON: I take the Minister up on that. The people in that area have been told blatant lies. The consultation process promised by this Government has never been implemented. The bypass is to be constructed through good farmland. That is unnecessary. If the original alignment were adhered to, the situation would be——

Mr Hamill: You don't believe in community consultation.

Mr JOHNSON: I do believe in consultation. The Minister has it all wrong, and he knows it. The people of Yandina will never support this Government on that issue.

I turn to the bypass at Toowoomba. The Minister stated to the people of that area that he is going to make an announcement on 15 December. This Government seems to be hell-bent on trying to construct roads through the best farming land remaining in the south-east corner. Once it has been destroyed, such land can never be recovered. It is about time this Government realised the needs of the people of Queensland.

Time expired.

Mr ARDILL (Archerfield) (4.13 p.m.): We hear from the Opposition strong words and fighting speeches about what should be done about public transport in south-east Queensland and throughout the State. However, the

Opposition's history in Government was vastly different from the policies that it now proposes.

There is no doubt that the massive increase in population which is predicted for the Moreton region will be located mainly outside the City of Brisbane, just as the Sydney population has occupied land to the west of Sydney proper and doubled the size of that metropolitan area. However, in the Moreton region, most of the one million increase in population in the next two decades will occupy land to the north and south, taking up the coastal strip and the hinterland. The Labor Government has accepted the challenge and ended years of National Party pie in the sky by constructing the long-talked-about rail link to the Gold Coast subregion, which will cost \$340m over the next three years.

It should be remembered that it was the Liberal Party and its senior partner, the Nationals, who tore up the railway which went right to the heart of the Gold Coast at Southport and Coolangatta 30 and 33 years ago. Just as the town started to boom, they destroyed the main passenger connection between Queensland's largest cities. Just when the line was being upgraded from branch line status——

Mr Veivers interjected.

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

Mr ARDILL:—to main line capacity to enable it to cope with the commuter passengers starting to use the line, it was closed, quickly torn up, and buildings were constructed on the right of way.

Mr Livingstone: They could have at least kept the land.

Mr ARDILL: That is right. Now the Opposition, which carried out this act of vandalism, is accusing the present Government of cynicism and hypocrisy. I will go further and inform the House of the method used to justify closure of that line. The express services which carried people to the coast were put back from 8.20 to 10.40 in the morning, turned around at Coolangatta near the Grande Hotel and immediately raced back to Brisbane, destroying any chance of use by day trippers. "No patronage", they said, "Let's close it down." Talk about hypocrisy!

Transport in the Moreton region cannot be supplied by one single transport mode. The Labor Government and the Transport Minister have accepted that right from day one, when steps were taken to include all transport—roads, rail, buses and water transport—in one department. At present, over 90 per cent of passenger journeys in this region are by private car. This cannot continue if we are to solve our

pollution problems and meet international obligations. There is no question that rail is the most efficient mover of large numbers of people. That is why this Government is allocating so much funding to remove the neglect of services over the last three decades and to restore services which were torn up. What happened to the coordinated rail services which were a feature of the local transport scene at Toowoomba, within the suburbs and the near north coast?

I have mentioned the Gold Coast line allocation of \$340m which, incidentally, should eventually provide the much-needed service from the Gold Coast to the Brisbane International Airport. However, that line will not solve all the problems of the Gold Coast, as all transport must be coordinated in timetabling and ticketing and in all aspects which will give confidence, smooth transfers and convenience to the vast majority of people who will not be able to walk to railway stations. Connections from the proposed stations will be provided to the Gold Coast itself to provide speedy, reliable, direct services. The line must be extended to serve the southern Gold Coast at Burleigh, Currumbin and Coolangatta, just as the previous line did up to 33 years ago, before it was torn up. I well remember the date—1 July 1961. At that stage, I had done over 500 trips on that line, so I remember it well.

The same applies to rail/bus connections to other satellite cities in the region. Bus services must be made more responsive to the through journey needs of the people of Albert Shire, Logan City, Moreton Shire, Ipswich, Pine Rivers and all areas north to Noosa. Again, the Opposition presided over the destruction of services to those areas. This Government has an integrated plan to restore the confidence and convenience to public transport in these areas which are essential to allowing and encouraging people to use them and to reduce the number of repetitive car journeys.

The public transport strategy recently promoted by the Minister, the Honourable David Hamill, has set the guidelines for bus operators to do these things and be financially rewarded for improving their services. The coordinated services which were allowed to decay under the Nationals will return under this strategy as a modern, convenient, truly coordinated, speedy service which will give the commuters the confidence essential to their needs. As the Minister has said, it will be performance based.

No expansion of public transport would be possible without the infrastructure which this Labor Government is providing, whether it be the new roads or the inner-city tunnels and quadruplication. Roads are being improved and

upgraded and transit lanes are being promoted to allow faster journey times for passengers and better utilisation of vehicles, which improves financial viability of the service. I will expand on that later.

One aspect of public transport strategy that must be tackled is in imposing a suitable fee for all-day parking in Brisbane. This is not a matter for the State but must be considered by the Brisbane City Council. If a fair share of costs is to be apportioned between public transport and the private car, the council must charge adequately for the use of real estate by immobile vehicles in the CBD.

Altogether \$778m is being provided by this Labor Government for upgrading passenger rail services in the Moreton and metropolitan regions of south-east Queensland. It includes—

\$240m on the re-establishment of the Gold Coast rail link;

\$150m on new electric rolling stock to replace the less comfortable diesel sets and service the Gold Coast line;

\$2.9m on a state-of-the-art signalling control system;

\$5.9m on the provision of an electronic ticketing system;

\$1.42m on the inner-city expansion project to accommodate four tracks from Bowen Hills to Roma Street as well as the inner-city tunnels, which will increase capacity by 80 per cent;

\$65m on the much-needed track expansion to increase network capacity, which includes the Beenleigh-Kuraby duplication, South Brisbane-Yeerongpilly dual gauging and the quadruplication of track between Mayne and Northgate; and

\$17m on the Operation Facelift program to upgrade stations with safer design, improved amenities and appearance.

Further demonstrating this Government's commitment to enhancing rail patronage, the Minister for Transport announced a \$22m rail security package—an essential package—aimed entirely at making people feel safe using this form of public transport. To be implemented over three years, this program will provide greater security to Queensland Rail's staff and its 40 million passengers through improved on-station security measures such as video surveillance, better lighting, alarm and motion detection systems and emergency phone links. This will see the widespread use of closed circuit television. Motion-detection alarms will be

activated after the last train at night. Altogether, this package will make people feel safe.

This clearly indicates the need for the integrated planning which has been a feature of the Labor Government's transport structure under David Hamill—one Minister for all transport. As I said, no one transport mode can supply the total transport needs of the entire region. Rail provides the basic radial service and buses also provide a service. However, there is an ever-increasing need for cross-city and cross-country travel. The Brisbane City Council does provide some of that service, but in other areas there is virtually none.

I have used the words "confidence", "convenience" and "coordination" throughout this speech, and advisedly so. This and passenger comfort is what a good public transport service is about, and this fact has been ignored in the past. Under recent public transport legislation, it will be addressed by this Government and is being addressed right now. There is a massive investment program in public transport to improve comfort, frequency and efficiency of commuter services. I have mentioned the rail. This program is for the whole State and must be so. If public transport is deficient in one area, confidence is destroyed.

Mr SANTORO (Clayfield—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (4.23 p.m.): I wish to support the honourable member for Gregory and the Opposition's claim that the Goss Labor Government is acting in a duplicitous and dishonest manner as it seeks to force its tollway nightmare on the people of south-east Queensland.

This duplicity and dishonesty seeks to camouflage several internal Labor party and union agendas which relegate the general public interest, the environmental interest and the interest of thousands of Queensland families and their homes to the status of mere pawns in the Labor Party's factional power plays.

