

WEDNESDAY, 22 FEBRUARY 1995

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—

Parking Stickers for Disabled

From **Mr Laming** (84 signatories) praying that action be taken to waive the \$10 fee to be paid by pensioners for the new disabled parking stickers.

Police Staffing, Mooloolaba

From **Mr Laming** (711 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take action to ensure (a) that extra police and vehicles are provided in the Mooloolaba area; (b) that the Mooloolaba Police Beat remains adequately staffed; and (c) that resources are allocated in such a way as to ensure that unacceptable behaviour is eradicated.

Juvenile Offenders

From **Mr Littleproud** (4,465 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will address flaws in the juvenile justice system by legislating for stronger penalties for juveniles who reoffend and that action be taken to make detention centres secure.

Eastlink Powerline Project

From **Mr Livingstone** (100 signatories) praying that immediate action be taken to halt the Eastlink powerline project.

Cannabis

From **Mr Livingstone** (20 signatories) praying that the statutory prohibition on the production and usage of cannabis be continued.

Bus Service, Nerang

From **Mr Livingstone** (50 signatories) praying that an open inquiry be conducted into upgrading the public bus service in the Nerang area.

Amalgamation of Albert Shire and Gold Coast City

From **Mr Livingstone** (18 signatories) praying that a referendum of ratepayers be conducted in areas affected by the proposed amalgamation of Albert and Gold Coast Shires and (a) that results of this referendum be binding on Government; and (b) that the referendum wording include a no-opinion vote.

Amalgamation of Albert Shire and Gold Coast City

From **Mr Livingstone** (7,707 signatories) praying that action be taken to ensure that the proposed amalgamation of the Albert Shire and Gold Coast City does not proceed.

A similar petition was received from **Mr Szczerbanik** (67 signatories).

Hospital, Robina

From **Mr Quinn** (3,207 signatories) praying for action to be taken to ensure that the proposed Robina hospital proceeds.

Red-Light Cameras, Sunnybank

From **Mr Robertson** (623 signatories) praying for the installation of red-light cameras at the intersection of Beenleigh and Mains Roads, Sunnybank.

Petitions received.

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

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

Agricultural Colleges Act 1994—

Proclamation—the provisions of the Act that are not in force commence 3 February 1995, No. 20

Building and Construction Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Act 1991—

Building and Construction Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 1994, No. 471

Dairy Industry Act 1993—

Dairy Industry (Market Milk Prices) Order 1995, No. 1

Electricity Act 1976—

Electricity (Articles of the Queensland Electricity Supply Industry Employees' Superannuation Scheme) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1994, No. 470

- Electricity Act 1994—
 Electricity (Electrical Articles) Regulation 1994, No. 469
 Electricity Regulation 1994, No. 468
 Proclamation—the provisions of the Act that are not in force commence at the appointed time on 1 January 1995, No. 467
- Exotic Diseases in Animals Act 1981—
 Exotic Diseases in Animals (Avian Influenza) Amendment Notice (No. 1) 1995, No. 4
 Exotic Diseases in Animals (Avian Influenza) Notice 1994, No. 484
- Fisheries Act 1976—
 Fisheries Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1995, No. 8
- Fisheries Act 1994—
 Proclamation—the provisions of the Act that are not in force commence 27 January 1995, No. 9
- Forestry Act 1959—
 Forestry Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1995, No. 12
- Fossicking Act 1994—
 Fossicking Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1995, No. 15
- Fruit Marketing Organisation Act 1923—
 Fruit Marketing Organisation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1995, No. 23
- Government Owned Corporations Act 1993—
 Government Owned Corporations (QGC Corporatisation) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1995, No. 21
 Government Owned Corporations (QTSC Corporatisation) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1995, No. 22
 Government Owned Corporations (Queensland Industry Development Corporation) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1995, No. 2
- Health Act 1937—
 Poisons Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1995, No. 29
- Indy Car Grand Prix Act 1990—
 Indy Car Grand Prix Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1995, No. 17
- Land Act 1994—
 Proclamation—section 526 and Schedule 4 (other than sections 1 and 3) of the Act commence 6 February 1995, No. 19
- Local Government Act 1993—
 Local Government (Albert, Beaudesert and Gold Coast) Regulation 1994, No. 478
 Local Government (Brisbane, Esk, Ipswich, Logan and Moreton) Regulation 1994, No. 479
- Local Government (Cairns, Douglas, Mareeba and Mulgrave) Regulation 1994, No. 480
- Local Government Finance Amendment Standard (No. 1) 1994, No. 481
- Mineral Resources Act 1989—
 Mineral Resources Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1995, No. 16
- Nature Conservation Act 1992—
 Nature Conservation (Declaration of Nature Refuges) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1994, No. 475
 Nature Conservation (Macropod Harvest Period) Notice 1994, No. 482
 Nature Conservation (Macropod Harvesting) Conservation Plan 1994, No. 476
 Nature Conservation Regulation 1994, No. 473
 Nature Conservation (Wildlife) Regulation 1994, No. 474
 Proclamation—the provisions of the Act that are not in force, other than section 85, commence 19 December 1994, No. 472
- Officials in Parliament Act 1896—
 Proclamation declaring that certain officers of the Crown liable to retire from office on political grounds are capable of being elected members of the Legislative Assembly and sitting and voting in the Legislative Assembly at the same time, No. 477
- Petroleum Act 1923—
 Petroleum (Adjustment of Pipeline Charges) Notice 1995, No. 14
- Primary Producers' Co-operative Associations Act 1923—
 Primary Producers' Co-operative Associations Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1995, No. 10
 Primary Producers' Cooperative Associations (Conversion of Association into Company) Regulation 1995, No. 11
- Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act 1926—
 Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing (Queensland Cane Growers' Organisation) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1995, No. 13
- Queensland Nickel Agreement Act 1970—
 Queensland Nickel Agreement Variation Regulation 1995, No. 26
- Revenue Laws (Reciprocal Powers) Act 1988—
 Revenue Laws (Reciprocal Powers) Regulation 1995, No. 5
- Security Providers Act 1993—
 Proclamation—the provisions of the Act that are not in force commence 17 February 1995, No. 24

- Security Providers Regulation 1995, No. 25
- Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982—
- Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements (Bankers Trust Australia Limited) Repeal Regulation 1995, No. 27
- Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements (Local Authorities) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1995, No. 28
- Sugar Industry Act 1991—
- Sugar Industry (Assignment Grant) Amendment Guideline (No. 1) 1994, No. 483
- Superannuation (State Public Sector) Act 1990—
- Superannuation (State Public Sector) Amendment of Deed Regulation (No. 1) 1995, No. 7
- Superannuation (State Public Sector) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1995, No. 6
- Traffic Act 1949—
- Traffic Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1995, No. 18
- Water Resources Act 1989—
- Water Resources (Kaywana Bore Water Area) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1995, No. 3.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Changes in Ministry

Hon. W. K. GOSS (Logan—Premier and Minister for Economic and Trade Development) (2.33 p.m.), by leave: I desire to inform the House that on 21 February 1995 Her Excellency the Governor—

- (a) Accepted the resignations of the Honourable David John Hamill, the Honourable Patrick Comben, the Honourable Kenneth William Hayward and the Honourable James Peter Elder as Ministers of the Crown;
- (b) Accepted the resignation of the Honourable Patrick Comben as an Executive Councillor; and
- (c) Appointed—
 - the Honourable David John Hamill to be Minister for Education;
 - the Honourable James Peter Elder to be Minister for Health;
 - the Honourable Kenneth William Hayward to be Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development.

I lay upon the table of the House a copy of the *Queensland Government Gazette Extraordinary* of 21 February 1995 containing the relevant notifications.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Gold Coast Indy Car Grand Prix

Hon. R. J. GIBBS (Bundamba—Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing) (2.34 p.m.), by leave: Yesterday, this House was debased by the honourable Leader of the Opposition's lurid accusations of criminal activity and corruption by people associated with the Indy car race. Each year, he seeks to destabilise this State's biggest international event which this Government uses to promote our State's fastest growing industry—tourism. Each year, he stoops lower and lower. This year, he has plunged to new depths.

Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition accused this Government and Indy management of straight-out corruption. No more serious charge can be laid. Queenslanders know all about corruption. They endured years of corruption brokered by the Cabinet of which this member was a part. This Gold Coast-based leader of a rural-based party yesterday misled this House and defamed various people in a cowardly, desperate and frenzied quest for a headline.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr GIBBS: Here it is. Let us have a look at it. One has only to look at the front page of today's *Courier-Mail* to see how successful that ploy has been. Frankly, it must send a shudder through the entire ranks of the Opposition back bench. The Leader of the Opposition took a report which queried estimates—and I stress "estimates"—for the 1994 event and deliberately contorted those figures to give the impression of a hidden \$3m loss for the 1993 event.

Mr Beanland interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Indooroopilly will cease interjecting. I warn him under Standing Order 123A.

Mr GIBBS: The Leader of the Opposition got it monumentally wrong. He misled the House. His preparation in this disgraceful matter is staggering in its sloppiness. He has shown his complete lack of credential and ability to be even considered as an alternative Premier of this State.

The Leader of the Opposition called for the Public Accounts Committee to investigate. It already did that in April of last year, with the full membership of the PAC, including the

signing by Mr Grice, Mr Santoro and Mr Elliott of a unanimous report giving Indy a clean bill of health.

Mr Santoro interjected.

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

Mr GIBBS: And the so-called secret Indy report was referred to on page 4 of the PAC report. The same page of the PAC report concludes that the Indy accounts meet prescribed accounting standards. I have to ask: is the Leader of the Opposition calling Messrs Grice, Santoro and Elliott incompetent, or does his research not extend to asking the most basic of questions of the members he appointed to the PAC?

Here is that report. It took me one phone call to obtain a copy. If so desired, I will table that report from the Auditor-General. The Auditor-General's reports are in the Parliamentary Library. I suggest that the honourable member acquaint himself with that place. The Leader of the Opposition is \$5m out—\$5m—in the total cost of the race to date. To make matters worse, his statement yesterday in the House contained a half-million-dollar error. And he is trying to lecture people on financial accountability!

Indy has been subject to the most rigorous auditing imaginable. Every dollar spent has been accounted for and the Government has kept the public well informed. We have not hidden our investment in the race, which this year will showcase the member's electorate in 128 countries, with the potential to reach a billion households. We will continue to support an event which pumps more than \$20m a year in direct spending into the member's electorate in what was once a flat spot on the tourism calendar. This is \$80m—I repeat "\$80m"—into the pay packets and pockets of the tourism industry that the Leader of the Opposition claims to represent in Surfers Paradise. His electorate has benefited from the Indy race to the tune of \$80m.

We are talking about the small-business people whom the Leader of the Opposition claims to represent—service stations, shops, newsagents, hot-bread kitchens and the like. The Ernst & Young report that this Government commissioned to estimate the Indy's value to Queensland identified a \$38m return from last year's race. That is \$150m worth of benefit to Queensland in four years.

I reiterate that the Indy event would have been several million dollars better off if the

member had not scared off potential investors with his campaign against the race. Like the tourist industry in his electorate, I remain staggered and appalled by his constant unfounded attacks.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Queensland Meat Inspection Arrangements

Hon. E. D. CASEY
(Mackay—Minister for Primary Industries) (2.40 p.m.), by leave: I take this opportunity to make public an assurance to Queensland consumers that high standards of wholesomeness and safety in meat are assured under the Queensland system of meat inspection and handling. This is timely in the light of the deep concern being felt around the country over the tragic incidence suffered by children of E-coli poisoning associated with meat in South Australia.

In that emotional climate, yesterday outside the Parliament the member for Barambah hurried to bring to light information from a butcher in Toowoomba in support of a claim that general meat inspection services in the whole of Queensland are deficient. The information took the form of documents prepared by the butcher, Mr W. Brakels, as part of quality assurance procedures which he has undertaken to follow. The documents itemised a number of problems associated with the trimming of some carcasses received at his butchery from suppliers, including the Q Meat plant in Toowoomba, during December and January last.

The Queensland Livestock and Meat Authority—QLMA—has advised that Mr Brakels did not follow through on an important undertaking under quality assurance, which was to report all problems that he had to the relevant authorities. I am informed that he made reports to the authority on two occasions during the time in question, December and January, and that action was taken in both cases. However, no further reports were registered, and I am advised that when a meat safety officer went to the premises to conduct an audit of the shop on 11 January and for another visit on 20 February, nothing was mentioned to the officer about any additional problems of carcass trimming being experienced. Instead, Mr Brakels passed this information to the member for Barambah, who placed first priority on attaching himself to sensational stories current in the news media.

The responsible action of reporting all cases to the Queensland Livestock and Meat Authority was not taken—neither by the butcher nor by the politician. A key point of the system is to provide feedback to suppliers without delay so that follow-up action can take place immediately. Reporting the problem two months later is of no benefit to public health. There is no place in such a system for political stunts. Quality assurance is internationally recognised as ensuring good, wholesome food products to consumers. The member for Barambah may like to update his own thinking on quality assurance. I therefore invite him to a detailed and patient briefing on quality assurance by officers of the Department of Primary Industries or QLMA whenever he cares to have one.

In regard to abattoirs, the inspections at domestic abattoirs are carried out by inspectors from the QLMA and at export abattoirs by inspectors engaged by the Federal body, AQIS—the Australian Quarantine Inspection Service. The same inspection standards are employed in both cases. The QLMA currently has at abattoirs 48 inspectors from its 74-member veterinary public health staff. The chairman of the QLMA, Dr Jennifer Wythes, has been very active in following up all the implications of the matters raised in Toowoomba, especially any implications for public health. To provide the best assurance, a senior officer of the QLMA is today carrying out a full review of procedures at the Q Meat Toowoomba plant, which is one of a number of suppliers to the Brakels premises. Such action was already being taken at abattoirs throughout the State on a precautionary basis since the E-coli cases first became known, and checks on procedures will continue. Dr Wythes has been in regular contact with the Queensland Abattoir Corporation and other relevant authorities and has kept me fully informed.

On the general question of meat quality in Queensland, the Goss Government has worked in close cooperation with industry to maintain the highest standards.

Mr Littleproud interjected.

Mr CASEY: So much so that the member's colleagues from other States are beating a path to our door—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Western Downs under Standing Order 123A.

Mr CASEY:—in order to get the lowdown on how things are being done in Queensland.

The first consideration of the Queensland Government is public health; the second is the protection of the reputation of our product on intensely competitive international and local markets. I want to stress that the issues raised in the Toowoomba case do not relate to the recent concerns over E-coli poisoning originating with a meat contamination episode in South Australia. The illness can be contracted from various sources apart from the consumption of meat, and I am advised that the case identified at Rockhampton has not at this stage been traced to red meat.

Animal health experts of the Department of Primary Industries have formed a group to keep a watching brief on the situation. After witnessing the work that those officers carried out in relation to the mystery horse disease, the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing knows full well the high quality of their work. A senior executive of the department and a senior officer of the QLMA have joined the national committee set up by the National Food Authority to manage information on the problem as experienced in South Australia.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Jobs Plan

Hon. M. J. FOLEY (Yeronga—Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Relations) (2.45 p.m.), by leave: Two years and five months ago, the Goss Government was re-elected for a second term with a mandate to introduce its \$150m Jobs Plan. Funded by an increase in the tobacco franchise fee, the Jobs Plan was intended to hasten the recovery of the labour market in Queensland. With the funds provided from that increase, the \$150m Jobs Plan has provided assistance to more than 68,000 Queenslanders to 31 December. Specifically, by the end of 1994, 15,800 people had been placed in jobs, 28,400 people had been placed in training and the remainder had received other assistance, including the provision of business advice.

Queensland is a leader in job creation. However, those new jobs can be elusive to the disadvantaged within the labour market, chief among them the long-term unemployed. The \$150m Jobs Plan reaches out to these people to help them break out of the unemployment cycle. They gain an opportunity to fulfil their potential. The community and the Queensland economy are the richer for them being able to do so. The Jobs Plan exemplifies what Labor in Government is all about—a fair go for all.

For the information of members, I am able to provide details of the seven programs of the Jobs Plan and the results achieved by each of those programs. Rather than take up the valuable time of the House, I seek leave to table those details and have them incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

The \$150 Million Jobs Plan assisted more than 68,000 Queensland to June 30, 1993 through:

payroll tax incentives

increases in the payroll tax threshold and extension of a rebate to employers who take on long-term unemployed people;

\$8 million Community Jobs Plan

to assist 5,000 people, particularly mature-aged long-term jobseekers, through community-based activities such as interest-free loans for unemployed people to start their own business; grants to community groups for training and job placement projects and the development of an additional five community-owned and five more enterprise centres to foster the development of small business and job creation;

\$15.2 million Safe Bikeways Program

to provide a network of bicycle paths throughout Queensland directly creating 330 jobs and more indirect jobs;

\$5 million Jobs for the Environment

600 training positions for long-term unemployed people and 200 other jobs improving national park facilities;

\$7 million Youth Jobs Plan

to assist 1,700 young people through extra training opportunities and jobs in the private and public sector, including 200 extra subsidised apprenticeships and traineeships in public sector agencies; awarding of public housing contracts to group training companies to allow them to employ apprentices; 140 training positions in an expanded Youth Conservation Corps and the appointment of 20 extra youth employment consultants across the state to help place young people in jobs and training;

\$19 million Jobs Through TAFE

to employ 500 TAFE tutors, creating 3,100 extra student places and appoint job placement officers in every college to help graduates find work;

\$60 million schools refurbishment

to spend \$60 million over two years fixing Queensland's schools, creating 1,200 jobs for unemployed people.

150 MILLION JOBS PLAN—DETAILS OF EMPLOYMENT BY PROGRAM ELEMENT SINCE JOBS PLAN IMPLEMENTATION TO 31 DECEMBER 1994

Program Element	New Jobs Created (Target)	People Placed into Jobs (Target)	People Placed into Training (Target)	People Receiving Other Assistance (Target)	Total Assisted (Target)
Payroll Tax Incentives Plan	not available	not available	not available	not available	not available
Youth Jobs Plan	1,129	2,973	3,339	2,507	7,824
Community Jobs Plan	648	3,490	7,876	11,731	21,066
Jobs Through TAFE	1,948	4,505	16,660	14,402	37,515
School Refurbishment	566	-	-	-	566
Safe Bikeways	414	-	-	-	414
Jobs for the Environment	160	-	555	-	715
Totals	4,865 (3,218)	10,968 (7,836)	28,430 (13,583)	28,640 (11,271)	68,100 (32,209)

NB: Because a client may receive multiple forms of assistance and therefore be listed in both a job column and training column, the sum of the columns may exceed the number of persons

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Draft Environmental Protection (Water) Policy

Hon. M. J. ROBSON (Springwood—Minister for Environment and Heritage) (2.47 p.m.), by leave: I am pleased to table in the House and inform members of the draft environmental protection policy for water 1995 and Explanatory Notes.

