

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 31 JANUARY 1984

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

QUEENSLAND



Parliamentary Debates

[HANSARD]

Legislative Assembly

FIRST SESSION OF THE FORTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT—continued

(Second Period)

TUESDAY, 31 JANUARY 1984

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. J. H. Warner, Toowoomba South) read prayers and took the chair at 11 a.m.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Assent to the following Bills reported by Mr Speaker—

- Building Units and Group Titles Act Amendment Bill;
- ANZ Executors & Trustee Company Bill;
- Coal and Oil Shale Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment Bill;
- Appropriation Bill (No. 3);
- Lotto Act Amendment Bill;
- Education Act Amendment Bill;
- Stock Act and Another Act Amendment Bill;
- Pay-roll Tax Act Amendment Bill;
- Land Tax (Adjustment) Bill;
- Land Tax Act and Another Act Amendment Bill;
- Registration of Plans (Stage 2) (H.S.P. (Nominees) Pty. Limited) Enabling Bill;
- Valuers Registration Act Amendment Bill;
- Nerang River Entrance Development Bill.

ASSENT TO BILL

Appropriation Bill (No. 3)

Mr SPEAKER: I have to report that on 23 December 1983 I presented to the Deputy Governor Appropriation Bill 1983-1984 (No. 3) for the Royal Assent and that he was pleased, in my presence, to subscribe his assent to the said Bill in the name and on behalf of Her Majesty.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Her Majesty's Acknowledgement

Mr SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received the following letter from His Excellency the Governor—

“Government House,
Brisbane, Q. 4001
12 January, 1984.

The Honourable J. H. Warner, M.L.A.
Speaker,
Queensland Parliament,
Parliament House,
Brisbane, 4000.

My Dear Mr Speaker,

I have the honour to inform you that the Message of Loyalty from the Legislative Assembly dated 30 November, 1983, has been laid before The Queen and Her Majesty has asked that her appreciation be conveyed to the Members of the Legislature of Queensland.

Yours Sincerely,
James Ramsay,
Governor.”

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

Miscellaneous Departmental Accounts and the Accounts of Statutory Bodies and Local Authorities

Mr SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Auditor-General of his supplementary report on his audit of miscellaneous departmental accounts and the accounts of statutory bodies and local authorities for the financial year ended 30 June 1983.

Ordered to be printed.

CIRCULATION AND COST OF “HANSARD”

Mr SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Chief Reporter, Parliamentary Reporting Staff, of his report on the circulation and cost of “Hansard” for the session of 1982-83.

ELECTIONS TRIBUNAL

Judge for 1984

Mr SPEAKER announced the receipt of a letter from the Honourable the Chief Justice intimating that the Honourable Mr Justice Thomas would be the judge to preside at the sittings of the Elections Tribunal for 1984.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table—

Orders in Council under—

Financial Administration and Audit Act 1977-1981

State Development and Public Works Organization Act 1971-1981

State Development and Public Works Organization Act 1971-1981 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982

Electricity Act 1976-1982 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982

Industrial Development Act 1963-1981

Water Act 1926-1983, the Irrigation Act 1922-1983 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982

Water Act 1926-1983

Water Act 1926-1983 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982

Harbours Act 1955-1982 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982

Harbours Act 1955-1982

Harbours Act 1955-1982, the Cairns Airport Act 1981 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982

Regulations under—

Public Service Act 1922-1978
Marine Parks Act 1982
Mining Act 1968-1983
Water Act 1926-1983

By-laws under—

Harbours Act 1955-1982
Harbours Act 1955-1982 and the Port of Brisbane Authority Act 1976-1982

Reports—

Report and Financial Statements of the Gladstone Area Water Board for the year ended 30 June 1983
Dumaresq-Barwon Border Rivers Commission for the year ended 30 June 1983
Financial Report on the Electricity Supply Industry in Queensland for the year ended 30 June 1983.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Effect of Floodwaters on Railway Traffic in North-western Queensland

Hon. D. F. LANE (Merthyr—Minister for Transport) (11.11 a.m.), by leave: I desire to inform the House of the situation regarding floodwaters and their effect on railway traffic in north-western Queensland.

The line between Richmond and Hughenden is still cut, with the worst affected areas being Mumu and Quarrell's, east of Julia Creek. Twenty railwaymen and 60 additional workers are still trying to repair damage to the track between Mumu and Marathon. This work is being severely hampered by the conditions confronting the gangs, many of whom have been forced to work in waist-deep water.

I am also advised that the Flinders River remains flooded and that this is preventing repair gangs from reaching the Barabon ballast pit. 8 000 cubic metres of ballast has already been used to repair sections of the track that have been severely scored by the floodwaters.

Some repair gangs say that flood damage in some areas seems greater than that of the 1974 floods. It has been estimated that the cost of repairing the damage now stands at \$3.3m, with much further work to be undertaken as the floodwaters subside. The situation has been further aggravated by rainfalls of up to 400 mm in the Hughenden area in the last few days.

An Opposition Member: Rainfalls of 400 mm?

Mr LANE: Yes, 400 mm. The honourable member must have had a very bad Christmas.

I would like to pay tribute to the magnificent efforts of the railway employees and local residents at Richmond who took care of the 61 people stranded when the "Inlander" was flood-bound at Richmond for eight days earlier this month. In some instances, the railway staff, headed by station-master Trevor Naylor, made their homes and facilities available to the passengers. The railway staff, as an example of the tremendous spirit in that area, organised cricket matches and other games to entertain the youngsters among the stranded passengers. The refreshment room girls from the stranded train griddle car also entered into the spirit by organising a cake from a local bakery to celebrate a stranded passenger's 83rd birthday.

In recent years, much preventive work has been done in that area, and much more will be done to overcome what has been a serious problem.

Flooding in North-western Queensland

Hon. R. C. KATTER (Flinders—Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs) (11.13 a.m.), by leave: I rise to praise the people of the mid-western areas of north Queensland for their generosity and fortitude during the

flooding that occurred recently in the area. The police, the State Emergency Service, Community Care in Richmond, the staff of the telephone exchanges, railway employees, council road gangs, owners of private planes, and local graziers all deserve the highest of praise.

Mrs Ann Fickling voluntarily fed and looked after stranded motorists and rail passengers. Mrs Lucy Rowe and Mrs Alloway at their local telephone exchanges deserve praise. Once again, Mrs Alloway had water lapping round her home and, once again, she and Mrs Rowe stayed at their posts.

Mr Harris and Mr Brown, with their understanding and calmness, were ideal men for the SES role that they had to play. Praise is due to the police who, at times, worked round the clock. Similarly, praise is due to the railway workers, particularly those in the maintenance gangs, who endeavoured to work in mud up to their calves. They deserve thanks and congratulations on a job well done.

I have had lengthy discussions both by telephone throughout the crisis and now in meetings held with various people and groups. At all stages, all of our requests were carried out expeditiously. Only marginal organisational improvements remain to be arranged, and throughout next week I will be having discussions with the appropriate Ministers.

Generally speaking, telephone lines were unharmed. On this occasion I was able to monitor closely all aspects of the flooding. I can say that the emergency services were working satisfactorily in every way. Problems that arose in the past did not arise on this occasion. Those mistakes that were made were quickly rectified.

On behalf of the people of north Queensland, I convey to all those concerned our heartfelt thanks and congratulations.

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

Death of Mr H. A. McKechnie

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (11.15 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

1. That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the services rendered to this State by the late Honourable Henry Arthur McKechnie, a former member of the Parliament of Queensland and Minister of the Crown.
2. That Mr Speaker be requested to convey to the widow and family of the deceased gentleman the above resolution, together with an expression of the sympathy and sorrow of the members of the Parliament of Queensland in the loss they have sustained."

It is fortunate that Peter McKechnie, the son of the late Henry Arthur McKechnie, is a member of this Assembly and that he is following in his father's footsteps. Peter's wife, Jeanette, and the late Mr McKechnie's daughter, Sue, are in the gallery today. Mr Speaker, I request that you convey to them and to the members of their families the sorrow of this Assembly.

The death recently at Toowoomba of Henry Arthur McKechnie would have been received with great sadness by members of this House and by his many friends and relatives. He was a very close friend of many members. He was my friend during the whole period of his parliamentary career, and I deeply regret his passing.

He was a man to whom I delegated a lot of work and responsibility and in whom I had a great deal of trust. He displayed ability and dedication in the way in which he carried out his responsibilities. In a special way, I pay a personal tribute to him.

Henry Arthur McKechnie was born on 14 March 1915, at Barraba, New South Wales, the son of a shearing contractor. He was educated at Barraba public and Armidale high schools.

He gained early experience as a shearer, contractor and ring-barker, and in 1935 won his property "Trevanna Downs", 34 miles north of Goondiwindi, in a Government ballot. The property was covered by prickly pear and scrub; but, with hard work and much foresight, he developed the property, as many honourable members know, into one of the show-pieces of the district.

He was a pioneer wheat-grower and foundation secretary of the Goondiwindi Graziers Association, and he was active in a wide range of community enterprises, including football, golf, bowling, show society work and jockey club activity. Prior to his election to this Assembly, he had served as a councillor on the Waggamba Shire Council and enjoyed a large following of his many community interests.

He was elected to the Legislative Assembly of Queensland on 1 June 1963, as the representative for the electorate of Carnarvon, and held that seat until October 1974, when he was succeeded by his son, Peter, who is now the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts. On 20 June 1972, he was sworn in as Minister for Local Government and Electricity and held that ministry until his retirement.

Mr McKechnie was deeply respected as a capable and dedicated individual who was sincerely interested in the problems of his electors. To his electorate, he was known as just about the most approachable man around. He was most certainly a work-horse and gave his full support to any new concept in which he believed. During his service as a politician, he had a reputation of never breaking an appointment or letting anybody down. Glenlyon Dam and the CWA students hostel are monuments to his hard work and interest in his electorate.

Mr McKechnie suffered a severe stroke in 1974, and it was because of his ill health that he retired from this Parliament.

He is survived by his wife, Agnes, and his four sons and four daughters by his first two marriages, and 11 grandchildren plus one great granddaughter and five step-children.

Henry McKechnie gave distinguished service to Queensland and he will be remembered for his devotion and dedicated hard work to further the progress and prosperity of this State.

On behalf of the Queensland Government, and, I am sure, all members of this House, I extend heartfelt condolences to his family.

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer) (11.20 a.m.): I second the motion moved by the Premier to express sympathy to the widow and family of the late Henry Arthur McKechnie. At the outset, I would like to join with the Premier in expressing my condolences to Mr McKechnie's son, the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts (Mr Peter McKechnie). He and his father enjoyed a very close relationship because of their mutual interest in politics and the grazing industry, and I sympathise with Peter in his sad loss.

When Henry McKechnie entered State Parliament in 1963, he brought with him a breadth of knowledge gained over more than three decades while working as a shearer, contractor, wheat-grower and cattleman.

He was the foundation secretary of the Goondiwindi Graziers Association and was a member of both the Queensland United Graziers Association and the Queensland Graingrowers Association. As well, he was actively involved with many civic and sporting organisations in his electorate of Carnarvon.

His move into politics came, as has been the case with so many members of this House, as a natural transition from his service to local government as a member of the Waggamba Shire Council. Mr McKechnie was elevated to the Ministry in June 1972, with the formation of the third Bjelke-Petersen Ministry. He held the joint portfolio of Minister for Local Government and Electricity until a massive stroke forced his retirement in October 1974.

The portfolio gave him a heavy work-load, particularly following the devastating Brisbane floods which resulted from cyclone Wanda in January 1974. Tennyson Power House was flooded and rendered inoperable. Swanbank Power Station was isolated from the Brisbane area for several days and from Ipswich intermittently. The floods affected 16 substations and 19 transformer stations in the main part of the city and many kilometres of 11 kV and low-tension mains. The human tragedy which resulted from the flooding led within days to the formation of the Queensland Welfare Disaster Committee, an organisation that involved a number of Government departments and the Local Government Association.

Mr McKechnie's period as Minister for Electricity also saw unprecedented capital expenditure, much of it involved with the development of the Gladstone Power Station. In 1973, investigations into the Tarong Power Station, which is now coming on stream, were completed and construction recommended. Investigations were also undertaken into the 500MW pumped-storage Wivenhoe scheme, which is also nearing completion.

As Local Government Minister, Mr McKechnie won the acclaim of the Local Government Association for his efforts towards a stronger relationship between his department and the association. He was responsible also for substantial increases in State grants to councils for revenue works and in loan subsidies. Perhaps his most important contribution in the local government portfolio, however, was his encouragement to local authorities to begin town planning of their whole areas and not just urbanised areas. The subsidised assistance that he obtained from the State Government to assist councils with this exercise has helped to control the urban sprawl and prevent the loss of valuable grazing and agricultural land.

I join with the Premier in extending condolence to his family.

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton—Leader of the Opposition) (11.23 a.m.): On behalf of the Opposition, I join with the Premier and the Deputy Premier in this motion of condolence extended to the family of Henry McKechnie. Henry was a friend to everyone, irrespective of whether one sat on the Government or Opposition benches. He was a very jovial man and a very caring man. When he was promoted to the Ministry in 1972 there was no change in Henry McKechnie. He was a person with whom we could discuss matters, whether they related to local authorities or to electricity. He was always willing to listen.

Henry McKechnie was not only a pioneer in the area of primary industries, as was pointed out by the Premier when referring to the wheat industry, but also a pioneer legislatively. He was a pioneer legislator. He endeavoured to give local authorities a brand-new deal by initiating a different approach—a regional concept—encouraging the then 132 local authorities to come together in 10 separate divisions and work together. Also, as the Deputy Premier has said, he offered them a new deal financially. In doing so, he put the spotlight on local authorities and made many people appreciate the work that they were doing and the important part that they played in the three-tier system operating in Queensland under the Westminster system.

He was liked by all who have served this legislature. He was well respected. I have no hesitation in joining the members of the Opposition in this motion of condolence and conveying our sympathy not only to Peter but to the McKechnie family.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (11.25 a.m.): On behalf of the Liberal Party, I endorse the sentiments already expressed. Because I knew Henry McKechnie well, both as a colleague in the Legislature and in the Cabinet, I speak to this motion with great sadness. During his 11 years in this Legislature, Henry McKechnie displayed the outstanding trait of being a very good listener, which is not what the general public believes of politicians. He listened very carefully to everything that was put before him. As a result, during his term of office as a Minister he made many good decisions. He was a very able representative of his electorate.

Any member who led a deputation to Henry McKechnie could be assured of the utmost courtesy, would know that all points of view would be listened to seriously and would know that, in the end, a decision would be made. The way in which he conducted his public affairs might well be a model to all members of Parliament.

I can recall one example of his prompt action in dealing with matters concerning the public. On that occasion half of Brisbane suffered from an electrical black-out. No messages were being broadcast by television or radio so I rang him at his home which, of course, had its own electricity supply. Nobody had informed him of the black-out. He immediately took steps to have messages broadcast over television for the benefit of those who had battery-operated sets, and over the radio for the benefit of those who had battery-operated transistor radios. Even though it was late at night, within half an hour of my ringing him, he made those arrangements so that the public would know what was happening. I use that as a simple illustration of the way in which he attended to his public duties.

When he suddenly and unexpectedly took ill, it was a matter of great sadness to those who were serving with him in the Cabinet. His condition remained unstable for quite some time. From time to time many of us inquired after his health and were concerned when we heard that his condition had deteriorated. On the occasions that he visited this House, we were pleased that he appeared to be improving.

To his son, one of our colleagues in this House, and to his widow and relatives, the Liberal Party extends its deepest sympathy on his passing.

Mr NEAL (Balonne) (11.28 a.m.): I wish to be associated with this motion of condolence to the late Henry McKechnie. I knew Henry prior to my election to this House. He assisted me with my first election campaign and helped me find my feet after my election. I will always appreciate and remember his friendship, assistance and counsel.

When he took ill I was only too pleased to assist in looking after the affairs of the Carnarvon electorate. Henry was totally dedicated to looking after the needs of the people of Carnarvon and, on his elevation to Cabinet, extended that same dedication to the people of the entire State. At all times he was available to listen to people's problems and was very, very approachable.

Both the Premier and Treasurer and the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer have spoken of his dedication. I believe that his dedication to the people of the Carnarvon electorate and the State of Queensland and the untiring effort that he put into his job were the main contributing factors to his ill health.

I am pleased to be associated with this motion of condolence and I extend my sympathy to his wife and family.

Hon. P. R. McKECHNIE (Carnarvon—Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts) (11.30 a.m.): Mr Speaker, on behalf of the McKechnie family, a very special thanks to you, to my parliamentary colleagues and to many people from all over Queensland for their messages of sympathy in regard to the death of my father.

Our family has received close to 1 000 of these messages. Obviously dad must have been highly regarded and respected by many people.

He taught us, his family, to work hard to endeavour to improve the lot of our fellow man. He taught us to be positive about the future rather than to lament the past. He set an example that is hard to follow.

Please allow me to quote but two extracts of letters I have received since his death. The first reads—

“I remember meeting one Friday night on some matter about a school bus when he was so tired he simply could not go on with the meeting. I thought then that he was just working too hard on our behalf. We will remember him with great affection.”

The second reads—

“Like so many good people in God's mysterious design, he was asked to carry extraordinary crosses and yet did so with a gentle patience and lack of bitterness that was an example to others.”

We, his children, are grateful for the part our mothers have played in standing shoulder to shoulder with him through the difficulties of life. All of us in Parliament know how much the love and support of our wives and families means in carrying out our often onerous duties.

Dad's death, after a long illness, should be judged as a compassionate act by a loving God. We, his family, are grateful for the prayers and messages of sympathy from so many people.

I hope that God will grant me the wisdom to prove a worthy successor today in the electorate of Carnarvon, the Parliament of Queensland and the Queensland Cabinet.

Motion (Mr Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to, honourable members standing in silence.

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton—Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave of the House to move a motion without notice regarding Cabinet's decision on prison visits.

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

Ayes, 35

Campbell
Casey
Comben
D'Arcy
Davis
De Lacy
Eaton
Fouras
Gibbs, R. J.
Goss
Hamill
Hooper
Innes

Knox
Lee
Lickiss
Mackenroth
McElligott
McLean
Miller
Milliner
Price
Shaw
Smith
Underwood
Vaughan

Veivers
Warburton
Warner, A. M.
White
Wilson
Wright
Yewdale

Tellers:

Burns
Prest

Noes, 42

Ahern
Alison
Austin
Bailey
Bjelke-Petersen
Booth
Borbidge
Cahill
Chapman
Cooper
Elliott
FitzGerald
Gibbs, I. J.
Glasson
Goleby

Gunn
Harper
Harvey
Henderson
Hinze
Jennings
Katter
Kaus
Lane
Lester
Littleproud
McKechnie
McPhie
Menzel
Muntz

Newton
Powell
Randell
Row
Simpson
Stephan
Stoneman
Tenni
Turner
Wharton

Tellers:

Lingard
Neal

Resolved in the negative.