It is no secret to many members opposite and to departmental people that the Transport Minister, Mr Hamill, wanted to announce his grand toll motorway vision many months ago. Pushed by his bureaucrats, he wanted to get on with the job of building his tollways as soon as possible and at a safe distance from the forthcoming State election.

What complicated the equation was the now on, now off, now on and now definitely off retirement of the current Deputy Premier, Mr Burns. The prospect of this retirement activated two people to consider a run for Deputy Leader of the Labor Party—Jim Elder and, members need not guess it, David Hamill. At this stage two

things came into play and started to complicate David Hamill's life and ambitions.

The first was Mr Hamill's willingness to stand up to the Premier in Cabinet and elsewhere and not simply be his lapdog, as most of the current batch of Ministers are. Secondly, the AWU, the union which controls Mr Goss and the Labor Party, informed the Premier that their man in Parliament, Mr Elder, was their preferred candidate for Deputy Premier and Mr Goss should do whatever was necessary to undermine Mr Hamill—something which by anyone's measurement Mr Goss has succeeded in doing very well.

In fact, it has been put to me by some Labor people that the now infamous Department of Transport pamphlets were leaked to the community deliberately by the pro Goss and pro Elder forces to deliberately embarrass Minister Hamill and cripple his deputy leader ambitions. These are the grubby Labor Party politics which are leading to the destruction of people's lives and livelihoods as the plans for tollways throughout south-east Queensland are unceremoniously leaked and dumped on unsuspecting people who have invested their life's earnings and ambitions in their block of land and the homes they have built on the land.

Of course, Mr Speaker, you and members opposite will note that I stress the word "tollways" for it is very significant that the Government is planning tollways. The benefits for the Government and its union mates are very obvious to all thinking and caring Queenslanders. The benefits for the Government of having the roads built by private enterprise include no need for the Government to outlay moneys for their construction; it can use the moneys from the ever-growing Consolidated Fund for its pet projects, which are stimulated by considerations of cronyism and social engineering. Of course, it also means more revenue for the Government. I will repeat that. It means more revenue for the Government.

For the unions it means more union members, more union fees from the people building the roads and, of course, more union donations to the union/AWU-controlled Goss Labor Government. It is a vicious, incestuous, self-serving, grubby, deceitful political circle which sees the hopes and happiness of thousands of decent Queenslanders crushed by the political imperatives of Labor and union political greed.

I now come to the very substance of the issue we are debating today, this being the way that the Goss Labor Government does business in relation to toll roads. Irrespective of which stretch of tollway or proposed tollway one

considers, the story is the same—broken promises, deceit, duplicity and damn the people whom this Government is supposed to represent.

The experience in my own electorate is a classic case in point. Despite many official requests by me within this Parliament, via my correspondence to the Minister and his bureaucrats, not to mention by the hundreds of constituents who, before buying their homes, sought assurances that they would not be confronted by a toll road, or a freeway, or a motorway going through their bedrooms—despite all of these approaches, and I stress hundreds of approaches—as recently as the Friday before I distributed the leaked pamphlet to my electorate, we were told nothing about the proposed airport toll road. In fact, we were told lies about it happening.

Mr Hamill: You mean "stolen document".

Mr SANTORO: I will come back to the so-called stolen document in a minute. I thank the whistleblowers who leaked the pamphlets—for whatever reason—for they have helped uncover the sinister and devious methods of a Government hellbent on playing havoc with the lives of thousands of Queenslanders. I say to these whistleblowers: thank you, for you have performed a public service far greater than that which the Goss Labor Government was prepared to perform, the most essential part of which is to actually tell the people what your plans are for them. These whistleblowers will be aware that the Minister is currently engaging in a witch-hunt.

I say to these whistleblowers: I and the Opposition will not shoot the messenger, as the Minister is obviously intent on doing. If the Minister and his Government continue in their diabolical determination to hang you and you require the protection of the Opposition, we are happy to provide it. I am sure that the thousands of my constituents who these days are wiser, if not happy, about the Government's dastardly plans will stand fairly and squarely behind you.

In fact, honourable members should be aware of what people say about leaked documents. In 1987, the Honourable Wayne Goss, the then Opposition Justice spokesman, said in the *Daily Sun* of 14 November—

"The leaked document shows that Sir Joh and his administration have a cynical and uncaring attitude to the concerns of ordinary people. This document dramatically highlights the need for openness and honesty when it comes to spending public money on important projects."

Mr Goss was talking about Hale Street—the Route 20 option—back in 1987. I have heard

those same statements from my constituents at a public meeting attended by 1 000 people. Honourable members should be aware that this morning the owners, editors and publishers of the *Bugle* received a visit from two policemen from the CJC. I wish to quote from a summary provided to me of that interview by Mr Bob Thacker, one of the owners of that fine community paper which has had the courage to pursue the issue in a fearless manner. This is part of what Mr Bob Thacker relayed to me—

"This morning at 11 a.m. I received a visit from a Murton Butler and Detective Inspector Gill Aspinall from the Criminal Justice Commission.

They tape recorded the interview.

They asked who owned The *Bugle* and I told them it was owned by Exhibitions 'R' Us Pty Ltd. A company owned and operated by myself and my wife, Cate.

They asked the details of how and when we came into possession of the document. I told them.

Cate and I made a decision to produce a special edition of our paper and involve our local Member of Parliament, Santo SANTORO in the production, as he had the facilities available, being a Sunday and all printers were closed.

They asked if Mr SANTORO came to our house or how we made contact with him.

They also asked if we were aware of any other copies of the brochure and I told them that I did not know. They also asked where Mr SANTORO got his copy from to show to the TV stations on the Monday. I could not answer that question as I did not know."

My constituents are worried about this sort of investigation. They think that public moneys can be better spent by a department and a Government clearly intent on lynching the messenger who blew their plans for a tollway wide open. I say to the editors of the *Bugle* and other freethinking and independent citizens of this State, "Do not be silenced and do not be cowered into copping the unsavoury dishes handed out by the Goss Labor Government." I say to my constituents that from me they will get all the information I receive, and I will always seek to protect and advance their interests even if it means that the CJC is asking questions about pamphlets and other information which I receive and which I choose to distribute in the public interest.

I call on the Minister to make available to me and all my constituents the information his department possesses in relation to the airport

tollway. I call on the Minister not to prevent access to this information by me or by the public by conveniently bundling it up and referring it to Cabinet in a bogus submission.

Of course, my personal experience in my electorate is not the only manifestation of the way in which the Goss Labor Government does its tollway business. The Government's record on toll roads was made very obvious shortly after the 1989 election when, after promising no tolls on the Sunshine Coast, it dropped two toll-collecting booths into the then Landsborough electorate for "Mike Ahern and his mates". The public outrage that has been maintained for the past four and a half years shows no sign of abating. Toll avoidance is continuing, even though this contributes to congestion on surrounding local roads. But the Sunshine Coast public prefer this congestion, problematic though it may be, to giving in to a broken promise made by this Government to remove all tolls on the Sunshine Coast.

Of course, not much needs to be said about the saga of the eastern corridor on the south side of Brisbane. Suffice to say, prior to the last State election the Goss Labor Government made these promises to the residents of the south side and they have not been kept.

I will quote directly from another pamphlet produced by the department—this one was released officially by the Minister. It states—

"The State Government has decided against identifying and preserving a corridor north of the Logan River.

Importantly, the Government's decision allows communities and land owners to plan ahead with confidence."

What a joke! Those people have not been able to plan their future with confidence.

For the 7 000 people who turned up to the protest meeting last Sunday and the many thousands who could not turn up, not to mention the voiceless koalas, it is clear that the commitment to consultation that the Minister and the Government have made has not been kept.