Environmental protection policies play a key role in implementing the Environmental Protection Act 1994. Environmental protection policies are subordinate legislation under the Act. The provisions of the Act require environmental protection policies to be developed through two rounds of public consultation. The first round of consultation for the draft policies was held in 1993 during the final public discussions on the Environmental Protection Bill. The release of this consultation

draft of the water EPP begins the second round of public consultation.

The Environmental Protection (Water) Policy 1995 is the first EPP under the new Act. Others will cover the management of waste, air emissions and noise. Sections with objectives, standards, definitions and regulations concerning the subject will be legally binding. Other non-regulatory sections will detail the objectives and principles of the legislation. The Explanatory Notes provide supplementary information to the draft EPP. The Explanatory Notes contain a section calling for public input to the draft Queensland Water Quality Guidelines. The draft guidelines are compatible with the national water quality standards and were developed from scientific research carried out in Queensland.

The draft water EPP challenges our way of thinking and requires us to question current practices and encourage reasonable alternatives. Many new initiatives are included in the draft water EPP, including:

- preventing the generation of waste;
- recycling and reusing waste instead of disposing it to the environment;
- minimising contaminated stormwater run-off;
- highlighting the need for the whole community and not just those regulated by Government to manage their activities to minimise environmental harm;
- requiring mandatory trade waste policies to manage the discharge of industrial wastes to sewer;
- developing programs to conserve water; and
- letting the community have a say in what values are placed on Queensland waters.

Protecting the quality of Queensland waters will require commitment from the whole community, including individuals, business, industry, farmers and all levels of government. Therefore, the consultation process will be open, public and fully accountable and will consider the interests of all members of the community so that the final, approved water EPP will reflect community wishes. Matters covered in these publications are to be discussed in a series of public meetings throughout Queensland which will be advertised in local newspapers. The community is further invited to comment on the draft water EPP, its aims and range of issues by the end of April 1995.

I seek leave to table the document.

Leave granted.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Reform of Parliamentary Procedure

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH

(Chatsworth—Minister for Housing, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Rural Communities) (2.50 p.m.), by leave: It is with pleasure that today I announce the Government's intention to place before the Parliament for its consideration sessional orders to provide for a number of significant procedural reforms. These new procedures will improve the effectiveness of question time, remove the archaic language prescribed for petitions and provide for follow-up action on petitions.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr MACKENROTH: We tried to do it through the Standing Orders but we could not get the Opposition to agree. They will also provide procedures to deal with complaints made by members of the public to the effect that they had been subjected to unfair or groundless parliamentary attacks on their good names and reputations.

PRIVILEGE

Standing Orders Committee

Mr BORBIDGE: I rise on a matter of privilege. What we have, without reference—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is no matter of privilege. The member will resume his seat.

Mr BORBIDGE: Mr Speaker, you have not heard me yet.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! It is not a matter of privilege.

Mr BORBIDGE: Mr Speaker, it reflects on the ability of members to ask questions in this place. I respectfully suggest that it also reflects on the work of the Standing Orders Committee and the fact that these proposals have not been submitted—certainly not for some four to five years—to the appropriate committee of the Parliament to which this Parliament has delegated the responsibility in respect of changes to the Standing Orders. Mr Speaker, as Chairman of the Standing Orders Committee, you have a responsibility to protect the integrity of that committee and to see that due process is observed.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition can rest assured that adequate time will be allowed for these matters to be looked at, discussed and debated in the House.

Mr BORBIDGE: It is being placed before the House for consideration now.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is no matter of privilege. The member will resume his seat.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Reform of Parliamentary Procedure

Mr MACKENROTH, continuing: Could I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that it is my intention to table it today and to allow him one month to read it. There will be no bigger committee than this whole Parliament that will decide it. I suggest that this Parliament is the supreme body that should make the decision.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition under Standing Order 123A.

Mr MACKENROTH: Mr Speaker, it is being moved as a sessional order, not a change to the Standing Orders, which would go through the Standing Orders Committee.

The key components of these reforms include: questions on notice will no longer have to be given during the time allotted for questions on each sitting day; every member will be able to ask one question on notice each sitting day; the Leader of the Opposition will continue to be able to ask two questions without notice on sitting days—all other members will be able to ask one question; an answer to a question on notice will have to be provided within 30 calendar days.

Mr Hobbs interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Warrego under Standing Order 124. There will be no clapping in the Chamber.

Mr MACKENROTH: The problem with Opposition members is that they live so far in the past they cannot see a parliamentary reform when it is being spelt out for them.

The changes also provide: rules for answering of questions; a revision of the wording and format of petitions; procedures for when formal responses to petitions are received by Ministers; the name and address of the principal petitioner will now appear on the front page of each petition so that signatories will be aware of the person and organisation sponsoring a petition; a formal mechanism which gives individuals a means by which they may, if the Parliament so determines, respond to allegations that have been made about them personally under the protection of parliamentary privilege.

This is a significant procedural reform not so much to the Parliament but for the people

whom this House represents. It is not an erosion of the privilege of freedom of speech to comments made in the Chamber.

Mr Borbidge: Censorship! What a disgrace.

Mr MACKENROTH: This would probably be the only time in history that parliamentary reform has been made where the Government has dragged the Opposition out of the past. I just cannot believe it.

This is an attempt to strike a balance between a member's rights and responsibility to inform the Parliament of concerns that they have in relation to an individual or event and the citizen's right to protect his or her reputation. This is not to suggest that a member would seek to abuse the privilege of freedom of speech to deliberately malign an innocent individual, but merely that, with the best will in the world, mistakes can and do occur. Without a means by which aggrieved individuals can seek to correct the record—and it may be just in terms of mistaken identity—that mistake may never be corrected.

This new sessional order will provide the following guidelines for a citizen's right of reply: that the procedures relate only to statements made in the Chamber; that the procedure be available to both private individuals and corporations; that the content of the reply be succinct, strictly relevant and include nothing that would aggravate the situation; that the Privileges Committee consider the submissions and, in doing so, adopt the practice of not attempting to determine the truth or otherwise of the initial allegation and subsequent response; and that a time limit of three months apply to any request by the Privileges Committee for further submissions from the citizen or corporation. The House will maintain the ultimate power of rejecting or accepting the Privilege Committee's report on the matter.

I now give notice of the motion which is being circulated to members in the Chamber and advise that it is my intention to bring this matter on for debate when the House sits again in March. I want to stress that these are only sessional orders so that the House can trial these new procedures. Finally, I want to acknowledge the contribution that Mr Speaker has made to the development of these new procedures.

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise—Leader of the Opposition) (2.57 p.m.): I seek leave to move a motion without notice that the

matters raised by the Leader of the House be referred to the Standing Orders Committee.

Question—That leave be granted—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 32—Beanland, Borbidge, Connor, Cooper, Davidson, Elliott, Gamin, Gilmore, Goss J. N., Grice, Healy, Hobbs, Horan, Johnson, Lester, Lingard, Littleproud, McCauley, Malone, Perrett, Quinn, Rowell, Santoro, Sheldon, Simpson, Stephan, Stoneman, Turner, Veivers, Watson *Tellers:* Springborg, Laming

NOES, 52—Ardill, Barton, Beattie, Bennett, Bird, Braddy, Bredhauer, Briskey, Burns, Campbell, Casey, Clark, Comben, D'Arcy, Davies, De Lacy, Dollin, Edmond, Elder, Fenlon, Foley, Gibbs, Goss W. K., Hamill, Hayward, Hollis, Mackenroth, McElligott, McGrady, Milliner, Nunn, Nuttall, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pitt, Purcell, Pyke, Robertson, Robson, Rose, Smith, Spence, Sullivan J. H., Sullivan T. B., Szczerbanik, Vaughan, Warner, Welford, Wells, Woodgate *Tellers:* Livingstone, Budd

Resolved in the **negative**.

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr LINGARD (Beaudesert—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (3.05 p.m.): I seek leave to move a motion concerning the PWC and the Brisbane Convention Centre.

Question—That leave be granted—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 32—Beanland, Borbidge, Connor, Cooper, Davidson, Elliott, Gamin, Gilmore, Goss J. N., Grice, Healy, Hobbs, Horan, Johnson, Lester, Lingard, Littleproud, McCauley, Malone, Perrett, Quinn, Rowell, Santoro, Sheldon, Simpson, Stephan, Stoneman, Turner, Veivers, Watson *Tellers:* Springborg, Laming

NOES, 52—Ardill, Barton, Beattie, Bennett, Bird, Braddy, Bredhauer, Briskey, Burns, Campbell, Casey, Clark, Comben, D'Arcy, Davies, De Lacy, Dollin, Edmond, Elder, Fenlon, Foley, Gibbs, Goss W. K., Hamill, Hayward, Hollis, Mackenroth, McElligott, McGrady, Milliner, Nunn, Nuttall, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pitt, Purcell, Pyke, Robertson, Robson, Rose, Smith, Spence, Sullivan J. H., Sullivan T. B., Szczerbanik, Vaughan, Warner, Welford, Wells, Woodgate *Tellers:* Livingstone, Budd

Resolved in the **negative**.

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr HOBBS (Warrego) (3.15 p.m.): I seek leave to move a motion without notice condemning the Government's—

Question—That leave be granted—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 32—Beanland, Borbidge, Connor, Cooper, Davidson, Elliott, Gamin, Gilmore, Goss J. N., Grice, Healy, Hobbs, Horan, Johnson, Lester, Lingard, Littleproud, McCauley, Malone, Perrett, Quinn, Rowell, Santoro, Sheldon, Simpson, Stephan, Stoneman, Turner, Veivers, Watson *Tellers:* Springborg, Laming

NOES, 52—Ardill, Barton, Beattie, Bennett, Bird, Braddy, Bredhauer, Briskey, Burns, Campbell, Casey, Clark, Comben, D'Arcy, Davies, De Lacy, Dollin, Edmond, Elder, Fenlon, Foley, Gibbs, Goss W. K., Hamill, Hayward, Hollis, Mackenroth, McElligott, McGrady, Milliner, Nunn, Nuttall, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pitt, Purcell, Pyke, Robertson, Robson, Rose, Smith, Spence, Sullivan J. H., Sullivan T. B., Szczerbanik, Vaughan, Warner, Welford, Wells, Woodgate *Tellers:* Livingstone, Budd

Resolved in the **negative**.

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Western Downs) (3:21 p.m.): I seek leave to move a motion without notice about the John Oxley Youth Detention Centre.

Question—That leave be granted—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 32—Beanland, Borbidge, Connor, Cooper, Davidson, Elliott, Gamin, Gilmore, Goss J. N., Grice, Healy, Hobbs, Horan, Johnson, Lester, Lingard, Littleproud, McCauley, Malone, Perrett, Quinn, Rowell, Santoro, Sheldon, Simpson, Stephan, Stoneman, Turner, Veivers, Watson *Tellers:* Springborg, Laming

NOES, 52—Ardill, Barton, Beattie, Bennett, Bird, Braddy, Bredhauer, Briskey, Burns, Campbell, Casey, Clark, Comben, D'Arcy, Davies, De Lacy, Dollin, Edmond, Elder, Fenlon, Foley, Gibbs, Goss W. K., Hamill, Hayward, Hollis, Mackenroth, McElligott, McGrady, Milliner, Nunn, Nuttall, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pitt, Purcell, Pyke, Robertson, Robson, Rose, Smith, Spence, Sullivan J. H., Sullivan T. B., Szczerbanik, Vaughan, Warner, Welford, Wells, Woodgate *Tellers:* Livingstone, Budd

Resolved in the **negative**.

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr JOHNSON (Gregory) (3.28 p.m.): I seek leave to move a motion without notice on the eastern corridor.

Question—That leave be granted—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 32—Beanland, Borbidge, Connor, Cooper, Davidson, Elliott, Gamin, Gilmore, Goss J. N., Grice, Healy, Hobbs, Horan, Johnson, Lester, Lingard, Littleproud, McCauley, Malone, Perrett, Quinn, Rowell, Santoro, Sheldon, Simpson, Stephan, Stoneman, Turner, Veivers, Watson *Tellers:* Springborg, Laming

NOES, 52—Ardill, Barton, Beattie, Bennett, Bird, Braddy, Bredhauer, Briskey, Burns, Campbell, Casey, Clark, Comben, D'Arcy, Davies, De Lacy, Dollin, Edmond, Elder, Fenlon, Foley, Gibbs, Goss W. K., Hamill, Hayward, Hollis, Mackenroth, McElligott, McGrady, Milliner, Nunn, Nuttall, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pitt, Purcell, Pyke, Robertson, Robson, Rose, Smith, Spence, Sullivan J. H., Sullivan T. B., Szczerbanik, Vaughan, Warner, Welford, Wells, Woodgate *Tellers:* Livingstone, Budd

Resolved in the **negative**.

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

Mrs McCAULEY (Callide) (3.35 p.m.): I seek leave to move a motion concerning the Goss Government's de facto policy of regionalisation by amalgamation—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members have been in this Chamber for some years now. I suggest they ought to understand that at this juncture they can only seek leave to move a motion without notice. I ask members to uphold that Standing Order. I suggest that the member for Callide do that right now.

Mrs McCAULEY: I have done it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will move the proper motion, otherwise I will not put the question.

Mrs McCAULEY: I seek leave to move a motion without notice.

Question—That leave be granted—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 32—Beanland, Borbidge, Connor, Cooper, Davidson, Elliott, Gamin, Gilmore, Goss J. N., Grice, Healy, Hobbs, Horan, Johnson, Lester, Lingard, Littleproud, McCauley, Malone, Perrett, Quinn, Rowell, Santoro, Sheldon, Simpson, Stephan, Stoneman, Turner, Veivers, Watson *Tellers:* Laming, Springborg

NOES, 52—Ardill, Barton, Beattie, Bennett, Bird, Braddy, Bredhauer, Briskey, Burns, Campbell, Casey, Clark, Comben, D'Arcy, Davies, De Lacy, Dollin, Edmond, Elder, Fenlon, Foley, Gibbs, Goss W. K., Hamill, Hayward, Hollis, Mackenroth, McElligott, McGrady, Milliner, Nunn, Nuttall, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pitt, Purcell, Pyke, Robertson, Robson, Rose, Smith, Spence, Sullivan J. H., Sullivan T. B., Szczerbanik, Vaughan, Warner, Welford, Wells, Woodgate *Tellers:* Livingstone, Budd

Resolved in the **negative**.

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr STONEMAN (Burdekin) (3.42 p.m.): I seek leave to move a motion without notice condemning Minister Warner—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! This is the last time I am going to say this. The honourable member will seek leave to move a motion without notice.

Mr STONEMAN: Those were the words I used, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. I will put the question. I ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to ring the bells for two minutes. I know that they are normally rung for four minutes, but in my view that is a waste of the time of the House.

Question—That leave be granted—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 32—Beanland, Borbidge, Connor, Cooper, Davidson, Elliott, Gamin, Gilmore, Goss J. N., Grice, Healy, Hobbs, Horan, Johnson, Lester, Lingard, Littleproud, McCauley, Malone, Perrett, Quinn, Rowell, Santoro, Sheldon, Simpson, Stephan, Stoneman, Turner, Veivers, Watson *Tellers:* Laming, Springborg

NOES, 52—Ardill, Barton, Beattie, Bennett, Bird, Braddy, Bredhauer, Briskey, Burns, Campbell, Casey, Clark, Comben, D'Arcy, Davies, De Lacy, Dollin, Edmond, Elder, Fenlon, Foley, Gibbs, Goss W. K., Hamill, Hayward, Hollis, Mackenroth, McElligott, McGrady, Milliner, Nunn, Nuttall, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pitt, Purcell, Pyke, Robertson, Robson, Rose, Smith, Spence, Sullivan J. H., Sullivan T. B., Szczerbanik, Vaughan, Warner, Welford, Wells, Woodgate *Tellers:* Livingstone, Budd

Question resolved in the **negative**.

ROYAL QUEENSLAND BUSH CHILDREN'S HEALTH SCHEME

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Keppel) (3.47 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I am delighted to be able to speak in the Parliament this afternoon on this very important—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! What is the member's motion?

Mr LESTER: I move—

"That this House calls on the Government to institute an independent inquiry into the Royal Queensland Bush Children's Health Scheme, in particular, to establish why homes operated under this scheme at Yeppoon and Townsville have been closed and why the Hervey Bay home will close soon.

Further, that the House requires that such inquiry examine the role of the Royal Queensland Bush Children's Health Scheme and what effect the State Government's new funding requirements have had on this scheme's operations

and clarify the situation with money donated over time by charities that now want this donated money returned."

The Royal Queensland Bush Children's Scheme has been operating very successfully for a long period. More than 30,000 young people have been assisted by the scheme.

Mr Stephan interjected.

Mr Elliott interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Gympie and the member for Cunningham! If I were the member for Keppel, I would complain to his colleagues who are interjecting. I cannot hear the member.

Mr LESTER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I believe that my colleagues are concerned about the Premier leaving the Chamber for this important debate.

The State Government's new funding requirements and the fact that some homes operated under the scheme have closed or are about to close give rise to concern on the part of people in coastal Queensland—where the homes have operated so effectively for so many years—and on the part of people in the bush who are assisted by the scheme. For many years, children from the bush who cannot access the types of facilities enjoyed by those in coastal areas or children who have health problems have been able to visit and be looked after in the homes located on the coast and operated under the scheme.

The scheme has many wonderful aspects. It has provided children from the bush with an excellent opportunity to mix with children who live in coastal regions. Many children who live in the bush have never seen the sea, and under the scheme they can enjoy that experience. Under the scheme, for a short period children from the bush can attend another school, which enhances their knowledge base. The children involved in the scheme can be examined from a mental and physical health perspective. If any child is being abused or molested in any way, such problems can more easily be identified by qualified people outside the children's home environment.

For many years, the Royal Queensland Bush Children's Health Scheme had been operating extremely effectively. Until 1987, the scheme had been funded by donations to the organisation and by assistance from the Federal Government.

In about 1987, the responsibility was transferred to the State Government, which is why difficulties have now arisen. We cannot

work out what is going on. The homes at Townsville and Yeppoon have been closed, and the home at Hervey Bay is going to be closed as well.

One major point of concern is that, according to Glenda Keeshan of the Bush Children's Health Scheme, it is the Government's fault. She claims that the reason for that is that the Government has put new funding guidelines into place. The Government now pays a subsidy to the home according to bed numbers. In addition, the Government used to pay the railway fares for these children to come to the coast and participate in the scheme. The State Government has stopped that funding, and that is not good enough. I think it should be condemned for that action. The Government has removed that funding and now provides funds only according to bed numbers. That is not good enough. All of that information is provided in a letter that Ms Keeshan has written to me.

A Government member: The executive committee made that decision.

Mr LESTER: Of course the executive committee made that decision because of the funding rules laid down by the State Government. That is the reason. The Government should not blame the organisation.

Mr Elder interjected.

Mr LESTER: The member is just learning. He is in a new portfolio and he does not know much about it. That is his problem. This is typical of this Government. When something goes wrong and the sugar hits the fan, the Government wants to blame everyone but itself. It will not get away with it this time because I have the letters and I will table them tomorrow. I referred to those letters in my speech during the Adjournment debate last night.