PETITION

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petition—

Bypass Road, Babinda

From Mr Hinze (418 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will stop the Western Route Highway through Babinda and relocate it between the sugar mill and the railway.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Hospital Identity Checks

Mr WRIGHT: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to a statement made in today's "Telegraph" in which a Government spokesman is reported as saying that after proving their identity at a public hospital Queenslanders could be redirected to their local doctor. That means that an identity check will be put on anyone coming to a public hospital. Although it might be legal to charge interstate patients for their treatment, identity checks could mean that Queenslanders could be turned away from hospitals. I ask the Premier and Treasurer: Will he give a specific and unconditional commitment on behalf of the Government that no patient will be turned away from a public hospital in this State?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I would like honourable members opposite to stand up for Queensland instead of defending the Labor Government in Canberra. I have not heard them once stand up for Queensland.

Mr Wright: Yes, we have.

Mr BELKE-PETERSEN: No Opposition members have.

I want to clearly state the attitude of the Queensland Government towards Medicare. Medicare also involves relativity. I ask honourable members to cast their minds back some six years before Mr Fraser was defeated. On that occasion the Federal Government under Mr Fraser set up the Grants Commission to determine the relativity between the States. For five years the Grants Commission went into all the ramifications of each State and it came up with the answer that, compared with other States, Queensland was underpaid to the extent of \$150m a year.

That was a serious situation. Mr Fraser found it hard to believe, so he asked the Grants Commission to look at another year and to reassess the situation. The Grants Commission arrived at the conclusion that the relativity between the States had been destroyed to such an extent that, compared with other States, Queensland's underpayment for that year had risen to approximately \$170m.

At the last Premiers Conference before Mr Fraser was defeated and vacated the scene, a lengthy debate and argument occurred because Mr Fraser said that he would not make a bigger cake, so that the \$170m to which Queensland was entitled would have had to come from the other States. That would have put all the other States against Queensland. To avoid that, Queensland said, "Give us a portion of the money this year and over the next two years give us the balance to retain the relativity." As we know, Mr Fraser was defeated. As to whether Queensland will ever receive the balance, the Leader of the Opposition's guess is as good as mine.

Besides that inequality between States, Queensland is faced with having to argue on relativities. It is not merely \$29 versus \$50 per patient per day. Will Queensland's allocation always be lower than its entitlement? The relativity is being destroyed in the present situation.

Mr Fouras: You never objected when Fraser did it.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: Yes, we did. Obviously the honourable member has not followed the argument.

Mr Wright: Answer the question. Are you going to turn Queenslanders away?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am coming to that.

The present Federal Government is going to continue the inequity. It has said that it will not pay Queensland what it is entitled to receive. That means that Queensland will lose \$260m over the next five years during which Medicare is in force. The Opposition has not supported the Queensland Government in its arguments; it has always supported the Federal Government.

Queensland cannot give in. It will not sign the Medicare agreement. The present serious situation involves a large amount of money and Queensland's relativity with the other States. What will future payments to Queensland be? Will they be even lower than they are at present?

As the Federal Government will not negotiate and give Queensland fair treatment, the Queensland Government has to determine how it will overcome the problem. Queensland has asked the Federal Government to request the Grants Commission to reassess the position. Queensland will abide by the decision of the Grants Commission, whether it is for or against us.

Because Queensland said "Yes" immediately to the suggestion of a Grants Commission hearing, Mr Hawke backed off. Queensland said that if the Grants Commission took two or three months to arrive at its decision, its decision would have to be applied retrospectively to 1 February. On Sunday Mr Hawke knocked that suggestion back. I received a long telex saying that he would not accept that argument. He would not agree to appointing an independent arbitrator to determine what was fair and what was not fair.

What should Queensland do? As was decided in Cabinet this morning, the Queensland Government could suggest to people who suffer from minor medical complaints such as colds that they seek medical attention from their local doctors under Medicare, which would mean that the Commonwealth Government would pay the doctors' bills. Such patients go in their thousands to doctors and hospitals. The Queensland Government could suggest to them that they seek treatment under Medicare. If the Commonwealth Government likes to play the game that way, it can pay for the consequences.

In answer to the honourable member's question—we will not turn people down, nor will we turn them out. People from interstate have been coming over the border and living on us for a long time. They all have to pay now.

Mr Wright: So the report is wrong, is it?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I do not know what the report says. All I am saying is that people from other States will have to pay to enter our hospitals. Queensland is not going to carry the cost of providing hospital services to New South Wales or Victorian persons. They are paying for it now and they are being called upon to pay for it in Queensland. It is a simple matter of asking them for their home address and so on. As far as the general public is concerned, there must be a redirection or a suggestion that, if they pay, those who do not want to go home will be admitted to our hospitals. There will be many people who will be quite happy—

Mr Wright: So you are going to turn them away.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: They will not be turned away.

Mr Wright: Redirect them.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: They will not be redirected. It will be suggested to them that if they have a minor—

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: Opposition members can laugh. They are not on Queensland's side; they could not care less. This is a serious matter. I thank you, Mr Speaker, for your tolerance. It will enable me to explain the situation clearly.

Mr Underwood: Are you going to sack all the doctors?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! A very serious question has been asked and a serious answer is being given. Because the matter is of such a serious nature, I ask honourable members to listen to the answer in silence, if possible. I ask members to limit the number of interjections. If interjections are made, they should have some substance.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I know that honourable members will go out to the media and say that we are going to redirect—

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I asked honourable members to listen to the answer in silence. As I have already said, a serious question has been asked.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You said we could make interjections if they are good.

Mr SPEAKER: As far as I am concerned, that one had no substance. Honourable members will listen to the answer in silence.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I rise to a point of order. I would have thought that the question of the future of doctors and nurses in out-patient departments was a matter of substance. Is the Government saying that those persons will be transferred to other parts of the hospital and, therefore, is it saying that the other parts of the hospital are understaffed? Or will it sack them?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have given my ruling. I ask the Premier and Treasurer to continue.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Opposition is not on the Government's side. However, the people of Queensland are. They voted accordingly at the last election. They know that the Government acts in their interests. They know what the Government stands for.

Unlike the Federal Government, the Queensland Government does not tax them so that they can obtain hospital treatment. The tax must be paid whether or not Queensland obtains any benefit from it. The Government must face the situation that confronts it.

I reiterate that people will not be turned away from hospitals. They are other ways in which people can be directly supported and helped. Opposition members can laugh as much as they like. However, the Queensland Government will not lose the battle with Canberra and the Opposition's mates down there who like to rob this State and give nothing in return.

Mr WRIGHT: I refer to what the Premier and Treasurer has just said and to his statements about clarification, and I ask: Will he now justify to this House and to the people of Queensland his statement that the Grants Commission could not hear any matter on Medicare until 1989 when the Grants Commission, at this moment, is calling for the terms of reference of the inquiry that is taking place into State relativities and as the report must be released before the Premiers Conference in 1985?

I suggest that there is no reason why the Premier cannot accede to the Prime Minister's request to have the matter referred to the Grants Commission immediately. Will he explain how on earth he can say that the Grants Commission cannot hear this matter until 1989?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: It is not a matter of hearing it.

Mr Wright: That is what you said. Explain it!

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: If the Leader of the Opposition recalls the procedure that was followed on the previous occasion, he will know that it took five years. The whole question of relativity must be reassessed. It is a very vast and complex matter for all States.

Mr Wright: You know that it has to be ready for the 1985 Premiers Conference.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: It is never obtained on that basis.

A document prepared by the Treasury sets out the information. If the Leader of the Opposition has time to read it, he may care to do so. The Queensland Government asked that Treasury deal with the issue of whether the suggestion by Canberra is fair or just.

Mr Wright: Will you table that document?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I can table a document that will set out that information. It will not necessarily be my personal copy. I am quite happy to set out the situation as it exists.

Mr WRIGHT: I move—

“That the document cited by the Honourable the Premier and Treasurer be laid on the table.”

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am quite happy to give all the information.

Question put; and the House divided—

Ayes, 29

Campbell
Casey
Comben
D'Arcy
Davis
De Lacy
Eaton
Fouras
Gibbs, R. J.
Goss
Hamill

Hooper
Mackenroth
McElligott
McLean
Milliner
Price
Shaw
Smith
Underwood
Vaughan
Veivers

Warburton
Warner, A. M.
Wilson
Wright
Yewdale

Tellers:
Burns
Prest

Noes, 47

Ahern	Henderson	Newton
Austin	Hinze	Powell
Bailey	Innes	Randell
Bjelke-Petersen	Jennings	Row
Booth	Katter	Simpson
Borbidge	Kaus	Stephan
Cahill	Knox	Stoneman
Chapman	Lane	Tenni
Cooper	Lee	Turner
Elliott	Lester	Wharton
FitzGerald	Lickiss	White
Gibbs, I. J.	Littleproud	
Glasson	McKechnie	
Goleby	McPhie	<i>Tellers:</i>
Gunn	Menzel	Lingard
Harper	Miller	Neal
Harvey	Muntz	

Resolved in the negative.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I wish to finish my answer, which was so rudely interrupted by that division.

For the information of members of the Opposition, I point out that under the Hospitals Act the Government cannot refuse to look after people. The Leader of the Opposition obviously does not know that the Act provides that all members of the public must be cared for.

Resource Rental Tax

Mr NEAL: I refer the Premier and Treasurer to the Hawke Government's intention to introduce a resource rental tax, to apply from the next financial year, to replace existing excise and royalties on all petroleum resources. I ask: Will that tax interfere with or replace any royalty payments to this State, and what effect will it have on State finances? What effect will it have on oil exploration in general? Is the tax simply a revamp of the previous Labor Government's resource rental tax under Rex Connor?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Commonwealth Labor Government does want to introduce a resource tax. It has held discussions with us from time to time and suggested that we forego our royalties. It has been suggested that royalties be collected and pooled by the Commonwealth Government, which would then make distributions from the pool according to its idea of what each State should receive. There is no way in the world that Queensland would agree to that. Such a move would be detrimental to Queensland's growth and development. The Queensland Government will oppose in the future, as it has in the past, any suggestion by a Commonwealth Labor Government of a resource tax.

If one wants private enterprise to move ahead, it is entirely wrong in principle to even talk about a resource tax, as Senator Walsh has been doing. Obviously he is opposed to private enterprise. He is out to destroy the system in a number of areas such as oil exploration and coal exploration and development. The Queensland Government will not introduce a resource tax under any circumstances at any time, because such a tax would be detrimental to employment and to the growth and development of our different resource areas.

National Biotechnology Program

Mr NEAL: I ask the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology: Has his attention be drawn to recent announcements by the Federal Government indicating funding assistance levels under the National Biotechnology Program? Is it a fact that Labor States, at the expense of Queensland, did extremely well under the program with, for example, South Australia receiving assistance for four projects compared to singular assistance for a research program conducted by the Queensland Institute of Medical Research? Is it not also a fact that very important and worthwhile requests for assistance by the Queensland Institute of Technology and the University of Queensland were rejected out of hand by the Federal Government?

Mr AHERN: Soon after its election, the Federal Government made great play about a funding initiative towards the promotion of biotechnology research in Australia. Public submissions were invited relative to the program, which was to be a major new initiative by the Federal Government to promote a new employment-producing industry. It was something that we all looked forward to very eagerly. It was to be a major new program.

The first disappointment was the level of funding—only \$4.5m over three years, or \$1.5m a year spread throughout Australia. Such an amount would obviously not fund much biotechnology research. However, 106 applications—very worthwhile ones—were received, some from this State. The Queensland Institute of Technology made a very worthwhile submission, as did the University of Queensland—Uniquest—and a great number of other organisations around Australia. To the great disappointment of many, only seven programs were actually funded, and four of them were in South Australia. The whole thing has been a massive disappointment to those who were looking towards an area of research that needed encouragement.

That very worthwhile Federal initiative has been a fizzer as far as the Queensland Government is concerned. The submissions from this State have fallen on completely deaf ears. South Australia has received four projects out of seven, and one of them relates to monoclonal antibody research, which is already being carried out by the Queensland Institute of Technology. That is contrary to the guide-lines that were laid down. It is very important diagnostic research that will lead to commercial operations in Queensland and the creation of jobs, but the project is now to be duplicated at the Flinders University in South Australia.

I understand that there is general disappointment all round. Some of the funding for this program has gone to the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, which is funded separately, anyway. As I have said, there is a lot of disappointment about the overall program. It has fallen flat. A very small initiative has been taken. Queensland has received only disappointment from the program.

In the next few weeks I hope to announce some initiatives that this Government will be taking in this area. Certainly the biotechnology program, which was much heralded by the Federal Government, has fallen flat and has created a considerable amount of animosity within the industry. Some serious mistakes have been made.

Extortion Threat to Release Foot and Mouth Disease Virus

Mr LEE: I ask the Premier and Treasurer: In view of the very serious nature of the recent extortion threat to release foot and mouth disease virus, will he give serious consideration to introducing legislation to provide a mandatory gaol sentence for offenders convicted of issuing threats and also to increasing to a minimum of \$100,000 the reward for the giving of information leading to an arrest? That is a very small amount when it is considered that a \$500 billion industry in Australia could be completely wiped out and that Australia could be brought almost to a state of disaster.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: Like the honourable member, we are all concerned about that threat and the consequences if it were carried out. This morning, Cabinet discussed the whole question. The Attorney-General and Minister for Justice (Mr Harper) brought forward a suggestion regarding the matter. I do not think that it is too early to say that we will be introducing legislation to provide for life imprisonment and a few other things in certain circumstances. When every detail has been determined by Cabinet, the legislation will go to the Minister's committee and then be introduced into the House. We will definitely do something about this matter.

A serious threat has been made in other areas. A year or so ago a threat was made to blow up a train with a lot of people on board. Those sorts of threats will come into the same category.

Access of Opposition Members to Prisons

Mr WARBURTON: I ask the Minister for Welfare Services and Ethnic Affairs: Under what Act or regulations has the Cabinet decided not to allow Labor Opposition members of Parliament access to Queensland prisons? Does not such action constitute a breach of the fundamental principles of democracy and the Westminster system, under which members of Parliament are allowed an unfettered right to investigate any complaints that they receive?

Mr MUNTZ: One thing that the Opposition does not realise is that it is not in government. It cannot accept that fact. Members on this side of the Chamber will make decisions as to who will inspect the prison system and visit prisoners. Inspections are being confused with visits. There has been no change in the policy that gives parliamentarians the right to visit their constituents in prison, should they so request. When such a request is made, it is my responsibility and that of the Comptroller-General to determine whether some benefit will be derived from the visit. Parliamentarians do not have a right to visit prisoners without first of all making out a case that they should visit them. Inspections of the prisons system are our responsibility, and will remain so.

Mr WARBURTON: I ask a supplementary question of the Minister for Welfare Services and Ethnic Affairs: In view of his comments that it is now possible to make visits but not inspections—

Mr Muntz: It was never any different.

Mr WARBURTON: Never any different? I refer the Minister to his statement that members of the Labor Opposition cannot make visits. I now ask: Does the ban by the Government extend to members of the Liberal Party?

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: Yes.

Mr WARBURTON: Perhaps I should redirect the question.

Does the ban also apply to the member for Callide and National Party back-benchers?

Mr MUNTZ: It is the Government's responsibility to decide who inspects the prison system. That will remain so. The Government will decide whether a member of a party or the public may inspect a prison. The Government will decide whether or not an inspection will be allowed.

An Honourable Member: I wish to ask a supplementary question.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I wish to present a question on notice.

Mr WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order. An honourable member wants to ask a supplementary question.

Mr SPEAKER: One supplementary question to each question is allowed.

Mr WRIGHT: I refer you, Mr Speaker, to Standing Order 69A, which says it is at the discretion of the Speaker that supplementary questions may be asked by any other member to elucidate an answer. I suggest that that is the situation here.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I gave a ruling previously that one supplementary question can be asked. That supplementary question has been asked.

Mr WRIGHT: With the greatest respect, Mr Speaker, the Standing Order says that a supplementary question may be asked by any other member.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The decision has been made.

Mr WRIGHT: I rise to a further point of order. I ask for your ruling on this matter because it is very important to the future operations of this place. I refer you, Mr Speaker, to Standing Order 69A which is in these terms—

“ . . . supplementary questions may be asked by any other Member to elucidate an answer, but such supplementary questions shall be counted as one of the allowable two questions which may be asked by that Member.”

The honourable member for Sandgate has asked his two questions, and I accept that. Another member wishes to ask a supplementary question to elucidate an answer given by a Minister. I suggest that it should be allowed under the Standing Orders.

Mr SPEAKER: The honourable member has asked me to give a ruling and I will give that ruling now. I draw the attention of honourable members to the statement relating to question-time made by my predecessor (Mr Muller). I advise honourable members that I agree with his statement. However, honourable members have raised with me the matter of the number of supplementary questions to be asked. I inform honourable members that

to avoid question-time becoming a debate, I will allow only one supplementary question. So that members may canvass as many matters as possible during question-time, I ask honourable members to keep their questions brief and to the point.

Mr WARBURTON: I rise to a point of order. Bearing in mind, Mr Speaker, that what you have said may be absolutely correct, am I to believe that you regard my second question, which I am entitled to ask, as a—

A Government Member: It was a supplementary question.

Mr WARBURTON: Mr Speaker, my second question, which was on the same subject, was not a supplementary question.

A Government Member: You said it was.

Mr WARBURTON: My point is that any member is entitled to ask two questions and the two questions may be on the one subject. I ask you, Mr Speaker, to consider the position. I suggest that your ruling that my second question on the same subject must be regarded as a supplementary question is incorrect.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member did mention that he was asking a supplementary question. He has asked two questions, and two questions are all that he is allowed to ask.

Medicare

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: In directing a question to the Minister for Health, I commend the Government's stand on the Medicare issue and express the hope that it is successful in its campaign. However, in view of the release of information in today's newspapers regarding the procedures that private individuals will have to go through to obtain medical attention at out-patient departments at hospitals, I ask: Will the Minister outline the procedures involved as they should be stated, rather than being reported in the press, thereby enabling honourable members to advise their constituents accordingly?

Mr AUSTIN: I must say that I did find the media reports confusing as to what would transpire in Queensland hospitals. At present, interstate and overseas persons who present themselves for in-patient treatment within Queensland's hospital system are charged for in-patient treatment, whereas those who present themselves for out-patient treatment are not charged.

It is of concern to me that the Federal Government has not elected to support Queensland's argument in relation to Medicare. Queensland is looking at alternative methods to ensure that the Federal Government carries its fair share of the cost of the health system in Queensland.

One method of achieving that is by encouraging people who usually present themselves at out-patient departments in hospitals to obtain treatment for coughs, colds and other common ailments to present themselves to their own private practitioners. By "out-patient departments" I do not mean casualty departments.

No person will be compelled to go to his or her private practitioner. However, the Queensland Government will be encouraging people to visit their private practitioners. Many benefits flow from receiving treatment from private medical practitioners. Under Medicare a patient will receive a refund of 85 per cent of the schedule fee. Furthermore, patients who present themselves to a private doctor have access to that doctor 24 hours a day. As all honourable members know, no doctors' call service is provided within out-patient departments in public hospitals. An after-hours service is provided, but doctors in out-patient departments do not make house calls.

Many people in the community suffer from ailments and illnesses that are related to family problems. It is impossible for doctors in out-patient departments of public hospitals to deal adequately and effectively with those problems that relate to the family. I and the Government believe that it is perhaps in the best interests of people to obtain the services of a family doctor, one who gets to know them personally, one who gets to know the family problems and one who gets to know the members of the family.

The Queensland Government will be encouraging people to support the private medical profession so that the burden on out-patient departments can be relieved. That does not mean to say that casualty departments in hospitals will be reduced.