In conclusion, I urge the hundreds of thousands of Queensland citizens, who feel betrayed and let down by the Goss Labor Government's toll vision, to maintain their rage. They need to tell the Government that they do not wish to simply be given a choice of Government-devised and planned options. Each will be worse than the other and less acceptable to the people who have not been consulted and whose lifestyle, needs and choices made by them in good faith have been ignored. Queenslanders have made decisions in good faith with a misplaced trust in a Goss Labor

Government, which said to the people, "Trust us." Those people have trusted Mr Goss and his Ministers for the last time, and they will certainly prove that at the next election.

Mrs EDMOND (Mount Coot-tha) (4.34 p.m.): As some members may be aware, I have some personal experience of fighting freeways and, indeed, of freeway-planning style under the National Party Government. I am not generally classified as a roads-at-any-cost supporter, but I could not sit back and listen to the absolute tripe, untruths and sheer hypocrisy of members opposite, who appear to be suffering from collective amnesia, or perhaps selective amnesia is a more accurate diagnosis. However, they are given away by the rate at which their noses are growing. These members opposite are now coyly calling for more consultation and uttering "how dreadfuls". These are the same people who urged Governments, local and State, to ride roughshod and willy-nilly over the inner-city residents of Bardon and Hale Street.

Where were they then, these so-called supporters of public transport and opposers of freeways? What did they say then? Where was Rob Borbidge, who looked decidedly uncomfortable as he attempted to straddle the fence on the eastern corridor issue? He was in Government—in Cabinet, a part of the decision-making process. He was part of a Government that believed in bulldozing first and then talking to the residents.

Where was John Goss, the new leader of resident action groups across the city? He was in civic Cabinet urging his leader "Salaryanne" on. Where was Joan Sheldon when her political heroine "Salaryanne" was bullying poor old Bill Gunn to ignore the protesters and keep on devastating Bardon and Ashgrove and, of course, bulldozing a few graves down Hale Street on her own bat? Well, Joan was unheard of. There was no community input, no EIS—now required by legislation—and no regional strategy until our community forced the Government to do them.

In those days there were no years of planning and community consultation. The first residents in my electorate—held in those days by the Liberals, of course—heard of the freeway was when the Main Roads surveyors turned up to see whether the freeway would go through their bedroom or their kitchen. There were no maps in the paper with alternatives to discuss. There were no brochures now produced like this one by the Department of Transport—and I will table it—clearly explaining their rights to fair compensation or their right to an independent valuation. The procedure was simple under the National Party Government. "This week your

property is worth \$100,000", they were told. "If you don't sign, next week it will be worth \$90,000, and the week after \$80,000." That was National Party negotiation tactics, especially for use with the elderly, the infirm and the inexperienced.

There were ways of keeping the cost of freeways down, too, under the previous Government. If it needed only three metres off the front of your property, it paid for the land value of only those three metres. What did it matter if your bedroom was left sitting just a footpath away from a freeway? Ask the people along Jubilee Terrace how they felt about that procedure. And what about noise barriers, landscaping and buffer zones? Well, members opposite were not interested. Such things were dismissed as namby-pamby socialist nonsense—"Don't you worry about that."

I am delighted that the Western Freeway is finally to benefit from that namby-pamby socialist nonsense. The residents were consistently told by members opposite that doubling the road capacity would halve the noise—something I have never been able to work out. The member for Moggill certainly has not been loudly opposing these socialist moves in what is now his electorate.

I hear the calls of those concerned by new bypass road proposals for more planning, and I understand them. Indeed, they are the same calls that I made prior to 1989 and also in my maiden speech. As a community, we called for an integrated Transport Department so that moves to improve public transport could be matched with planned bypass roads, rather than seeing rail and road infrastructure needs competing against each other. This has now happened. We also called for a moratorium on road building until a regional study had been done on public transport needs and also on regional planning, looking at all important aspects, such as environmental concerns and land usage.

These calls led to a protracted process of demographic studies and community consultation initiated by this Government, never undertaken by the previous Government, which contracted an EIS on the Route 20 corridor only in the face of several years of community opposition and, purely cynically, did so only to delay the decision past the 1989 election when the former Minister told me himself that the then Government was prepared to ignore the results and go ahead with the original Main Roads option.

Over the last four years, we have had the SEPTS—the South East Passenger Transport Study—SEQ 2001, with further work by the Regional Planning Advisory Group, RPAG; and

also the specific corridor studies. The SEQ 2001 regional study was set up with great gusto and publicity in 1990 to plan for future growth in this rapidly growing region from the Sunshine Coast to the New South Wales border and west to Toowoomba. All commentators recognised the need for strategic regional planning was essential and urgent. Indeed, some foresight and planning by previous Governments could have obviated the need for the difficult decisions this Government is now facing.

Five RPAG working groups were established to look at environmental management, social planning, transport, infrastructure and urban futures. The RPAG consisted of Ministers, local authority representatives—mayors and councillors—Commonwealth bureaucratic representatives, business sector interests, union representatives and community group representatives, and yet somehow we are expected to believe that this was a secret process.

They produced draft working papers, reports, position papers and strategy papers and, because of keen interest in involving the widest possible community consultation, laid the Government open to the oft-repeated accusations of members opposite that this Government was not prepared to make decisions. We have heard a lot of rhetoric about the secretive way this planning process has been undertaken. How was that so? How was it secret? Are regular ads calling for submissions, mountains of draft statements, planning data and a constant stream of press releases a secret process? This process has been about as secret as the royals' love lives!

Just wading through the press releases over the last few years, certainly there has been much criticism from Opposition members of both coalition parties and, for once, their criticism has been fairly unified. They have all loudly criticised this Government for the same thing—for not getting on with the job and not building the eastern corridor route sooner. We have heard the members for Surfers Paradise, Nerang, Southport and Gregory all regularly criticising this Government for pursuing its agenda of consultation and planning and not acting. I could not understand how the member for Gregory could even contribute to this debate, because he is on the public record as saying that the new freeway is required. It is required because—

Mr Hamill: Where did he say that?

Mrs EDMOND: In this House. The member for Southport has also made such statements in this House.

Mr Hamill: So he's a good coalitionist?

Mrs EDMOND: He said that it was required as a critical element in the management of the projected growth of south-east Queensland. He has actually criticised this Government for not getting on to doing it. But I will defend that important and protracted planning process.

Mr Hamill: Can you table the quote? Table his quote, if you've got it.

Mrs EDMOND: Yes, I am happy to table the quote.

But I also want to defend that protracted planning process, even though Governments do have to make the final decision. Many of the people buying into the current debate have obviously come lately to it and do not realise that their calls for planning and so on are as late as their calls for public transport studies. They have been done, and many of the recommendations are currently being implemented. The only criticism I have heard of SEQ 2001 was from Professor Stimson of the QUT, who criticised it for being overly optimistic about the numbers of people who could use public transport, and for somewhat understressing the need for increased bypass roads.

The need for strategic regional planning has been obvious. It has also been obvious that land use studies have to be part of that regional planning. In the past, there was no genuine planning by the former State Government, just ad hoc, highest price, best-mate style development. It is this uncontrolled development at the fringes of the city that is now a threat to the middle and inner-city suburbs—and where are the "white shoe boyos" now? To keep channelling traffic through these suburbs is to destroy them. There is an undeniable need for bypass routes outside the major built up areas. To continue to force more traffic through the South East Freeway and hence through the inner suburbs of Petrie Terrace, Herston and Kelvin Grove before it finds its way north to Gympie Road is just not going to work.