We have to get to the bottom of this problem. The Government will turn around and say that an audit carried out by Ernst and Young claims that the Royal Bush Children's Health Scheme has a credit of over \$5m. For God's sake, what is going on? The people who have donated money over a long period want to know what on earth is going to happen to that money. The Lions Clubs in Emerald and Yeppoon, and other clubs from all over the place, have raised a great deal of money. Thousands and thousands of dollars have been raised by organisations that support this scheme. However, the Bush Children's Health Scheme staff tell me that the

Government has said that funding will not be provided unless it sends people into the bush.

The Government also wants to do away with what is called institutionalised care. I want to know what the Government is on about. In one instance it wants to close down the Bush Children's Health Scheme because it says that this home/institution type care is not needed, yet on North Keppel Island the Education Department is introducing institutional-type care so that people can stay on the island and learn more about the environment. So what the Government is doing on North Keppel Island is the complete opposite to what it is doing for the children who participate in the Royal Bush Children's Health Scheme. This Government wants to kick the bush people in the tummy, while at the same time it wants to look after the academics and give them five-star institutional accommodation on North Keppel Island so that they can increase their knowledge of the environment. The Government will have to decide what it is going to do. It cannot have one rule for one person and another rule for another; it is not good enough.

I want to make myself abundantly clear. The Opposition wants an investigation into this issue. We want to know what is going on. I believe that the Government will not have the courage to instigate an investigation because a lot of things have happened in relation to the Royal Bush Children's Health Scheme about which nobody seems to know too much. When a public meeting was called in Yeppoon, which people from Hervey Bay attended, the people were very unhappy about what was going on. They wanted to know what the Government was up to concerning the Royal Bush Children's Health Scheme.

People are also very unhappy that the committee does not appear to have consulted at all with the locals who, over time, have raised a great deal of money for this scheme. If the Government wanted to change the scheme, it obviously should have consulted with everybody and tried to work it all out. But there was just an announcement without any consultation. If Government members think for one minute that sending social workers and health therapists out into the bush, to places such as Mount Isa, Longreach, etc., will solve the problem, I will tell them now that it is not going to work because they will not be able to employ them. Has that ever occurred to the Government? Such people will just not be available. There have already been resignations from the Royal Bush Children's Health Scheme.

Mr Mackenroth interjected.

Mr LESTER: Instead of carrying on, the Minister for the bush should fix the problem. What is he going to do about it? He should be on my side. He should not be carrying on, trying to be all things to all people. He should get out there and do his job; he should look after the people in the bush and fix this problem.

If a child has been molested by its parents, a social worker going spasmodically into the home is not going to get the real truth of what is happening by talking to the child when two parents are looking over the social worker's shoulder. That will not work. Also, the Government will not be able to get the qualified people to stay in the bush. What will happen at the next Budget when the Government is a bit short of money? It will cut out funding for social workers in the bush.

A Government member interjected.

Mr LESTER: The Government has cut out funding for everything else in the bush; it will cut this out, too.

Why on earth does the Government want to do away with this scheme? In the end, where will this money go? What I want to know is what will happen with the proceeds from the sale of these homes? Will the proceeds from the sale of the homes at Hervey Bay, Yeppoon and Townsville go into Government coffers to prop up some union heavies; will it go to build the tunnel for the koalas in the south-east corner; or will it prop up some of the Labor members' campaigns at the next election? This is bush money that should be going to the bush. The Government seems to be the one that has put the bogey on it. At least when the National Party was in Government it gave money to the Royal Bush Children's Health Scheme to do with as it wished, and it was doing a heck of a good job.

Some people will try to argue that it is a good thing to be able to send social workers into the bush, that times and needs are changing. I think we should forget about some of these changing times and get on with what works. Over time, the Royal Bush Children's Health Scheme has worked well. I thought the fact that disadvantaged children could be brought down to the seaside, live in a different environment, have their health checked and given some assistance was a very good thing. A large number of children have been through that scheme—over 30,000 of them—and they have done very well. The odd social worker, health worker or paediatrician flitting around—when you can get one—will not be able to do the same job.

Without repeating myself, I want to make it very clear that the whole thing is a sham. The Opposition wants this inquiry. We want it to be a totally independent inquiry, not some cover-up that will make the Government look good. People want open, accountable, honest government. This Government should do the right thing. It should hold an inquiry and appoint an independent person to conduct it. The inquiry should be independent and open, so that everybody can have a go and everybody knows what is being said. That is the reason why I have moved this motion.

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Western Downs) (3.59 p.m.): I rise to second the motion and to support the arguments put forward by the honourable member for Keppel. I first became involved in this issue as the shadow Minister for Family Services when I was contacted by people associated with the home at Yeppoon who expressed to me the same sentiments as were expressed to Mr Lester. I made inquiries of officers of the Department of Family Services. It would seem that, at that particular time, they, too, were concerned. That being the case, I was amazed that the Minister for Family Services had not stepped in. My understanding is that this residential situation was depended upon by country families. It was a place where children could live so the Family Services Department could provide various types of counselling required. To date, I understand that nothing has been done by the Family Services Department with regard to the provision of these sorts of services to the children who would normally go to Yeppoon.

I also support the comments made by the honourable member for Keppel and share his concern that the new system of welfare workers travelling through the bush and helping the people will break down. Sure, things have changed in the bush. In the past, children had to be brought to the seaside so that they could access medical services. That is no longer the case. However, the broad spread of people throughout Queensland makes it almost impossible for welfare workers to have contact with people in places such as Normanton, Cloncurry, Monto and Yuleba. Abuse, neglect and health problems occur not only in the far-western parts of Queensland but throughout rural Queensland. Those needs still exist, whether one is 50 miles from Gladstone or 50 miles from Rockhampton. The Government will find that model very difficult to maintain.

As shadow Minister for Family Services, a more important matter to me is the home at Hervey Bay that is to be closed in March or

April this year. That home accommodates 18 young people who are profoundly intellectually disabled. When I say "profoundly intellectually disabled", I mean that their condition requires constant medical care. By law, people who need medical care because they have that type of disability must have their medication administered only by a qualified medical practitioner or a qualified nurse. As well, their disability is such that in many cases they must spend most of their days lying down. They must be washed, they must have their toilet requirements attended to, and they must be turned over to prevent bed sores. They need constant care.

The parents of those young people who currently reside at the Hervey Bay Bush Children's Home have attempted to contact the Minister, but she has refused to respond. So they contacted me. I have made repeated requests for the Minister to contact those parents and tell them exactly where their young people will be placed when that home closes. Despite those requests, the only assurance that I have received from a spokesman for the Minister is that no child will be put at risk. That is a pretty empty promise to the parents of severely disabled children who know that disabled people need 24-hour care. The statement that no child will be put at risk is not very comforting.

Departmental officers have told me that, recently, Cabinet gave \$770,000 or thereabouts to the Department of Family Services specifically to handle this situation. The department was advised that the Hervey Bay Royal Bush Children's Home was to be closed down and that it would need that sort of money to accommodate those 18 people and access the necessary services. Together with the families of those children, I have pleaded with the Minister for information, including exact details as to where those children will be put and what services will be available. The latest information I have received is that neither the department nor the Minister has been able to tell those people exactly what they want to hear. I support the motion moved by the honourable member for Keppel for an inquiry into this matter.

I wish to talk further about inquiries. I certainly hope that the honourable member for Keppel did not ask that an inquiry be set up by the Minister for Family Services. Earlier today in this House, I gave notice of a motion in relation to an inquiry that was set up by the Minister for Family Services, which was done by someone unknown to Opposition members. The Minister received a report, but

she will not show it to members of this House and will not comment on it at all.

Mr MACKENROTH: I rise to a point of order. This has no relevance to the motion before the House.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: It is quite appropriate. I can talk about——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Keppel to give me a copy of his motion so that I can check whether this issue is relevant. The honourable member is digressing.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: Mr Speaker, I shall explain my point. The member for Keppel called for an inquiry, and I commented on who should conduct that inquiry. I suggested that, because of the poor performance of the Honourable the Minister for Family Services in the handling of the John Oxley Youth Detention Centre matter, to which I referred earlier today, she not be given responsibility for the carriage or organisation of that inquiry. Her performance was quite appalling.

Earlier today, I made the point that the House should censure the Premier because, prior to the election in 1989, he gave a grand promise to the people of Queensland that the Labor Party would have open and accountable government. I support the motion moved by the honourable member for Keppel. The Opposition wants an open and independent inquiry, not one that is run by a Government department, and especially not one that is run by the Minister for Family Services.

As to that figure of \$770,000 which was allocated by State Cabinet to compensate for the closure of that home at Hervey Bay and to look after those 18 young people who are profoundly disabled intellectually—the policy of this Government, as it empties out the Challinor Centre and the Basil Stafford Centre, is to allocate \$80,000 per resident per year for three years while those disabled people are relocated into the broader community. That would create an enormous anomaly, because 100,000 carers throughout Queensland now look after their own relatives in their own homes. Many of those people receive nothing like \$80,000 per year to look after their intellectually disabled siblings. There is an anomaly, and those people are anxious to be treated fairly and given some support.

On Sunday, in Townsville, I attended a meeting at which the member for Thuringowa spoke on behalf of the Government. He would acknowledge that people at that meeting talked about the total inadequacy of only 35 hours per week in support from the

Department of Family Services for those people with intellectual disabilities. The member would recall that people at that meeting said that, in some cases, the level of disability amongst the people for whom they care is such that the existing support was completely inadequate.

People who want to look after their own relatives face all sorts of other anomalies. They are very concerned about the push that is afoot within the Department of Family Services. People talk about the right of disabled persons to live independently in the community. That is a grand thought. One can put one's hand over one's heart and say, "Yes, it is a good idea." However, when one starts thinking about the cost and the practicality of it, the practicality is that one must maintain medical care and care for day-to-day living. One must also be responsible for supervising those people in their day-to-day living skills. Those people are subject to abuse.

This matter was raised recently in articles in Gold Coast newspapers, which stated that the number of people looking for crisis housing has increased and that among those people—shame, oh shame, on Queensland—are young people with intellectual disabilities. I fear that this very thing could happen to those people in Hervey Bay. Perhaps some of those people at Yeppoon also come within this category. We have a very serious situation on our hands. It is all right for Government members to postulate strategies of integrating those people into the wider community, giving them a good chance in life and saying that they have a right to live independently. We also have a responsibility to make sure that they are safe and supervised so that people cannot abuse them.

I fully support the motion that an independent inquiry be held into what is going on. In particular, I ask the Minister: why were those people in Yeppoon not told about the decision to close that home? How were all those local organisations allowed to raise money and hand it across to the Royal Bush Children's Home when all those proceeds will probably become part of the sale and go elsewhere? Why was it that, when officers of the Department of Family Services said that they, too, were worried about the closure of that centre, the Minister did not step in and say what she would do about it? The Opposition has concerns about what will happen to those profoundly intellectually disabled people in Hervey Bay. A report must be made, not by the Minister but by someone

who is quite independent and will report to the House.

Hon. A. M. WARNER (South Brisbane—Minister for Family Services and Aboriginal and Islander Affairs) (4.10 p.m.): I am delighted to take this opportunity to clarify a very serious confusion in the minds of Opposition members. First of all, the Leslie Wilson home at Hervey Bay, which is run by the Bush Children's Health Scheme, is funded and supported by my department. The home in Yeppoon is funded by the Health Department. As to Government policy in relation to funding of the residential facilities at the Royal Bush Children's Home in Yeppoon—

Mr Littleproud: I wrote to you weeks ago. How come you haven't sent me back a letter?

Ms WARNER: Because the honourable member's letter probably made as much sense as he made when he spoke in the debate.

In respect of Yeppoon—the Queensland Health Department has not changed its decisions on the funding. The administrators of the Royal Bush Children's Health Scheme are entitled to make decisions on the services they provide; that is their entitlement. That independent facility is not controlled by the Government in any totalitarian way—as members opposite are suggesting.

As to the Leslie Wilson Home in Hervey Bay—the community in Hervey Bay, the fundraising committee in Hervey Bay and the management committee of the Bush Children's Home are unanimous in their agreement that the present policy of the Leslie Wilson Home, namely, to divert its resources to provide residences for individuals who have a disability, is appropriate. It is inhumane to try to make individuals fit the needs of services rather than services fit the needs of individuals.

Through individualised and focused funding, which the Leslie Wilson Home supports, it has decided to take away its institutionalised facility and redirect its services to where people actually live. I would have thought that members opposite, many of whom represent people in the bush, would believe that was reasonable. That policy allows people from the bush to access services in the bush and not have to move to the coast to avail themselves of those services which, more appropriately, should be available locally in order to keep families together—another of the Opposition's great stalwarts.

We need to support those people in their homes rather than dragging children out of their homes and putting them into institutions. That view is supported by everybody in Hervey Bay. Mrs Fraser of the fundraising committee informed the media that Mr Littleproud was playing politics and that he should stay out of it because he did not understand the issue.

Mr Littleproud interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! For the last time, I warn the member for Western Downs under Standing Order 123A.

Ms WARNER: The member did not understand the issue, and he was causing trouble and confusion. It is clear that today the National Party used a strategy in this House. I am not quite sure what that strategy was. It was confused. The National Party got caught out on this issue. This debate has exposed a complete lack of understanding amongst Opposition members of the situation in Hervey Bay and Yeppoon and as to which department is responsible and how the funding is administered.

This Government is magnanimous. It is large hearted, and it is insisting that appropriate services are made available. To that end, we have allocated a further \$770,000 to the Leslie Wilson Home to ensure that it continues to provide services on an individual case-by-case basis for those people who have suffered for so long in institutions.

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth—Leader of the House) (4.14 p.m.): I move—

"That the question be now put."

Question put; and the House divided—

AYES, 52—Ardill, Barton, Beattie, Bennett, Bird, Braddy, Bredhauer, Briskey, Burns, Campbell, Casey, Clark, Comben, D'Arcy, Davies, De Lacy, Dollin, Edmond, Elder, Fenlon, Foley, Gibbs, Goss W. K., Hamill, Hayward, Hollis, Mackenroth, McElligott, McGrady, Milliner, Nunn, Nuttall, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pitt, Purcell, Pyke, Robertson, Robson, Rose, Smith, Spence, Sullivan J. H., Sullivan T. B., Szczerbanik, Vaughan, Warner, Welford, Wells, Woodgate *Tellers:* Budd, Livingstone

NOES, 32—Beanland, Borbidge, Connor, Cooper, Davidson, Elliott, Gamin, Gilmore, Goss J. N., Grice, Healy, Hobbs, Horan, Johnson, Lester, Lingard, Littleproud, McCauley, Malone, Perrett, Quinn, Rowell, Santoro, Sheldon, Simpson, Stephan, Stoneman, Turner, Veivers, Watson *Tellers:* Laming, Springborg

Resolved in the **affirmative**.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The question now is that Mr Lester's motion be agreed to.

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

AYES, 32—Beanland, Borbidge, Connor, Cooper, Davidson, Elliott, Gamin, Gilmore, Goss J. N., Grice, Healy, Hobbs, Horan, Johnson, Lester, Lingard, Littleproud, McCauley, Malone, Perrett, Quinn, Rowell, Santoro, Sheldon, Simpson, Stephan, Stoneman, Turner, Veivers, Watson *Tellers:* Laming, Springborg

NOES, 52—Ardill, Barton, Beattie, Bennett, Bird, Braddy, Bredhauer, Briskey, Burns, Campbell, Casey, Clark, Comben, D'Arcy, Davies, De Lacy, Dollin, Edmond, Elder, Fenlon, Foley, Gibbs, Goss W. K., Hamill, Hayward, Hollis, Mackenroth, McElligott, McGrady, Milliner, Nunn, Nuttall, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pitt, Purcell, Pyke, Robertson, Robson, Rose, Smith, Spence, Sullivan J. H., Sullivan T. B., Szczerbanik, Vaughan, Warner, Welford, Wells, Woodgate *Tellers:* Budd, Livingstone

Resolved in the **negative**.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Gold Coast Indy Car Grand Prix

Mr SANTORO (Clayfield—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (4.26 p.m.), by leave: Earlier today, the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing misrepresented me and other Opposition members of the Public Accounts Committee. During his ministerial statement the Minister said—

"The so-called secret Indy report was referred to on the same page of the PAC report."

Implied in this statement is the suggestion that members of the PAC—

Mr GIBBS: I rise to a point of order. I did not make that statement—that it was referred to the Public Accounts Committee—at all. I ask that that statement be withdrawn. That was not what I said in this House.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr SANTORO: Mr Speaker, I have quoted precisely from the Minister's ministerial statement, and I say again that the so-called secret—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have asked the member to withdraw.

Mr SANTORO: I withdraw that statement, but the statement that I have just quoted is directly from the Minister's ministerial statement. Implied in this statement is the suggestion that members of the PAC had been given copies of this report. That is simply not true. I wish to table a letter from the Chairman of the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee to the Minister for

Tourism, Sport and Racing within which he states—

"During Question Time on Wednesday 1 September 1993 you advised the House that, within two weeks, you were expecting a report on the previous Board of Management's financial and management practices.

I would appreciate a copy of this report being made available to the Committee, as I believe matters raised in the report will answer some of the Committee's questions in relation to the Gold Coast Indy Car Grand Prix."

I table that letter.

During the divisions that have occurred in this place, I have sought the advice of the Executive Research Officer of the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee, who informs me that the now infamous report titled Indy Event Commercial Review September 13, 1993, which was tabled yesterday, was not in the material tabled in the Parliament in conjunction with the report titled Gold Coast Motor Events Co—Indy Car Grand Prix. I further table the reply—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I suggest—

Mr SANTORO: I am coming to the point.

Mr SPEAKER: The member ought to be saying how he has been misrepresented on this issue.

Mr SANTORO: Mr Speaker, I am saying that precisely. I table the reply of the Minister to the letter of the Chairman of the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee. Honourable members will note from even a casual scrutiny of the letter that there is no indication that the report was sent to the committee. I contend—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! How was the member misrepresented?

Mr SANTORO: The point is that I contend that the parliamentary committee was never sent this report by the Minister as requested by the Chairman of the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee and that if it was—

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

Mr SANTORO: Mr Speaker, I have almost finished. I contend that the parliamentary committee was never sent this report by the Minister as requested by the Chairman of the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee and that, if it was, there

is no reference to it in correspondence; that, if it was, it has never been made available to Opposition members of the committee.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Gold Coast Indy Car Grand Prix

Mr BORBIDGE: In directing a question to the Minister for Tourism, I refer to a signed letter from Gold Coast Indy Car Grand Prix Chairman, Mr Ron Richards, to the then general manager of the event, Mr Bob Minnikin, dated 6 June 1993, which I now table. This letter offers a \$50,000 bonus payment to Mr Minnikin. I ask the Minister: why did the Indy board propose the \$50,000 payment for Mr Minnikin—the bonus payment—for sponsorship acquisition duties clearly related to his responsibilities as general manager and on top of his generous salary? Was the Minister aware of this extraordinary arrangement, which included consideration being given to paying the money through a Minnikin consultancy company? Did the Minister approve of the payment?