Some honourable members and people in the community hold the mistaken belief that the out-patient department in a public hospital attends to everyone who walks through the front door for treatment. Hospitals will continue to operate and maintain their 24-hour casualty departments. People who enter hospitals seeking casualty treatment, as distinct from out-patient treatment, will be treated. As the Premier said quite correctly, under the Hospitals Act it is illegal—I repeat “illegal”—for a hospital to refuse to treat any person who presents himself.

Mr Wright interjected.

Mr AUSTIN: The Leader of the Opposition would like us to try.

Mr Wright: That is what you said in the paper.

Mr AUSTIN: I said nothing of the sort. This is the place in which I make my statements. Instead of supporting the people of Queensland in relation to Medicare, the Leader of the Opposition has been conspicuous by his absence during the whole debate on the question. He has been conspicuous by his absence because he has dumped the people of Queensland in favour of his Federal colleagues. Their claims in relation to Queensland cannot be substantiated. Likewise, the Leader of the Opposition cannot substantiate his claims. That is why he has kept out of it. He knows that the people of Queensland are being duded. It is about time that Opposition members stood up in support of the people of Queensland instead of supporting the Canberra line.

The Leader of the Liberal Party raised a valid question. No-one will be refused hospital services. I hope that I have clarified the position by the statement that I made today.

Foot and Mouth Virus Extortion Threat

Mr ELLIOTT: I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: In view of the abhorrent threat by some deranged person to release foot and mouth virus in this State, will he inform the House of the latest situation, and, secondly, assure the people of Queensland that his department is doing everything humanly possible to co-ordinate contingency plans to combat any outbreak that might occur now or in the future?

Mr TURNER: The question raised by the honourable member has received a tremendous amount of publicity recently. It is of major concern to this State and to the nation because of the position in which it places the livestock industry of Australia. As a result of the co-operation and consultation between Commonwealth and State police forces and Commonwealth and State authorities at the Department of Primary Industry level, everything possible has been done. All quarantine and veterinary services have been alerted. There is no alternative to treating the threat as serious. Present indications are that in the very near future there could be a breakthrough that will result in the apprehension of the persons responsible.

I assure the honourable member that his concern about this matter is shared by the Queensland Government. Everything possible is being done to ensure that foot and mouth disease does not break out in Australia. However, if it does break out, action will be taken immediately to stamp it out.

Queensland Prisons

Mr McELLIGOTT: I ask the Minister for Welfare Services and Ethnic Affairs: Is it a fact that extreme tension still exists in Queensland's prisons, and would it not be advisable, therefore, to enlist the support of the Opposition and the media by allowing open and proper access to prisoners and the prisons?

Mr MUNTZ: In answer to the first part of the honourable member's question, I point out that extreme tension does not exist in the prison system at present.

In answer to the second part of his question, I state that it would not be advisable to allow Opposition members into the prison system as the Opposition spokesman has suggested.

I repeat that every member of Parliament has the right to make an application to visit a constituent and to talk to that constituent if it is thought that some benefit can be gained from such a visit.

Numinbah Prison Farm Escapees

Mr McELLIGOTT: I ask the Minister for Welfare Services and Ethnic Affairs: What are the full facts concerning the escape of prisoners from Numinbah Prison Farm? Is it true that the escapees simply walk out of the front gate, and is it becoming a regular occurrence?

Mr MUNTZ: The cases mentioned by the member have been investigated and the persons have been dealt with. As he knows, prison farms could be regarded as free places. A great deal of trust is placed in the inmates.

Numinbah Prison Farm Escapees

Mr R. J. GIBBS: In directing a supplementary question to the Minister for Welfare Services and Ethnic Affairs, I refer him to his ban on visits by Opposition members to the Brisbane Prison. I ask: Would he not concede that in this Year of the Family, which the Government of which he is a member has proclaimed, such a ban could severely hamper the relationship between members of Parliament, prisoners and families resident in a member's electorate? Only last year the Minister granted seven other members of the Opposition and me permission to visit the Wacol Prison and then withdrew that permission, much to the consternation of prison officers then serving at Wacol who disagree with his action. What has precipitated the action taken against members of the Opposition? Why are we no longer allowed access to the prison system?

Mr MUNTZ: I repeat that no benefit would be derived from an inspection of the prison system by members of the Opposition, whether or not it be in the Year of the Family. Under the Prisons Act, every member has an opportunity to visit his constituents or family members of a constituent.

Medical Gap Insurance

Mr SIMPSON: I ask the Minister for Health: Is the refusal to provide gap insurance to cover the shortfall between Medicare cover, which is 85 per cent of the schedule fee, and the total cost of a doctor's bill lawful? Cannot a person insure himself against any eventuality if an insurer is willing to accept that challenge?

Mr AUSTIN: I am unable to advise the honourable member whether it is lawful or unlawful. The advice I can give him is that the Federal Parliament, at the instigation of Dr Blewett, amended what I think is called the National Health Insurance Act—though I stand to be corrected on that—to specifically prohibit what is called gap insurance. I inform honourable members that that insurance covered the difference between the 85 per cent of the schedule fee paid under Medicare and the actual fee charged by a doctor. It will be impossible for people to cover themselves for that amount.

One can only surmise the reasons why the Federal Government has outlawed gap insurance. However, I suspect that it is part of an overall plan to dismantle the private medical profession by what I would call price control. It is very clear that the intentions of the present Federal Government are to totally control and nationalise the health industry throughout Australia. The amendments so far passed by the Federal Government give several indications that that is the course of action proposed by the Federal Government, which now controls directly or indirectly procedures carried out in any hospital. It could control procedures carried out under the Queensland public hospital system if the Government signed the Medicare agreement. It can now directly or indirectly control procedures carried out in a private hospital simply by placing pressure on that private hospital, because of the subsidies introduced under the scheme for private hospitals. It can control private medical practitioners directly or indirectly by financial stealth. Although the people of Australia perhaps have not recognised it, for the first time since 1945 a Federal Government has attempted—and this time successfully attempted—to nationalise an industry.

Mr Comben: 1949.

Mr AUSTIN: Yes, 1949 for the banks; I stand corrected. It was 1945 for the airlines.

For the first time since 1949, the Federal Government appears to have successfully nationalised an industry in this country totally, except in Queensland. It has done that by financial stealth. It has offered sufficient financial carrots to the States to attract them into

the scheme. Those States whose hospital systems imposed charges could not afford not to accept the scheme. It was a sorry day for this country when Medicare was introduced. The old Medibank scheme has been broadened so as to totally nationalise the health industry in this country.

Retail Shop Leases Bill

Mr WHITE: In asking a question of the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology, I refer to the recently introduced Retail Shop Leases Bill. Is the Minister aware that the retail service station operators have been excluded from the schedules of the Bill? If so, is this a matter of deliberate Government policy? If that is true, will the Minister give consideration to reviewing that?

Mr AHERN: I do not think it is appropriate to debate during question-time the form of legislation currently before the House. That discussion should take place at the appropriate time. However, I indicate that I have received a letter and had discussions with the organisation referred to by the honourable member.

General Motors-Holden's Limited Plant, Acacia Ridge

Mr GOSS: In asking a question of the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to his recent overseas trip and statements by him to the effect that he would be discussing the possibility of a foreign car manufacturer taking over the Acacia Ridge plant of GMH. I now ask the Premier and Treasurer to advise the House of the names of the companies with which he had discussions, to give a broad outline of any incentives he offered and the success or otherwise of his attempts to have the operation of the plant continue.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: At this time I would not mention the name of any particular car manufacturer. All I can say in relation to the whole problem is that it is very difficult to get very far with the attitude of the honourable member's colleagues in Canberra, who oppose the involvement of another car manufacturer both in this State and the rest of Australia. The honourable member's colleagues in Canberra are completely and utterly against another car manufacturer taking over the Acacia Ridge plant, which would save the jobs of the workers. If the honourable member does not believe me he should check with Canberra and he will find that the Federal Government is completely opposed to that. The Federal Government would rather see the workers out there go without a job.

Mr GOSS: I wish to ask a supplementary question of the Premier and Treasurer.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member has already put two questions.

Mr GOSS: This is a supplementary question.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I thought the honourable member tabled a question on notice.

Mr GOSS: Yes. I did.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! That is counted as a question, so the honourable member has already asked two questions.

Return of Fraser Island to Aborigines

Mr STEPHAN: In asking a question of the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to comments that Fraser Island should be returned to the Aborigines. Bearing in mind the amount of Crown land on the island, I now ask: Have any groups or individuals discussed with the Government the suggestion that the whole or any part of Fraser Island should be set aside for the sole use of Aborigines? Would that be likely to create animosity within the community and divide opinions rather than develop understanding and goodwill?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am aware of no discussions about Fraser Island with me or with other Ministers. All I say on this subject, in relation to Fraser Island or any other part of Queensland, is that this sort of thing is just not on. People can talk about it as much as they like; they can campaign as much as they like and get the Federal Government to support them as much as they like, but that sort of thing just will not happen in Queensland.

A vast area of land is already set aside for the Aboriginal people and is not being utilised. That land contains ample resources. The Canberra attitude of giving away large areas of land to particular people is entirely wrong. It does not take into account the hundreds of thousands of people who died in wars fighting for Australia or the survivors, who are not entitled to anything. The policy is wrong in principle, and I cannot support its continuation. I have made Canberra fully aware of my attitude in this regard.

Domestic Sugar Agreement

Mr RANDELL: I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: In view of the importance of the Commonwealth-State domestic sugar agreement to the Queensland sugar industry, can he inform me of the outcome of his recent discussions in Canberra with the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin)? Does it appear that an agreement, which will be satisfactory to the Queensland Government and the Queensland sugar industry, will be reached?

Mr TURNER: Yes. Last week I did travel to Canberra with a deputation of sugar industry leaders from New South Wales and Queensland to meet with the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin). I believe that the discussions were fruitful. Mr Kerin requested that the industry leaders go back and, one might say, do their sums and come forward with reasons to justify their request for an increase in the domestic sugar price. They are now doing that, and in the not too distant future I will have further discussions with Mr Kerin.

It is worth mentioning that the agreement terminates at the end of this financial year, so there are still five months during which a new domestic sugar agreement can be negotiated. As the honourable member mentioned, the agreement is of tremendous importance to the sugar industry because the domestic market, on which 20 per cent of the crop is sold, is the industry's major market, and it is imperative that this nation's sugar producers receive a return for their product which will enable them to remain viable, while at the same time the consumers receive a quality product on their tables. I hope that a new domestic sugar agreement can be finalised in the not too distant future.

Coupled with that problem is the problem of the International Sugar Agreement and the necessity for having a new agreement signed before the end of this year. But there are still 11 months during which the International Sugar Agreement can be negotiated.

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

FISHING INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION AND MARKETING ACT AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 25 November 1983 (see p. 189) on Mr Turner's motion—
"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr BURNS (Lytton (12.44 p.m.): It is time that this Parliament and the people of Queensland were provided with complete details of the Queensland National Party Government's master plan for the State's fishing industry. This National Party Government should spell out, clearly and concisely, the long-term plans and on which research information and submissions those plans are based.

As a result of Fish Board problems in the late 1970s, the Government set up a National-Liberal committee, which produced a couple of reports. I stress that it was a National-Liberal committee because no Opposition member was invited to join it. It was a closed shop. The final report was produced in January 1981 and, as a result, the Primary Producers' Co-operative Associations Act was amended to allow fishermen to form co-operatives. I might add that a deliberate effort was made to prevent the co-operatives from being successful and, in fact, some co-operatives are still complaining today of the actions of the Government, the Fish Management Authority and the licensing laws and fees which have really made it very hard for some co-operatives to survive.

In 1982, the Fishing Industry Organization and Marketing Act was passed by this Parliament. It integrated the old Fish Supply Management Act and the marketing provisions of the Fisheries Act. At about the same time a fishing industry advisory committee was established. At that time amateur fishermen were represented on that

body, which I thought was to be the forerunner of the Fish Management Authority, but they were surprisingly dumped when the authority was established. I understand that happened because the then Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Ahern), on advice, said that he did not want them on the authority.

Amateur fishing is an integral part of the fishing industry. Amateur fishermen are entitled to the same representation as any other section of the fishing industry, and they should be fully represented on the Fish Management Authority. In this State probably more money is spent on amateur fishing than on commercial fishing. In the long term, amateur fishing probably has a greater potential for providing jobs and income, particularly through the tourist industry, than the commercial fishing industry.

I do not want to denigrate the commercial fishing industry, but everybody seems to be aiming at giving the Queensland Commercial Fishermen's Organisation all the say. No say is being given to the growing band of family people who spend millions of dollars on fishing each year.

In December 1982, the Fish Management Authority was established. As I have said, amateur fishermen were not represented on that authority, and neither were retailers nor other sections of the fishing industry. It seemed to me to be a nice little closed shop.

No-one quarrels with the need to provide management of the fishing resource. Our fishery is not limitless. Many areas have been over-exploited and, in some cases, little regard has been paid to breeding and spawning seasons and grounds. So management is the answer; it is essential.

Many fishermen question the constitution of the Fish Management Authority and its advisers, the role of the QCFO and the obvious keen desire of the FMA to hit everybody with higher licence fees. All that the authority seems to have done to this stage is license everything. An article in the press on 28 November 1982, under the heading "Fishing clamp call", reads—

"Every commercial fishing line, net, crab pot and boat in the state will be registered if the newly-formed Queensland Fish Management Authority follows industry advice."

That is exactly right; that is what the authority is out to do. It is a new way of raising a dollar. It is a new way of paying for the operations of the Fish Management Authority. It is a new way of allowing the Government to walk away from its responsibilities. The Government is saying to the authority, "Get out and charge the others for it. Get out and raise some fees. Get out and levy people. Hit the fishermen, hit the retailers, hit the shopkeepers, hit the hardware merchants, hit everybody who sells anything associated with the fishing industry." People who say that that is not happening should think about the matter for a minute.

There was uproar when Cabinet, on the recommendation of this unrepresentative Fish Management Authority, gazetted regulations and fees that were described by retailers as being grossly excessive and likely to cause unemployment. Those are not my words. A letter from Mr Lynde, who is the president of the Fish Distributors Association of Queensland, reads—

"The Membership of my Organisations who cover many facets of the Retail Industry and every type of fish purveyor are unanimous in their belief that the fees are grossly excessive, and we can show that these Regulations and Conditions will also cause unemployment.

Further, as the new Regulations and the prescribed fees do not cancel requirements and Licence fees imposed under any Local Government Act, it is fair to assume that further increases deemed necessary by both groups will progressively rise adding to the Consumer Price Index.

The Retail Marketing side of our Industry is not represented on the newly formed Fish Management Authority, neither has this body ever consulted organised groups of retailers on any matter that is covered by prescribed Regulations.

It is a matter of record that Mr. Mike Ahern, The Honourable Minister for Primary Industries, did not wish the retail side of the industry to be involved in the preparation of the Fishing Industry and Marketing Act of 1982, and only recently after a meeting with him did he suggest that representatives of the Fish Distributors Association of Queensland make a full submission to the Fish Marketing Authority;

however we must assume that Retailers will not receive an impartial hearing because in June of this year, the F.M.A. representative of the Commercial Fishermen's Organisation threatened to blacklist retailers."

I know that the regulations and fees have been altered, but the fact remains that those fees can be increased again next week or next month because Cabinet can do it by regulation.

When I talk about the retailer I am referring to the little bloke in Charleville, Longreach, far north Queensland or even in South Brisbane, who is retailing fish. He is not represented on this authority.

It is disgraceful for Mr Bryan, or whoever it was from the QCFO, to say that he would blacklist the retailers. He should be doing his best for the fishermen and trying to get people on their side.

Retailers are badly needed to make commercial fishing a success in Queensland. It is far easier for the retailers to handle New Zealand perch, which is caught by Russian fishermen off the New Zealand coast and sent to Queensland as a nice, hard, white piece of flesh that has been properly filleted, prepared and packed, than to handle mullet or tailor that goes black and has been badly prepared in Queensland. The support of the retailers organisation must be behind commercial fishing. It is a scandal that the retailers are not to be involved in the Fish Management Authority. Because the aim of the authority is to get everybody together in the interests of the industry Mr Bryan, or whoever it was from the QCFO, who said that the retailers would be blacklisted, should not be on it. The retailers cried rape. An article highlighting their troubles appeared in the magazine called "Inside Queensland Hardware". The following appears on page 15 of that magazine under the heading, "If it's fish it's to be licensed!"—

"With the State Governments introduction of the Queensland Fishing Industry Organisation and Marketing Act, some major hardware retailers could be asked to take out a fish buyers license!

Within its objective of making the fishing industry more viable, the Government through the Primary Industries Department, intends to issue licenses for commercial buyers and restricted buyers of fish and 'fish products'.

'Fish products' includes fish based fertilizers and pet foods that include fish products."

The Fish Management Authority, which is supposed to be setting out to cure the ills of the fishing industry, suggested that hardware merchants pay a licence fee to the authority if they sell fish-based fertilisers.

It is easy to see what the Fish Management Authority was after. The members of the authority are quick quid merchants out to raise a fast buck at the expense of the consumer. No matter who is levied along the way, it was the person who buys the local fish or fertiliser, not the South African cod, the New Zealand perch, or the haddock, in many country supermarkets who will pay the increased cost. Because of the levy that they would be required to pay to the authority, people in the hotel industry told me that they would stop selling fish as counter lunches. They are not subject to a fee for selling beef or meat pies.

That is what the Fish Management Authority wanted to do but they were stopped by the hue and cry raised by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Lynde, people in the hardware industry and the hotel industry and the retailers. The authority backed off. I do not trust the authority now and I did not trust it then. I suggest that it will not be very long before the fees are increased, and they will continue to be increased.

The shop-keepers were not the only ones affected. I now turn to the Rosslyn Bay Co-operative. It wrote to the then Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Ahern) in August 1983 as follows—

"The Directors, on behalf of the Members of this Co-operative wish to express their concern and annoyance regarding the Marketing Licence requirements being introduced by the Queensland Fish Management Authority for the Fishing Industry."

The co-operative went on to say that in 1981 the Queensland Fish Board ceased operations in Rockhampton and Yeppoon because the Rockhampton and Rosslyn Bay depots were operating at a financial loss. At one stage the facility at Rosslyn Bay was the highest money loser operated by the Queensland Fish Board. The legislation under which the Queensland Fish Board operated—the Fish Supply Management Act—failed to

meet the needs of the industry. The action by the Queensland Fish Board created a big gap in seafood marketing in the Rosslyn Bay area that resulted in major problems for fishermen.

The Queensland Government then asked fishermen to form co-operatives to take over and run Queensland Fish Board depots. The fishermen in the Rosslyn Bay area were forced into forming a co-operative to market produce and the co-operative has been forced to operate in an economic environment from which the Queensland Fish Board withdrew. Markwell Fisheries has now sold its depot. Many fishermen borrowed money to finance the co-operative.

At the time of the letter, the co-operative had been operating for approximately 11 months and had been assisted by the Queensland Fish Board in some areas.

The co-operative was wholesaling and retailing, it was supplying ice to fishermen for the Queensland Fish Board, and it was receiving green prawns and scallops for the Queensland Fish Board and other processors.

The co-operative sells only Queensland-produced seafood, and at that time the finalising of a sublease agreement with the Queensland Fish Board was very close.