I am rapidly running out of time. I want to acknowledge and recognise the support for the western bypass by the member for Gregory and to say that I, too, support it. The western bypass will keep through traffic that is unlikely to use public transport out of the built-up areas rather than into the city and out again through the closely built residential areas. It is only when we get that through traffic out of the built-up areas that we can then introduce traffic calming and reduce speeds to play an important role in improving residential amenities and improve public transport options.

The examples of such work in Europe relate to cities where those characteristic and excellent

autobahns run between major cities, with great bypass roads outside the residential areas and increased residential density to make public transport viable. We need to pursue all of those directions simultaneously.

Time expired.

Mr LINGARD (Beaudesert—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (4.45 p.m.): One has only to look at the track record of this Government over its five years in office to see that the tag of "secrecy and duplicity" has been the real agenda behind Labor's facade of openness and accountability. In addressing this issue today, the first point that I wish to deal with is the process of Transport Department searches when people buy property.

When the Government's secret plans for an airport motorway were exposed recently, the shortcomings of the department's property search system were also highlighted. People who had purchased property in the motorway corridor literally only days, or in some cases weeks, before the Government's announcement were unaware of such plans. For many, the investment of what constitutes their life savings has been jeopardised by the secrecy which permeates this area of the Transport Department—a secrecy which must be broken down if people are to be aware of what planning is taking place.

People are entitled to accurate information at the time when such searches are undertaken in regard to property purchases. After all, this Government has now imposed a fee of \$15 for such searches and \$25 if one wants it fast-tracked—a dangerous precedent for setting Government fees if ever there was one. Obviously, based on the information that was handed out recently to north side residents, such searches were a waste of time and money. What the Government needs to do is overhaul its planning process so that this secret cell that plots and plans future highway corridors in the department's Roads Division is exposed to public accountability.

The debate has been about the Goss Government's secretive agenda on roads and the cloak and dagger approach of the Minister for Transport to the south-east Queensland road transport network. But the story does not end with the airport route debacle or the eastern tollway calamity.

On 12 March 1994, the Minister announced that the southern Brisbane bypass would proceed. Rather than selecting either the red or the blue options originally presented to the public for consideration as in the original Maunsell report, the Minister came up with a third secret option and endorsed it without

consultation with affected residents in Stretton and Stretton Heights. In fact, residents only found out about the third secret, and subsequently approved option, through an FOI request. This was in spite of earlier strenuous denials by the Minister in this House that there was no secret route under consideration.

The Minister said that "the Government adopted a preferred corridor for the bypass after extensive community consultation", and further stated that he could not "find any document or map that supports the maps and claims which have been made". He accused anyone claiming that there was a secret route of being "deliberately dishonest and mischievous". However, the route announced by the Minister is virtually identical to that which was obtained through freedom of information. This is the level to which the Goss Government's public accountability has sunk.

I have written to the Minister regarding this matter, and I have just received an answer. The people of Stretton advised me—and they are adamant about this—that the first Maunsell report had two routes, a blue route and a red route, but that there was no selective, special route in those reports that were discussed with the residents of Stretton. They said that the first routes were certainly discussed with them, but not the final linking alignment which was east of Stretton. They have stated that there was no consultation with the affected residents about that final linkage. There was no consultation with the affected developers about that special linkage. Yes, there was the original Maunsell report about two routes, but not about this special linkage route. They have said—

Mr Hamill interjected.

Mr LINGARD: Yes, of course, I am. That is what I wrote to the Minister about. They have said that there was no detailed evaluation of the linking alignment, including its noise and visual impacts.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Palaszczuk): Order! The House will come to order.

Mr LINGARD: They have stated that there was a significant understatement of resumption costs by the Government. They say that a realistic statement would be \$46m to \$60m extra that this Government has paid for this secret alignment. They say that a property devaluation of \$7.6m is also grossly understated and would certainly be in the vicinity of \$25m to \$30m. They say that selective noise modelling has been undertaken subsequently and that this was engineered to achieve acceptable results.

This Government has paid an extra \$70m to \$80m—

Mr Hamill interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LINGARD:—to choose a special linking alignment in this southern route. They have certainly not listened to the residents who have said that there could have been a \$2m saving in the construction and resumption costs. They said that there could be less visual and noise impacts, reduced ongoing maintenance costs, and no noise amelioration required.

As I have said, the Minister has written back to me—and I received his letter yesterday—regarding those complaints. He has said that there was extensive consultation and that it included the affected residents, the land developers and the special interest groups, such as the Karawatha Forest Protection Society and the Brisbane City Council. Yes, Mr Deputy Speaker, there was extensive consultation on the original Maunsell report, which had two options, but not on the secret alignment which was finally decided upon. There was no consultation with the residents about that. These residents of Stretton have a very big Chinese population. Thirty-five per cent of them cannot even speak English, and there was no consultation, even in Chinese, until well after the route was decided. There was no consultation at all.

Further in that letter the Minister stated—

"The cost of constructing the adopted alignment is considerably less than the proposed alignment, and this difference will more than compensate any additional costs in maintaining some 220 metres of road."

There are certainly comments from the Department of Transport, through Mr Bullock, to the effect that this realignment will cost more. It will certainly cost more than the proposal from those residents.

The Minister stated further—

"The eastern severances of properties created by the adopted alignment are greater in area than the proposed alignment."

The Minister has not taken into account the fact that 29 hectares of forest would have been retained; that there would have been a bridge, which would have given access to the Karawatha Forest; and that land known as the Paratz land could have been saved. The Minister has also said—

"Shortening the length of the bypass

by some 220 metres would have no impact on the accident rate and represent a negligible saving in transport costs."

The Department of Transport is saying that 55 000 vehicles a day are going to use that road. If people look at the new alignment east of Stretton they will see that there is a considerable curve and a considerable amount of land that has to be excavated there. There is certainly a greater distance that people will have to travel, compared to the proposed routes put forward by the residents, which would have taken this route further away from the people at Stretton. However, the Minister had to placate Mr Soorley and the greens. To do that, he spent an extra \$70m to \$80m of taxpayers' money. The Minister has not been honest. He has been secretive. He has imposed an additional cost of \$70m to \$80m to pacify a minority supportive group simply to get this through.

What the Minister is doing with the Mount Lindesay Highway is irresponsible. He is continuing to talk about a western route through Greenbank. He is continuing to promote such a route. But he is doing nothing for the Mount Lindesay Highway. The Minister has already knocked back a \$4m offer from the Leader construction group, which is constructing a shopping centre in Browns Plains Road. That group offered \$4m as a third of the cost to fix up the intersection of Johnson Road, Browns Plains Road and the Mount Lindesay Highway, which will be an absolute and utter nightmare when that shopping centre opens. But because the Minister's department is short of money, it could not accept that \$4m. The department is not improving the Mount Lindesay Highway. The Minister is continually suggesting western highways. He is ignoring the main issue, that is, that the Mount Lindesay Highway should be improved so that people from Park Ridge will have access to the new road, namely, the Brisbane south route, which I support. That would provide access to the Gateway Arterial road.

Hon. D. J. HAMILL (Ipswich—Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development) (4.53 p.m.): It is interesting to note that, when the Opposition proposes a discussion in the House to talk about transport planning in south-east Queensland, the only thing Opposition members can talk about is roads. That clearly draws the line between this Government's approach to transport planning and the Opposition's outmoded approach to dealing with the needs of the people of south-east Queensland. Quite clearly, the Government's approach to transport planning contains much more than simply dealing with roads. In fact, there are four key

aspects of transport planning in south-east Queensland. Although I have only 10 minutes within which to respond to points raised in the debate, and I know that there are some members with thick heads on the other side of the Chamber, I will do my best to try to permeate their grey matter—if it does exist—on these particular points.