Mr GIBBS: The fact is that Mr Minnikin was always retained by the Indy board on a consultancy basis. He was never ever a full-time employee of the Gold Coast Motor Events Corporation. I repeat: it was always on a consultancy basis. As far as I am aware, this is a commercially negotiable situation, which the—

Mr Borbidge: \$50,000 extra. Bye, bye, Bob, here's \$50,000.

Mr GIBBS: The Leader of the Opposition is like a desperate person grasping at straws. The reality is that, because he made such a fool of himself over this whole matter, because of his monumental stuff-up in this Parliament yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition has had to come in here today to save some face in front of his backbenchers. I will answer his question, but for the information of members of this Parliament I will reiterate exactly what was said by the Leader of the Opposition in this Parliament yesterday. The Leader of the Opposition said—

"The due diligence report . . . points to an alleged multimillion-dollar fiddle of the accounts of the 1993 event"—

and therein lies the crux of it—

"to produce a more politically palatable result—a result presented by Indy management as some \$3m better than it ought to have been in the view of the report team."

That is not only arrant nonsense—

Mr Borbidge: Out of the report.

Mr GIBBS: No, it is not out of the report. The honourable member has totally misrepresented what the report said. I commissioned the due diligence report in a letter that I sent to then Chairman—

Mr BORBIDGE: I rise to a point of order. My question related to an undisclosed \$50,000 pay-out to Mr Minnikin, whether the Minister knew about it, and whether he approved of it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister.

Mr GIBBS:—of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation by way of a letter dated 30 August 1993—in other words, after the 1993 event had taken place in March of that year. Here are the Auditor-General's reports for the Indy event in 1993 and also 1994, which not only give it a clear bill of health but also speak about the fact that management changes and so on have been implemented.

What the Leader of the Opposition blatantly set out to do yesterday was to give the false impression that \$3m had suddenly been "scammed" or creamed off the top and that it had disappeared somewhere. The point that the Leader of the Opposition completely missed was that the report that I commissioned related to the business practices of what could happen to the event in 1994. Three million dollars never ever disappeared from anywhere, and that is the allegation that the honourable member made.

The due diligence report that I asked for in relation to the 1994 event revealed that it had underestimated its budget by some \$3.4m. It had underestimated that, and because of that underestimation I made sure that new management practices were put in place. New management was brought in—the whole box and dice—which substantially reduced the investment of the Government in last year's event and which will again substantially reduce the Government's investment this year.

I will return to the question that the member has asked. As I said, the reality is that Minnikin was taken on on a consultancy basis. The negotiations between the board of Indy, the chairman and Minnikin are, as I have said, of a commercial nature. I understand that Mr Minnikin believed that he was worth more than he was being paid for the event. As far as I am aware, the board made a decision that in order to extract a better performance from him—or anybody else, but particularly in his case—he would be offered an incentive

based on performance, that is, if he was able to bring in additional sponsorships from the corporate sector, he would be rewarded for doing so. That is a normal business and commercial practice and, quite frankly, I find nothing objectionable with it.

Gold Coast Indy Car Grand Prix

Mr BORBIDGE: In directing a further question to the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing, I refer to—so far, anyway—the failed employment by the Indy of the IMG company to head-hunt sponsors for the 1995 event, and I ask the Minister: what is the commission payable to IMG for sponsors it achieves for the event? Is the figure on an escalating scale? Can IMG earn on sponsorships a commission as high as about one-third of all dollars raised?

Mr GIBBS: In relation to the negotiated position with IMG, I think it should be recognised that IMG has a reputation worldwide—and an excellent one at that—for being able to tap into corporate dollars. It was brought in to replace the firm—I think somebody has leaked information to the honourable member about Barns Dyer—which formerly had that job. In my opinion, it certainly did not deliver to the degree that was required.

This year, as a result of IMG, we are 500 per cent up—and I repeat "500 per cent up"—on ticket sales already. We are \$1.2m further advanced on budget as a result of the platinum sponsorships taken out by corporate sponsors throughout Australia.

Mr Borbidge: What's the commission?

Mr GIBBS: I will come to the honourable member's question. I will repeat what I said on ABC television last night, where the Leader of the Opposition performed so abysmally. This will be a decision that the people of Surfers Paradise have to start to make. It simply comes down to this: it is Borbidge or the Indy. I will tell honourable members why I make that statement. If the Gold Coast wants to keep this event, it has to realise that this fellow makes it increasingly difficult for Government, in particular for myself, for organisations such as IMG and for the Indy management team. When we speak to potential corporate sponsors, the reality is—

Mr BORBIDGE: I rise to a point of order. I say to the Minister: never mind about the threats; tell us about the commission.

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

Mr GIBBS: We can tell by the look on his face that he has been biting the carpet all

night from frustration. As I said, when we speak to potential corporate sponsors, they react by saying, "Look, we would love to be involved in this event, but we don't want to get tied up in a political bunfight. The Leader of the Opposition in Queensland and his party supporters keep wanting to wreck this event." The Leader of the Opposition has to understand that it is about time that his electorate made a decision. I will be calling on people to stand up and be counted; it is either the Leader of the Opposition or the Indy.

In relation to IMG—again, this is a commercially negotiated situation. It is one which will appear in the books of Indy when they are audited. When they are audited, the Opposition will be made fully aware of what it is.

Mr Borbidge: You are not going to tell us?

Mr GIBBS: No, at this stage I will not reveal that. I will wait until the books come out.

Let me tell the House how the Leader of the Opposition suddenly got onto this point. After the interview on the 7.30 *Report* last night, the interviewer, Mr Margan, said, "The Liberal Party in New South Wales never seems to want to reveal what organisations such as IMG or those organisations involved with public moneys get paid on commission rates." My reply to him was, "That is something that we are addressing." Mr Borbidge walked out of there last night and thought, "What a good idea! I will ask a question on this in the Parliament tomorrow." This is about as original as Mr Borbidge's idea of original sin. He has no idea. Those figures will be revealed in the audited books at the time I choose to table them in this Parliament.

Job Creation

Mr LIVINGSTONE: I refer the Treasurer to claims by the Leader of the Opposition in the weekend *Gold Coast Bulletin* of 4 February that more jobs were created in the last five years of the Joh Bjelke-Petersen National Party Government than in the time Labor has been in power. I ask: can the Treasurer inform the House as to whether this is an accurate comparison of the job creation record of this Government and that of the previous administration?

Mr De LACY: I thank the member for the question.

Mr Connor: Are these ABS figures?

Mr De LACY: Yes, they are ABS figures. I am not going to dispute the figures,

but what these figures tell us is that the Leader of the Opposition has a special way of using figures. What the figures do not tell us is the important point. In fact, I think somebody said that they are slippery, and one has to be a slippery person to make that sort of statement. I noted—because nobody else picks these things up—that Ken Crooke, the Director of the National Party, has been sending out press releases saying the same thing.

Mr Borbidge said that in the four and a half years from May 1985 to November 1989 there were 278,000 new jobs created in Queensland. That is correct. He said that during an equivalent period—in other words, December 1989 to May 1994—there were 103,000 jobs created in Queensland. On that basis, Mr Borbidge claimed that the National Party is a better performer than the Labor Party. I wonder why the Leader of the Opposition stopped at May 1994 when he could have had figures up until January 1995? He probably adopted that course because another 50,000 or 60,000 jobs were created in that time. Let us stick to Mr Borbidge's time frame, and let us view it in the context of what was happening in the rest of Australia.

Remember the great boom of the late 1980s, which the National Party played no role in creating? When the National Party created its 278,000 jobs, there were 955,000 jobs created in the rest of Australia. When the Goss Government created its 103,000 jobs—wait for it—there were 102,000 jobs lost in the rest of Australia. The fact is that, for the four and a half years to which the Leader of the Opposition referred, there were actually 1,000 new jobs created in Australia, but 103,000 of those were created in Queensland.

We used to look at the unemployment rate on a monthly basis. During the four and a half years or the 55 months to which the Leader of the Opposition referred, Queensland's unemployment rate was never below the national rate. Not for one single month in those 55 months was the unemployment rate in Queensland below the national average. During the 4.5 years to which the member referred under the Goss Government, Queensland's unemployment rate was higher than the national rate 20 times, but all in the early stages after we inherited the National Party's economy. Since August 1991, Queensland has never been higher than the national unemployment rate. So for the last three and a half years, we have always been below the national rate.

In conclusion—Queensland in fact had the highest level of unemployment of all the

States 27 times during those five years to which the Leader of the Opposition referred, and the only time it never had the highest unemployment rate in Australia is when it was beaten by Tasmania or South Australia. In Queensland, the unemployment rate under the Goss Government has been the highest of all the States three times in the first few months. But since August 1991, it has either been the lowest or the second lowest consistently in Australia. As I say, it is statistics, statistics and lies, but the way in which the Leader of the Opposition puts them forward, they are almost inevitably lies.

Sunshine Motorway Toll

Mr LIVINGSTONE: I refer the Treasurer to the decision announced last week by the Leader of the Liberal Party that a coalition Government would scrap the Sunshine Motorway toll. I ask: can the Treasurer inform the House of what impact this decision would have on State finances?

Mr De LACY: Surprise, surprise! The coalition held a shadow Cabinet meeting in Caloundra—the "save Joan campaign"—and announced that a coalition Government would abolish the motorway toll. The member for Ipswich West queried the effect that that would have on the State Budget. I guess it depends from which direction one approaches it. To start off with, it will have a \$192m effect, because the outstanding debt for the Sunshine Motorway is \$192m. But I guess when she put the case to shadow Cabinet, she probably said—

Mrs Sheldon: Who's "she"?

Mr De LACY: Mrs Sheldon; I apologise. When Mrs Sheldon put the case to shadow Cabinet, Mrs Sheldon probably said, "Well, it won't have any effect."

Mrs Sheldon: How do you know what I said?

Mr De LACY: I am assuming what the member said on the basis of what she said one day when she was a backbench member.

Mr Hayward: She said, "I'm in trouble in my electorate."

Mr De LACY: No, that is not what Mrs Sheldon would have said. Mrs Sheldon would have said, "The taxpayer should not pay; the Government should pay", because that is what she said one day in this Parliament.

If somebody was querying Mrs Sheldon and being the devil's advocate, they may have said, "But \$192m—it might raise the debt." What is Mrs Sheldon's attitude towards debt?

On the Anna Reynolds program one day, Ms Reynolds asked—

"Are you saying it could come from efficiencies or should we increase the debt or should we raise taxes further?"

Mrs Sheldon said—

"We would seriously look at the realistic debt position and as I just highlighted anyone who runs a business usually runs it on an overdraft anyhow."

It appears that we are going to run this show on bankcard!

I want to talk about the motorway. The toll was established by the National Party Government. Let us get that clear.

Mrs Sheldon: Ray Barber said he would abolish the toll.

Mr De LACY: We did say that we would abolish the toll, but when we got into Government and had a look at it, what we found was that if we abolished that toll it would be at the expense of road funding in the rest of Queensland—in provincial and regional Queensland.

Mrs Sheldon interjected.

Mr De LACY: Of course it would not be! Mrs Sheldon would say that the Government pays, not the taxpayer. Unfortunately, when a party gets into Government, it finds that it always comes back to the taxpayer.

The backbench members of the coalition, particularly the members from country areas, ought to start seeing how they are being done over in the promises that are being made. Last week, a meeting was held of what is called the National/Liberal Coalition Transport Policy Committee. That meeting was chaired by Mr Johnson, and that is appropriate—

Mr Johnson: You're wrong there; he didn't chair it.

Mr De LACY: I do not know whether the member did or did not, but it says so in the *Gold Coast Bulletin*, and I would not argue with that. Those attending were Bob Quinn, Mick Veivers, Allan Grice, Ray Connor, Judy Gamin and Kevin Lingard. Is that the coalition's transport policy committee? No wonder people are being done over in the bush! That committee promised "piggyback or underground duplication of the Gold Coast Highway". They are going to piggyback it! I asked the Department of Transport how much would it cost to piggyback it.

Mr Johnson: Who said that?

Mr De LACY: I do not know. Who briefed the *Gold Coast Bulletin*? I asked the

Transport Department how much it would cost to piggyback it. The reply was \$1.5 billion.

Mr JOHNSON: I rise to a point of order. What the Treasurer is quoting is without foundation. It is inaccurate and I think he has made up those statements and those figures, too, for that matter.

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

Mr JOHNSON: I ask that those comments be withdrawn. The Treasurer knows that they are not true.

Mr De LACY: I cannot withdraw something I have read out. The member can deny that he said it. He is entitled to deny that he said it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! That is true.

Mr De LACY: I cannot withdraw what is printed here.

Mr JOHNSON: I rise to a point of order. Half of the people the Treasurer has quoted in that statement were not even in attendance at the meeting.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member will resume his seat. The member can ask for something that affects him to be withdrawn on the basis that he knows it to be untrue.

Mr JOHNSON: It does affect me, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Treasurer to withdraw.

Mr De LACY: I will withdraw, but I think I am entitled to read directly from this article and people can come to their own conclusions. I suggest that tomorrow Mr Johnson makes a personal explanation saying that the *Gold Coast Bulletin* got it wrong. The article was in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* of Monday, 13 February.

Mr LINGARD: I rise to a point of order. Standing Orders indicate that members are not allowed to quote directly from a newspaper article to substantiate an argument. Mr Speaker, I ask you to rule accordingly.

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

Mr De LACY: The article states—

". . . the possibility of future spurs or extensions of the Brisbane to Helensvale-Robina Gold Coast Railway; 'piggy-back' or underground duplication of the Gold Coast Highway; a transit lane for commuter buses and local and intercity coach services."

Just to conclude, I did ask the Transport Department how much it would cost for

underground duplication. It said that to cut and cover would be \$4 billion. I asked if we cut and cover, what would happen to the old road while the cutting and covering is taking place. The reply was that there would need to be a proper tunnel, so we would finish up with a tunnel three times as long as the chunnel that goes under the English Channel. What the Opposition is proposing is a tunnel from the Gold Coast to Brisbane, with an indicative cost of \$10 billion.

Gold Coast Indy Car Grand Prix

Mrs SHELDON: I ask the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing: was the full due diligence report into the Gold Coast Indy tabled yesterday ever made available by him to the Auditor-General and the Public Accounts Committee at the time of the previous inquiries into the Indy car race—yes or no?

Mr GIBBS: No.

Gold Coast Indy Car Grand Prix

Mrs SHELDON: I got the right answer for that one. In asking a question of the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing, I remind him that the Government's justification for losing more than \$70m of taxpayers' funds on the Indy car race is based on the alleged marketing benefits to the State and that, despite a \$1m marketing budget and four well-paid executives, the due diligence report found that there was no marketing plan in place for the 1994 race and that responsibility for marketing had been left to an ad-hoc arrangement with the Channel 9 network. I now ask: why did the Minister allow taxpayers' funds to be wasted and marketing opportunities lost through mismanagement and bungling by the Indy managers?

Mr GIBBS: Again, people try to overrate some of the comments that are made in the due diligence report. I would like to make an observation in relation to the Parliamentary Committee of Public Accounts. If the member refers to page 4, which was the point that I made earlier today, section 5 under the heading "New Management" states—

"With the change of responsibility, the event now falls within the portfolio of the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing. Shortly after accepting this responsibility the Minister advised members of the Legislative Assembly that the Gold Coast motor events company board had been restructured and that the

Government would make a contribution of \$5m towards the 1994 event."

This is the relevant section that I was making reference to this morning when I made a ministerial statement to the House. It says—

"The Minister also requested a report on the financial and management practices of the previous board."

Although the committee did not have a copy of the report, the members were aware that I had commissioned a due diligence report. That is the point that I am making now and it is the point I made this morning.

Mr Santoro: And the chairman of the committee asked you for a copy and you never sent it to him.

Mr GIBBS: Acting on legal advice that it could be defamatory, that copy was not made available. That is the reality of it. Sorry, I would like the member to refresh my memory on her question.

Mr Santoro: You're losing concentration.

Mr GIBBS: No, I just want to make sure that I cover every aspect of the question.

Mrs SHELDON: I referred to the \$70m of taxpayers' funds and to the no-management plan and the ad-hoc arrangement with Channel 9.

Mr GIBBS: My memory is refreshed enough. Honourable members should remember that the initial contract was negotiated with Channel 9 by, as I recall it, a card-carrying financial member of the National Party, Mr Fred Maybury, who initially worked through this with Channel 9. The arrangement was that Channel 9 would be paid \$1m in return for what basically was a contra agreement where it would promote the race as much as possible in the lead-up to race time. As I understand it, there certainly was not a clambering by the electronic media to broadcast the first event. For the success of the event it was imperative that it receive both national and international coverage. In my opinion, Channel 9 has done a fairly good job of promoting the event each year.

To take the line that there was no management plan is probably drawing the longbow. I am aware that there may have been no strategy plan actually down on paper, which was the criticism contained in the report by the experts from the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation whom I sent in to have a look at this. We are talking about people who are recognised as the best in their field in terms of marketing and promotion. It is

conceded that one of the criticisms contained in the report is that, sure, the marketing plan was not there on paper, but to say that there was no plan in place in terms of actually promoting the event is incorrect.

If one considers the number of events that took place on the Gold Coast, the number of promotional events that took place interstate, the newspaper advertisements and the television advertising campaigns, one realises that, around the time of the event, the previous board and the previous management undertook marketing and promotion. In my opinion, they handled that to the best of their capacity.

Abortion Files held by Government

Mr BUDD: I ask the Attorney-General and Minister for the Arts: is he aware of claims that the State Government holds 18,000 files of patients who attended Dr Peter Bayliss' fertility clinic, and are those claims correct?

Mr WELLS: I am aware of those claims, and the claim is very, very far from correct. It is irresponsible scaremongering to suggest that the Government has anything like that number of files. After the May 1985 raid of Dr Bayliss' Greenslopes clinic, the Full Court held the search warrants to be defective and ordered that the medical records seized by the police be returned to Dr Bayliss. They were returned and Dr Bayliss filed an affidavit that he had subsequently destroyed the records.

The writ filed by Dr Bayliss in 1988 has resulted in a very lengthy and protracted period of discovery. The discovery process unearthed the fact that Dr Bayliss' solicitors themselves had kept 14 files. On 23 January 1995, Mr Justice Moynihan ordered that Dr Bayliss hand copies of his 14 files back to the State. His Honour further specified that the identity of the women concerned was not to be disclosed. Indeed, the Crown indicated to His Honour that the Crown had no interest in the identity of the patients and that the information discovered would not be used to pursue the identity of the patients.