Since the withdrawal of the Queensland Fish Board from the Rosslyn Bay area, a free-enterprise market system has evolved. That system has fulfilled the requirements of the industry in the area, and the co-operative is playing a part. It has paid better prices to fishermen and in the area it has been successfully marketing products that have never been widely accepted there before.

The co-operative does not have a major marketing problem. In actual fact, the opposite applies; its problem is **getting enough product to sell.**

In that situation, the Fish Marketing Authority came along and wished the co-operative to implement the authority's version of orderly marketing, with high licence fees, a return to restrictions, standards, limitations, inspectorials and all the similar systems that failed before. The fishermen in the co-operative do not believe that that is necessary in the marketing sector, nor do they believe that this licensing system will assist in times of over-supply that periodically occur.

The licence fees applicable to the co-operative would be much more wisely spent in buying fast-freezing equipment to overcome those short-term situations, thereby assisting the industry. The policing aspect that was put forward by the authority, that of dobbing others in, will cause tremendous problems for the industry.

The industry in Rosslyn Bay is not in a position to bear the cost of the present proposal. If a licensing system is to be imposed, the co-operative should not be subject to the same fees as are paid by other commercial operators. And isn't that correct? The shareholders in this co-operative are the fishermen, who are being levied a licence fee to be fishermen. When they joined together to form a co-operative to sell their fish, the authority said that it would levy another licence fee because they were selling their fish. Surely a fisherman who is doing just that should pay only one licence fee. That is only fair and reasonable. As I have said, the fishermen are already making substantial contributions.

Not only were the retailers, the amateur fishermen who were left out and the hardware merchants upset; the fishermen, too, were upset in relation to the first few steps of the Fish Management Authority. Both the retailers and the fishermen have been critical of the Fish Management Authority. In addition, the fishermen have been critical of the QCFO and its representatives, who, in my opinion, have over the past couple of years become complacent, lickspittle Government doormats. The QCFO itself has become a National Party front organisation.

Anyone who wants an example of the way in which the QCFO and its consultant, Mr Peter MacDonald—who is a former employee of the Premier, Mr Bjelke-Petersen—operate need only look at the way in which the QCFO and Mr MacDonald handled a couple of issues.

I have here some copies of QCFO press releases. I seek your permission, Mr Speaker—I can see that you are involved in a discussion, so I do not suppose that you can hear me—to table those press releases dated 12 October 1983 and have them incorporated in "Hansard". On behalf of the Queensland Commercial Fishermen's Organisation, Mr MacDonald is alleged to have telephoned the "Daily Sun", "The Courier-Mail", the ABC and AAP.

Mr Speaker, in a moment I will ask you again for leave to have those press releases incorporated in "Hansard". Do not let the Minister dob me in.

As I was saying, Mr Peter MacDonald is alleged to have telephoned the media and issued a press release that attacked the Bjelke-Petersen Government and threatened to sink it. Mr MacDonald is alleged to have telephoned the release to four outlets. I have searched through the newspapers in the Parliamentary Library, but I cannot find any evidence of that release in the papers for the next day. I telephoned the four media outlets concerned, but no employee even recalls the releases being telephoned through to him. No-one remembers them. The next day the QCFO attacked the Federal Government.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.]

Mr BURNS: Mr Deputy Speaker, before the luncheon recess I asked for permission to table and incorporate in "Hansard" two media releases dated 12 October 1983 from the Queensland Commercial Fishermen's Organisation. I have spoken to Mr Speaker about the matter.

(Leave granted.)

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

Telex: AAP

Courier-Mail

ABC

Daily Sun

Cairns Post

Townsville Daily Bulletin

October 12, 1983.

Torres Strait Sellout

Queensland's commercial fishermen today in Brisbane signalled a fight against new Commonwealth legislation to create a special fisheries zone in Torres Strait.

Delegates at the opening session today of the Queensland Commercial Fishermen's Organisational Annual General Meeting described some provisions of the legislation as a "complete sellout".

They refused to accept assurances from Commonwealth Government legislative draftsmen that there would be full consultation with industry before Federal Parliament debates the new Torres Strait Fisheries Bill.

The Commonwealth drafting team, headed by a D.P.I. Assistant Director, Mr. David Barnes, briefed the twenty-six Q.C.F.O. State Councillors today on the Bill, which is to control fishing in a Torres Strait protected zone as part of the Australia-Papua New Guinea Border Treaty.

Mr. Barnes listed three types of fishing to be licensed under the Bill—traditional fishing for food by Torres Islanders, community fishing for sale by groups of islanders and general commercial fishing.

He said general commercial fishing would be controlled to avoid interference with traditional fishing and the Federal Government could declare some fisheries as reserves for islander community fishing only.

Mr. Barnes also said waters "outside but near" the protected zone could be declared off-limits to commercial fishermen to protect fisheries inside the zone.

The Q.C.F.O. State Councillors became angry when Mr. Barnes indicated that strict controls were likely on the number of commercial boats licensed to fish the protected zone.

Delegates from Q.C.F.O. northern branches attacked these likely new limits on commercial fleet access to the \$8 million a year Torres Strait prawn catch.

Port Douglas delegate, Mr. Mike Walsh, told Mr. Barnes: "This is a complete sellout of white fishermen who have fished there traditionally."

He said the islanders already were over-protected and the new Bill would mean that commercial fishermen "will be thrown out of Torres Strait whenever the Islanders complain enough".

Mr. Barnes said the new Bill would be tabled in Federal Parliament next week, but debate was not due until mid-1984.

Further information: P. MacDonald, River Room, Hamilton Hotel. Phone (07) 268 2564.

Media Release—October 12, 1983

Telephoned to: Daily Sun
Courier-Mail
ABC
AAP

The Queensland commercial fishing industry is ready to "sink" the Bjelke-Petersen Government over harbour fuel levies, according to State Chairman of the Q.C.F.O., Mr. Dale Bryan.

He said in Brisbane tonight his organisation was calling on consumer groups to help fishermen to fight the levies.

"Maybe housewives and consumer groups will be interested because after all, if the fisherman's production costs go up, he has to try to pass them on and the consumer pays in the end," Mr. Bryan said.

"We hope Queenslanders will agree with us that these new harbour board levies are a totally unfair imposition on a food production industry."

Mr. Bryan said Harbour Boards were claiming that they needed fuel levies to finance debts on facilities for the fishing industry.

"But we can't find the facilities," he said.

Mr. Bryan said the Premier and his Maritime Services Minister (Mr. John Goleby) had promised months ago to intervene in Townsville, where the Harbour Board was charging "an outrageous" 2.4c per litre on fuel for fishermen.

"The Townsville Harbour Board is still happily charging this levy and now, the Board in Bundaberg has announced that it wants to levy our fuel by one cent a litre," Mr. Bryan said.

"The State Government is to blame. It is turning a blind eye to Townsville and Bundaberg, knowing that after these two, every harbour board will want to get in on the act," he said.

He said Queenslanders would be thinking about likely new rises in seafood prices on State Election day.

Further information: P. MacDonald, River Room, Hamilton Hotel, Q.C.F.O. Conference.

Mr BURNS: It is wrong that the QCFO has tied itself in many ways to the National Party because many senior officers of the QCFO are members of the National Party and supporters of it. It reduces the organisation's opportunity to operate fairly and impartially in an area in which fishermen need everybody onside instead of offside.

Mr MacDonald, who used to work for the Premier, is now a consultant for the QCFO. He issued some press releases. A press release dated 12 October was allegedly telephoned by Mr MacDonald to media outlets. It contained an attack on the Queensland Government. As I said earlier, I visited the library and examined the newspapers that were published the following day. Not one word appeared about the matter. I rang the newspapers and asked them why nothing was printed about the matter. I was told that most members of the staff could not remember it. I rang the ABC and AAP and was told that they could not remember anything about it.

On behalf of the QCFO, Mr MacDonald then issued a press release attacking the Federal Government. Surprisingly, that press release was sent by telex and not by telephone. It was distributed to four newspaper outlets and to the ABC and AAP. Reports on the matter appeared widely throughout these media outlets.

One might ask why Mr MacDonald telexed one attack on the Federal Government and telephoned the attack on the Queensland Government. I suggest that he deliberately set out to cover up the attack on the Government that he supports. Mr MacDonald and some of the senior officers have done that deliberately on a number of occasions.

I cite the classic example of an attack on the Federal Government's fuel levy. A telex was sent to the Prime Minister and to the then Queensland Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Ahern). Why would a telex be sent to Mike Ahern? He had nothing to do with the Commonwealth Government's policy on fuel. However, Mr Ahern then issued a lengthy press release indicating what the QCFO had said about the Federal Labor Government. I believe that that was part of a deliberate campaign by Bryan, Graham, Conaty and MacDonald to use the QCFO for their own political means. It was not done in the interests of the fishermen.

Damage has been done to the fishing industry. Labor members in Canberra are not fools. They see people acting politically and making political statements and launching one-sided political attacks. They say to themselves, "How can we trust those people when we deal with them on a day-to-day basis about the fishing industry and matters associated with the fishermen?" Some fishermen in the industry say, "I don't trust them. I don't trust what they are doing." I can see what they are doing. I understand the way in which they are manipulating the media releases. They are acting to the detriment of the fishing industry. If those people are honest, fair and impartial in their dealings, they will obtain co-operation from everyone. Anybody who is concerned about the fishing industry is concerned about its long-term future.

I have a vested interest in fishing. I am a keen amateur fisherman. I do not want to see the industry destroyed by over exploitation. I do not want to see the commercial operators who operate in my electorate out of Doboy Creek, out of Wynnum or out of the Colmslie fish market areas put out of business. I want to see those fishermen make a success of their operations. Today, most small fishermen are struggling. They are not making a great deal of money. Because of economic considerations, most small fishermen, having in mind the value of conservation, are now being forced to do things that they would not have done had the industry been properly managed.

The QCFO and its management, through the manipulation of the press releases to which I have referred, and dozens of other things that they have done, have put themselves into the position of being regarded as a political group. They lack the trust of the fishermen and the people with whom they deal.

Earlier, the former Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Ahern) said to me, "I am Fisherman of the Year." How could he be Fisherman of the Year? The Fisherman of the Year before Mike Ahern was Vicky Kippin, the former member for Mourilyan. She lost her seat in this Assembly and tried to get it back. How could she possibly be declared Fisherman of the Year by an industry interested in fishing? I could take honourable members to people at Wynnum, Yeppoon, Rosslyn Bay, Townsville, Cairns or places in the Gulf who have contributed more to fishing in the last 12 months than has either of those two persons.

They have not been recognised as being Fisherman of the Year. This political stunting and manipulation of the QCFO do nothing at all for the industry and do nothing for the fishermen themselves; they only make the QCFO look like a group of lickspittles and crawlers.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: It's a bit like awarding the title of Father of the Year.

Mr BURNS: I am not involved in that, but I do know that in the fishing industry the authorities have made a joke of it. People do not regard it as an honest award that has any relation to merit. I do not argue that the recipients have not done something for the fishing industry, but hundreds of people have done more and deserve greater recognition.

It is very difficult to organise fishermen as a group. They do not like getting together. They are individualistic. They work on their own. They go out to sea to work. In most cases two or three of them work together. They are not the types who attend meetings or organise unions. However, they are violently opposed to the Government's deliberate campaign of forcing them to join the QCFO as a condition of obtaining a master fisherman's licence. Frankly, I cannot understand it.

We continually hear and read statements from the Premier that he is against compulsory unionism in the public service. He will stop people having to join a union before obtaining a job in the Queensland public service or railway. However, if a person involved in the fishing industry does not join the QCFO—if he does not take out its ticket and

pay the dues—he cannot be a master fisherman. There is a double standard somewhere. Either the Premier believes that the same standard applies to fishermen and public service employees or he does not. If membership of the QCFO were to be voluntary, membership would drop by half in the first month. After membership renewals became due, there would be hardly any members. Those fellows who allegedly represent the fishermen of this State would be sitting on their own, twiddling their fingers. Fishermen object to being compelled to be members of the QCFO. It is strange that that provision is being enforced by the National Party, which has taken a stand against compulsory unionism.

It is time for an investigation of the QCFO and its operation. There are stories about a deficit of thousands of dollars last year. Secrecy surrounds the appointment of MacDonald as a consultant and about the need for a consultancy. There is a lack of successful fishing involvement by top officers. How many successful fishermen are at the top of the QCFO?

What about the way wages and expenses are paid? Stories abound throughout the industry about the involvement of some officers in the alleged sinking of boats to claim insurance and bankruptcies that companies are not enforcing. People are saying, "Why don't these companies which are taking action against ordinary fishermen under the provisions of the bankruptcy laws take action against QCFO officials?" What has happened about the fraud charge arising from the alleged sinking of a boat off central Queensland? Why are there not answers to these questions? Are some people being treated differently from the ordinary old battler in the industry? People want to know and they are entitled to know.

There is a pressing case for a closer look at the QCFO. I do not think it is responsive or responsible to its rank and file. The amendments to the Bill will not help the ordinary fisherman to make ends meet. In fact, I think things will get harder for him. The ordinary fisherman wants answers to a number of questions. For example, why was each of a small number of NSW trawlers issued with an open Queensland licence about 12 months ago? Traditionally, those trawlers were confined to the southern part of Queensland. Many of the owners had worked the grounds for years. Without requesting a full Queensland licence, each received one out of the blue in the mail. It was issued on the direction of the chairman of the QCFO. He was challenged at a meeting. He said, "Yes, I told them to do it." What authority has the QCFO chairman to issue a direction that those people be given what is virtually a golden licence worth a lot of money? To bypass the freeze on new vessels in this State most of the vessels with those licences have now been sold to Queensland buyers. Licences were given to people in New South Wales, and they sold them back to Queenslanders and made a quid out of it. People here who could not get a licence from the Government have virtually paid a licence fee to buy a boat out of New South Wales. New South Wales owners who still hold their golden licences are sending their vessels up north as far as Princess Charlotte Bay to do the same damage as they have done to the southern fishery. Not one south-east Queensland fisherman would argue with the statement that for years those southern fishermen have raped the local waters.

New South Wales trawlers without any Queensland entitlements are presently undergoing massive refits and having massive refrigeration plants installed, and are heading north. They are using Queensland facilities and prawning grounds at the expense of Queensland fishermen. Those southern fishermen are claiming that they are operating under a Commonwealth permit and are working outside the three-mile limit, but a great deal of evidence shows that they are not operating outside that limit. A great deal of evidence also shows that they are landing their goods at Queensland ports in competition with Queensland fishermen.

Those southern vessels must be stopped from working local fishing grounds. The traditional golden licence must be revoked when the vessel is sold. I admit that the Government, through the Queensland Fish Management Authority, has given them the licence, but when the vessel is sold the licence should be cancelled. At that stage their traditional rights to Queensland fishing grounds are over. Holders of those golden licences, as I call them, should not be allowed to operate north of Sandy Cape.

To protect Queensland fishermen, who have invested heavily in the industry, the New South Wales fishermen who are poaching in Queensland waters by working on a Commonwealth licence must be stopped at the border.

The operation of the QCFO must be carefully examined. Why would the Commonwealth Government hand over control of Commonwealth waters to the QCFO, which is obviously made up of people who are politically hostile to it? The members of the QCFO have done everything they can to damage the Federal Government and to distort the press releases to advantage the State Government over the Federal Government. A Government official in Canberra would not say that those people are honest gentlemen whom the Federal Government can trust. They are the sort of people who are being sent to Canberra to represent Queensland. Their history is so bad that I am sure Commonwealth officials find it very hard to trust them in any way at all.

I shall now consider the buy-back scheme that the QCFO is proposing. Although some of the senior officials are keen on it, the rank and file members and the councillors are divided, particularly on the subject of unitisation. The northern fishery, with a couple of good seasons behind it, may be able to afford a small resource rental and a buy-back scheme, but the southern fishery cannot. Most members of the southern fishery are barely breaking even and have been forced to move north and hand over the southern fishery to the New South Wales fishermen.

The chairman of the QCFO, who comes from the north, knows little of the southern fishery. He claims that the Queensland boats from the southern fishery should be bought out of the industry. He wants to kick out the Moreton Bay boats and argues unitisation on the basis of big boats that work in the Gulf of Carpentaria. Unitisation is based on overall length, draft and beam, so big boats have a substantial advantage over the smaller, southern boats. The chairman of the QCFO claims that the smaller boats are uneconomic and should be taken out of the industry. If the QCFO keeps heading in its present direction, Queensland's fishing industry will be run by big company boats. The ordinary owner-fisherman will disappear.

Mr Kaus interjected.

Mr BURNS: Of course that is the position in other States and other countries and it will happen here. However, I would like to ensure the survival of the little bloke. I would not like Parliament to pass legislation that would produce monsters in the industry that would force the little bloke out.

Mr Kaus: Some of those smaller fellows are very efficient. I know a few of them who operate out of Mooloolaba.

Mr BURNS: The honourable member is speaking about the really small ones; I want to talk about some of the others.

In 1979, southern trawlers changed from using a single net to using three nets. In those days trawlers would use one 24-fathom net but now some of them are hauling three 12-fathom nets and I know of some vessels that are hauling three 20-fathom nets. Not a thing escapes them.

I have in my hand 12 prawns that were sold at Noosa. As honourable members can see, they would fit on a 50c piece. Similar prawns are sold to interstate tourists in Noosa. How can the industry survive when prawns of this size are being caught regularly in the estuaries and in Moreton Bay? When trawlers drag three nets, not a thing survives on the bottom. I might add that the prawns I have here are larger than some I bought, but the smaller ones were carried away by ants. Similar prawns can be purchased in fish shops in Noosa. I am not critical of the chap who sells them, because he is legally entitled to do so. I put 300 of them into an oyster bottle. Because the prawners in that area are dragging the guts out of the bottom, the future of the fishing industry is going down the drain. Not only are fishermen out in Moreton Bay using three trawl nets but also the New South Wales vessels are moving up here. Prior to 1979 the catches in southern Queensland waters held up season after season. Between 50 and 60 southern trawlers are moving north this season. I question how long the northern prawning grounds will continue to operate when they move in.

Recently I have heard discussions about a resource rental. Queensland fishermen are on their knees. They cannot make ends meet. They have to put themselves in the hands of loan sharks who charge high interest rates. They have to pay the high fuel prices charged by oil companies, and there is little competition in ports throughout the State. Fishermen have to face the problems of the weather as does every other primary producer, but they have the additional problem of the legislation passed by this Parliament telling

them where and when they can fish. At the same time they are being told that they will be hit with a licence fee. If they belong to a co-operative they will have to pay another licence fee to sell their fish. There is talk about a resource rental. There is talk about unitisation, which might cost \$1,000 a year for a 40-ft trawler, and another licence fee for something else. They cannot afford it. The introduction of all those fees will mean the end of the industry for many battlers.

It is all right for people who fail in the industry and are not working at sea to sit in their offices and make decisions while the average bloke is out trying to earn a quid. The ordinary fisherman does not attend meetings. In good weather he is out where the action is; where the fish and prawns are. If the ordinary fisherman does not attend meetings, the organisation is not receiving the right sort of advice. Some of the fellows representing fishermen today could not catch a decent feed in the centre of a shoal of mullet off a Gold Coast beach in the middle of winter.

Too many people are trying to slug the fisherman in too many ways. The same thing applies to retailers. The Fish Management Authority does not properly represent the people who sell the fish. At lunch today I had Australian salmon as an entree. It was the lousiest piece of fish that one could eat. It was dry, tired and old—like the National Party.