One point that was made very eloquently by my colleague the member for Mount Coot-tha was the proper role for roads. Without question, we need more roads in south-east Queensland. Indeed, only recently the Leader of the Opposition said, "We need more roads between Brisbane and the Gold Coast." I could not find any reason to object to that statement, although members of the Liberal Party and his other colleagues here might not necessarily share his view—or at least for political expediency they do not necessarily share his view.

Roads are important. Bypass roads—arterial links that take traffic away from suburban areas and the CBD—are also important. It is also vital that we service two other key facilities that are linked with transport infrastructure. In south-east Queensland those two key facilities are our international airport and our international seaport. Both of those are located in Brisbane on either side of the Brisbane River. If we are going to be serious about transport planning, and if we are going to be serious about managing the growth process in this corner of the State, then we need to address that particular issue.

Let us be clear about the size of the task before us. There has been no new major road development in south-east Queensland—with the exception of Stage 2 of the Sunshine Motorway—since 1988. Yet during that time the population increase in the area has been of the order of 25 per cent. I do not know whether Opposition members subscribe to the old theories of alchemy—where people could turn base metals into gold—but I can tell them something: we are not going to be able to pump all that population growth down the existing arterial corridors and expect that to service the needs—the economic needs, the social needs, the work needs and the leisure needs—of people in south-east Queensland now or into the future.

Mr Johnson: You're the Minister for Economic Development. What are you going to do about it?

Mr HAMILL: Indeed, as the Minister for Economic Development, I am telling members exactly what I am doing about it. I stand by this Government's record on infrastructure provision.

The second key element of the overall transport approach in south-east Queensland

relates to our rail network. Opposition members could not even agree whether we need a standard gauge rail link to the port of Brisbane. They could not even agree whether the port of Brisbane should be linked to the interstate national freight network—such is their vision, unity and commitment.

Mr Johnson: Who said that?

Mr HAMILL: Mr Beanland and Mr John Goss said that they opposed the standard gauge project. It was only the boy from the bush, Mr Johnson, who came rushing in like a bull at a gate and said, "We support it." Urban passenger rail transport development is also vital. That is why we are restoring a rail link to the Gold Coast. That is why trains will be running to Helensvale near Southport next year. That is why we electrified the rail link between Ipswich and Rosewood. That is why we are spending \$142m on expanding the urban rail network to increase its capacity to carry passengers in south-east Queensland by 80 per cent. That is our commitment to rail as part of the overall transport strategy.

The third element is our passenger transport review. Our reforms are designed to provide local area transport solutions to transport needs. Whilst the Liberal Party does not care what happens outside the 30 avenues of Clayfield, the 30 avenues of Kenmore or the acreages of Moggill, the people of south-east Queensland—those people who live in Caboolture, Beenleigh, Logan City, the Albert Shire and the Beaudesert Shire—have been operating without a decent public transport system. The previous Government spent 30 years as the custodian of what should have been planning for the needs of this community. But that was frittered away by this lot when they were in office. As I said, the third plank of our transport strategy is our passenger transport review. A little later this year, I will be introducing to the Parliament legislation that will activate that review.

The fourth element is policies to demand management. Where do Opposition members stand on issues such as land use planning? Their idea of land use planning is to open up more rural residential areas, which are ill served by public transport or transport infrastructure. Then they bleat and squeal when we need to provide the necessary transport infrastructure to serve that population growth. Councils need to consider issues such as where people are going to live; what sort of state people will live in; what acceptable urban densities are in south-east Queensland; how we can allow people to move about; what transport infrastructure is necessary; and how people can get to work, their places of

recreation, and so on. Transport management is important.

This Government has been accused in this place of secrecy, duplicity, deceit and lack of consultation. Let me table for the information of an ill-informed Opposition 32 documents on the public record which deal with transport planning in south-east Queensland. I know the Leader of the Opposition does not believe in reading these sort of reports, so just so he has the Readers' Digest version, I table those 32 reports and seek incorporation of their titles into *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Standard Gauge Rail Link to Fisherman Islands—Impact Assessment Study—Executive Summary.

Standard Gauge Rail Link to Fisherman Islands—Impact Assessment Study—Draft Final Report and Appendices.

Standard Gauge Rail Link to Fisherman Islands—Impact Assessment Study—Supplement to Draft Final Report.

Standard Gauge Rail Link to Fisherman Islands—Impact Assessment Study—Supplement to Draft Final Report Appendices.

Standard Gauge Rail Link to Fisherman Islands Impact Assessment Study Working Paper No 1—Flora, fauna and flood studies.

Standard Gauge Rail Link to Fisherman Islands Impact Assessment Study Working Paper No 4—Archaeological Assessment.

Standard Gauge Rail Link to Fisherman Islands—Impact Assessment Study Working Paper No 5—Landscape Evaluation.

Standard Gauge Rail Link to Fisherman Islands Impact Assessment Study Working Paper No 6—Safety and Risk Assessment.

Key Port Brisbane—Strategic Plan to 2005 and Beyond.

Brisbane International Airport Master Plan.

Coolangatta Airport—Planning for Tomorrow.

State Ports Strategic Development Plan—November 1993.

Yandina Highway Upgrading Flooding Assessment..

Brisbane Airport Master Plan 1991.

Eastern Corridor Planning Study—Executive Summary.

Eastern Corridor Planning Study—Main Report.

Yandina Highway Upgrading—Route Recommendation Report.

Nundah Community Consultation Report on Short Term Traffic Issues at Nundah.

Toowoomba Road Network Review—1991.

Caboolture Transport Study—1993.

The South East Queensland Passenger Transport Study (SEPTS)—September 1991.

Logan Road Network Study—1991.

Southern Brisbane Bypass (Gateway Arterial to Logan Motorway Sector) Environmental Impact Assessment—Final Report—January 1994.

Creating our Future—Towards a framework for growth management in South East Queensland.

Transport Position Paper—SEQ 2001 Framework for Managing Growth.

Transport—SEQ 2001.

The Regional Framework for Growth Management for South East Queensland.

Route 20 Study—Recommendation Report Executive Summary—August 1989.

Route 20 Study—Recommendation Report—August 1989.

Route 20 Study—Environmental Impact Statement—Volumes 1 and 2.

Passenger Transport—Planning for Our Future Today Brisbane/Gold Coast Regional Transport Strategy.

Mr HAMILL: The only joke is that the joke is on them. How can they brazenly come in here and say that this Government does not plan, that this Government does not consult? They run around the place and say, "There ought to be a moratorium." Should we clear a couple of other forests and prepare some more reports, or should we get on with the job of preparing south-east Queensland to cope not just with the people who are living here but the thousands more who are coming here?

This Government consults extensively, but what this Government will not do is allow some people to hide behind the term "consultation" when what they are really trying to do is to frustrate. What they are really trying to do is to play the ostrich. As Clive Bubb said, this Liberal and National Party coalition is trying to indulge in insanity, and I wonder just which one of them he was thinking of at the time he made that statement. I wonder which one was the insanity that he was really referring to. I heard a bit of insanity here this afternoon. I heard the member for Clayfield, a prodigious correspondent who writes to me about traffic congestion on Nudgee Road, on Kingsford Smith Drive, on Sandgate Road, and at Nundah and then comes in here and says that he does not want the solution. He also has the temerity to go to public meetings and say how local newspapers gave him copies of brochures and he comes in here and tells the House how he was the fence. He was the one who received stolen goods and he was the one who went out into Clayfield peddling the stolen

documents, causing great concern to residents and devaluing their property.

Mr SANTORO: I rise under Standing Order 120A, which deals with imputations of improper motives and all personal reflections.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Palaszczuk): Order! The member will resume his seat. The Chair is aware of Standing Orders. Will the honourable member come to the point that he wants to make?

Mr SANTORO: I find the comments made by the Honourable the Minister offensive and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The member shall resume his seat.