The claim that the Government holds 18,000 files is simply wrong, and whoever is behind that scaremongering is to be condemned because that person has caused almost 20,000 women to revisit an event in their own lives which happened almost a decade ago. There are not 18,000 files being held by the Government. The plain facts are, firstly, that the Supreme Court ordered Dr Bayliss to provide the Crown with copies of 14 patient files with names and identifying

features removed; secondly, that the Crown has a small file which contains the records of six women who have voluntarily given statements to the police—that file is completely confidential; and, thirdly, there are also some police surveillance records, but they do not contain any medical records.

The Crown has already assured the court that it is not interested in the identities of any women and will not pursue the question of identity. The Crown takes very seriously the confidentiality of those records and, I repeat, the suggestion that vast numbers of records such as that are being held secretly by the Government is irresponsible and dangerous scaremongering.

Kinka Beach

Mr BUDD: I ask the Minister for Environment and Heritage: is she aware of an erosion problem at Kinka Beach near Yeppoon and can she inform the House what action she intends to take about it?

Ms ROBSON: We face a very difficult problem of erosion of the coastline of Queensland, which we certainly intend to address with our new coastal protection and management legislation. Like many of our coastal areas where development has been allowed historically to encroach on frontal dunes, erosion has been a long-term problem at Kinka Beach. About 12 months ago, that problem was originally raised with me by the former member for Rockhampton North, Mr Robert Schwarten, who has a family property at Kinka Beach. Late last year, it was raised with me also by the ALP candidate for Keppel, Mr Bruce Saunders. I even had a letter in January this year from the member for Keppel raising the issue further with me. However, we were well under way with taking action by the time that I heard from the member for Keppel.

In 1979, the Beach Protection Authority released a report titled "The Capricorn Coast Beaches", which referred to erosion problems at Kinka Beach and presented some alternative measures to combat the problem. The width of coastal land assessed by the BPA in that report to be an erosion-prone area varies between 100 and 175 metres, and both the main coastal road and the residential blocks have been located within that erosion zone.

Last year, officers of the BPA met with local residents and with the Livingstone Shire Council. Last week, another meeting to discuss the issues was held with the council. I have had conversations with the Mayor of the

Livingstone Shire Council, Barbara Wildon, and I have agreed with her that I must inspect the site. My office is setting a date to do that and I have accepted an invitation from the ALP candidate, Bruce Saunders, to visit Yeppoon.

Mr Johnson: What about the sitting member?

Ms ROBSON: He came in a bit late. We were already doing something about the matter. Those types of erosion problems are now common along the coast of Queensland. They are of great concern to people in communities who have been allowed to build within those frontal dune systems. We are trying to address the problem systematically. It will be a very expensive exercise, but the Government is tackling it.

Gold Coast Indy Car Grand Prix

Mr LINGARD: I ask the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing: on receipt of the Indy due diligence report indicating a multi-million dollar underestimation of the operating loss for the 1994 event, which the review team suggested was calculated to keep the loss in line with the Government's directions for a break-even or near break-even result based on its \$5m contribution and which may have involved management misleading the board, why did he not immediately seek a wider and more detailed independent audit of the Indy operation?

Mr GIBBS: Quite simply because, in my opinion, there was no need for a wider audit of the operation at all. What better audit could there be than having the books and accounts of the Gold Coast Motor Events Corporation on four occasions audited and given a clearance—a clear record—firstly by the Auditor-General and secondly by the Public Accounts Committee, which had looked at each Indy race and examined the performance factor, and given a clean bill of health to the event?

Further to that, the report that I commissioned was effective upon a budget which the previous management prepared in which it believed that the event could fall within the guidelines of the \$5m cap that the Government said that it was committed to investing in that great event. At that stage, no expenditure had taken place. There had been no expenditure by the board. No attempts had been made to miscalculate or to mislay moneys. There was no money missing. The report was prepared and a budget came to me.

When I saw the budget, I had concerns, as I should have as the Minister, that the figures did not stack up. One of the reasons—as the honourable member probably saw in the report—was the board's overestimation of corporate sponsorship. For example, the board said that in excess of \$1m in corporate sponsorship had been committed. When I asked how much was virtually in the claw, the reply was, "About half a million dollars." In my opinion, one simply does not frame budgets on money that has not already arrived in the tin. It is a pretty simple exercise to grasp, if one understands it.

No impropriety had taken place. Nobody had done anything of an illegal nature or of a criminal nature. I took steps to ensure that management was restructured. I expressed the opinion that the event could be run in a more professional manner. That is why the QTTC was brought in and why the Queensland Events Corporation was given a greater role in the structure of the event. Obviously, my judgment proved to be totally correct. Expenditure on last year's event came in significantly under what had been spent in the past. As a result of that restructuring and some further changes, I already have a rough idea in my head of what the figures for the event will come in at this year. I will announce what the Government's contribution will be. I will announce it at a press conference at the conclusion of the motor race itself on the Sunday night, as I did last year.

If the Opposition members read the report again in detail they will find that it is a report into management structure and marketing, etc. Primarily, it identified a number of concerns in terms of corporate sponsorship, but nowhere does it make a suggestion of impropriety or criminality on behalf of anybody involved with the event.

Funding for Surf-lifesaving

Mrs ROSE: I ask the Deputy Premier and Minister for Emergency Services: is he aware of the support offered by the Queensland Government for surf-lifesaving in comparison with that offered by other States?

Mr BURNS: The honourable member's family is very much involved in lifesaving on the Gold Coast. In fact, I accompanied her on a visit to a number of surf-lifesaving clubs on the Gold Coast and have since met a lot of members of surf-lifesaving clubs throughout the State.

We should be very proud of the constant vigil that our surf-lifesavers maintain. As Mrs

Rose said to me one day, in Queensland we have never lost a person in a controlled lifesaving situation, that is, on a patrolled beach. That is to the credit of our lifesavers. We do everything we can to support those people and the clubs that organise their efforts. Queensland is the only State in which the Department of Emergency Services provides subsidy funding. In New South Wales, Tasmania and Western Australia, that subsidy is provided by the Departments of Sport and Recreation. In Victoria, the funding is provided by the Department of Sport and Tourism; and in South Australia, by the Department of Recreation and Sport. So, in addition to Emergency Services money, Queensland's Department of Tourism, Sport and Racing provides grants. For example, I am aware of a \$146,000 grant to Surf Life Saving Queensland Inc. under the 1995 Statewide Sports Development Program.

State Government subsidy funding through Emergency Services for the 1994-95 financial year totalled \$2,045,657. The State centre received \$868,205, and the 55 surf clubs and 6 branches along the coast received \$1,177,452. That funding is far above that offered by Liberal/National Party Governments in other States. In New South Wales there are 125 clubs and 11 branches of surf-lifesaving centres. Its State centre receives \$600,000, and the clubs get nothing.

That means that this State Government provides more than three times the financial support provided by the New South Wales Government. In Victoria, the 30 clubs are given \$700 each, and the central organisation receives only \$129,000. In Tasmania, the 10 clubs are given nothing, and the State centre receives only \$15,000. In South Australia, the 18 surf clubs receive only \$6,000 each, and the State centre retains the remainder—only \$37,000. The allocation in Western Australia for 1994-95 is \$300,000, but its 19 clubs have been given nothing.

We are very lucky to have those volunteers and administrators in the lifesaving movement. This Government provides a substantial measure of assistance for them and will continue to do so. We are addressing a workers' compensation problem that has been bedevilling those people recently, and it will be solved when the next Budget is brought down.

Job Training in Schools

Mrs ROSE: The transition from school to work has been identified in the Wiltshire

Review and in the National Training Reform Agenda as a priority area for reform. Can the Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Relations outline to the House the Goss Government's contribution to bringing the world of work closer to our school students, in particular those students at Palm Beach-Currumbin State High School?

Mr FOLEY: I thank the honourable member for the question and for her interest in the very important transition that young people must make from school to work. The importance of this was highlighted in the recent report by Professor Wiltshire, which stated that there is a need for a greater convergence of vocational education and general education, particularly in the post-compulsory school years, that is, Years 11 and 12.

Last week, the honourable member and I were delighted to attend at the Palm Beach-Currumbin State High School to launch a very practical example of trying to obtain reform and progress in this sector for the benefit of young people at school. I refer to the \$79,000 of State Government funds made available to Group Training Australia on the Gold Coast, which is running a project with 16 Palm Beach-Currumbin State High School students in a six-month construction skills course. The students are doing part-time classroom study at the school and part-time on-the-job training at a housing estate at Elanora. In fact, they will actually build their own classrooms on the site. I am surprised that the member for Southport shows so little interest in the wellbeing and welfare of students on the Gold Coast. As I said, those students will build their own classrooms on that site together with a house that will later be sold commercially. That is very good example of bridging the gap between school and work. Importantly, that project meets the educational needs of those students and responds to the real need of industry on the Gold Coast. The local industry needs a pool of potential young recruits who have practical skills and real experience on a building project. That is particularly important because there is a construction boom on the Gold Coast. A regional economic report released last week showed building approvals on the coast have almost doubled in the past two years. Those students will gain up to 12 months' credit towards a building trade apprenticeship.

It is extremely important that our education system caters for all students, and it is particularly important that it caters for those 70 per cent of students who are not going to

attend university. In Years 11 and 12, real vocational education must be available to cater to students' needs. This is a good example of the Goss Government's contribution towards making that happen in practice in Queensland's schools.

Main Street Program

Mrs BIRD: In relation to the Main Street program, I ask the Acting Minister for Business, Industry and Regional Development: can he outline to the House the communities to be supported in this year's program?

Mr ELDER: I can, and I am pleased to announce that we will be supporting another five centres with Main Street funding for this year. They include Gordonvale, Proserpine, Hervey Bay, St George and a number of centres within the South Burnett region. In terms of applications—we have decided that these were the best and the most deserving of support. We did have concerns about those who missed out on funding for this year's Main Street program, because Main Street is important to those in the old CBD districts who are losing business to large shopping centres. It is also important to those centres that we supported three years ago with the first round of funding as a pilot program. Members in Maryborough, Redcliffe and Ipswich have said that, without doubt, it was a very successful program and it should have been continued. But, as I said, we did have some concerns.

This year, there were some 28 applications for funding. We could only support the five that I have mentioned. However, we have taken a further initiative to help them with Main Street and with training. We will produce a self-help video and a self-help manual, which will be sent to all of those centres that applied for Main Street funding. It is in our interests to see that those businesses start working together to create a footprint so that we can help them with funding further down the track and also to create that sense of business community that ensures that those business centres that are so vital to rural communities survive.

I will be talking to them in the next two days—those that I can reach—about the opportunities that will come through the training video and through the self-help manual. I have already been to a number of those centres, including Proserpine, to look at opportunities and to assist them in getting the BID committee and the BID program up and running. This program has been very

successful. We believe that those five centres will benefit from additional funding and through those extra measures we will support those centres that did apply.

Mr R. Matson

Mrs BIRD: I ask the Deputy Premier, Minister for Emergency Services and Consumer Affairs and Minister Assisting the Premier on Rural Affairs: can he inform the House of the unscrupulous sales of computer gambling systems by Mr Roger Matson?

Mr BURNS: I thank the honourable member for the question.

Mr Lingard: You've been used as a reserve.

Mr BURNS: I would like to be used as a reserve, but I have never been used that way. I can inform honourable members of a scam that has been perpetrated by Mr Roger Matson, which was reported to my Office of Consumer Affairs and other offices throughout the State.

Roger Matson is known to have been selling computerised gambling systems since 1990. I have to say that I cannot understand why anyone would buy one. Mr Matson has operated under various company names, which include Silverhouse Investments, Amber International and, most recently, Locomotive International. In the marketing of these computerised gambling systems, names such as Moneyplus, S.U.N., T.O.P. and, most recently, the Win System have been used.

Mr Matson has an extensive criminal record, which includes convictions for false pretences and possession of an unlicensed concealed firearm. Consumer affairs agencies throughout Australia have received complaints against Mr Matson and/or his associated—

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr BURNS: The member should stay out of that. To be quite truthful, I did not expect the member to interject on this subject. Complaints about Mr Matson and/or his associated companies and/or his betting system have been received from places throughout Australia. Matson promotes himself as a specialist computer programmer and states openly that he has been declared bankrupt. He states that his part-time professional business can add \$200,000 to people's income. He states also that it would be quite realistic for clients to aim for a million-dollar income in the third year of this part-time business.

Mr Lingard interjected.

Mr BURNS: Matson targeted people from interstate, particularly prospective investors in New South Wales and Victoria. I am sorry that the member had to complain about this if he bought one. Mr Matson entices people to Brisbane to view the system with the promise of a fully paid business-class air ticket.

The price of the system is \$25,000. The pocket computer supplied by Matson retails at \$369. It should be noted that the contract that clients are asked to sign contains a clause which states—

"The licensee acknowledges that they have been advised and are aware that past performance is no guarantee of future success or income either now or in the future."

New Zealand police have seven complaints outstanding against Matson that relate to offences allegedly committed during 1993, and which involve the sum of \$205,000, which Matson obtained in cash. In that country, Matson traded under the name of Lifestyles International Pty Ltd and called the gambling system International Totemaster, or IT.

In January 1991, the TAB of Queensland conducted an assessment of the Moneyplus racing system. On a race day held on 29 December 1990, the total loss incurred by using that system for that one day was \$1,399.50. An assessment was made.

Mr Lingard interjected.

Mr BURNS: We understand that the member is one of Mr Matson's best customers, so if I were him, I would stop interjecting. From September 1992 to February 1993, an assessment was made of the S.U.N. betting system by the Government Statistician's Office. The cumulative loss for the S.U.N. system for the six-month period was found to be over \$50,000. So a person is a bit of a mug if he or she pays \$25,000 to lose \$50,000. One consumer, who complained to my Office of Consumer Affairs, purchased the T.O.P. program from Locomotive International last year. That system operates under the rules of the Win System. Although he paid \$25,000 for the system, he decided not to risk any further money on bets and did a dry run on the system, using it day and night for eight weeks. The resultant loss was \$27,597. He stated that the system never had a successful week and had lost consistently each week.

Recently, Consumer Affairs recently obtained a copy of the Win rules and

computer. On 10 February 1995—just the other day—the Government Statistician's Office tested it for a race meeting. The day was started with a bank of \$2,500, which fell away to \$963.25—a loss of \$1,536.75. The S.U.N. system—Matson's other system—was used simultaneously on the same day and resulted in a bank of \$2,500 being reduced to \$715.95—a loss of \$1,784.05 for the day. The test also showed the computers perform the same calculations under each system.

Of course, Mr Matson is not the only supplier of computerised gambling systems. Other suppliers sell systems on promises of high returns, but what they are really selling is a dream. One could just imagine; if we all bought one and it worked, we would all be betting on the TAB on the same horse on the same day. What would it pay? If such systems worked, gambling on horseraces would be at an end. We would all be on winners and the TAB would have to close its doors.

These systems should be exposed for what they are, a waste of money and an odds-on loser. People who receive pamphlets promoting such systems should throw them in the rubbish bin where they belong. Investors can only lose money.

Drought Assistance Scheme

Ms POWER: I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: can he inform the House of the Goss Government's success in rebuilding the Commonwealth's confidence in this State's drought assistance schemes after it had been destroyed by the rorting which took place under the previous Government?

Mr CASEY: This is a very important question, because the Goss Government has restored totally the confidence of the primary industry sector of this State in the way in which drought relief for primary producers should be handled.

There can be no greater example of this than what has occurred this morning, when I had the great pleasure of launching *Wet as a shag Dry as a bone* by Mr Dan Daly, who was the former officer in charge of the drought secretariat of the Department of Primary Industries. Mr Daly was sacked by a former National Party Minister, Mr Harper, because he spoke up about the rorts that the previous Government in Queensland was perpetrating on the drought relief assistance scheme.

Mr Hobbs: How many convicted?

Mr CASEY: The member for Warrego wants to speak up in relation to this matter. He

asks, "How many were convicted?" I say to him that if he keeps going, one day I will start talking about the seven people who were referred to the Fraud Squad and the result of those reports. I bet that, overnight, his phone will ring hot with calls from members of the National Party saying, "Don't you mention that at all", in exactly the same way as yesterday and this morning the member for Barambah found his phone ringing hot from members of the Cattlemen's Union and the United Graziers Association telling him to lay off the nonsense that he was going on about the beef industry in Queensland. All he was doing was giving the beef industry a bad reputation.

I recommend Dan Daly's book to everybody. It outlines the way to go with drought relief.

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

MATTER OF SPECIAL PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Transport

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members, I advise the House that I have received a proposal for a Matter of Special Public Importance debate submitted by the Minister for Transport on the following matter—

"The importance of the draft discussion paper Towards an Integrated Regional Transport Plan".

I now call on the member for Mount Coot-tha to speak to this proposal.

Mrs EDMOND (Mount Coot-tha) (5.30 p.m.): The recently released discussion paper Towards an Integrated Regional Transport Plan for south-east Queensland is welcomed by all persons seriously concerned about the management of growth and its allied transport and environment problems in Queensland. Predictably, the Opposition bagged it, with both the leader of the minority group and one of its Transport spokesmen saying, "We don't need more planning." Why should members be surprised by that attitude? That is the team that made ad hoc decision making an art form. It left a legacy of approved development everywhere, but there was no approved or planned infrastructure to support it in transport, health or wherever. Indeed, that is the team that ripped up the Gold Coast railway and then complained bitterly about the lack of public transport to that area. The former coalition Government's solution to difficult road decisions was simple: put the road through a Labor or Liberal

electorate, because the Liberals would just cop it, and Labor was in Opposition. Give me a bit of honest fact finding, community discussion and planning, as outlined in this discussion paper, any day!

With growth in the order of 60 per cent expected by the year 2011, there will be tremendous opportunities for that region and its people in terms of economic development and jobs. But there is a danger that this could seriously affect our open, relaxed and enjoyable lifestyle. Much of the downside of that growth is related to the impact of predicted increased car usage of up to 80 per cent, leading to a decline in air quality and increased contribution to greenhouse gases. Over the past five years, in the face of either persistent opposition or apathy from members opposite—depending on who was here at the time—this Government has been working steadily to address these problematic hangovers from the past. It is a massive task, but one that must be accomplished if we in Queensland, particularly in the rapidly growing south-east corner, are to retain our present wonderful quality of life.

Significant improvements are planned for urban rail services, with a \$778m investment program for the south-east Queensland passenger rail network. That upgrading package focuses on continuing to improve and expand the capacity of the current urban rail system to cater for the projected population growth. This funding includes \$240m for a Gold Coast railway. In late 1995, the Beenleigh to Helensvale rail link will open, and the rail link to Robina will be finished by 1997. It includes 46 kilometres of new track and five new stations from Beenleigh to Robina. Almost \$6m is allowed for improving ticketing systems throughout the suburban network. New electric trains worth \$150m are on order for the continued expansion of the Citytrain network.