Mr Neal: It was very nice.

Mr BURNS: The honourable member for Balonne might have thought it was very good, but there was hardly a person I asked afterwards who said he enjoyed it. The point is that it had been frozen, stored and defrosted. It cannot compete with the old Russian sea perch that comes from New Zealand. Because of the way it was prepared, handled and maintained, it could not even compete with New Zealand flathead.

The Government has to help Queensland fishermen. Rather than imposing on them, it should be helping them to prepare the product for sale. I am appalled that most of the fish sold in this State comes from interstate or overseas.. Nearly every time someone eats fried rice in a Chinese restaurant today he eats prawns imported from Thailand. I would not like to see how they are peeled and handled there. The same observation could be made about many of the small seafood items being sold in Queensland now, including prawns used for bait.

Fishermen with wide experience and people with wide experience in the retail industry are needed on the QCFO. The FMA should be expanded to include representation from amateur anglers. All those people are entitled to have a say.

If the fisherman continues to be screwed to the wall, the more difficult it will become for him to make a dollar. The more difficult it is for him to make a dollar, the more likely he is to enter into fish habitats and reserves and to fish in the closed seasons to make a dollar. The Government does not have the staff to control fishermen. Quite truthfully, I do not believe that it can enforce the existing fishing laws. How is it going to handle all the new laws that honourable members are considering today?

In the last five years, I have not seen an officer from the Queensland Boating and Fisheries Patrol near a ramp where amateur fishermen have been fishing. If an officer from the Boating and Fisheries Patrol turned up one morning at one of the more popular ramps in the Gold Coast area and then turned up at that ramp again the next week, the word would quickly go round. The people bringing in undersized fish and crabs would stop that practice. People are bringing in undersized fish and crabs today without worry, because officers from the Boating and Fisheries Patrol are not at the ramps. In some rivers and bays, people are breaking the laws within 100 metres of the office of the Boating and Fisheries Patrol. One rarely sees action taken by officers of the Boating and Fisheries Patrol. There are not enough to do the job properly.

The good old hard-working, loyal professional fisherman who is conservation-minded says to me, "I am a mug, Tom. I am not working in the closed area around Darcy Light or out a bit further. But come and I will show you the trawlers working there at night." It is unfair to the decent fisherman who is sticking to the rules if the Government does not enforce the rules on those people who are deliberately flouting the laws.

More patrol officers are required. I ask the Minister, "How many additional Boating and Fisheries Patrol officers will we get this year? How many additional officers will be available to handle the influx of new people buying boats?" Thousands of people are coming into Queensland, buying aluminium and fibreglass boats and fishing on the rivers. They never see an officer from the Boating and Fisheries Patrol.

The promotional activities of the Boating and Fisheries Patrol need to be expanded into schools and clubs so that people can be informed of the fishing laws. If the ordinary fellow was asked, "How big is the sand crab that you can take?", or, "What is the minimum length of a summer whiting or a winter whiting or a jew?", he would say that he did not know. Even the tide book that the Government produces does not contain the information that it did.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: It is not a good tide book, either.

Mr BURNS: As I get older, the book is becoming more difficult to read.

The fishery resource is finite. If over-exploitation continues, it will be destroyed. The commercial fisherman who is battling to earn a living is taking home fewer fish and smaller fish. He cannot afford a Government that is continually saying to him, "I am going to levy you this and charge you that." He says, "What am I going to get out of it?" I do not think that the Fish Management Authority has yet shown him what he is going to get out of it, other than more levies, fees, fines and charges.

First, reliable, practical research information and statistics are required before decisions are made; secondly, proper staff is needed to enforce the laws that we continue to write in this Chamber. It is no good having closed seasons, closed habitats and reserves and new marketing laws if officers are not provided to enforce the laws. As I said, legislation without enforcement is useless.

I now wish to talk about fish sizes. Of course, I wrote to the former Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Ahern) about this matter, and I have also written to the present Minister for Primary Industries about it. When I first wrote to the Minister about fish sizes I was talking about the catching of prawns at Noosa. In June last year the Minister's own department published a little story about the prawning industry suffering if further urban development occurred on the Noosa River. If further development occurs there will be no need to worry about the size of the prawns; there will be nowhere for the prawns to breed in the Noosa River.

Most of the estuaries are good nursery areas and should be protected.

On 9 June last year I went to the fish market. As a result of that visit, I wrote a letter to the Minister for Primary Industries along these lines—

"I realise that some years ago size limits were removed on a large number of Queensland fish but I am sure amateur fishermen and tourist operators would be surprised to see tray after tray of Tailor 3 or 4 inches long, trays of small Jew from the Noosa River that would average about 6 inches at the most, prawns from Tewantin that fit 300 in an oyster bottle, John Dory that were as small as three inches."

They were all on sale at the fish market. When I raised the matter with commercial buyers, they told me that was not an isolated incident and listed dozens of others. Those little fish are sold for bait at the lowest possible price. They are too small to be filleted and sold for fish and chips. Some good friends of mine are bait-sellers. When there is a glut of mullet, or when half a ton of mullet is left over from commercial sales, they take a lot at 40c a kilogram, pack it in boxes and throw it into the freezer. Later on they sell it to crab fishermen for 90c or \$1 a kilo.

Mr Vaughan: They sell each mullet for 80c.

Mr BURNS: I am being kind to my mates, the bait-dealers.

The bait bloke makes a good deal, but the poor fisherman does no good at all. By the time the fisherman pays his Fish Board charges and his handling, transport and ice costs, little is left of the money he makes.

Why is this small fish resource being exploited? The Minister replied to my letter and explained that there are rules and that certain things are done, but the main point was that there is not enough staff.

At the time I raised the question of Australian bass. It is one of the best fresh-water fish in Australia. Pound for pound it is the best fighting fish. It is not a large fish; a 1-kg bass is large. Fishing for it in the Noosa River is very popular and fishermen from all over Australia are attracted to the area. Members of the Sport Fishing Associations go there.

On the day that I went out to the market, three or four trays of bass were being sold. In the spawning season the bass make their way towards the sea. However, on this occasion, rain fell and the fish were washed down the rivers, where the fishermen caught them in nets. It is my view that Australian bass should not be sold commercially. Because it has a muddy sort of taste, it is not the sort of fish that is really caught to be eaten. It is a good fighting sport fish that a fisherman enjoys catching. I have caught a dozen or so but have let them all go because I have caught a whiting or a flathead, which are better to eat, to take home. The only way to protect Australian bass is to make it a non-commercial species. The same thing happens with black marlin. People catch black marlin for the fun of catching it, not for it to be cut into pieces of flake and sold at the fish market. Australian bass should not be sold as commercial fish. Then the fisherman who sees them will not worry about netting them, packing them and icing them up. Neither the fisherman nor the man selling Australian bass broke any law but the fish that I saw at the market were the spawning stock for the bass that I like to catch. The bass at the fish market were mothers full of eggs and were sold for about the same price as mullet. That sort of exploitation should not be allowed at this time.

Mr Randell interjected.

Mr BURNS: I support bag limits, but it is too hard to enforce them. There are no inspectors. In the last five years I have not seen an inspector at the popular boat ramps that I use and I have been to many boat ramps throughout south-east Queensland. That is the best place for an inspector to sit because everybody must use the ramp. How can a bag limit be enforced if there are no inspectors to do it?

The Moreton Bay crab fishermen have suggested that Marys and other small female crabs could now be taken.

My first reaction to that suggestion is to oppose it, because all my life I was taught that I do not take Marys or undersized crabs. The fishermen's argument, which I cannot fault as I do not know enough about the matter, is that the crabs are producing millions of eggs and the Marys get so big that a small buck cannot mount them. In those circumstances, the Marys are no good for breeding any more, so the suggestion is that after the Marys have passed a certain size fishermen should be allowed to take them. I do not know enough about the matter. I do not even say that I support the argument. However, someone should get hold of the document that the fishermen have submitted and tell us what is wrong with it or what is right with it.

Government Members interjected.

Mr BURNS: Government members should not laugh when I am talking about natural procreation, because that ensures that we can catch fish and other seafoods.

I turn now to the illegal sale of fish. The QCFO has a very strong case to argue that many people are selling fish outside the system. I suggest that the reason why the Fish Board got itself into financial difficulties was that most fishermen were selling their poor-quality product to the Fish Board and were hawking their high-quality product to outside commercial interests. They let the Fish Board carry the bag. Many people are beginning to be deeply concerned about the illegal sale of fish, the sale of poor-quality fish and the fish substitution rackets.

I want to read from a letter written in June last year by a lady whose husband is engaged in the barramundi industry. She says—

“My husband and I have a reef and barramundi boat which we built and have since poured all our efforts and savings into. We have now exhausted all our reserves and are sinking backwards fast despite our tremendous efforts and tenacity. I write out of concern for the problems which face us because I feel we deserve at least some reward for everything we have forgone to be in and remain in this business. At the moment my husband is up near Cairns somewhere ”

I do not want to imply that her husband is up north catching barramundi in the closed season. She goes on to say—

“We cannot sell our barramundi, for instance, and receive a fair return for investment for effort made by the men, long hours in all weathers away from the comforts and conveniences of home and family, apart from trying to cover costs, let alone make some small profit.”

She sets out the reason why. It is buyer, hotel and restaurant resistance after the substitution scares.

Any honourable member who knows a professional barramundi fisherman will be aware that every time there is a story about substitution the fishermen face a downturn in their price or a downturn in demand, with more people turning to the Russian-caught sea perch, which is plastic, white, and firm. It is easily handled and easily marketed. The poor old barramundi goes down the drain. Buyers have turned to the imported Russian-caught sea perch and are not buying Queensland fish. Barramundi is being sent to Brisbane from the Northern Territory, and that causes near glut situations.

In her letter, the lady makes the point that it would be a good arrangement if the Northern Territory barramundi fishermen could send their product south to areas in which there are no barramundi. It seems reasonable to ask the Northern Territory to get together with Queensland to enter into some marketing arrangement for barramundi.

Mr Turner: You could not direct them.

Mr BURNS: No, the Northern Territory could not be directed to do that, but Queensland and the Northern Territory could get together and do something about the situation.

This lady went on to say that a good deal of Northern Territory barramundi is rubbish. That is true. I have been at restaurants when Northern Territory barramundi has been unpacked.

Whilst I was in New Guinea I looked at the fishing in the Fly River. Under that nation's rules, nets are given to the villagers who catch the barramundi, and the boats move in and take the barramundi from the fishermen, process it on the boats and bring it back to Daru. Under the hygiene standards that operate in that industry, some of the barramundi, by the time it gets to the Queensland markets, is not the type of seafood for which I would be willing to pay big money in a restaurant. Nevertheless it is true barramundi. If when it is sold it is bad barramundi, it depresses the value of our barramundi. Queensland must ensure that fish that is sold in this State is of high quality. Besides protecting the health of persons, the State should protect its fishing industry.

In her letter, the lady says that as a result of "feed-back" she believes that some Northern Territory fish can only be described as rubbish. I agree with her. Its sale creates buyer resistance.

The letter goes on to say—

"We can no longer sell our 'high-quality, well-handled, well-frozen, well-packaged' fish to whomever we want unless we pay the Fish Management Authority a couple of thousand dollars a year and a licence fee."

They are not doing very well now. The Fish Management Authority says, "If you want to sell it direct, you will have to pay us a bigger fee." It seems to me that the Fish Management Authority becomes another group that bludges on those poor fishermen. It is another group that is making demands on the industry. It raises licence fees and obtains additional funds from people who cannot afford to pay.

She makes the other point that if one travels up and down the coast one finds that most of the tourist resorts sell sea perch. If the persons who patronise those restaurants ate the Australian salmon that was provided in the dining-room today, I would not blame them for eating sea perch; it was a terrible piece of a good Australian fish.

However, honourable members ought to ensure that Australian fish is promoted. I cannot understand why the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation has not done more to promote Queensland seafoods throughout Australia, particularly sand crabs and Moreton Bay bugs. Perhaps first the name "Moreton Bay bug" should be changed to ensure that the beautiful lobster-like meat that comes from that creature is sold and promoted as a delicacy. Tasty seafood can be sold in our restaurants. However, many flash restaurants on the coast sell sea perch. The owners might tell their customers that they are eating barramundi, but I am sure that they are not. I am sure that I have eaten sea perch at some restaurants on the coast.

Illegal sales of fish is another matter. No-one knows—and the industry wants to know—how much fish is sold illegally by private operators. A great deal of reference is made to the pro-am, the fellow who supposedly goes out, catches tonnes of fish and sells it through the fish board. If he is doing that on a regular basis, he must be such a regular supplier that the retailer can count on him or he must obtain a licence so that he can sell his excess fish through the fish board. Those sales should be stopped. The pro-ams should be licensed in some way so that we know where they are. They should be made to sell their

fish through the board. I would rather that they were not charged a fee if they sold their catch through the board. It would then be possible to gauge how much is being sold or caught in that way.

The fishermen are told, "You can sell through the board. It will cost you \$20." The fisherman says, "I am going to sell only \$20 worth of fish. Why should I pay you \$20?" He does not go near the board. No record of the sale is obtained. It would be better if he was told, "You can use the board's facilities for free. Bring your fish in and sell it there." At the end of the year the Government could say, "We will have to do something about this. Here is 100 000 tonnes of fish being sold by that method through the board."

The Minister's predecessor wrote to me and made the point that he did not know what was happening. I attended a meeting of an amateur fishing council with the chairman of the QCFO. He said to me, "If you can find out, let us know." They know that it is big; so do I. I do not think that anybody who has anything to do with the fishing industry would doubt that it is a massive problem. However, no-one has the facts to back it up. We are left in limbo. Nothing much can be done without the facts. Research should be undertaken. It should be made easier for fishermen to sell their fish through the board so that we have complete records.

Black-market activities by fishermen will never be overcome. Greed will always exist in our community. Nothing much will be done other than by enforcement. The simple solution would be for an inspector to go into a restaurant or a retail fish establishment and say to the owner, "Show me the receipts for that fish. Show me the name of the person from whom you purchased it." The owners of those establishments should be required to maintain some record of the source of the fish that they are selling. The point of sale is the best place at which to do that. It would not be possible to find the fishermen. Inspectors would be required all along the coast waiting for boats to come in. The point of sale to the consumer is the place at which it could be checked out.

The Bill refers specifically to the power to declare closed seasons and closed waters. It refers to allowable apparatus and specific species of fish. I do not believe that the Government is fair dinkum in regard to fish habitats. I remember the loud outcry when the Gold Coast Waterways Authority decided to make a boat harbour at the back of Browns Island, which was fish habitat 13 or 14, if I remember correctly.

A fish habitat reserve is supposedly set aside so that fish can breed in an undisturbed environment. When I was a young lad I used to fish off Browns Island. That was a very good area for black bream, John Dory, mullet, whiting and other species of fish. It was a great area in which to fish during the winter months, because of the abundance of seaweed. The Gold Coast Waterways Authority wanted to establish a boat harbour in that area. A channel was dredged. The spoil was pumped onto the mangroves in the fish habitat reserve. One can say that fish habitat reserves mean nothing to the Government.

I thought that the Government might learn by that mistake. However, the same thing is happening at Woongoolbver Creek on Fraser Island. For years, barges have pulled in there to handle timber. However, the fellow who has a tourist establishment on the island wants to dredge into the mouth of the creek so that he can get his barge in more easily. He wants to build a gravel road across the top end of it so he can move more quickly and more readily. The Government has agreed. The mouth of Woongoolbver Creek is a fish habitat reserve; so what the hell is the use of declaring areas fish habitat reserves if someone can come along and interfere with them without any environmental impact study or discussion with the fishermen?

I could table letters from the Maryborough District Amateur Angling Association and tourist associations saying that they do not want dredging there, that it is not necessary. There are a number of other areas in which barges could be landed without interfering with that fish habitat reserve. The Government cannot be fair dinkum in speaking about protecting fish habitats when it allows things such as that. That is the second example. There are probably dozens of others.

It is part and parcel of our job as members of this Assembly to ensure that fish—one of fragile finite resources of the State—are protected. If we are to protect the fishing industry in this State, we must face up to the problems of pollution, dredging, destruction of habitat reserves, closed seasons and over-exploitation. The Government has to be callous and hard in making its decisions.

I turn now to a decision that was to be made about Bribie Island. On 8 April 1981 the Minister wrote as follows to the Caboolture Shire Clerk—

“I refer to previous correspondence in relation to fishing in Pumicestone Passage, and I am pleased to advise that the investigations carried out by my Fisheries Service have now been completed.

The Service's recommendations are as follows—

1. Further growth in net fishing and beam trawling should be restricted by limiting the number of fishermen and trawlers to those presently operating full time in the area (12 and 6 respectively).
2. Beam trawler endorsements should not be automatically transferable.
3. No netting should be permitted anywhere in the Passage in the main holiday season (between December 15 and January 31). Beam trawling should be permitted at this time in order to maintain bait supplies in the holiday season.
4. No netting should be permitted between Skirmish Point and the Bribie Island bridge from September 1 to November 30—the main whiting angling season. The beach from Skirmish Point to South Point should be opened to mullet netting from May 1 to August 15 including weekends.
5. The entire Passage and its creeks should be closed to commercial crab fishing.
6. King's Beach at Caloundra should be opened to net fishing for the month of August (from 1981 this will no longer be a school holiday period).
7. Existing netting and trawling restrictions in the area should continue except as detailed above.
8. Owners of beam trawlers should be encouraged to upgrade the appearance of their vessels.
9. No dredging or disturbance of sand or mud banks should be endorsed other than for maintenance dredging of access channels.

I propose that a meeting to include representatives of the two Shire Councils bordering on the Passage, and of the Queensland Commercial Fishermen's State Council, as well as other interested parties, be convened as soon as possible to discuss these recommendations.”

That was almost three years ago, but the meeting has not yet been held. What has happened? Since then, there have been stories of people driving at each other on the beach with four-wheel-drive vehicles. I have written about complaints I have received from fishermen that at Skirmish Point net fishermen have seen fellows catching whiting with rods and pulled a net right round them—rods and all! The professionals say that they are entitled to do it. I wrote to the then Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Ahern) in September 1983 and he said that there was nothing he could do about it.

What happened to the proposal for the joint meeting? The fishermen in Pumicestone Passage, knowing full well that the Premier went up there during the recent State election campaign and promised a national park and a marine park over all of Pumicestone Passage, or half of it—whoever asked the last question got the answer—want to know what their future is. What is a commercial operator at Pumicestone Passage to do? Would he be secure if he bought a new boat, borrowed money on a new boat or bought new equipment, or is he threatened by the 1981 letter and the Premier's declaration of national parks and marine parks? What about the tourist operators and the fishermen who go there? Bribie is one of the best spots that I know of for whiting fishing.

Mr Menzel: You've been there?

Mr BURNS: Oh, yes, I have been there. It is very good. Let me tell the member for Mulgrave that each season, between August and February, amateur fishermen catch 25 tonnes of whiting at Bribie. When the Australian angling championships are held there, people from all over the country say that it is probably some of the best fishing in Australia. That is a lot of whiting!

Barry Pollock, who works for the Government and is one of the best fishermen in this State, obtained all the records of all the amateur angling clubs from 1959 to 1980. Those records contained statistics on who caught the most fish, how many pounds and the total number caught. Because the clubs were giving prizes, there is no doubt that the records would be accurate.