Mr HAMILL: One of the great problems with all transport planning is that there will be all sorts of propositions made to Government, some which are outrageous and some which are not, but one thing that should not be done is for a member to go out and frighten people in the way that the member for Clayfield has done.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The time for this debate has expired.

DAIRY INDUSTRY AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. E. D. CASEY (Mackay—Minister for Primary Industries) (5.03 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill for an Act to amend the Dairy Industry Act 1993."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr Casey, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. E. D. CASEY (Mackay—Minister for Primary Industries) (5.04 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

The main purpose of this Bill is to clarify the financial powers of the Queensland Dairy Authority. Honourable members will recall that the Dairy Industry Act 1993, which was enacted in June 1993, introduced a series of comprehensive reforms. These included a five year industry program to achieve:

removal from 31 December 1998 of post

farm gate milk price controls, exclusive vendor areas, powers for vesting of milk and intervention by the authority in the market; replacement of the existing processor franchise system at the end of 1995 by exclusive annual area licences until 31 December 1998, after which no such licences will be issued; and

a voluntary, industry-funded milk vendor restructuring scheme to improve vendor efficiency while maintaining a full range of services to customers.

The restructuring of milk distribution in Queensland has been successfully completed under the Distribution Restructuring Scheme. Over 90 per cent of vendors participated in this voluntary scheme, which restructured milk runs into supermarket, shop and household categories. Leases for supermarket and shop runs were sold at auction. The proceeds of the auctions, together with borrowings, were utilised by the Queensland Dairy Authority for payments to vendors who had surrendered their runs for restructuring. I am pleased to note that the scheme has been a success. The authority has reported that milk consumption continued to increase during the year, something like 2 per cent during 1993-94. The distribution sector is now structured on more commercial lines and will be better positioned to meet the challenges of the post regulation market from 1999.

The purpose of the Bill is largely procedural. All of the significant actions have been completed. The distribution sector has been restructured, payments have been made to participating vendors and financial arrangements completed. All that remains is for the borrowings to be repaid by the scheduled termination of the Distribution Restructuring Scheme at the end of 1998. I am advised that payments are proceeding according to schedule. However, given the nature of the financial arrangements, the lender has sought the statutory provisions now before this House to put beyond any doubt the authority's security as borrower. I would remind members that the scheme is entirely industry funded and does not involve contributions from the taxpayer.

These amendments are necessary to ensure the smooth operation of the remaining stages of the Distribution Restructuring Scheme and make no substantive difference to the laws or policies applying to the industry. The amendments are supported by all relevant parties. The Bill also implements small machinery amendments relating to the time period for appeals to the tribunal and procedures for the constitution of the Policy Council.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Perrett, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH
(Chatsworth—Leader of the House) (5.06 p.m.): I move—

"That the House do now adjourn."

Golden Casket Art Union Office, Blackbutt

Mr PERRETT (Barambah) (5.07 p.m.): I rise to support the right of the people of Blackbutt and district to have access to the services supplied by the Golden Casket Art Union Office. The people in that part of my electorate cannot understand why they are being denied fair access to on-line Casket products such as Gold Lotto and the Pools. They are citizens of Queensland and they believe that they should have the same access to Government services as people living in other areas, but they are becoming very disillusioned at the way the Casket Office and the Treasurer simply shrug off their pleas that the local newsagent in Blackbutt should be allowed to supply Casket services. They have become so disillusioned that the staff at the Blackbutt newsagency have collected more than 800 signatures in support of the service this Government seems determined to deny them. I will table those signatures to show the Government that the people up there are serious in their desire to be treated in the same way as other Queenslanders.

I do not accept that the Government should turn its back on a town with a population of over 1 200 people, with several hundred more living close by in smaller communities such as Benarkin. Blackbutt has the full range of retail businesses typical in a town that size and even retains that real rarity these days, a bank branch. It is ridiculous for the Casket Office to think that the area could not support a Lotto agency, but that is what the Casket Office has suggested. The Acting Manager of the Casket Office rejected an application from Blackbutt News by pointing out the requirement to demonstrate that "It can create significant new incremental lottery sales".

In that letter of refusal there was not one reference to servicing the needs of the people living in the Blackbutt area. There was no acknowledgment of the inconvenience to the people of Blackbutt in having to drive 20 kilometres to the nearest existing Lotto terminal in Yarraman. There was no feeling for the people of Benarkin, who must travel 30 kilometres. The Casket manager was interested only in profits.

Even if Casket and Lotto agencies in Blackbutt did not make the Government big profits, so what? What about service to the people in the town and district? In a democracy, the Government should provide the same levels of service to all citizens. The fact that people live in country areas should be no excuse to treat them as second-class citizens. If it is good enough for people in Brisbane to have convenient access to Lotto at virtually every newsagency, then it is good enough for the people of Blackbutt and every other part of the State. No town or district should be denied access to a Government service on the basis that the Government will not make enough profit on the deal. If there is a need, it must be met on the same terms as apply to other citizens. That is why we elect Governments and pay taxes.

Unfortunately, the Treasurer appears to agree with the "profits first" attitude of the Casket Office. When I complained to him about the treatment of the Blackbutt people, he was far less than sympathetic. In his reply, the Treasurer tried to deflect any blame for Casket Office policy away from himself. The last time I looked, he had ministerial responsibility for the Golden Casket Art Union Office. The Treasurer then went to some lengths to argue that Blackbutt was simply too small a community to be considered for on-line services. Whoever drafted the Treasurer's reply even cut Blackbutt's population to 527. I know that Labor has decimated country towns, but I can assure the Government that there are close to 1 200 people in Blackbutt. They may not be in the immediate gazetted town area but, in common with many Queensland communities, Blackbutt spreads out a little bit. The Treasurer did concede that populations in nearby communities might make up the numbers to support the necessary level of Lotto sales, but he said that possibly would not be considered until next year.

The Treasurer and the Labor Government have the wrong attitude to people in rural Queensland. It shows up in the contempt they show for providing so many basic services that their city voters take for granted. When they have to drive 30 kilometres for a Lotto entry, the people of Blackbutt and district will find it hard to accept the Labor propaganda that the Goss Government really wants to help the bush. Anyone who fell for that line would probably believe in pigs that fly.

Liberal and National Parties, Preselection

Mr NUTTALL (Sandgate) (5.12 p.m.): The latest brawl between the Liberal Party and the National Party over preselection has been

highlighted in the latest *Bulletin* magazine. The article spells out the difficulties that the coalition is having in arriving at some type of formula to select candidates to oppose the Labor Government in the 54 seats that we currently hold. The Liberal State president, Mr Bob Tucker, wants to divvy up the Labor seats around the State according to the respective strength of the coalition parties in different areas. He adds that, under the Nationals' plan, the Liberals would be left largely with the unwinnable Labor seats to contest. He said—

"We would pick up all the crap . . . It is also politically naive. You end up with the wrong brand of politics in the wrong areas."

Without wanting to tip a bucket on Mr Tucker, he needs to understand a few facts about politics and about campaigning. Firstly, there is no such thing as a safe seat. No-one who holds a seat for the ALP in Queensland takes their seat or their constituents for granted. We as a political party are well aware that members of Parliament must work hard in their electorates in order to maintain and build on the results of the previous election. Secondly, and most importantly, we do not believe that our constituents are "crap". In fact, we find the remarks quite offensive. Nor do we believe in the Liberal Party philosophy of the born-to-rule mentality. Out there in our heartland and in the marginal seats we hold, we understand the importance of voters, and we are well aware that their respect and support for their local member of Parliament comes from one simple philosophy: hard work.

One of the reasons we hold the Government benches today is that we did not look for the easy options and the easy answers. We understood that every vote, regardless of where one may live, has to be earned and not just expected. For the State leadership of the Liberal Party—a party that is in coalition with the Nationals—to imply that voters in Labor-held seats are "crap" shows contempt for the voters of Queensland and a total lack of understanding of the needs and the desires of the people of this State.