Due to a total lack of planning by the previous Government, expansion of the rolling stock for urban rail has been restricted by the lack of capacity of our city tunnels. The sum of \$142m for the expansion of the Cityrail network will go towards the construction of new tunnels to accommodate four tracks from Bowen Hills to Roma Street. This will allow an 80 per cent capacity boost in our rail system and mean more and faster trains. The completion of this project is planned for mid 1996, and additional services are planned for the high-growth areas on the North Coast Line through to Gympie.

The sum of \$65m will be spent on track expansion on the urban network, including \$33m for the Beenleigh-Kuraby duplication to accommodate both local services and new high-speed services. The sum of \$12.6m has been allocated for the South Brisbane to Yeerongpilly dual gauge line, and \$18.7m has been earmarked for the Mayne-Northgate quadruplication. Some \$17m has been allowed for the Operation Facelift Program, which is designed to improve safety features for rail commuters and appearance standards at station complexes throughout the city. This move has been welcomed by my constituents. Some \$106m has been allowed for tilt trains, and \$5m for Traveltrains.

Many areas of Brisbane and south-east Queensland rely on bus services for public transport because they have little access to rail services, and no corridors were retained during the important planning phase to allow for rail extensions. In Brisbane, most of the bus routes have remained unchanged since they were introduced in the early part of this century, and other routes have just been added as the city has grown. Some routes merely followed the old tram routes, which were designed for tram lines' capacity, not passengers' needs.

Through legislation introduced into this House last year, bus companies will be required to develop a route network in a designated area, thus ensuring that 95 per cent of all residents live less than 400 metres from a bus route in peak periods and less than 800 metres in off-peak periods and at night and on weekends. There will also be minimum levels of service frequencies. As a result, many more peak-period bus services will be provided, and there will be a dramatic increase in the number of off-peak, weekend and night buses. The State Government's subsidy for bus services to the Brisbane City Council is \$27m a year. New contracts between the BCC and the Government stipulate that timetables must, as much as possible, be integrated with adjoining bus services. The Brisbane City Council is one of the largest operators of public transport in this State, and it is necessary to seek its cooperation in the planning and provision of future bus transport services in Brisbane.

Last year, a package endorsed by both State Cabinet and the civic cabinet offered a blueprint for the future management and improvement of Brisbane transport services. As I mentioned earlier, the package featured a capped subsidy of \$26.9m per annum, with a commitment to productivity improvements of

30 per cent over three years, including significant improvements in patronage, the meeting of required service levels, innovative services responding to consumer needs and restructuring Brisbane transport along business lines. As part of the package, this Government would jointly fund a major review of Brisbane transport operations and develop a central district parking strategy for more appropriate inner-city parking.

It is essential to address the public transport needs of the community to halt the decline in usage and our continued overreliance on the motor car. At present, only 8 per cent of vehicle trips in south-east Queensland are made on public transport, and only 6 per cent Statewide. The vast majority of those trips are made to the inner city by commuters in single-occupancy cars. The bulk of those people could, with only minor inconvenience, use public transport. As has been said so often, we could halve the amount of traffic through Brisbane's suburbs simply by getting two people into each car travelling to the inner city each day.

Recently, the Leader of the Liberal Party was trotting about the Mount Coot-tha area telling people that the Government should be building bigger roads through the area. The honourable member is wrong—as she so often is. The last thing Mount Coot-tha needs or wants is bigger roads through the area. The Liberal and National Parties have tried that, and the community told them exactly where to get off. It told them that it would not have it. We do not want a freeway. We want more sensible planning for land uses—the type of planning that the honourable member and her spokesman derided. We want rail corridors and road spaces preserved. We want user-friendly public transport. The SEQ 2001 studies indicated a need to increase public transport trips to 12 per cent, that is, a 50 per cent increase in public transport usage in the south-east Queensland region. Surely that is a sensible, modest and very achievable aim. With the projected population growth predicted for south-east Queensland, it is essential that an environmentally responsible transport strategy is put in place.

Transport—and I refer mainly to cars and trucks—has been estimated to contribute 45 per cent of air pollution and 34 per cent of greenhouse emissions in south-east Queensland. On current trends, and without corrective action, vehicle emissions will double by 2011. Minimising vehicle traffic is one of the most significant contributions we can make towards meeting the State's commitment

under the National Ecologically Sustainable Development Strategy.

The recently released discussion paper *Towards an Integrated Regional Transport Plan* examines seven main areas of concern, namely, the environment, urban planning, freight, public transport, travel culture, roads and the social implications of transport. It offers alternatives and strategies, as it clearly states, for consideration and discussion. Some ideas are thought provoking, controversial and somewhat futuristic, but as a whole it is a much-needed document that follows through and pulls together feedback from the South-east Queensland Passenger Transport Study and the SEQ 2001 regional planning studies.

Members opposite have indicated that they are quite content to bury their heads in the sand and to pull them out occasionally to oppose the Government's decisions. Whether it be to build a freeway, or not to build a freeway, or to build a road or a tunnel—if there is a Government decision, Opposition members mindlessly oppose it. Nothing is surer! There is no consideration of demographics, environment or land usage, just the blanket whingeing Opposition that members have grown to know so well. I recommend this document to all members interested in considered and informed decision making and encourage them to be part of the planned growth and prosperity of south-east Queensland.

Mr J. N. GOSS (Aspley) (5.41 p.m.): If I were considering future career and education options, I would certainly become a traffic planner in this State. Over the past five years, all we have seen from this Government is report after report—with a pretence of consultation. These documents I have here are just some of the reports on traffic and roads, including some Commonwealth—

Mr Pearce: Read them out. Prove it.

Mr J. N. GOSS: We have the *Integrated Regional Transport Plan for South-east Queensland*; the *Northern Suburbs Transport Study*; the *SEQPTS*; *Target 2015*; and *Urban Transport volumes 1 and 2*. We have seen report after report on transport and traffic, yet this Government keeps calling for further reports. Sadly, the timing of the *Integrated Regional Transport Plan for South-east Queensland* exposes this document for what it is—another report designed to make the people of south-east Queensland feel that they are making a contribution to our future transport needs. The timing is such that by the time an election is called the public workshops will be under way

or completed and public input will have been received, but the final plan will not be produced until the end of the year, well after the election. As a result, all the bad things that will come out of this report and all the plans that the Government currently has will not be revealed until after the election. This document is designed purely to make people feel as though they are making a significant contribution.

If we examine the Government's record over the past five years, we discover a lack of consultation with the people. Such lack of consultation is evidenced by the southern bypass and the pretence of consultation that was undertaken in relation to that matter. At the last moment, the road was placed where no-one involved in the consultation process had so much as hinted at. Why should the people of Queensland believe this Government now? The first priority of this Government is toll roads. It has downgraded its expenditure on public transport.

Under the review of bus transport in this State, operators were told, "You go out and buy new buses, run them more frequently and you will make a profit." In urging operators to adopt that course, the Government wanted to achieve its aim of drastically reducing the subsidy and eradicating the cross-subsidy. As a result of the actions of this Government, more than 100 bus operators in this State will be forced out of business, many of them going broke in the process. Because of the Labor Party's grand bus review, students at some of Brisbane's schools now have no public transport.

For the past 10 years, the Brisbane City Council has been buying new buses and running regular services and Cityxpress services—exactly what the Government is telling the private bus operators to do—and yet the council's loss is close to \$50m a year. Approximately \$25m to \$27m of that amount is subsidised by the State Government. Of course, the basis of the subsidy has been changed from fare box to CPI increases. As a result of the Government's decisions, at the end of this month the Brisbane City Council will scrap the \$1.20 flat rate on Sundays. The council has also been forced to increase the fares for the West End and New Farm hail-and-ride services. The Brisbane City Council is being forced to increase its charges at a time when it should be trying to contain charges in order to encourage more people to use bus services. The council has indicated that it has to raise another \$250,000 this year from bus passengers in order to cover its costs.

The Government has levied a one-third adult fare on students travelling by rail, but what has it done to support the tens of thousands of students who pay to travel by bus? Motorists in Brisbane in particular notice that on school holidays there is a drastic reduction in the number of vehicles on our roads. That drastic reduction indicates that most of the people using our roads during peak periods are conveying students to schools.

Patronage on QR's Citytrain network is declining due to poor service and outrageous fares, which are among the highest in Australia. People living in suburbs such as Sherwood, Graceville, Chelmer and Taringa once enjoyed a service in which a train ran every eight minutes during peak hours. However, they now receive three services an hour. The same applies to a number of stations on the Caboolture line and on most of the other main lines. The trains bypass a large number of stations that once had a regular peak-hour service. Some of the stations on the Caboolture line that are bypassed include Bald Hills, Carseldine and Geebung. The decision to cut back that service was a disaster for Citytrain patronage, because the outer stations on the network did not increase their patronage to cover the loss of patronage from the inner-city stations. People on the north coast are offered a very poor rail service. People from the north coast tell me that, due to the poor rail service, they have to drive to Brisbane because they cannot return home during the middle of the day.

Another issue on which this Government has not been serious is passenger safety on rail, particularly at night. The statistics indicate that on average there are five incident reports every day on rail services. That is a turn-off to the public. The frequent attacks on rail staff, including guards, drivers and rail employees in general, has seen staff morale plummet. The ALP's priority is income before services.

We keep hearing about the large number of heavy vehicles still travelling through the city and the inner suburbs. However, when trucks have to pay such high tolls and wait for such long periods to be processed through the booths at the Gateway Bridge, it is no wonder that they choose to take the inner-city route.

In what areas has this Government made a commitment to urban transport over the past five years? I acknowledge that the Government has initiated projects such as the quadruplication of the inner-city rail tunnels and the Brisbane-Gold Coast rail link, which was funded from the Building Better Cities

Program. At the same time, we have a bus industry that is under threat. Deregulation of the taxi industry by this State Government is a real possibility, as is deregulation of the limousine industry. It was this ALP Government which destroyed the Brisbane River ferry service and which is now pretending to be concerned about managing growth and maintaining quality of life in this city.

When one considers the Government's record in relation to the Transport Department, it is easy to see why morale is rock bottom and why the Premier had to appoint a new Transport Minister. A classic example was the announcement by the former Minister that all vehicles entering the CBD area would be charged an entry fee—yet another money grab. The majority of Brisbane's bridges force motorists to pass through the CBD area. The actions of the Government and the contents of the Integrated Regional Transport Plan for South-east Queensland make it obvious that Route 20 is a goer once again. My colleague the member for Clayfield will have to keep his eyes open, because the wording of the survey contained in that report makes it obvious that the airport tollway could once again be on the agenda after the election. Is it any wonder that the Premier rushed in recently to rescue the Government from the previous Minister's outrageous remarks? It is quite obvious that the Government is planning additional bridges over the Brisbane River between Newstead and Bulimba and St Lucia and Dutton Park. This Government has done more to put vehicles on the roads in this city than any other Government in this State's history.

A perusal of the survey form contained in the report reveals that there is a box for everyone to tick—more roads, less roads, more vehicles on the road, less vehicles on the road—

Time expired.

Dr CLARK (Barron River) (5.51 p.m.): If it ain't broke, don't fix it. How many times have we heard that cry from the Opposition in response to much-needed reforms from this Government? That philosophy sums up the National Party because it did leave things as they were in Queensland, not because they worked but because it did not dare risk unsettling people with change or else upset the vested interests that supported it and benefited from the status quo. Because the National Party did not believe in planning for the future, when we took office there were many things that were well and truly broke in Queensland that required radical change, and the public transport system was one of them.

When the Transport Minister at the time, David Hamill, introduced Queensland Rail to the realities of commercial life and turned it into a profit-making enterprise for the first time, he turned to Queensland's totally inadequate public transport system and commissioned a review in late 1992 to investigate ways to improve services and encourage more people to leave their cars at home. The results of that review explain very clearly why so few people used public transport. It was inefficient, unreliable, inconvenient and often non-existent, and in regional Queensland, if one wanted to travel by bus at night or on a weekend, a bus could not be found. That summed up the bus system.

The licensing system that provided operators with their small, exclusive territories meant changing buses and long waits to access basic facilities such as shops and hospitals. Many buses were old, slow and uncomfortable, particularly in regional Queensland and outlying areas. The level of service varied enormously across the State depending entirely on the initiative or entrepreneurial skills of the operator. A comparison between New South Wales and Queensland revealed that services in many regional centres were well below those being provided commercially in New South Wales to towns of comparable size.

The environmental imperative for reform was also very real. Increasing reliance on motor vehicles is increasing congestion, air and noise pollution and traffic accidents and creating a greater need for new and improved roads. That situation is just as true in regional centres where rapid growth is occurring, such as Cairns, as it is in the south-east corner. So it was clear to the Government that, unless changes occurred, and people utilised public transport, both the environment and the road system in Queensland would come under increasing pressure to the detriment of the community.

Buses were not the only focus of attention in the review. Taxis, private hire vehicles, charter and courtesy transport were all included. Trains, ferries and planes complete the public transport scene in Queensland, and they have all been subject to review in order to improve service levels. The Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act that was passed by this Parliament last September was the beginning of this task. This Act requires that, in the Cairns case, the four operators there, each with their separate licences, will be replaced by one company which will enter into a service contract with the Government. This

contract should be announced shortly. Hopefully, by April, things will have settled down and the new system will be under way.

That contract will provide for high levels of performance in frequency, fleet standards, vehicle safety and customer service. Cairns bus routes will be redesigned so that 85 per cent of residents will live within 400 metres of a bus route and there will be new evening and weekend services to many areas. Buses will operate every 15 minutes throughout the day between Cairns North, Cairns CBD, Westcourt and Earlville. There will be new links from the south-western suburbs to the northern beaches, and some buses will operate through the city centre instead of terminating at the Lake Street Mall. Operator accreditation and driver authorisation will be required in Cairns, as it will be for all public transport operators throughout the State.

The success of public transport in growing areas requires good forward planning. However, proper passenger transport planning must go hand in hand with land use planning. Already the Government has done considerable work in this area by setting up mechanisms for regional planning so that land use development and transport can be coordinated. The SEQ 2001 project identified a need for an integrated regional transport plan for the south-east corner.

As the House has heard, this plan will be a blueprint for achieving an efficient, high quality, environmentally responsible transport system for Australia's fastest-growing region. Today, I do indeed, as this motion says, want the House to note the importance of a discussion paper titled *Towards an Integrated Regional Plan for South-east Queensland*, which will involve the community in this vitally important transport planning process because the outcome of that process, in the form of a regional integrated transport plan, will be vitally important for far-north Queensland where the community is also grappling with problems associated with rapid growth and is requiring an environmentally friendly public transport system.

Fortunately, in the Cairns region we have not yet reached the levels of congestion experienced in south-east Queensland because we do not have that kind of population growth, but we can plan ahead and hopefully avoid some of the problems that Brisbane faces today. We can do that by getting our own regional transport plan in place early. We have already started that most important task. In 1993, the Cairns/Mulgrave transport study was one of the most ambitious

transport and land use studies ever undertaken in Queensland, and it recognised that transport policy should be directed towards shifting travel demand to favour public transport use, which is very low in the Cairns area—less than 1 per cent. That report says that increased public transport use is vital to meeting the future demand for travel as the expansion of road capacity is heavily constrained by physical, environmental and quality-of-life factors and that the principal issue is whether a need exists to adopt a track-based system. The report says that for populations up to 300,000, a bus-based system is adequate for all scenarios tested. However, special provisions will be needed on the arterials to ensure efficient bus operation.

Further transport and land use planning has occurred. Indeed, I think that those conclusions that a bus-based transport system might be adequate for a population of up to 300,000 are coming under review, and I am very pleased to see that. As part of that FNQ 2010 process that I have just described, we are tackling these issues. That regional planning process takes in an area from the north of Douglas Shire down to Cardwell Shire in the south and all of the Atherton Tableland. Also, as part of that process, a regional growth management framework is to be released soon for public comment, and it has identified a preferred urban expansion pattern. It has recommended that 80 per cent of the projected growth in the population for the region be accommodated in the Cairns/Mulgrave local authority areas. This more intense residential development in the coastal corridor will actually support a very good public transport system. The RGMF document has recommended assessment of the viability of establishing a fixed rail system between Buchan's Point in the north and Gordonvale in the south with a view to developing this rapid transport system for the Cairns urban area within five to 10 years, and certainly with a population of fewer than 300,000.

As I said in the House yesterday, part of the FNQ 2010 process will involve the preparation of our own integrated regional transport strategy. I am pleased to note, too, that as part of the FNQ 2010 process there is a recognition that rail can play a very important role in public transport for the region, and it also recommends investigating its use for the tablelands and to Innisfail for commuting.

At a local level, I am very pleased to note that Vince O'Rourke, the CEO of Queensland Rail, recently came up to a meeting in

Kuranda and has agreed to form a task force of Queensland Rail staff and Kuranda residents to investigate the re-establishment of some kind of rail commuter service between Kuranda and Cairns, which would be welcomed by residents there.

There are a number of specifics in that particular transport strategy to which I have referred. The 10-year plan that is outlined in the RGMF has objectives for the first five years and further objectives for the next five to ten years. For example, in the first five years we should develop a public transport strategy for the Cairns urban area and the far-north Queensland region; identify proposed rapid public transport routes and the location of core urban nodes; preserve and/or obtain primary public transport corridors; plan for new urban areas to incorporate provision for development of public transport, etc. In five to ten years the objectives are to actually develop the rapid public transport system for the Cairns urban area; develop interchange facilities at key nodes on the rapid transport network with local services to neighbouring residential areas; and develop public transport links between subregional centres and growing urban areas outside the Cairns urban area.

I will conclude with the words of the Minister for Transport in his foreword to the transport discussion paper. He said—

"We need a transport system which supports a vital economy and provides people with a range of choices for accessing employment, education, recreational and social activities and shopping without always relying on a car."

Those words are equally true for far-north Queensland. I look forward to the outcomes of the efforts here in south-east Queensland so that far-north Queensland can learn from those experiences.

Miss SIMPSON (Maroochydore) (6.01 p.m.): After listening to the speech made by the member for Barron River, I must say that I do not think that the Government is considering fixing something that is broken or breaking something and trying to fix it afterwards. It is not breaking someone's leg; it is trying to chop it off at the knee.

The key plank in the discussion paper is public transport. Everyone wants to see better public transport. No-one in Queensland does not want to see better public transport, but it is a question of how the Government brings that about. The discussion paper correctly identifies the environmental, social and economic impacts of the increasing use of cars in

Queensland and the increasing percentage of the population in Queensland relying on cars to get about. It is very much an environmental concern. However, the Government will not improve public transport by threatening the viability of bus operators, the people who provide most of the public transport in Queensland.

The public wants better public transport, but I warn the Goss Government that, when I say to members of the public, "Do you want better public transport?" they say, "Yes, yes, we definitely want better public transport", but as we discuss it further and I say, "What would happen if some of your bus operators were no longer viable?" those people tell me that they genuinely do not want their local bus operators to go broke. The Goss Government may not believe it, but the average person in the community—the person who wants better public transport—does not want it at the cost of losing the local bus operators. Those people have the intelligence to recognise that, if they lose their local bus operators, they will be worse off.