Mr Randell: How long can an area sustain that sort of fishing?

Mr BURNS: That is the argument.

On top of that, the professionals come in with their nets and trawl right over the top of those amateurs who are catching that 25 tonnes. Those nets also take away tonnes of fish. So that area is being smashed to smithereens.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The Chair is also interested in the honourable member's arguments.

Mr BURNS: Mr Deputy Speaker, you are a northern fisherman. Northern fishermen are not interested in fishing for whiting.

Professional fishermen want to know what future they have and how the Premier's election promise of a marine national park will affect them. The amateurs would also like to know.

For those honourable members who may doubt my story, I have a pamphlet dated 1 July 1983 from the Royal Society of Queensland. It contains an assessment by B. R. Pollock and M. J. Williams from the Fisheries Research Branch, Department of Primary Industries, Brisbane, of the angling fishery for summer whiting in Moreton Bay. That is a very worthwhile article. It points out that although there is no evidence of changes in the numbers and average size of fish at Moreton Island, which is a different type of summer whiting but is still summer whiting, the average size of whiting taken at Bribie has decreased, in Pollock's words, apparently because of the heavy fishing pressure. So, over the years, because that tonnage of fish has been taken out of that area, the size of the whiting has decreased.

The 25 tonnes taken by the amateurs, in addition to the professional take, has created a substantial challenge to that fishery. I want to know why nothing has been done about the threat to that Bribie Island fishery since 8 April 1981. I want to know why nothing has been done to protect that marvellous fishing resort, because Bribie is a place where people go for a quiet fishing holiday. The honourable member for Nudgee (Mr Vaughan), who owns a house on Bribie Island, will verify my statements.

Mr Vaughan: It will get worse, too, because people are taking eugaries from there by the bucketful.

Mr BURNS: That is correct.

As an honourable member sitting in the back of this Chamber on the Government side would know—he is one of the Minister's advisers—in the last few weeks in the bayside area a group of Vietnamese families has moved in like a plague of locusts and picked up every shell from the beach. They started round Wellington Point. As the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services (Mr Goleby) would be able to tell the House, if he knows what is happening in his area, they have gone through that area and taken bucketful after bucketful of shells. In fact, they have taken them away by the truck load. I wrote to the Minister, who passed it to one of his advisers who is presently smiling in the back of the Chamber. I was very pleased with the answer. The Government is very well aware of the problem and is trying to get the Vietnamese community together to inform them that that sort of thing does not happen in Queensland. I do not know why they were taking the shells instead of just taking the creatures that live inside them. I must say that I have been to a couple of functions at which I have eaten in spaghetti marinara things that I have turned over with my fork when worming and kicked away.

The fight at Bribie is only one of a number that have to be faced. The Broadwater is closed to netting between 1 September and 1 February. The honourable member for Chatsworth (Mr Mackenroth) knows that area very well. Amateur fishermen advise tourists not to fish there after 1 February because the professional fishermen stake every one of the channels. When the season is open to them they are legally entitled to do that. When that happens the whiting catch drops away. Although the Gold Coast has become a concrete jungle, many people go there to fish. When virtually overnight The Broadwater turns from a prolific whiting fishery to a barren area because the netters have an open season, visitors to the Gold Coast complain. That is a legitimate complaint.

The commercial fishermen also have a legitimate complaint. They say, "Why can't we keep earning a quid? This is where we get our living. We have to get our living out of here." I disagree with the QCFO when it takes sides in that sort of argument. A group of arbiters is needed to sit in on conferences of that sort. For example, I would like to say to the fishermen on The Broadwater, "I will buy you out. When you die, your licence cannot be transferred. I will buy your boat, gear and equipment and the goodwill of your business." That would be one fewer fisherman in that area. If he did not want to do that—

Mr Kaus: Don't allow anybody else.

Mr BURNS: No more new licences should be issued, and the existing licences should be gradually bought out. Government members talk about thousands of tourists coming to Queensland, but a tourist who sits on the cement wall of a barren canal catching nothing will go home and give Queensland a good bagging and no-one will come here next year.

The Maroochy Shire Council has asked the Department of Primary Industries to ban net fishing in the Maroochy River from the mouth to the Bli Bli bridge. A number of shire councils want four-wheel-drives kept off the beaches. So wherever one goes one finds a conflict between amateurs and professionals, and it will get worse. The argument needs to be settled. There is a need for an authority that is more representative than the Fish Management Authority. Amateur fishermen should have a say.

Mr FitzGerald: How would you select the amateurs?

Mr BURNS: The Queensland Amateur Fishing Council represents the underwater fishing groups, the deep sea fishing clubs, the Moreton Bay Trailer Boat Club, the yacht clubs and the amateur fishing clubs, such as the Australian National Sports Fishing Association. All of those groups could elect a representative.

Mr Lee: There are hundreds of them.

Mr BURNS: There are some great blokes such as the chairman (Dr Peter Saenger), some of the old blokes such as Tommy Ludlow or Bill Kerr or even young Denis Griffiths. There is a team of fair and reasonable blokes who would do a good job. They realise that the commercial fishermen have to make a living. They are not in the business of chasing someone out of the industry.

I have a few moments left, so I want to talk about national parks, because they will be the next big area of conflict. A letter from the Director of National Parks to the Amateur Fishing Council points out that amateurs—in fact, everyone—will not be allowed to fish in national parks. The letter reads—

"I am sure your Council will agree that fish are an important component of the wildlife of an area and it is as important to protect the fish as it is to protect flowers, insects, reptiles, birds and so on. Hunters shooting ducks during an open season accept that not only all National Parks but all sanctuaries are unavailable to them for their sport. Likewise all National Parks are closed to fishing to the extent that the waters concerned are actually part of the National Park."

There will be a decent sort of barney about that. I will not be able to throw myself under a bulldozer in a stream when I am fishing, but I will throw myself under something if that sort of law is to be enacted. That sort of situation calls for bag limits, licences and control. No-one would deny that there must be pristine areas in which no-one can fish, such as habitat areas, but in many of the American national parks that I visited one of the great joys was fishing in the streams. People camp in the controlled areas, but the great joy is to be able to fish along the banks of a stream.

Mr Simpson: Stand there, anyway.

Mr BURNS: Yes, but the point is that at least people are allowed to do that. It seems from the letter of 18 April 1983 that Queenslanders might not even be able to do that.

I do not have a lot of time left today, but I want to talk about the problem of mining companies being granted leases over large areas of land. I refer specifically to the Bowen

area. I received a letter from some mates of mine in that area who are sports fishermen. I met them in Yeppoon last year. They told me about their problem and I asked them to write to me about it. The letter reads—

“Dear sir,

The people of Bowen and district, and the thousands of visitors and tourists that come to Bowen annually have a major problem. Out of a total of seventeen creeks that flow in the Bowen district to 50 km north and south of Bowen, there are only two creeks that have public access all year round. These are the Elliot River and Adelaide Creek.

The other fifteen creeks are only accessible through private property and grazing lease, or sea access at high tide only and only when weather conditions permit. Due to recent land ownership changes to large mining and refining companies, Comalco and Mount Isa Mines, all access by land to the creeks on their properties to the public has been denied.”

Comalco just said, “You are not allowed to fish in our creek.” The Government has given the company a lease only to mine the area, but it has closed the area off. Mount Isa Mines Limited has done the same.

The letter continues—

“The Bowen district is growing rapidly due to the influence of these two companies and their investment in the area, therefore the number of people in the area has increased and their leisure activities certainly include fishing.

Public in Bowen need access to these creeks because;

- (1) fishing pressure on the creeks that are accessible is severe and fish stocks are depleted.
- (2) Bowen is the recreational centre for residents of inland areas interstate visitors, and tourists currently numbering one thousand per night.”

Mr Randell: Are they denying them access to the area?

Mr BURNS: Yes. The letter continues—

“(3) the prevailing winds that affect Bowens unprotected coastline severely restricts offshore boating and fishing for much of the year, therefore also preventing creek access.

- (4) fishing in the Bowen area is a major drawcard for tourists who bring small boats to fish the estuaries every year.”

Mr Deputy Speaker, I have not shown this document to Mr Speaker, but it is a one-page list of creeks in the Bowen district, and I seek leave to incorporate it in “Hansard”

(Leave granted.)

The Gregory River	Grazing lease—nil road access Sea access when weather permits at high tide.
Longford Creek	Grazing lease—Dry season access through property.
Kangaroo Creek	Grazing lease Access at \$100.00 (one hundred dollars) per key per annum—sea access as above.
Yeates Creek	Comalco owned—nil road access—sea access as above.
Emu Creek	Comalco owned—nil road access—sea access as above.
Duck Creek	Comalco owned—nil road access—sea access as above.
Adelaide Creek	Comalco owned—road access about to be closed—sea access as above. Heavy fishing pressure—fish stocks depleted.
Gordon Creek	Grazing lease—access in dry season fishing pressure heavy—fish stocks depleted.
Doughty’s Creek	Crown land—access dry season fishing poor due to major recent fish kills due to introduction heavy salt pollution.
Don River	All weather access but 4 wheel drive boat launching—crown land—heavily silted fishing poor.

Boat Creek	Grazier—nil road access—sea access as above.
Merinda Creek	Grazier—key access at \$30 a key at owners discretion— heavy fishing pressure—sea access as above.
Eurie Creek	Mount Isa Mines—nil road access total siltation of mouth— fishing poor.
Stuart Creek	Mount Isa Mines—Limited access before M.I.M. takeover— nil now—sea access as above.
Splitters Creek	Dry season access at owners discretion—owner looking at present to closure because of over fishing—due to other creeks being closed to the public.
Saltwater Creek	Grazier—4 wheel drive access in dry season to high reaches sea access as above.
Elliot River	Gazetted road and commercial fishermans reserve—heavy fishing pressure—fishing poor.

Mr BURNS: I have never heard of a similar situation before. The Government has given a big company a lease to enable it to search for some sort of ore—in this case, coal—and the company has put up fences and signs and blocked off the roads. People cannot get to their favourite fishing-holes.

Mining companies are not involved in all of the cases listed. In regard to Merinda Creek, I see that, for \$30, a grazier will give people a key that gives them access to the property at the owner's discretion. Because people are allowed into that property, there is heavy fishing on the creek. In regard to Emu Creek, which is owned by Comalco, there is no access by road and sea access is difficult in certain weather.

Mr Randell: This is going over private property?

Mr BURNS: Comalco property.

Mr Randell interjected.

Mr BURNS: I am talking about organised groups. I am sure that arrangements can be made so that people have access to these creeks. When the leases are negotiated we should say, "Provision will be made for access to these areas." Comalco is not running cattle on these areas. I agree that there are always two sides to an argument.

My colleague the member for Bundaberg will ably stand in for the former member, Jimmy Blake. I am sure that he also will speak about beam trawlers. Bundaberg has a specific problem with beam trawlers, but honourable members who fish around Caloundra will know that many people blame the falling off in fish numbers in Pumicestone Passage to the beam trawlers that operate up and down that passage. Honourable members who fish in waters in south-east Queensland know that some rivers have been badly damaged by beam trawlers.

I do not know a lot about beam trawlers, but I do know that their engines are getting bigger, the boats are getting bigger, they are pulling bigger nets and they are scouring deeper into the mud and the other material that makes up the bottom of the rivers. I would like some assurance from the Government that it is doing something to overcome that problem. I heard the former Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Ahern) say in this Chamber, "Yes, we are having an inquiry and we will produce a report." This is 1984 and honourable members have not received the report. It is about time that we received some information on beam trawling. Many of the big trawler operators think that beam trawlers are taking all the young stock in the rivers before they move out into the bays. I do not know whether that is right, but that is why the Opposition has asked questions.

In November 1982, Jimmy Blake said—

"I have received deputations from people in the industry, with particular regard to beam trawling in what might be called the nursery areas within rivers. I doubt whether any honourable member in this Chamber has not received some complaints about the size of boats now operating in nursery areas. At one time a beam trawler was considered to be a small boat with a small catching ability. I believe that at present the law provides for boats up to in excess of 29 feet, or just under

30 feet, with tremendous catching ability provided by the trawling apparatus that is used. They are very efficient fishing machines and are playing havoc in the nursery areas at the mouths of rivers."

Mr Kaus: I think I said that, too.

Mr BURNS: The honourable member has been saying that about Tingalpa Creek and other creeks in that area. It has been talked about in the Brisbane River and the rivers all along the coast. Now is the time for the Government to bring some facts before honourable members so that a decision can be made about beam trawlers. Queensland cannot afford to back away any longer on those matters.

Mr Lee: I thought Doug Mactaggart fixed all that up with his new bait.

Mr BURNS: His new bait is all right. Don't knock "Catchit". Some friends of mine have done very well with it. It is a good bait for bream. This sounds like a commercial. It has to be moulded first. When it is moulded in the fingers and wrapped around a 1.0 hook, some good-size bream can be caught.

Fish imported to Queensland should be closely inspected to stop fish substitution rackets. It is not good enough to say that that is a Commonwealth responsibility. The inspectors from the Queensland Health Department do a marvellous job at the fish market, but I have always considered it crazy that the only way in which kerosene taint in mullet can be detected is by the inspector in the fish market taking a slice from a mullet, cooking it and tasting it. If that is the only practical way, then it is the sensible way of doing it.

The inspectors at the fish market are supposed to check whether a product is in good order. At the same time, they must check whether anything is undersized, check on heavy-metal and pesticide-residue levels in all sharks over 5 kg, sample at random cooked prawns and do many other things. They are very busy people and their work is very important.

It worries me to see at the fish market bags of crab meat weighing 10 or 20 kg. That crab meat can only come from undersized crabs, Marys or crabs that might be a little bit off. A fisherman or retailer can tell by the feel of the shell of a crab whether it is sound. If it is undersized, the meat is packed in bags and sent to the fish market. It is difficult to believe that a fisherman would send a tray of whiting fillets to the fish market. Why would he sit on his boat, prepare a tray of whiting fillets and send it to the market for sale?

Mr Lee: The fish might not be biting at the time.

Mr BURNS: Fishermen do not catch fish on a line; mesh nets are set.

The fillets in the fish market must be from undersized fish. I would not allow crab meat or fish fillets to be sold through Fish Board outlets, because fishermen are bypassing the inspectors. Health standards must be maintained. A standard should be established and maintained so that everybody knows that Queensland seafood is the finest.

The way in which the salmon was served to honourable members in the dining room today is a disgrace to the Australian seafood industry. Any member who tried it would not choose it again from a menu of sea perch, South African haddock and Australian salmon. He would try the haddock or the perch rather than the salmon. That is not the right attitude, because Australian salmon are good eating fish.

I would now like to discuss pollution and reclamation in Moreton Bay. I have fished the bay all my life and now I enjoy taking my young daughter on to the bay with me. Most people do not realise the value of the bay. Sand crabs, whiting, tailor, bream and mackerel can be found in abundance. It is a good fishing area that is being threatened by the reclamation of swamps. The Government needs only a little bit for the port and a little bit for the airport; Raby Bay is needed for a few canals and part of the area around St Helena is to be dredged for the coral. The Government is only going to do this and only going to do that. In addition, so many thousands of yards of sand was taken from the Middle Banks to be used as filling for the new airport. What has been the result? The gradual destruction and degradation of the bay itself.

Areas in which people used to walk on sand are now covered with mud. Areas in which fine coral reefs used to abound are now big empty holes as a result of dredging. Areas that used to contain massive breeding grounds for small fish and crabs have been dredged away to form a canal development.

People do not realise that Queensland is at the beginning of an era of tremendous development. In years to come the population of Queensland will be many millions. In the future people will look back to our day to see what areas we set aside for future generations.

I think of the Brisbane Forest Park. Some years ago, someone decided to set that area of greenery aside for our generation. In turn, we should be setting something aside for ourselves and future generations. Moreton Bay is one of those areas in which we need to plan. The Fish Management Authority, the airport authority and the Port of Brisbane Authority should not be allowed to engage in development at the total expense of Moreton Bay.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr BURNS: It is not a matter for the Brisbane City Council, the State Government or the Federal Government. All of us have to get together to plan for the protection of Moreton Bay. Now is the time to do that.

Recently I visited Sandy Strait, where I saw massive fish kills. I have seen such fish kills in Doboy Creek. I have heard the excuse put forward that fish kills are caused by nature. I do not believe that.

At present, a problem exists at Armstrong Beach near Sarina. The problem is created by the power alcohol plant. It is estimated that the cost of installing pollution control equipment at the plant will be \$25m. That cost will be involved to protect the beach from pollution. That plant has been in operation for at least 30 years. If it had spent a small amount of money each year to overcome the problem, it would not now be faced with the tremendous expense that is involved. However, because no-one complained, nothing was done about the problem. The stage has been reached at which people are angry and upset that nothing seems to have been done.

This is where the division of Government authority comes in. Anyone who wants to complain about the fish kills in the north has to write not to the Fisheries Department but to the Water Quality Council or some other department. The Government should institute some overriding control to cover such matters. The mangroves and bayside areas hold the key to the future for fishermen like me.

Finally, I make the point that the amateur fishing industry in Queensland should be given the recognition that it deserves. That industry, of which I am part, is bigger than most other industries in Queensland. Each year, more money than most people realise is spent by amateur fishermen on their holidays, on their cars, on their four-wheel-drive vehicles, their boats, outboard motors and fuel, on their accommodation and on their fishing gear. The amateur fishing industry in Queensland is a multimillion-dollar industry. In spite of that, it is sadly neglected by Governments. All that seems to happen to those of us in the industry is the imposition of a tax on something that we handle.

In my area alone, although others and I pay registration fees to the State Government on our boats and trailers, we do not have a decent boat ramp between Bulimba Point and the mouth of the Brisbane River. My area services hundreds of thousands of people on the south side of the river, but they have very few places at which they can launch their boats.

Wynnum Creek itself is a very poor landing area because it is badly dredged. Similar areas exist throughout the State. Look at the boat ramps that are available to amateur fishermen. At most of them we should mount warning signs to read, "Deep hole at end", "No light available", "No water available", "No power available" or "Don't park your car here because items will be stolen".

Fishermen are warned, "Don't park down there. When you come home the wheels will be missing from your trailer." Surely fishermen have a right to say, "Because we belong to an industry we are entitled to be protected. We are entitled to have spent on the fishing industry the same amount of money that is spent on other industries in this State." The money that is being paid into the State coffers by the amateur fishing industry is not being returned to it.

A couple of years ago, in a letter from a Japanese group, I read that it would bring 500 people to Queensland each year to go fishing. It wanted a place at which it could be guaranteed that fish would be caught. That request was passed on to the tourist authorities. That Japanese group now travels to Lord Howe Island. At that time the Queensland Government was not organised enough or capable enough to handle the matter.

The Gulf rivers are rich in barramundi, and the Great Barrier Reef region has great potential for tourism through fishing. Its potential is greater than the persons in power recognise. The persons who talk only about jumbo jets flying to Australia ought to talk about

the busloads of local people and the people from the south with their caravans who want to fish in Queensland. They want protection from the Fish Management Authority, and one way of obtaining that protection is to have a few amateur fishermen on the authority who can put forward the views of the people whom I represent.

Mr SIMPSON (Coorooora) (3.26 p.m.): I support the Bill. The fishing industry in Queensland has not been fully exploited. It is like a large paddock. Many independent persons harvest that resource. Persons who think that primary producers are very independent have not seen fishermen at work, because they are even more independent.