Out there in voter land, the Labor Party works on the simple formula of grassroots campaigning. We will go out there and we will tell our constituents what the Liberal Party thinks of people in Labor-held seats. We will go out there and we will tell them that they think that they are "crap". In every State election, every council election, and every Federal election, we will be out there saying, "The Liberal Party thinks you are crap."

The branch network and the current structures of the ALP serve us well, both in between and during campaigns. We strive to ensure that our feet are kept firmly on the ground and our contacts with the community groups and others within our electorate are maintained. But the most important thing of all is the respect that we have for our constituents. All Queenslanders should be appalled at the attitude which currently prevails within the coalition towards the people of Queensland.

The attitude by the Liberals to consider voters as "crap" has caused the Liberal Party to be where it is today: on the Opposition benches with nine seats—some of which are very marginal—and broke. There is certainly not a bright future for that party. One example of its born-to-rule mentality is the seat of Yeronga. That seat was once considered a safe Liberal stronghold. That seat is now held by the Labor Party with a reasonably safe margin, but it is held by the Labor Party simply because of the hard work and the grassroots campaigning. The Liberal Party in this State now has nine seats, and five of those nine seats are on the Gold Coast and the Sunshine Coast, four seats are on the north side or in the western suburbs, and there is no seat on the south side between the Brisbane River and Southport. To sum up the attitude of the coalition in a few words, it really has only two brains: one is lost, and the other is looking for it.

Currumbin Valley State School Principal

Mr QUINN (Merrimac) (5.17 p.m.): The recent appointment of a permanent principal to the Currumbin Valley State School was marked by blatant political interference by the Minister for Education in the selection and appointment process and a clear infringement of PSMC guidelines. This shameful and naked interference occurred at the direct request of the member for Currumbin, Merri Rose. The whole unsavoury episode leaves open to question how many other times the Minister has indulged himself in similar actions in other Labor electorates across the State.

The events as they unfolded expose the Minister as a bumbling incompetent, willing to subject a principal to unnecessary stress and strain in order to satisfy a Labor mate's demands. The Currumbin Valley State School has had an acting principal for the past six months. Instead of advertising the principal's position as vacant and filling the position by the normal so-called merit selection process, the Department of Education, through the relocation panel in Brisbane, decided to appoint an unattached principal to the position. The department was entitled to take

this action under the current regulations, and the permanent appointment was effective from 27 June.

This procedure was contrary to the evidence given by the Education Minister to the parliamentary Estimates committee examining the Department of Education, during which he stated that all vacant principal positions—and I repeat, "all"—would be filled by the so-called merit selection process. He made similar statements when responding to public protests about how a principal was appointed to the neighbouring Ingleside State School—also, incidentally, in the Currumbin electorate. One might remember that parents protested at that school by erecting a tent city to highlight what they believed to be shortcomings in the selection process. During this debacle, the Minister gave a public assurance that all acting principals would be automatically short-listed and interviewed when subsequent positions were going to be filled permanently.

On hearing that the department had filled the Currumbin Valley position by direct relocation of another principal rather than by the enlarged merit selection procedures expounded by the Minister, several Currumbin Valley parents began to express their concern that the acting principal, whom they thought would be excellent, would not be given a chance to apply for the position. Because of the Minister's statements at Ingleside, they were entitled to believe that such would be the case.

The threat of another embarrassing incident similar to Ingleside obviously was enough to panic the Labor Party. At the request of the member for Currumbin, Merri Rose, the appointment of the principal was revoked by the Minister on or about Monday, 4 July. That was a case of blatant political interference in the very sensitive appointment process of a school principal. The principal then worked at the regional office at Southport for the rest of the week and was informed of her appointment's cancellation on Wednesday, 6 July. A Currumbin P & C meeting, at which a departmental officer had been requested to explain the department's actions, was scheduled for the Thursday night. This was cancelled when the Minister organised a meeting between himself and that group on Friday at the regional office.

However, prior to the meeting on Friday, a large number of parents had indicated to the Minister that they supported the department's actions. Consequently, the Minister then reversed his decision and announced on Friday to the parents, in the presence of the executive director and the member for Currumbin, that the department's original appointment would stand.

In the end, the due process of the appointment was followed, but not before the Minister had displayed himself, trapped by his own ignorance on how his department operates and by his clumsy attempts to placate the naive bleatings of the member for Currumbin. Her grubby manoeuvrings for cheap political gain could have adversely affected the principal's professional career and undoubtedly had caused much personal angst to that innocent officer.

It also demonstrated the Minister's willingness to subvert the proper processes within his department by imposing his own political dictates on the administrative decisions of senior departmental officers—a scenario that would cause unease amongst all senior departmental officers. The unfortunate principal concerned has been used as a political football and deserves a public apology from both the Minister and the member for Currumbin for their contemptible actions.

Eastern Corridor

Mr BUDD (Redlands) (5.20 p.m.): I would like to place on public record my position regarding the proposed eastern tollway. That position is that I am totally opposed to both options A and B. Although I appreciate that the Minister for Transport has to take a somewhat global, long-term view, my responsibility as the member for Redlands is to represent the views of the people in the electorate of Redlands. Their position is quite clear: they do not want this road. Both the Daisy Hill Forest and the Venman Reserve are not only environmentally sensitive areas that are acknowledged as pristine koala and other wildlife habitats but they also provide a natural green belt that is used extensively for recreation.

Those of us who live in the outer metropolitan areas do so as a matter of choice. We accept long travelling hours to work, without the convenience of a rail link, because we want a quality of lifestyle for our families. I am determined to do everything that I can to preserve that lifestyle.

As the Minister for Transport is aware, I have always opposed both of these options in our private discussions prior to the public announcement. However, one of the reasons that I have decided to now speak publicly on this issue is that I am totally disgusted with the political point scoring that has gone on over the past few weeks. The Opposition members have been playing games for the sake of political mileage, and it is time that they were stopped. The Liberal member for Nerang, Mr Connor, and the National Party member for Southport, Mr Veivers, are both on public record calling for early

action to proceed with the eastern corridor as an alternative highway. As a matter of fact, only last year Mr Veivers said—

"... but I say that the needs of a few have to make way for the needs of the greater community. We must consider the whole economic picture, not just the needs of a few."

National Party member Brian Littleproud, as recently as 7 July this year, wrote of this road in his newspaper column in the *Northern Downs News*—

"Why is this colony of koalas so important?"

...

I do believe the needs of people who don't have a sealed road should be placed before a desire to preserve a small pocket of the environment in the crowded south-east corner of the state."

Opposition Leader Borbidge said—

"I have never hidden the fact that some time in the future there will be more roads between Brisbane and the Gold Coast."

He also said—

"I'm not saying that at some future time there does not have to be another corridor."

But two years ago Mr Borbidge said—

"Plans for a partial eastern corridor would be scrapped under a National Party State Government."

The Opposition members are quite cynical when it comes to telling people in my area that they will stop the road and then going back to their own electorates and arguing that the eastern tollway is needed and will go ahead. It is time that they started being honest and putting people before politics.

In case members should think that I, too, am only seeking to score political points over the Opposition on this matter, let me say further how annoyed I am at the way the Department of Transport has handled this issue. For the past four years, the department has repeatedly floated different options over a wide range of areas as a solution to resolve the traffic problems on the Pacific Highway. In putting forward these various options the department has created an enormous amount of stress and disruption in people's lives, much of it unnecessary. I have listened to the arguments put forward by the Department of Transport that, on projected growth figures, widening the Pacific Highway will not resolve the traffic problems and will increase the road danger for both motorists and maintenance workers. This may be the case but I

am not convinced that the Department of Transport has fully explored other more innovative options, such as those that have been carried out overseas, but has once again just taken the easy option of "build another road".