To deal with one contractor, as is proposed on the Sunshine Coast—a massive area—the Government proposes one licence area. Many people fear that, ultimately, that will mean a more faceless, less responsive and more centralised service that is a little bit more removed from the local people. The greatest threat faced by people living on the Sunshine Coast and in many other areas of Queensland is that, under the forced new licensing system, the little guys, the smaller operators, need not be talked to; they need not even be involved in the negotiations.

If one reads clause 59, which I believe is being left out of the Sunshine Coast contracts, one realises that those people need not be involved in the amalgamation or rationalisation; they can simply be dropped off the edge. When a new contract is issued, they must wait three months before they have a chance to go to arbitration. Small bus operators who must go through three months without having that guaranteed income will not survive. They will go to the wall. Those are the very real fears held by bus operators on the Sunshine Coast, the smaller people who operate and provide urban services.

Even the operator who gets that one licence, considers how to provide those services, gets all the buses and decides whether to negotiate with other people, does not face an easy road. Such operators face a very rocky road in terms of the financial viability of their businesses. After five years, their

licences can be taken from them. They also face a system of reducing subsidies.

Brisbane has a subsidised public transport system. Brisbane is much more heavily populated than the Sunshine Coast; it has a very heavily subsidised public transport system, yet its system is still not viable. It still cannot stand on its own feet. The very real fear is that, as the subsidy for the licence holder is reduced, the person who is successful in getting that licence must still, with a decreasing subsidy, abide by the condition to maintain and increase the frequency of the service. Given the population base of the Sunshine Coast, it is not realistic to expect people to invest and survive in that environment.

Furthermore, the Government has not cared about the loss of people's capital and their businesses. It has not cared about those people who have invested in that industry. If people are potentially successful licensees for the whole of the Sunshine Coast or for any other area in Queensland, would they trust the Government?

Mr Beattie: Of course we are. This Government—of course we trust it.

Miss SIMPSON: I do not know whether I would trust the Government. People on the Sunshine Coast do not trust it. Certainly, when we talk about the toll issues, the honourable member will see exactly why that is. The toll ring issue is on again, off again, depending on which page of the report one reads and when one listens to the Premier.

There is not the certainty or the security that that industry needs in order to provide people with a real public service; in order to provide people with public transport. The reality is that an area that is more spread out, such as the Sunshine Coast—

Mr Beattie: A important area.

Miss SIMPSON: It is a very important area, but compared with Brisbane, which has had a continuing subsidy, how do we expect bus operators to survive in the environment that has been created by the Government?

I want better public transport, but I do not want those guys to go broke. We do not want bus services to be lost. We do not want the system to be so broken that, when the Government must suddenly review it and put it back together, those people will be lost; they will have gone. I want a guarantee from the Minister for Transport that he will compensate bus operators who go broke under the new system. I want a guarantee from the Minister that he will compensate people when they

lose, say, 50 per cent or a sizeable chunk of their businesses, because that is what those people face.

The Government has decided that it wants to look as though it is doing something in an election year. As the member for Aspley pointed out, here we go through the consultation process again. If the Government is so sure that it has got it right with its new bus formula, it should financially guarantee that system for the people involved in it. I believe that, if we want a basic line of public service, there are times when, in the public interest and for social equity, we must consider appropriate subsidies.

Under the new contract process, out of six existing operators on the Sunshine Coast, only one will be granted a licence, but the losers will not be able to go to arbitration for three months. That is just ridiculous. The problem is that it is the people—the public—who suffer. Government members do not understand. Once we lose those people, we cannot get them back.

In the present negotiations, another very real fear is that the process has not been transparent. The process must be transparent for the public, all potential licensees and anyone who must negotiate with the successful licensees. People do not know what certain Department of Transport officials have talked about to people. It is not an equal footing. It is not a level playing field, if you like, because that is not the way the game is being played. People are being picked off one by one.

In a meeting in my office between members of Parliament and Queensland Transport officials—I realise that there has been quite a change in Department of Transport personnel in the past 12 months—those officials said that only two bus operators provided a real urban service. Actually, six bus operators on the Sunshine Coast provide an urban service. The so-called reforms to the whole Transport juggernaut are going through at warp speed so that, regardless of the cracks, it will explode. The Government knows that it will probably explode after the election.

Before the 1992 election, the Labor member for Cooroora, Ray Barber, said that he would improve certain bus routes. So Queensland Transport then jogged out, did his bidding and told one bus operator that he had to provide X number of new services. Of course, everybody knows that one cannot argue with Queensland Transport; it controls one's destiny. That bus operator provided the

extra services. Over the three-month period running up to the election, that cost him \$60,000. He averaged one and a half passengers on the services, and he had to close those extra services down after the election.

Ray Barber did not have to pay for his election promises; a small businessman did. That is the problem with the Government. It makes people in the public who run small businesses and who have been providing jobs for locals pay the price for its political promises. It will blow up.

I must talk about the toll rings and other toll proposals. The Premier said that they are off the agenda. Everyone knows what the Government did to the people on the Sunshine Coast. When it promised to take away a toll, it came back and gave us two extra tolls. There is no way that toll rings are off the agenda or that extra tolls on existing roads in Queensland are off the agenda, because the Government takes them off the front shelf and puts them on the back shelf until it thinks that people have forgotten about them. Then, mysteriously, back comes the toll. The Government proposes to do that on existing roads in Queensland.

Where is the social justice in making the gap between the poor and the rich greater by saying that some people will have the right to travel on those roads but other people will not? That is what the proposal is all about. It is about dividing people so that some people will have the right to travel on so-called public roads and other people will not. In the meantime, the public transport system is undergoing the terrible sham of a forced licensing system.

Time expired.

Hon. K. W. HAYWARD (Kallangur—Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development) (6.11 p.m.): This debate is to note the importance of the draft discussion paper *Towards an Integrated Regional Transport Plan*. That paper is designed to give everyone the opportunity to participate in the discussion stage as we develop an integrated regional transport plan for south-east Queensland. That will be done and is clearly spelt out on page 43 where, under the heading "Get Involved", it states—

"This discussion paper . . . will be undertaken to assist in the development . . ."

It will deal with the key transport issues because, as everyone in this Parliament

knows, south-east Queensland is Australia's most livable region. No-one can question that as people are pouring into this State every day. Hundreds of thousands of people will come here over the next 10 years. To ensure that we keep it as the most livable region, we need to plan for our long-term future. This document begins that process. All of the documents referred to by the honourable member for Aspley are part of the process. In the end, the result will be a plan that everybody can see. It will provide clarity and it will provide certainty so that people will know and understand the issues involved and be able to deal with the big ideas for the future of everybody in south-east Queensland over the next 10 years.

Part of the direction, of course, comes through the SEQ 2001 program, which provides the blueprint. From what I have heard from the Opposition so far, it has no strategy and no policy. If it does not have those two, it has no chance of being able to produce a plan. I have had recent experience in putting together a metropolitan hospitals plan for south-east Queensland and I believe that when people are presented with the issues, they can understand, think about and grasp the big issues and ideas.

From what I have heard this afternoon, the interesting aspect of this debate as it affects transport is that the Opposition does not have any ideas. It has some complaints, whinges and whines. That is basically its standard approach. However, people want and need some certainty and clarity. That is what this document begins to give them. It begins to do that in south-east Queensland and the process will produce a plan so that people will be informed.

In the foreword to this document my predecessor stated—

"This discussion paper canvasses ideas and possible actions which can reverse the trends towards car dependency . . ."

It will raise such issues for debate, so that everyone is informed about the trends that have held sway for many years.

Owing to the large numbers of people pouring into this State—and some of the members in this House are directly affected by that and should be aware of that—we need ideas and we need long-term planning. That is what this process is about. Importantly, through this process I am determined to ensure that we develop a practical plan. We can develop a practical plan, but I believe it is

important that the plan provides for reviews on a two-yearly or three-yearly basis. In that way, when changes occur—because of changes in growth patterns, we all know that they inevitably will—the opportunity will exist to integrate systems.

What is this debate about? It is about finding solutions. It is about dealing with the issues. In dealing with those issues and preparing a plan such as this, we need to take account of the many and varied vested interests in the community and also the needs of our rapidly growing population in south-east Queensland.

What does this document set forward in what I think is pretty readable form? As everybody knows, I have been in this portfolio only a couple days. I believe that this document, in a readable form, tells people how to get involved. It sets out seven key strategies: improving public transport, managing the demand for travel, achieving a better fit between transport and urban planning, improving strategic planning for regional roads, providing a strategic freight network, addressing the social dimensions of transport and minimising the impact of transport on the environment. It raises those issues as strategies for people to consider and gives them the opportunity to participate in the process.

As I said, I am determined to ensure that by the end of the year we are able to produce a clear plan for south-east Queensland. That will demonstrate again that this Government is the Government of ideas and that it can put those ideas into practical effect through a practical plan which, as I said, as population growth occurs in south-east Queensland, can be reviewed on a two-yearly or three-yearly basis.

What did the former Government leave us? Of course, we were left with no plan and no ideas. What have we heard from the members of the Opposition so far? They have not changed; they have no ideas and no strategy—just whingeing, whining and complaining. I say "so far" because Mr Johnson has not yet spoken.

This discussion paper will give the people of south-east Queensland the opportunity to tell the Government what they see as the issues in transport planning and what impact those issues will have on them. Those issues will contribute to a plan which, when completed, will be an important blueprint for achieving an efficient, high quality, environmentally responsible transport system for Australia's fastest growing region. It will

draw together the plans to manage the movement of people and goods in the area extending north to Noosa, west to Toowoomba and south to the New South Wales border. As I said, the plan provides seven key strategies.

At present, public transport accounts for only 6 per cent of all transport journeys in south-east Queensland. In the Brisbane metropolitan area, where there is an established rail and bus system, only approximately 8 per cent of travel is by public transport. When the plan is completed, it has to be practical. We all know—we all live in the real world—that Queenslanders will turn to public transport only if it means that their own quality of life will not be affected directly by such issues as access to that public transport. Of course, in relation to planning for our region's future growth, one of the major problems that the people of south-east Queensland face is access to public transport.

As to the development of transport infrastructure, the plan sets out the balancing act between providing realistic, affordable infrastructure and relating to and meeting the expectations and ideals of the people who live in south-east Queensland. Of course, everybody would like to be able to catch a bus or train at any time they need to do so. But all sensible people would agree that that simply is not possible; nor is it realistic. Of course, the challenge of this process is to ensure that the plan is able to overcome the transport obstacles that inhibit better mobility for people and meet those community transport ideals to the greatest possible degree and in the most acceptable manner.

Through this process, I am looking for people to become involved and to come forward with ideas. I believe that the solution to particular problems will not always be an obvious, single solution. It is important to note also that, when we finally come up with a plan, the options in the plan will not be accepted universally. As I said before, it is important for people to have the opportunity to have clarity and certainty. I believe that is what the community of south-east Queensland—and the Queensland community—are looking for.

Time expired.

Mr JOHNSON (Gregory) (6.21 p.m.): I rise to speak on this Matter of Special Public Importance—

"That the House note the importance of the draft discussion paper Towards an Integrated Regional Transport Plan."

As my colleague the member for Aspley mentioned in his contribution this afternoon, we have seen plenty of discussion papers. We can see that pile in front of me; that is only about one-quarter of what this Government has tabled in this Parliament and distributed throughout this State over the last five and a bit years it has been in Government. I make the point that, when the former Minister was in control of this portfolio and in control of the transport strategy for the south-east corner about which we speak today, he had committees, committees and more committees, and many members sitting in this Chamber were a part of that committee process.

I do not know how much it cost to distribute this publication to constituencies in the south-east corner in recent weeks, but it compounds the cost of this document, Towards an Integrated Regional Transport Plan for South-east Queensland.

Mr Beattie: Are you against community consultation?

Mr JOHNSON: The member should listen to me. He is a party to this deal. I refer to the SEQ 2001 Planning for the Future document, which states that in the late 1980s the State Government convened a conference to discuss issues facing south-east Queensland in the face of the predicted high population growth. That conference was attended by more than 300 people from across the community. As a result, a regional planning advisory group was established to oversee the SEQ 2001 project. Five years down the track, the Transport Minister has walked off camp because he cannot handle the situation, another Minister has been appointed in his place to try to take control of it, and we are calling on the people of the south-east corner to try to help this Government out of its predicament. I think that the entire Government should resign and give somebody who can address the transport problem in the south-east corner a go.

This enlarged committee invited Mr Beattie to have input into the matter. In one part of this document, reference is made to ferries. My colleague the member for Aspley made reference to the ferry system, but what did the Government do with the ferries? It took them off the water. It has closed most of them down, denying people access to the ferry system. What about the passenger transport system and the legislation relating to passenger transport that was passed recently by this Parliament? That passenger transport legislation was only a licence to ruin the bus

operators of this State and possibly even force taxi owners out of their businesses. It probably gave the private vehicle hire industry a better go at the expense of taxi operators. The former Minister—and Government members know it—also introduced legislation that allowed for bus companies to operate in certain areas. The Government knows that, if only one person is to be picked up on one route, it is certainly not going to send a bus that holds 50 people; it will use a smaller vehicle. If a job requires only a one-tonne truck, a firm will certainly not send a semitrailer. However, that seems to be the philosophy of this Government. It neither understands nor addresses the transport requirements of the people of Queensland.

Mr Ardill interjected.

Mr JOHNSON: The member for Archerfield should listen. My colleague the member for Maroochydore made mention a little while ago of bus operators on the north coast. In that area, five bus operators will be pursuing one licence. What is going to happen to those other four operators? One of those operators has 40 coaches; another one has 10. They are going to go to the wall, and who is responsible for that? David Hamill and the Government—his Government! The Government is responsible for the downfall of some of those bus operations. I do not believe that is consultation with business.

Mr Ardill interjected.

Mr JOHNSON: The member knows perfectly well that the bureaucrats in this State were the ones who were responsible for the implementation of that piece of legislation and that, at the time, the Minister did not have the guts to stand up and be counted and listen to the real concerns of those bus operators. The situation continues and gets progressively worse. I have referred to buses and the passenger transport system. I turn now to the rail network in Brisbane.

Mr BEATTIE: Ah, well!

Mr JOHNSON: The member for Brisbane Central made mention of the rail network. I know that this matter is very close to his heart. However, as the member well knows, the point is that the urban system is subsidised to the tune of \$300,000 a day—a cost of \$108m a year—which is contributed by the taxpayers of this State to the urban passenger transport system in Brisbane. Yet the Government is propping up the Brisbane City Council bus system by another \$50m. There is already a loss of \$50m.

Mr Ardill: Twenty-seven million dollars.

Mr JOHNSON: The member knows that there is a loss of \$50m, so the figure compounds further. I will take that interjection. The member says "\$27m", but it is \$50m on top of that \$108m. At the same time, the Queensland Government has proposed a further injection of \$191m in 1994-95 towards the upgrading of the rail system in Brisbane, with a proposal over the next four years of injecting \$698m.

Mr Beattie: That's quadruplication of the rail services.

Mr JOHNSON: Yes, that is rail services. The Government is catering for further rail services. It is money that is going to be spent on a further upgrade, of which I do not disapprove. However, I am talking about the moneys that have been spent. Government members seem to think that nothing is happening, but the whole thing is that they are not doing it right. As I said in relation to the passenger transport legislation, the consultation process was only with the people whom the Government knew were going to give a favourable reply, and that is exactly what happened.

My colleague the member for Aspley made reference to the toll system in Queensland. As Government members know perfectly well, I live in the western part of the State. However, every time I drive through the electorate represented by the member for Brisbane Central, heavy trucks are congesting the Valley. That is because the Government does not have any foresight. A little while ago, the Minister made reference to having a vision to address the problem. I ask the Minister to act urgently to address the matter of the tolls on the bridge. I believe that if the tolls on that bridge were relaxed at certain hours, a lot of the congestion in the Valley in peak hours would be alleviated. I believe that is one way to go.

Government members say that the Opposition does not have a vision or a blueprint. It does have a blueprint; it does have a vision. Opposition members have said before—and we will continue to say it—that our vision is to utilise existing resources. In Europe, existing resources are utilised very, very well.

Mr Braddy: What a vision!

Mr JOHNSON: No, the Honourable the Minister for Police has it wrong. Another of the Opposition's concepts is to re-educate people to live in areas other than the south-east corner. This Government thinks that the whole of Queensland revolves around the south-east

corner. The Government may hold 62 seats in the south-east corner, but many people live in the other 27 electorates outside the south-east corner. I say that it is the people who live outside the south-east corner who provide the goods and services that keep the people in the manufacturing and export industries.

It must be borne in mind that the National Road Transport Commission has a blueprint for road transport reforms in this nation. The former Minister for Transport followed many of those initiatives, but did he not follow enough of them with enough vigour. I urge the Minister to pursue those issues, because I believe that there are many more problems with transport in this State than the former Minister tried to address, and there is the need for consultation. I urge the Minister to enter into the consultation process with all quarters of the community. The member for Mansfield is laughing, but I will give her the mail, she will not be laughing after the next State election because I will make sure that she is not here to laugh. I saw her in action a couple of weeks ago at Rochedale. One bloke told me that he had not seen her in five years.

Time expired.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. K. W. HAYWARD (Kallangur—Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development) (6.30 p.m.): I move—

"That the House do now adjourn."

Gold Coast Indy Car Grand Prix

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise—Leader of the Opposition) (6.30 p.m.): This evening, I wish to address the horrendous and unacceptable conflict of interest by senior executives of the *Courier-Mail* who quite rightly would not tolerate in the political arena the conflict of interest in which they have placed themselves in regard to the Gold Coast Indy Car Grand Prix.

It should be noted that the Indy Car Company is an entity fully owned by the Queensland Government, which has seen fit to invest some \$70m of Queensland taxpayers' funds in a motor race. This morning, we saw the coverage of events in this Parliament taken out of the hands of political correspondents and put in the hands of a motoring writer. We saw comments attributed to Mr John Cowley, a member of the Indy board, and Mr Ron Richards, another senior executive of Queensland Newspapers,

who is the Chairman of the Gold Coast Indy Car Company. In other words, Messrs Richards and Cowley are effectively the servants not only of Queensland Newspapers' extraordinary and inappropriate professional interest in this disastrously performing taxpayer subsidised event but also of the Queensland Government of the day.

It is little wonder to anybody in the Opposition that a newspaper whose senior executives are engaged in a business which has cost the taxpayers of this State \$70m are such staunch and constant advocates of the current ALP Government as, among other things, allegedly sound economic managers. They have a specific interest in maintaining that particularly unsustainable charade.

An element of the extraordinary coverage in the *Courier-Mail* today was the suggestion in the comment piece that certain matters should not have been raised in the political arena. I would like both Queensland Newspapers figures to understand that I sought to raise concerns in relation to the Indy with the then Chairman of the QTTC, Mr Jim Kennedy, in late August 1993. I wrote to him and said—

"I wish to offer the State Opposition's support for today's announcement regarding Government backing of the Indy Grand Prix for another year. In media interviews, I have indicated that we welcome the decision, including outlined changes to the Indy board. While we have been as positive as possible in this, there are some residual concerns which need to be addressed in order to reinforce what should be bipartisan support for this event."