The Government is making an endeavour to control the future of that industry by allowing it to be the regulator and controller of its destiny. A great deal more research needs to be carried out to discover what is happening with that resource before the right recommendations can be made.

To find the best management for the resource, we should build on the present controls, with closed seasons for barramundi and so on. Reference has already been made to Australian bass. One area in which it is found is the Noosa River system. If controls are not exercised, fish are put at risk. When the river is flushed out, bass can be found in an area in which they can be netted, particularly Lake Cootharaba. A complicated process is involved in finding out the extent of the present resource and determining for that resource effective controls that are not restrictive on commercial and amateur fishermen. Until that stage is reached, no real progress will be made in maintaining an ongoing industry. Many years ago there were more fish than there are now.

Mr Davis: How do you work that out?

Mr SIMPSON: That can be worked out very simply. Large cod cannot be taken now because they do not exist. Even though fishermen's stories have always been stretched a little old photographs do not lie. It is well known that large quantities of large fish have been taken. Many of those catches cannot be matched today.

Offshore resources are not being utilised fully. At present, long-liners have been operating in some areas. Beyond the 200-mile territorial limit a resource is commercially available. Boats from other countries fish within the 200-mile limit, and beyond it, using massive equipment, processing the catch and taking it to their countries. In some instances, it is later sold back to Australia. There should be something done to develop that resource for Australians, for both employment and profit and also for the enjoyment of the Australian consumer.

It is true that, when compared with other areas of the world, the fish resource of our sub-tropical region is not abundant. The temperate regions of Australia are more prolific, and quantity improves the further one goes into the tropical region. The fish that are associated with the Great Barrier Reef are very much in demand in our restaurants. However, much more work needs to be done to place a consistently reliable product before the public. Some claim that the reef fish is exotic. However, the product must be processed and marketed correctly so that it is consistently available to diners in restaurants in this State. It must be properly prepared and presented. Without that professional approach, the amount of fish products sold will diminish. I know that, in turn, they compete with red meat, other white meats, venison and wild game.

That is only one part of the industry. Hatcheries and fish-farming comprise the other part. However, their viability has not yet been established in this country.

Mr Davis: Have you done any fish-farming?

Mr SIMPSON: Fish-farming in this State, as in other States, is not viable. Other countries successfully produce fish by those methods because the fish are smaller and people consume them in a different way. Australians like the big fillets that come from larger fish. They eat only part of the fish. People from other countries utilise more of the fish.

Risks are involved in taking reef fish. The life of a trawlerman is precarious and fraught with danger. One often hears about those who are shipwrecked, those who are lost at night and those who are left to the mercy of sharks. Those who chase reef fish are plagued by sharks eating fish as they haul them in. Permits are available for shooting sharks and selling the meat. It is most important that that be encouraged; otherwise our reef fish will be even scarcer and dearer. The factors of danger, vagaries

of the season and natural predators all add to the cost of reef fish, a resource that I suggest honourable members should be promoting. The fish on the dining table right here in Parliament House has already been referred to in this debate. The kitchen at Parliament House should be able to serve to visitors the very best of products, whether they be fruit and vegetables, fish or anything else. In that way, visitors from interstate and overseas would know of the State's primary produce.

Mr Davis: Why don't you push for the introduction of Nile perch?

Mr SIMPSON: I will come to my old subject of Nile perch shortly.

Until now, the farming of fish in Queensland has not been a viable proposition, but I am not sure that in years to come it will not be viable. New technology in primary industry could lead to many changes. Research is being conducted into the gestation period of fish in an endeavour to find a method that will increase the survival rate of the eggs. If that could be done, perhaps fish could be produced commercially in tanks and ponds.

The various forms of crustaceans, from prawns through to lobsters, are very much in demand.

Mr Davis: What's a crustacean?

Mr SIMPSON: I do not know the technical description, but a crustacean has its frame on the outside, not a skeleton on the inside. I am sure that the honourable member is just as confused as he was.

All primary industries have the problem of producing a consistently good product for the consumer. Although the Government is criticised for establishing orderly marketing, that form of marketing ensures the supply of quality produce during times of boom and bust. Marketing in the fishing industry will be much the same as marketing of products such as milk, eggs and butter. In the long run, the consumer will be the one to benefit.

Because of the many variables that affect the crop out in the big paddock of the sea, much research is needed into the fishing industry. Some of the problems could be overcome by commercial fish farming, which would control some of the variables. However, to date that has not been viable.

Barramundi, a high-quality fish, is found in north Queensland and Papua New Guinea. The problem with that fish is getting a consistent quantity and quality to consumers. Because many anglers see barramundi as a wonderful sporting fish, which it is, a closed season has had to be introduced to ensure future supplies.

One answer to the problem is the introduction of Nile perch, which is very similar to barramundi. It will reproduce in fresh-water impoundments. In Australia, many rivers and streams have been dammed to provide irrigation for primary industries, water supplies for cities and flood mitigation. That has upset the breeding cycles of barramundi, as it has denied the fish access to certain parts of rivers. To compensate for that and to utilise the impoundments, the Nile perch program must be pursued vigorously. Although a start has been made, it has been difficult to get the Nile perch fry from third-world countries. In addition to that, there must be controls over any disease problems that may result. However, I am sure that in the future Nile perch will be a great resource. It will complement the barramundi and will be consistently available for the table. In the future there could be commercial production, and the sporting aspect could be an advantage as well.

Commercial fishermen coming from interstate to fish in Queensland are causing problems, particularly when Queensland fishermen are having difficulty making a living. Greater control should be exercised to protect Queenslanders. At the same time the Government should be helping Queensland fishermen with the development of new ideas for catches, nets and net safety. One often hears of trawlers sinking when their big nets snag on coral or something similar. Surely some improvements could be made to overcome future tragedies.

The Federal Government was wrong in attempting to impose an additional excise on fuel used in the fishing industry, and at least it has agreed to a moratorium. Ports need to be further developed so that commercial fishermen can have ready access to the resource. At the moment Mooloolaba has a good port but one has to go many miles further north before finding another of the same standard. Some people might claim that Tin Can Bay is a good port, but fishermen have to cross the very dangerous Wide Bay bar

to get out to sea. That bar periodically claims lives. More research needs to be done into safety in the fishing industry and into the resources made available for the commercial and amateur fisherman.

In terms of ultimate commercial value, eventually there could be a far greater return from amateur fishing than from professional fishing. A good deal of research has been done on that subject. It indicates that in New South Wales an average of \$2,000 per kilometre of river was derived from amateur fishermen. That figure indicates the tremendous amount of money involved in amateur fishing, and that amount is raised without even trying, because a lot is still to be done to promote amateur fishing as a tourist attraction not only for Queenslanders and Australians but also for overseas tourists. A large number of overseas tourists would be interested in fishing in Australia. Some have already discovered the attraction. Of course, the spectacular attraction is big game fishing.

Queensland's fish resources need to be developed. The people already in the industry need to be helped. The industry should be regulated so that it will remain viable and so that all Queenslanders benefit from it. Consumers must not be forgotten. They are often overlooked by the industry, yet they are the ones who purchase the product. The Government should impose as little restriction as possible in that area. I appeal to the Minister to implement a thorough education program to explain to the people in the industry and also to the community at large the reason why various controls are being introduced to cover fish sizes, closed seasons and so on.

Bag limits are set for amateur fishermen. If they were true sportsmen, they would set their own bag limits. However, the reason for imposing bag limits should be explained to them. If it were, they would accept it. If the reason is not explained to them, they cannot be expected to understand what the Government is trying to do. If something is explained to children, they will understand it far better than older people do. It is essential that we educate Australians about what we are trying to do to manage the fish resource.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (3.47 p.m.): Reference has been made to a quite knowledgeable gentleman by the name of Jim Blake. He served this House well by passing on his knowledge of the fishing industry. I wish to refer to some matters that he raised when dealing with previous fishing legislation.

Mr Blake is now an active amateur fisherman. One of the greatest shortcomings in this Bill is that amateur fishermen are not represented on the bodies set up by this legislation. They are not being given a say in an industry that is very important to the towns and cities along the coastline of Queensland.

We are debating the Fishing Industry Organization and Marketing Act and Another Act Amendment Bill. I have said that the amateur fishermen should be represented on fishing organisations. Similarly, consumers should be represented, because the overall aim of a marketing Act for the fishing industry should be to ensure the maximum utilisation of the fishing resource over a long period of time. They are the two greatest shortcomings in this Bill. There is no consumer protection and no representation of amateur fishermen. Two large sections of the fishing industry will not have a say in the management of our fish resources.

The fishing industry is not just concerned with the people who take fish and prawns. It also covers those people who make fishing lines, fishing reels and boats. In addition, the views of the tourist and restaurant industries should be taken into account.

The member for Lytton mentioned two important matters. He questioned whether these bodies should handle fish filets and crab meat. Views on those products will not be put to these bodies because there is no-one to put them. I agree with the member for Lytton that amateur fishermen should have a say in the management of fish resources. They know what is going on. They could play an active role in the long-term development of the fishing industry. The provision for honorary rangers under the Bill could be very dangerous. I can already see the Ronald Reagans of the Queensland Coast rushing up to amateur fishermen, jumping on their boats and demanding to see their fish. The rangers will have the right and power to have people fined up to \$5,000 and to have boats seized. I do not believe that those honorary rangers will have any training in the law.

Mr Randell: You are exaggerating.

Mr CAMPBELL: I am exaggerating because that is what is in the Bill. The civil liberties of someone like the honourable member for Mirani—

Mr Randell interjected.

Mr CAMPBELL: I am speaking about more inspectors. They should be trained. The provision in the Bill means that the Minister for Primary Industries could make the honourable member for Mirani an honorary inspector.

The Bill provides in new section 45AE—

“(5) (a) The Minister may, by notification published in the Gazette, appoint for the effectual administration of this Act such persons as he considers necessary to be honorary rangers.

(b) The procedure with respect to an application by a person for appointment as an honorary ranger shall be as prescribed.”

Will that person have to be a justice of the peace? I believe that the Bill gives the proposed honorary rangers more power than a justice of the peace has. Before a person is appointed an honorary ranger a full inquiry should be made into his background. However, the Bill provides that the Minister may give those powers to any individual.

Some of the powers of the honorary rangers are set out in these terms—

“(a) may require a person found by him committing or suspected on reasonable grounds of having committed an offence against this Act—

- (i) to state his full name and address of his usual place of residence and, if the honorary ranger considers it necessary, the full name and address of the usual place of residence of any other person;
- (ii) to produce evidence of the correctness of a name or address given, if he suspects on reasonable grounds that it is false;
- (iii) to deliver up the fish or marine product, if any, in respect of which the offence is being or is suspected of having been committed, and any apparatus,—”

I do not know whether “apparatus” includes the actual boat that is used in the crime—

“explosive, explosive-propelled missile ”

The Bill provides that honorary rangers may board a person's boat and demand seizure of that boat. That could be a dangerous provision, because it affects civil liberties and gives certain powers to people who should not have such powers.

Sections 45AG and 45AH, dealing with closed season and closed waters, are important. They relate to the important points of closed waters and beam trawling. Because of the bad management of the fishing industry by the Government, the beam trawlerman has borne the brunt of public abuse and outrage over the exploitation of fish resources. The Government should be giving the lead for the proper exploitation of fish resources. That is the key to the problem that the beam trawlermen are facing. They are having abuse thrown at them by amateur fishermen and other trawlermen over what has become a contentious issue that is splitting the community.

Because Queensland's fish resources have not been properly managed, people are beginning to take matters into their own hands. Some people have fired guns to protect what they believe is their right as fishermen. They are trying to maintain the resource for the years to come. One of the problems is that there is very little information. That makes control difficult, and is a key aspect to be considered in the future. Adequate research must be carried out to ensure proper control and management, thereby allowing the optimum long-term exploitation of the State's resource.

The Government's lack of understanding of the fisheries resource can be traced back to the illogical approach that it adopted towards beam trawling. Suddenly, a magical line was drawn at the Noosa River. The Government claimed that the attitude adopted by fishermen south of that line was totally different from that adopted by fishermen north of the line. To protect the river estuaries south of the Noosa River, the Government introduced restrictive licensing. That was done to prevent the over-exploitation. However, the Government said that it would not license north of that river to prevent over-exploitation. That shows how illogical the Government's approach was.

I turn now to the history of beam trawling. Back in 1981, local amateur fishing organisations expressed their concern about beam trawling. They wrote to the Minister and suggested certain ways in which an investigation should take place. They suggested that matters that should be investigated were—

“(1) The number and species of recreational angling fish species killed as a result of beam trawling operations. The identification should include all bait and trash species.

(2) The effect of repetitive meshing on fish feeding and breeding grounds.

(3) The number of licensed operators that can be sustained in an estuary or river system without significant effect on recreational angling.”

Although that inquiry was asked for three years ago, no investigation has been forthcoming.

The local fishermen went on to say—

“In light of the current situation it is recommended that until the results of such an inquiry are known there be a moratorium on the issue of new licences for beam trawlers.”

That was back in May 1981.

The Government, in its wisdom, decided to do away with the freeze on beam trawling licences because it found that the freeze would not be effective. On 1 January 1982 the freeze was terminated. Just after that the Bundaberg Sportfishing Club wrote and said that the freeze should be reimposed.

I read from the letter that the Director-General of the Department of Primary Industries, at the direction of the then Minister for Primary Industries, wrote to the Bundaberg Sportfishing Club. That letter reads in part—

“In May 1981 a freeze was placed on the issue of licences endorsed for use as beam trawlers. This policy was introduced following representations from commercial fishermen, particularly in the Brisbane area, who were concerned at the increase in numbers of operators entering the fishery from outside the industry, with resultant pressure on a limited bait market. In consideration of the Queensland Commercial Fishermen's State Council's policy not to limit the freedom of operation of fishermen throughout Queensland, the restriction was applied to the entire east coast. The policy was introduced suddenly in accordance with the wishes of commercial fishermen, but was subject to review by 31 December, 1981.

In the ensuing months, it became apparent that this limitation on vessel licences covering the entire east coast was ineffective, because the number of licences involved was far in excess of that predicted, and because such licences were readily transferable both between persons and between centres of operations. Licences were readily traded, accrued a market value, and provided neither the protection sought by commercial fishermen in their original request nor the control sought by your Club on specific river systems such as the Burnett River. At last count, it was theoretically possible for more than three hundred vessels to operate in the Burnett River under the policy.”

Since 1981, 22 vessels have been working in the Burnett River, and today only 22 vessels work out of the river. The Government's claim of 300 vessels is outlandish. It tried to claim that the freeze was ineffective because it would not stop vessels going into the area. Instead of imposing a freeze on the system, why did the Government not limit the areas along the coast that the vessels could visit and why did it not limit the number of licences in that area? It was not until November 1983 that that decision was made.

That was an illogical approach. South of Noosa, licensing is restricted and, therefore, over-exploitation is prevented. North of Noosa the opposite is the case. It was said that that was ineffective because the boats could not be stopped from going up and down the coast.

The letter also indicates the total lack of respect that the Government and the department showed for the amateur fishing organisation. There was no concern about answering its requests; it would listen only to the Queensland Commercial Fishermen's Organisation. The member for Lytton was very seriously concerned about the authority not having a broad enough membership to take an overall view of the whole industry and to make good decisions. The amateur side of the industry is not being heard. That is why poor decisions will be made for ever more under the Fishing Industry Organization and Marketing Act. Until more people are given a fair say, there will not be good management of our resources.

After the freeze was removed, the Bundaberg Sportfishing Club, to which I have referred, at least took the interest to reply to the Minister. It told him exactly what was happening. In May 1982 it pointed out what a dangerous effect beam trawling was having in Bundaberg. The points were summarised as follows—

“There is a conflict between recreational fishermen and beam trawlers in our local area. A long term policy of controlling beam trawling is necessary to be formulated after the studies into the effects of beam trawling are complete.

Controls need to be imposed in the short term to prevent escalation of the present situation.”

In November 1983 it was decided to limit the number.

Because of an interest in the industry, the club made further points that it believed should be examined. To this day, I do not know whether it has received a reply. A large section of the industry is involved and wants to look after the long-term conservation of the fishing industry, and it is not allowed to be heard.

I shall refer to two aspects of the Bill, namely, the closed season and closed waters provisions. The closed season is a potential management measure to give good, long-term conservation and optimum exploitation of resources. However, a closed season cannot be based solely on setting a specific date. The season should be based on research that has been gathered on the full life cycle of prawn and fish species.

To prescribe a certain date for a closed season or an open season is like telling a cane-farmer that the harvest will begin on 1 June or 1 July. In the Act governing the sugar industry, seasonal aspects are taken into account to ensure that there is sugar in the cane. A cane-farmer is not asked to cut his cane when it contains no sugar. There should not be a closed season or an open season in the fishing industry when it may not be the optimum time for that season. Good research is needed to decide on the optimum closed and open seasons. Decisions should be made on a more knowledgeable basis rather than hearsay.

Mr Randell: Do you believe that there should be closed seasons?

Mr CAMPBELL: I believe that there should be closed seasons if it is found that they are needed for the long-term conservation of resources. They should be based on factual information and not be merely a date on which the season is declared open or closed, as that does not work. The prawning industry in the Gulf has proved that to be so. Flexibility of the seasons is required. Another aspect that should be considered is closed waters.

Another matter to be taken into consideration is the capacity of those holding the licences to catch fish. Once again, I refer to beam trawling. Although there are now only 22 trawlers, they have the capacity to do more trawling than was done in the old days. The trawlers are usually 16ft to 18ft aluminium trailer boats. In effect, they can now do three runs a day—a three-hour run in the Burnett River, a run in the Kolan River and then a run in Baffle Creek. Such ease of moving from one area to another was not available years ago. Therefore, when the number of licences is considered, the capacity of those licensees to harvest the resources should be taken into account.

I turn now to the proposed report on the effect of beam trawling in the Burnett River. Investigations have been carried out by fisheries research officers of the Department of Primary Industries. Over two years ago there was a call for the report. I ask the Minister when the report will be released. Will all the findings be made public so that those affected might have a say in the changes ultimately decided upon? The authority that makes the decisions should not hide behind a wall of silence. Sound decisions are made when all knowledge gained is made public so that people can have their say. Major changes have been made to the Burnett estuary. The Burnett barrage has been constructed. Because of the changing environment, one must be sure that the research done and the decisions made encourage the protection of the fishing industry in the long term. The habitat will then be available not only to the commercial fishermen but also to the amateur anglers. Such usage is to the betterment of all. Those areas are the nurseries of both prawns and fish. They need protection.

I reiterate that sound decisions for the long-term betterment of the industry can be made only on factual information. I hope that proper research will be done in the future so that information is ascertained that will result in the long-term betterment of the whole of the Queensland fishing industry.

Mr De LACY (Cairns) (4.8 p.m.): I enter this debate because the fishing industry is extremely important to the area that I represent. Over the years, its importance in Queensland and the whole of Australia has been underrated, but especially is that so in the Cairns area. I am referring not only to fishing by commercial fishermen but also to fishing by amateur fishermen and tourist fishermen. Many people come to live in Cairns because of its access to prolific fishing grounds. Reef fish are known throughout Australia. Cairns people fish for barramundi in the estuaries and streams. It follows that people who like fishing come to Cairns as tourists because they can enjoy their sport productively and pleasantly.