I have also listened to the people in my electorate and their message is quite clear. They want me to ensure that their voice and their objections are heard in this Parliament. I speak for them tonight and I give them my commitment that I will continue to oppose and vote against either of these options— whenever or wherever this issue is raised.

Yandina Highway Route

Miss SIMPSON (Maroochydore) (5.26 p.m.): Now that the State and Federal Governments have accepted without question, lock, stock and barrel, their consultant Ove Arup's report on the new Yandina highway route, it is necessary that several points are put on record for the public's safety. I am aware that engineers in the Queensland Transport Minister's department may not have briefed him that the new route that he has supported as "the best" does not come up to the latest highway design standards.

It is quite astounding that the consultants dared to propose a route that compromised motorists' safety with a less-than-minimum radius bend. At previous points in the consultancy period I questioned the consultants about this inconsistently sharp turn just south of the railway line near the Big Cow which appeared in the eastern route options but which does not appear in other route options. The eastern bend is so inconsistent with the Nambour Bypass with which it is supposed to link that it will be a future blackspot. But the consultants ignored my concerns and obviously decided that their preferred eastern option might look bad if it wiped out some more trees. Thus Ove Arup kept the below-standard bend in its plans, saved a few trees and then, ironically, went on to wipe out between eight and 10 homes, according to its plans, including an historic and beautiful turn-of-the-century Queenslander homestead. To highlight this design impact, I will quote from the Government-endorsed Route Recommendation Report—

"The recent trial speed limit increase on sections of the National Highway in Queensland to 110 per hour, has had an impact on design standards for all routes. As a consequence, wherever feasible, a minimum horizontal curve radius of 1,000 metres has been adopted. This minimum radius has also been selected to maintain

consistency with other upgraded sections of the Bruce Highway. This change has the effect of 'straightening' alignments and reducing the designer's ability to avoid particular features. At the southern end of the Eastern Routes, a minimum radius of approximately 750 metres has been retained on one curve to minimise the effect of an adjoining environmentally sensitive area."

I note that on page 47 of the final report Ove Arup stated—

"The adoption of a minimum horizontal radius curve, approximately 750 metres, at the southern extremity of the route is an integral part of the recommended scheme . . ."

Then in strong contrast on pages 45 and 46 the report says that the route meets national highway requirements. This does not add up with the report's own admission about the new route failing the most recent design standards for the higher speed limits—removing inconsistent bends with a 1 000 metre minimum radius curve.

I will mention that old Queenslander homestead because, strangely, on the cultural and heritage reports it did not even get a mention. It is a beautiful turn-of-the-century home, one of the oldest in the district. In a so-called walk-through assessment of the routes the owner of the property was never approached. He has never seen the people who did that study. They never came near him. Yet the new East 4 goes right over the top of this home that is one of the oldest in the district.

Last week a lot of old-timers were ringing me up. They were stunned by the impact upon the flood plain between the twin rivers—the North Maroochy River and the South Maroochy River. There have been at least three floods in the past 101 years that exceed the engineer's computer-generated one-in-100-year flood height. There is real concern about the impact of flooding. Some of the interchanges and roundabouts are going right through the middle of some of the water courses. I have constituents who live upstream from there. We are very concerned. One cannot get away with playing with the environment in a flood plain with the dirt embankments that the report talks about.

The new route destroys more homes, more farmlands and more jobs than the previously resumed route design. That is a fact; that is not opinion. This is a devastating route for the local cane industry, which has lost more caneland to Government resumptions than any other canegrowing region in Queensland. The fact of resumptions has to be faced. A route does exist

that was 99 per cent resumed. Land for the new route has to be resumed.

The present laws are not fair. People will be fighting for years to receive resumption compensation that is fair and adequate. For the last two years, under the current laws, people have been fighting to receive payment for roads that have been built over their properties on the Sunshine Coast. People are not receiving compensation because their properties are indirectly affected. They are subsidising the roads of Queensland, and they deserve compensation as well.

I want to mention the consultation process, because it really was callous. Now that the Government has made a decision, it still has not notified the people who will lose their homes. Those people are expected to go to their local post offices to read a map to see if the road will be built over the tops of their homes. That map shows that homes that were not marked previously as vague squiggles on a map will go. It is a terrible thing to see people treated so callously by the Government. The Government said that it had detailed plans, yet it took us over a week before we could get the plans out of the Government. What a way to treat people who have just lost their homes! What a way to treat people who have lost their properties! Now, it will be nearly three weeks by the time the Government calls a meeting for those people who have lost their homes and their properties.

The Government does not understand the stress and the terrible pain that that puts people through. I will stick up for my constituents who have been put through hell by this Labor Government, which was supposed to build the road in 1991.

Eastern Corridor

Ms POWER (Mansfield) (5.31 p.m.): Today, I would like to place on the record my strong objection to the proposed eastern tollway. I would like to stand up for my constituents in this matter because all options meet in Mansfield and have a common corridor through Rochedale and Burbank.

My constituents can be assured that I have represented them and their concerns to the Minister for Transport and the Premier. I have also explained the problems being faced with the corridor in my electorate to other Cabinet Ministers, including the Deputy Premier, the Minister for Police and Corrective Services and the Minister for Environment and Heritage.

Yesterday, I spoke of the hypocrisy of the Opposition in regard to this matter. I want to reiterate that the reason we are at this point is

that the previous Government failed to plan for the future. It is the Opposition parties that did not undertake some future road planning, nor did they provide for rail and bus alternatives. In fact, they tore up the Gold Coast rail line. To compound the problem, the Opposition parties while in Government failed to develop a regional plan for the area to meet the growth it bragged about. To add insult to injury, it did not control the local governments that have allowed development and urban sprawl to flourish, thus causing the need for infrastructure.

The evidence is mounting to support the building of the eastern corridor. I note the tabling earlier today by the Minister for Transport of all that evidence—facts such as an additional 1.12 million people in south-east Queensland in 20 years, an increase of one car per household to 1.5 cars per household from 1966 to 1992, despite a drop in population from 3.7 million in 1961 to 2.8 million in 1992. Those facts are hard to dispute. The information coming from SEQ 2001 is well documented and available. It is now on the public record.

After reading that information, which has been in members' electorate offices, I can understand the Department of Transport's quick-fix solution was a road. When I see the freeway clogged up, as occurs almost

daily—at least every time an accident happens—I can appreciate the need for alternatives. But I am not convinced that the eastern tollway is the only alternative. By itself, it is not for the long term.

I am also not going to be like the hypocrites in the Opposition. They did not provide funding to finish the Gold Coast rail line. Instead, they ripped it up. They decided to build a freeway and they turned people out of their homes. Some 400 residents of the inner southern suburbs were turned out of their homes. There were no noise barriers considered, no buffers, no relocations. It is the Labor Government that has addressed this issue for these residents.

I will not be deserting my constituents. I will not be asking them to wait 20 years for another member and another Government to protect their lifestyles. If an eastern corridor must be built, I will be insisting and ensuring that certain protection measures will be put in place for the comfort of my constituents. I will be making sure that fair compensation measures are adhered to, which is better than the previous Government ever did. I will be making sure that noise barriers are constructed. I will be making sure that there are noise buffers. I will be looking at innovative ways to build roads in the area, not just simply putting down a road because it is the easiest, but not necessarily the best, solution. I will be ensuring that we will be protecting koala habitats for the future. I will be making sure—and I do not believe that this has occurred—that a comprehensive passenger transport strategy is considered and put in place for the future. I will be making sure that we protect people's lifestyles. Above all, once this corridor is finalised, people will be able to plan their lives with confidence.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.36 p.m.