I went on to request a meeting with Mr Kennedy. He wrote back, saying—

"Dear Rob,

Thank you for your letter of 31 August last and for your support. I would be delighted to meet with you. In order to follow the correct protocol, I assume you will be contacting Bob Gibbs to make arrangements through his office for such a meeting to take place at a mutually suitable time."

So I wrote to the Minister, and received the following reply—

"Dear Mr Borbidge,

I acknowledge your letter of 23rd September 1993 requesting a briefing from Mr Kennedy and members of the Indy board. I have given consideration to this matter and advise that I am not

prepared to accede to your request. I have advised Mr Kennedy of my decision."

We were quite prepared to meet with the board and to convey our concerns to it in confidence. We were prevented from doing so by the current Minister, Mr Gibbs, yet some apparatchik at Queensland Newspapers has the audacity to say that we should not raise it in the political sphere. We had nowhere else to go. I table the relevant correspondence. I make no apology whatsoever for bringing valid criticism of the Indy to the notice of this place in a manner that is clearly anathema to the *Courier-Mail* given the vastness of its conflict of interest and that of its Indy colleague, the ALP Government.

Mr Cowley may believe that, as he stated this morning, with the exception of Indy, Queensland is down to "Trevor Hendy and a couple of beaches". I do not share this view. I would have been negligent if I had not raised in this House what the *Courier-Mail*, because of a massive conflict of interest, has not accurately or fairly reported. I place on record once again that, if such a massive conflict of interest existed in this Parliament, whether it be on the Government side or on the Opposition side, the *Courier-Mail* would be the first to complain.

Mr Cowley and Mr Richards have some decisions to make as to whether they are prepared to put the interests of the public of this State ahead of their board positions and their commercial considerations.

Time expired.

Mansfield Electorate

Ms POWER (Mansfield) (6.35 p.m.): Last week, the Liberal candidate in Mansfield wrote his version of a Dear John letter to the residents of Wishart. It was full of lies and designed to instil fear in people. However, if he is taking his lessons from the member for Gregory, that would not be surprising. This afternoon, the member for Gregory has stated that he does not believe that, in spite of its population, money should be spent in south-east Queensland. The honourable member threatened me with the loss of my seat. My only fault will be that I tell the truth, unlike him and the Liberal candidate in Mansfield. I would be more worried about the way in which the members for Caloundra and Keppel have been running back to their electorates.

The honourable member compounded his lies in his statements to the protest

meeting at the pony club. He led people to believe that he had travelled to the meeting at his own expense. All of us know that he would have used his parliamentary allowance. That only starts the ball rolling in relation to the lies that Opposition members are prepared to tell. The list goes on. I used the term "Dear John" because it connotes a sad story. When people are not game enough to face others, they put what they have to say down on paper. He started off by telling everybody that all the roads including the Southern Bypass, will meet at Prebble Street, Rochedale. I am sure that the member for Sunnybank will be interested to know that we have now shifted the Southern Bypass through Rochedale instead of creating heartache in Eight Mile Plains.

As well as that, he suggested that we called the route the south coast motorway because we wanted to hide any reference to the eastern corridor. I do not think that that has been the case at all. He then suggested to the people of Wishart that they have been left out of the whole equation. I do not know about anybody else in this place, but I reckon that the people in my electorate would have to be living on another planet if they did not know of the eastern corridor and the south coast motorway. It has been on show at Garden City and at other shopping centres in the area since August last year. I think that is when my sleepless nights began.

Unlike my opponent, I do not tell lies and I do not run away from my responsibilities. He wants to pretend that it can all be solved by a piece of paper; that that will stop it. Firstly, he calls my integrity into question. I want to set the record straight. When I went to the people of Rochedale, I told them that they would not like what I had to say, but that the Cabinet decision about the road had been made.

I have sought answers from the Department of Transport and others to all of the problems that people have raised. The reality is that transport projections, population growth and interest groups such as the tourist industry, the bus and trucking industries and the Gold Coast population are all putting pressure on the department and this Government—and on any other Government that might be concerned—to build a road.

The other saviour that is suggested is an upgrade to the Pacific Highway, as is proposed by the Liberal candidate. We have already canvassed that idea. Despite upgrading the Pacific Highway to six lanes and improving public transport, if we were to go further with that idea and put a tollway in the middle of the Pacific Highway, I am told by

experts in Emergency Services and the Police Service that we would not solve any of the problems on the highway; we would simply be adding to the existing ones and we would still have the hold-ups that we now experience. The Liberal candidate is giving people false hope by putting forward proposals that have already been canvassed.

If people cannot be won over by fear, their hip pockets will be targeted. The Liberal candidate talked about toll fees of \$12 each way for cars and \$20 for trucks. In none of the blurbs so far have we even talked about what trucks might be using the road. The Kinhill projections have all been about cars on the road, and the figure is certainly not \$12. More fears and more lies! Why let the truth stand in the way of a good story?

Mr Beattie: They're good at lying.

Ms POWER: The Liberal candidate takes lessons from the member for Gregory.

Then we heard all about the noise and visual pollution, as though that is an original thought on his part. Not so! I have been urging the department—and working with it—to ensure that visual and noise pollution will be addressed. But the triple whammy that he highlights is outlandish. He raises the famous issue of the Rochedale dump and suggests that Pacific Waste Management will have its trucks running all over the place.

Time expired.

Former Education Minister; Robina Hospital

Mr QUINN (Merrimac) (6.41 p.m.): In the short time available to me tonight, I wish to raise two issues. I raise the first one because, in the fury of a State election campaign, another appropriate occasion may not arise for me to do so. I wish to make some comments on the recent resignation of the former Minister for Education, Mr Comben. I make these comments in a spirit of goodwill, acknowledging that the former Minister has indeed given good service to education in Queensland over the past two years. It is rare for a Minister in any Parliament in Australia to retire of his or her own volition. As members of this House would be aware, normally it is a case of being asked to go or being told to go when the time has come.

I acknowledge that over the past two years the former Minister has indeed had the best interests of Queensland schoolchildren at heart. The Minister and I always participated in very robust and vigorous debates in this

House; but when we did disagree, it was always on the policy issues and never on the personalities. I appreciate the former Minister's approach in that regard. I wish the member for Kedron well for the future, and I compliment him on the choice of university at which he has decided to continue his studies.

The second issue that I wish to raise is the Robina hospital and, more particularly, the Government's decision to renege on what was a clear commitment to construct the hospital at some time in the future. That commitment was indicated clearly by a former Minister for Health, Mr McElligott. The opening paragraph of his reply to my letter of late 1990 leaves no doubt in anyone's mind that the Government did acquire a site on which to construct the hospital. The opening paragraph of that letter, which illustrates the Government's clear intention at that time, states—

"I refer to your recent letter with respect to the approval by the Albert Shire Council to the Robina Land Corporation's proposed development for the Robina district of the Gold Coast region. As you have stated, a site for the future development of a 200 bed Hospital has been acquired at Robina."

So not only did the Government acquire a site for the hospital, it also had the size of the hospital in mind. A clear commitment was given by this Government, and on the basis of that commitment, maps of the region included the proposed hospital site. On that basis, many people moved into the area and purchased homes. As members would be aware from the demographics of the region, the Gold Coast—and Robina in particular—has a high percentage of retired or elderly people. Many people made the decision to move to Robina based on the maps that they were shown which indicated that the Government intended to build a 200-bed hospital there.

Commercial decisions were also made based on the Government's intentions to construct a hospital at Robina. Indeed, the new multibillion-dollar Robina town centre is based around the geographic locations of the proposed hospital site, the proposed railway site and the new high school. Everyone within the area and, indeed, within the central Gold Coast area in general had the impression that a hospital would be constructed on that particular site. The Government has reneged on that promise. It has moved away from the commitment to build a hospital and is now moving towards some sort of health facility that is to be provided further down the track. That announcement is causing quite a deal of

angst among residents in that area because they have no idea what "health facility" means. They are also unsure whether or not, in five or ten years' time, the Government will move away from the commitment to a health facility and onto something else.

The Robina hospital fiasco is typical of the poor actions of Queensland Health over the past four or five years when promises have been made but not delivered. This is a typical example of the gross mismanagement of Queensland Health over the past couple of years.

Red-light Camera, Sunnybank

Mr ROBERTSON (Sunnybank) (6.46 p.m.): Earlier today, I presented a petition to Parliament from nearly 700 local residents requesting that consideration be given to installing a red-light camera at the intersection of Mains Road and Beenleigh Road at Sunnybank. The substantial public support for the installation of a red-light camera at that extremely busy intersection is based on the fact that the Runcorn State School is located adjacent to that major intersection. Since my election as the member for Sunnybank, improving the safety of children attending Runcorn State School who use that major intersection has been a high priority. That is why I support that petition from residents which was tabled today in the House.

At present, only one road crossing supervisor has been allocated to usher students across part of the intersection. For the remainder of the journey—about three-quarters of the way across—students must rely on traffic lights and "walk" signs to provide for their safe passage. The problem is that, although the children of Runcorn State School can be relied upon to obey traffic signals, the same cannot be said of motorists. As a motorist who regularly uses that intersection, time and time again I have seen motor vehicles, trucks and buses crossing that intersection after the traffic lights have turned to red. Parents and local residents tell me of numerous incidents in which children begin to cross Mains Road after the green "walk" signal commences, only to find that motor vehicles are still travelling through the intersection. I have brought this situation to the attention of the Brisbane City Council via local Councillor Gail Macpherson, who has done everything possible to improve safety at that intersection through the installation of additional signage warning motorists of the pedestrian crossing at that intersection. Consideration is also being

given to delaying the change of the "walk" sign from red to green to stop children walking out onto the road while cars may still be turning into Mains Road even though the lights have turned to red.

I believe that the only solution to improve safety for students of Runcorn State School is the installation of a red-light camera at that intersection. To this end, I have already written to the Minister for Transport requesting consideration of this suggestion. However, it appears that under current regulations the installation of a red-light camera is a matter for the police to determine following an analysis of road accident statistics. Although I understand the need to use some form of criteria to determine priorities for the location of red-light cameras, I remain unconvinced that the sole basis for setting priorities should be motor vehicle accident statistics. Surely, if a school is located at a major intersection, such as Mains and Beenleigh Roads, we should not have to wait until road accident statistics are accumulated before we can investigate whether the installation of a red-light camera would have the effect of improving motorists' behaviour at that intersection. I agree with the view expressed by officers of the Department of Transport that red-light cameras should not be located at sites where the public may form the view that they are installed simply as a revenue-raising exercise. However, I do not believe that the public would view the installation of a red-light camera at the Mains Road and Beenleigh Road intersection in that way.

Runcorn State School, which is over 80 years old, has witnessed tremendous population growth in the district and has now become a victim of it. Recent estimates of the number of motor vehicles that pass by the school on Mains Road each day indicate that it is one of the busiest intersections in Brisbane. Over 34,000 vehicles use Mains Road each day, and over 27,000 vehicles use Beenleigh Road every day. The congestion that this number of vehicle movements creates, particularly during the hours when students are either going to or leaving Runcorn State School, means that many motorists take chances by using amber and even red lights to turn into Mains Road or Beenleigh Road. Although road accident statistics may not support the installation of a red-light camera at that site, I believe that a need still exists for this particular means of driver behaviour modification to ensure that road accident statistics do not increase.

As I said earlier, I support wholeheartedly the call by the many hundreds of residents

who signed the petition calling for the installation of a red-light camera at the Mains Road and Beenleigh Road intersection. I hope that the Department of Transport and the Police Department will respond positively to that call before accident statistics make the installation of a red-light camera an inevitability.

Protection of Subcontractors and Suppliers

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (6.51 p.m.): I wish to draw to the attention of the House what happens far too often in this State when building companies go into liquidation, particularly when that is what could be termed voluntary liquidation. I draw to the attention of the House a circumstance in my own electorate from which a lot of people are suffering hurt. I remember a few years ago that Mr Tom Burns was going to take this matter on board.

Mr Beattie: But he did.

Mr STEPHAN: He did not take it on board. We heard a lot of rhetoric and he brought legislation before the House, but it was nothing more than rhetoric. I remember him saying that he was here to look after the battler.

Mr Beattie: He is.

Mr STEPHAN: He did not look after the battler; the battler is still out there.

Mr Beattie: He's a battler's mate.

Mr STEPHAN: In the meantime, Mr Burns has gone from one portfolio to another, yet subbies and suppliers in my electorate are still battling and are not protected at all. I remember having relayed to me an occasion at Noosa when Tom Burns spoke to the building contractors and suppliers. Unfortunately, at that time they believed what he had to say, but they were left dangling at the end of a string. This is what has been of great concern to me and to those suppliers and the subbies who are suffering.

Mr Beattie: Give us the facts.

Mr STEPHAN: I am giving the facts. These people are suffering. The member should put himself in their position. For example, how would he feel if he had supplied goods, equipment and the labour, only to find that no money was received at the end of it?

One particular case to which I wish to refer is Jack's Traditional Homes. The company has gone, but the fellow who was running it is still around. Subcontractors and suppliers have

supplied goods and created a considerable amount of employment, yet they are left waiting for their payment, which cannot be forthcoming because of the attitude of the likes of Jack's Traditional Homes, which has ceased operations.

Mr Beattie: What's their name?

Mr STEPHAN: Jack's Traditional Homes. It has gone into liquidation leaving behind a number of debts to local businesses.

Mr Purcell: The prices weren't too low for their jobs, hey?

Mr STEPHAN: I hope that no Government member would agree with that sort of activity. I am just pointing out to the honourable member the repercussions from these things. Subcontractors and suppliers are after some action that will mean something. They want protection for their livelihood and some guarantee of payment for services rendered and supplies delivered—on the same basis as applies to home owners. Insurance is available to home owners to give them the support and backing that ensures that their home is constructed. However, that is not the case with the poor old subbies and suppliers. They are on the end of a branch and sometimes that branch is cut off.

Under the sorts of conditions that they work, there is no legal assistance for them, either. We should all remember that many thousands of dollars are owed to subcontractors and suppliers because they have done the right thing and paid their employees. They are left with nowhere to go. They are looking for an amendment to the Companies Act, which currently shields directors from litigation. They want to make sure that directors who place companies into liquidation and then start up new companies to do exactly the same sorts of things are brought before the law.

Time expired.

Achievements, Mount Ommaney Electorate

Mr PYKE (Mount Ommaney) (6.56 p.m.): Through you, Mr Deputy Speaker, I wish to provide a report to my residents of the Mount Ommaney electorate. I intend to detail my responses to a number of vital issues in the Mount Ommaney electorate and a number of the achievements of my office.

I refer to the intersection of Cook and Oxley Roads. Oxley Road is now a very busy road. This intersection is a source of concern to residents and, therefore, to my office. While

this is a council matter, my office will continue to act by lobbying the Lord Mayor to have the intersection upgraded with traffic control lights as soon as possible.

The intersection of Horizon Road and Dandenong Road is a council responsibility, but this intersection is long overdue for upgrading. While not currently listed as a priority for the installation of traffic lights, it is my opinion that the intersection is dangerous and difficult to negotiate during peak times and should be controlled by traffic lights. My office has presented a petition to the Lord Mayor to try to persuade the council to install traffic lights in the 1995-96 financial year.

The next matter deals with constituent power. I was asked by Mr Bob Norman of Corinda to meet him at Corinda Railway Station, where he showed me that people changing trains at Corinda were having to walk up and down ramps, instead of across a simple platform. For older and infirm people and those with disabilities this was very difficult in fine weather and unpleasant for all during bad weather. As a consequence of Mr Norman's suggestion, Ipswich trains now pull up at platform 2 instead of platform 5 when possible. This allows passengers changing between the Ipswich, city or South Brisbane services to simply cross the platform. This win illustrates the power constituents have through my office to have a real influence in our democratic process. Even a small improvement like this can be difficult to achieve within our bureaucratic structures, but it is possible. I thank Bob for having enough community spirit to bring this matter to my attention.

I turn to the Corinda State High School. This school has a new activities room at a cost of \$50,000, a new science lab building at a cost of \$216,000, and extra classrooms at a cost of \$152,000. The old graphics area space has been converted to a general learning area.

At the Jamboree Heights State School Operation Big Fix is complete. For two decades Jamboree Heights State School has had a serious erosion problem throughout its school grounds. In 1993, I took the risk of saying that the erosion problem would be fixed. My office initiated Operation Big Fix and, 12 months later, the problem is no more. With State Government funding, money raised by the P & C and two prisoner WORC gangs working in the school grounds for 12 months, the erosion problem has been eradicated. It was a great effort and an example of the

cooperation possible between the State Government, the school community and local business. I thank all the people who made that project possible.

Multipurpose courts have also been completed, enhancing the excellent results of Operation Big Fix. It was also a cooperative effort between the school community, prisoners from the WORC program, the State Government and my office to ensure that these multipurpose courts were built. I congratulate all associated with that. Also, \$19,000 has been allocated for seating, concrete paths, security lighting and drinking fountains. The school now has grounds comparable with other State schools within the electorate with a grassed oval and multipurpose courts, pathways and playgrounds.

The new roofed outdoor areas to units one and two of the Jamboree Heights Pre-school have been completed.

The Middle Park State School has seen the expansion of the administration block to Stage B at a cost of \$172,000. This development includes a staff lounge, sick room, health services room, student waiting area, stores and toilets. There are now multipurpose courts at a cost of \$28,000. These courts are able to be used for netball, basketball and tennis. That was a great effort by this school's P & C. I congratulate everyone involved.

At a cost of \$1.4m, Stage 2 of the Mount Ommaney Special School is being added. This stage will include two more teaching blocks and a hydrotherapy pool. Each block will have its own laundry, bath, showers and toilets and will complement the award-winning existing special school.

In regard to non-contact time for teachers, primary, special and pre-school teachers will benefit from one hour a week non-contact time to allow them to do program preparation, corrections and student assessments. My office campaigned hard for this improvement.

At the Oxley Secondary College, a new home economics block has been completed at a cost of \$505,000.

Students with special needs benefit from an additional \$4.5m which has been provided for more teachers, teacher aide support time and new equipment.

I refer to Budget increases. Education has been allocated \$100m more in 1994-95. The Education budget is now \$2.435 billion. Non-State schools are to benefit from an increase in funding of \$127.4m. An amount of \$15.9m

has been allocated to assist non-State schools with major building projects. The Goss Government believes that parents have a right to make choices about their children's schooling.

As regards Health, Year 8 students of State high schools became eligible for free dental services for the first time last year. The aim of the school dental program is to encourage young Queenslanders to take precautions from an early age to take care of their teeth and gums. Curative treatment is also undertaken if necessary.

I refer to migrant education. This year, my office is proud to have been able to initiate English as a Second Language classes at the Mount Ommaney Special School through the Yeronga TAFE College.

Time expired.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 7.02 p.m.