Tourists are lured to Cairns in search of the big game fish. The black marlin has become a symbol for the tourist industry in Cairns. There is no doubt that during the months of the marlin fishing season—September and October—the very rich tourists from overseas spend hundreds of thousands of dollars, if not millions of dollars, there. Big marlin-fishing boats worth millions of dollars are tied up at the Cairns wharves.

In recent years the commercial fishing industry has grown not only in the Cairns area but also throughout the whole State. A bit like Topsy, it just grew, and many people did not realise its contribution to the local economy. More recently, the fishermen have fallen on hard times. However, they have begun to get their act together and become a very active lobby group, make representations to the Government and make statements in the media.

I wish to put into context the value of the commercial fishing effort in the northern region of the State. I am advised that last year the value of the catch based on the port of Cairns was in the vicinity of \$60m. I have had put to me—I cannot argue with it—that to assess the true value of that to the total economy, conservatively, it should be multiplied by the multiplier effect figure of four, which gives a figure of approximately \$240m. However, for the moment I will stick with the value of the catch, which is \$60m.

The Australian tobacco industry, in which I have a great deal of experience, has an annual crop value of \$60m. The value of production in the Mareeba/Dimbulah area, which is in the Cairns hinterland, is \$30m per annum. That means that annually the fishing industry based on Cairns is worth twice as much as the tobacco industry. However, over the years, the tobacco industry has been much more capable and much more successful in putting its case for assistance to the Government. I have always supported its case for assistance. It is a well-organised group and has the ear of Governments at Federal and State levels, whether they be Labor Governments or Liberal-National Party Governments. The tobacco industry has played a key role in the development of the north, so the support that the Government has given to the industry has been justified. However, I am trying to make the point that the value of the production of the tobacco industry is one half that of the fishing industry in the same region. I am sure that surprises many people.

Last year, the value of the production of the four sugar mills in the far-northern region, that is, Babinda, Mulgrave, Hamilton and Mossman, was in the vicinity of \$75m. Sugar is the really big primary industry in that part of the world, but the raw statistics show that it is only marginally bigger, in terms of the value of production, than the fishing industry.

Those figures show the importance of the Government's addressing itself to the problems of the fishing industry. The industry has not always had problems. Trawling for prawns, which is the major part of the fishing effort in the far north, began in the 1960s when the grounds were discovered and the fishermen learned how to exploit them. During the middle and late 1970s, many people made a great deal of money from prawn-trawling, with excellent catches and bouyant overseas prices. However, as always happens, that attracted many other people into the industry, and at the same time as the total fishing effort was getting bigger than the sustainable resource, prices crashed on the overseas market. The prawning industry depends on exporting 80 per cent of its catch. With the drop in price and the increased number of boats in the industry, hard times prevailed.

My point is that the fishing industry is extremely important in terms of the value of total production, the number of people it employs and the spin-off effects it has on the economy. It has developed this level of importance not because of any assistance, guidance or leadership from the Government but in spite of it. The only thing that the Government did to assist the prawning industry, and it was rather too late—after the horse had bolted, as it were—was to restrict the licensing of new prawning vessels. But by that time something like 1200 vessels were in operation. I do not know whether they have their statistics

right, but the fishermen in the far northern region tell me that there is probably sufficient resource there to give a good living to approximately 500 boats, so there is something like twice as many vessels as the resource can sustain.

The State Government was proved most effective—and it was the only time in recent years that it has really tried to do much for fishermen—when the Federal Labor Government was seen to be vulnerable in certain areas. Of course, that is the way in which the Queensland Government has tended to operate over the years, even with the sugar industry. Prior to the last State election the Minister for Primary Industries, who was responsible for fishing, was known as the Minister for bucketing the Federal Government, particularly in relation to the sugar industry and the fishing industry.

When the Federal Government decided to withdraw the fuel freight subsidy there was, obviously, an outcry from the fishing industry. That subsidy was withdrawn because it was pointed out and demonstrated that it was not effective, that it was not achieving what it was supposed to do, and that the people who were supposed to be benefiting from it were not. In other words, the fishermen who were actually doing the catching were not receiving the benefit. I know that many people say that it was not abused, but they were mostly National Party parliamentarians who wanted to blame the Federal Government for doing something that was opposed to the fishing industry and, of course, the fuel barge operators. But every fisherman in the Cairns region to whom I have spoken has freely admitted that the whole system was being abused and was not achieving its objectives. So in its wisdom the Federal Government—I did not support its action—decided to withdraw the subsidy altogether. There was a great deal of agitation by the industry, which has become a fairly effective special interest group, and I am pleased to say that the Federal Government has decided on a moratorium and rescinded its decision for a period of at least 12 months on the understanding that a system be developed under which that fuel freight subsidy can be administered in such a way that it benefits those people whom it was designed to benefit.

As a demonstration of the way in which Government members used this opportunity to attack the Federal Government, I mention the member for Barron River who I think at that time had been elevated to the Ministry. The Federal Government signed a contract with the Taiwanese Government for fishing off the Queensland coast. The member for Barron River issued a statement saying that that demonstrated the way in which the Federal Government was opposed to the interests of the prawning industry in north Queensland. He said that the Queensland Commercial Fishermen's Organisation had told him that its members could not believe their ears when they heard about the agreement. However, many people in north Queensland could not believe their ears when they heard the statement by the member for Barron River (then Minister for Administrative Services) that that agreement would destroy the prawning industry in north Queensland. It had nothing to do with the prawning industry. The area in which the Taiwanese were to fish was 100 miles to the east of the prawn-fishing grounds.

The agreement that the Federal Government drew up with the Taiwanese Government was the type of agreement that the commercial fishing industry had been talking about for some time. It was a joint-venture operation. It had 50 per cent Australian equity. The Taiwanese were paying approximately \$1.3m in licensing fees each year. Over a three-year period, three of the eight vessels were to be phased out or replaced by Australian vessels. That is the type of assistance that is needed to help identify and develop the offshore tuna resource. We can develop expertise in conjunction with a proven overseas fishing country.

We still do not know how that agreement would affect the prawning industry in the far north. I am pleased that the local Federal member of Parliament made the point, which received some national media coverage, that the member for Barron River was confusing prawns with tuna and that, for his edification, he would send him photographs of a prawn and a tuna. I am led to believe that in actual fact he sent the honourable member a photograph of a tuna and a photograph of the honourable member himself. I suppose he represented the prawn.

Another indication of the lack of support of the State Government over the years and of its lack of recognition of the worth of the fishing industry to Queensland, and certainly to north Queensland, was given last year, prior to the State election, when the whole of the National Party Cabinet visited Cairns in the best orchestrated election stunt of the whole election campaign. The National Party's northern policy was launched in Cairns. The

Premier released a policy statement that contained many hundreds of fine sounding words, but there was not a single word on the fishing industry. That policy, which was aimed at the people of north Queensland, completely ignored the fishing industry, which has an annual catch of \$60m and whose value to the north Queensland economy is second only to that of the sugar industry. I am certain that it is on a par with that of the tourist industry. That lack of recognition of the value of the fishing industry demonstrates the Government's record in this area over the years.

The member for Bundaberg, who preceded me in this debate, referred to a lack of research effort in the fishing industry. I think that the industry is still being hamstrung because of a lack of research. My predecessor spoke about closures, and I support closures. However, I do not know how flexible they can be. The point that my predecessor really made was that there should not be arbitrary closures. If there are to be closures that are designed to protect the resource, they should be based on good research. That type of research is not available at present because, over the years, no such research has been carried out. There are arbitrary closures based on somebody's idea that it would be a good time to have a closed season. As I say, I support closures or any scheme or strategy designed to preserve a resource. Closures are necessary but, as I say, they should be based on good research. Over the years, that research has not been carried out and the Queensland Government and successive Federal Governments over the years have been at fault in that regard.

The only positive thing that the State Government has done is to restrict the licensing of prawn vessels but, as I said, that was done too late. The horse had already bolted. However, the situation as it existed has been maintained.

The second thing that the Government has done is to attack the Federal Government. That is not constructive, but it has been done effectively and the Government continues to do it. The third is to introduce this Bill, which creates the FMA.

I compliment the Government for addressing the problem in this Chamber by introducing amendments to the Act. The Act has been amended once before and this is the second set of amendments.

The first step in the right direction has been taken. Some kind of authority which is representative of the people affected must be established. The authority must have a strategy or, to use the in phrase, a management regime which will allow the fishing industry to develop in such a way as to be fair to all people involved with it.

The honourable members for Lytton and Bundaberg are concerned, as I am, about the structure of the Fish Management Authority. I do not believe that it is fully representative. It seems to be under the control of one particular group of people. I am not saying that the Commercial Fishermen's Organisation is not an important group in the industry, but there is a lot of doubt among the ordinary rank and file who are fishing for a living about whether the QCFO represents them. That has been said to me many, many times in Cairns by people who may even vote for the National Party; they are not recognised Labor people. They tell me that they know that Dale Bryan represents the National Party and not them. I have not made that up. Because it has been said to me so many times, it is important that I say it in this Chamber. It is important that the Minister for Primary Industries knows that people are saying that kind of thing in the areas of Queensland that count.

I have also received feedback from the retailers who are being hit by fees. They are saying that they are being forced out of business. They want to know why they have to pay the fees. Because they have not been involved in the development of the authority, they do not understand how the fees can help the fishing industry.

Mrs Chapman: Now you know how people feel about Medicare.

Mr De LACY: I believe that Queenslanders are getting more out of Medicare than they are putting into it. Medicare is quite different from the retailers who are getting nothing out of the large amount of fees they are paying.

What the fishermen really want is a total management package. An authority is needed because that is the first step towards developing a package that will do the right things for the whole of the industry. The fishermen realise that the industry must be rationalised or stabilised. It is true that a decent stabilisation scheme for an industry can only be achieved when things are bad; it is never introduced when things are good. The Government should be actively involved in assisting the industry to rationalise itself. More

is needed, however, than the Fish Management Authority. It seems to be obsessed with levying fees on all the different people who are involved in the fishing industry. It has not developed a scheme which will overcome the really big problems that the industry faces.

The biggest problem concerning fishing in north Queensland is the need to reduce the number of boats. The member for Lytton said that the north Queensland fishing industry does have an opportunity to start a buy-back scheme.

However, I am led to believe that the fishing industry in the north does not have a great deal of money and that, without Government assistance, it would not be able to embark upon such a scheme. The industry is being restructured, but it is being restructured in a roundabout way. I guess that is the philosophy with which the Government agrees in theory, because it is purely private enterprise or the survival of the fittest. However, even that is being gone about in a funny way.

Fishermen who still have boats, by paying high premiums on their insurance policies, are subsidising people out of the industry. The less competitive boat-owners can go out and sink their boat, claim on their insurance policy, and then go out of the industry. I suppose that is one way of restructuring an industry, but it is a totally ineffective, inefficient and cruel way.

It is a fact that fishermen are being encouraged to sink their boats. One night recently I was talking to a fisherman who claimed that the buy-back value of his type of craft was only \$75,000, yet he is not allowed to insure it for anything less than \$100,000. The message to him and to others like him is that he should go out and sink his boat. I shall not mention his name. If I did, and if his boat did happen to sink in the near future, he might be held responsible. However, I assure the House that that fisherman does not intend to do that; he prefers to battle on, even though he is experiencing great trouble in battling on.

What needs to be done in association with this buy-back scheme is to match the fishing effort to the available resource. That would give the highest quantity of product at the cheapest possible price to the consumer and also the maximum catch for the vessels involved. People who have put all of their life-savings and effort into a particular industry will, under the scheme, obtain a reasonable return. The Australian Labor Party has no argument against that philosophy.

Associated with that, the management of the littoral—the coastal area—is needed. I am pleased to note that fishermen are beginning to understand what the “greenies” have been saying for years, namely, that our wetlands and mangroves do have some value as breeding grounds for the fishing industry. The fishing industry is now quite vocal in its calls to preserve the wetlands and breeding areas. Their preservation must be part of the whole management package.

What is needed also is an education program for young people who will be involved in the fishing industry. I have read a few circulars about the new licences for master fishermen. An education program is probably part and parcel of those new licences.

In the fishing camps that children attend, fishing must be a little more than learning how to thread worms on hooks. The children should be taught the need to be responsible, to preserve breeding grounds, to maintain resources and to adopt a responsible attitude to fishing. Perhaps children could be taught something about the reason for the existence of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority and what it is trying to achieve. Children should be taught the different roles of the amateur fisherman, the tourist fisherman, the commercial fisherman, the trawler fisherman, the offshore fisherman and so forth. An education program should be aimed at the young people of today, who are the fishermen of tomorrow. Such a program should get away from the short-term monetary gain mentality that so many people who enter industries have.

The next thing that is needed is some kind of strategy to begin developing fishing far off shore. By that I mean the long-line and drop-line fishing at which apparently only fishermen from Taiwan, Japan and the Soviet Union are expert. Australia does have a 200 mile fishing limit, and I am sure that there is scope for giving assistance to fishermen in the prawning industry, which contains too many fishermen, to convert their boats to offshore vessels. The agreement negotiated with Taiwan by the Federal Minister for Primary Industry is the first step in the right direction to establishing an Australian presence to develop, exploit and identify tuna and other fish resources that are a long way off the coast.

The member for Bundaberg referred to proposed new section 45AE of the Bill, which relates to honorary rangers. Of course, I have a great deal of concern about the appointment of honorary rangers to inspect and police the fishing industry. I say that because the Queensland Government has developed to a fine art the practice of providing jobs for the boys. If honorary inspectors were selected on the basis of their ability, their maturity, their understanding of the industry and their commitment to it, some progress may be made. I believe that in Queensland they would be selected on the way in which they have supported the National Party over the years. That would not be good for the fishing industry. Let us stick to the public service and select public servants. I support the need for the establishment of an enforcement authority. There is no point in having all the regulations in the world and the best management regime in the world unless the enforcement agency exists to police it.

That is where the whole system is becoming unstuck. It is never more obvious in Queensland than in Cairns. Honourable members may be surprised to learn that there are six different bodies—I do not refer to the honorary rangers; they might be included as No. 7—that have a surface enforcement role on the sea in the Cairns area. One is the Queensland Boating and Fisheries Patrol. It is the one that is most often recognised. It has the broadest terms of reference. Over the years it has policed both marine legislation and the legislation incorporated in the fishing Acts.

(Time expired.)

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (4.38 p.m.): There are several issues on which honourable members wish to speak, so I will take only five minutes. I shall refer first to the reconstitution of the Fish Board. When the Fish Board was the supreme authority, it was not a great success. That bears examination. I cannot see a role for a reconstituted Fish Board. Perhaps it will need another section to look after. It failed completely when it was the supreme body in Queensland in the fishing industry. It was ineffective and unable to organise the industry.

If the Fish Promotion Advisory Committee is to be successful, its actions will need to be scrutinised carefully. The consumer must foot the bill for the high cost of licences and the fees imposed upon fishermen.

For reasons that have been mentioned this afternoon, various problems arise as a result of Federal Government's policies. Some problems are created by the fishermen themselves; some arise from the unsavoury economic climate, and they involve all those in primary industries.

Several aspects of the Bill please me. I refer first to research, which the Government has neglected over the years. From time to time, on behalf of various people in north Queensland, I have contacted officers of the department involved in research into oysters, barramundi-breeding, trochus shell and beche-de-mer. I have copies of letters from overseas. One is from the International Fish Corporation of Norway, the principal of which is J. L. Haavaldsen, which has operations in Asia. There are inquiries from other parts of the Pacific dating back in 1976, all requesting information about importing our exotic species.

An opportunity has existed for a long time to establish markets, and the Government has fallen down on the job. It ought to have been aware from importers and exporters of the opportunities that existed. I have about 20 letters making such inquiries. They are principally from the Asian area, but there is also that one from the Norwegian company. It is no good making laws and trying to enforce them unless there is a market for the product. That is the secret of success. If the Government is able to find a market, the fishermen are able to produce the product. Their problem really does not begin until their product gets to market and they receive a return on their investment. The Government's role in that aspect ought to be fulfilled more seriously and in a more dedicated fashion. I appeal to the Government to make a great effort to implement the Act as it was intended.

I draw to the attention of the Government the problems that have already been created and will be created in the future by restaurants advertising reef fish and barramundi on their menus. I receive a number of complaints from people who have ordered coral trout, red emperor or barramundi but have not been served it. Very few people know what those fish are. Steps ought to be taken under the Act to protect the fishing industry in that respect. Honourable members are all aware of the cost of harvesting those choice, delicious fish. If restaurants are to capitalise on those names, they ought to be prepared to pay the cost of buying those species. If no provision exists to penalise misrepresentation, the Government

ought to take steps to ensure that a restaurant that has those fish on the menu is required to provide proof from the vendor of the fish. Without such proof, restaurants must render themselves liable to punishment.

The Bill covers a wide field, much of which has been covered by previous speakers. I promised the Minister that I would take no longer than five minutes, so I conclude by mentioning the reconstitution of the fish board in Innisfail. The fish board owned a building, a freezer and all the equipment necessary to ensure the sale of a high-class product. A co-operative was formed that wished to take over that choice piece of real estate. The Government did nothing to help. Private enterprise has now moved in and the Government is bending over backwards to help. A good, responsible group of fishermen formed a co-operative, and I condemn the Government for giving it very little help. The establishment of co-operatives to ensure adequate outlets for the product would be to the benefit of all concerned in the fishing industry. The private enterprise that is now running the Innisfail establishment is providing a good product, but the Government should take stock of itself. It had an opportunity to put something back into the fishing industry by helping those fishermen who formed a co-operative following the dismantling of the Queensland Fish Board.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (4.45 p.m.): I rise to speak briefly to this Bill. In doing so I recall speaking in the last debate on this legislation. At that time members of the Liberal Party issued a strong warning on the extent of the legislation. Members of this House will recall that the Liberal Party had no reservation whatsoever in supporting the licensing system that operated at sea. The argument for licensing in the ocean is compelling. The resource can be overfished and the means of regeneration and, therefore, constant supply, can be affected. So it was necessary to preserve the resource by restricting the number of people taking it and by restricting the areas in which they could operate.

As I said, the Liberal Party had no qualification at all about the operations of the licensing system at sea. The fact that that has not been totally successful is by the by. Complications exist in the overlapping of Commonwealth and State licences. Another complication is the fleet of interstate trawlers fishing for the prawn resource which is very greatly affected by seasonal conditions—that is, the number of prawns that can be caught—and the international vagaries of the price of the product.

The Liberal Party warned about the extent of the definition of the product and about the extension of the licensing system from the wharf into other areas. There has been an example of the lack of heed of that warning. The Liberal Party did not see it necessary, nor do I still see it necessary, to have a licensing system that follows the product to the fish shop refrigerator. Allegations have been made of small vans operating to country towns. It can be argued that the product might spoil in anything other than proper premises. In fact, the requirements of the Health Act, the Food Act, and other legislation secure the quality of the product so far as regulations can. In the end result, it is the market that is the best controller of quality, because if a consumer buys a piece of bad fish, in the same way that he might have purchased other bad foodstuffs, he does not go back to the same shop and the shop-owner cannot rely on return trade.

Nobody in this Chamber would be foolish enough to think that legislation could stamp out the fellow who appears in the public bar of a pub or behind a club saying that he has some bags of freshly cooked prawns or some eskies of fish to sell. Unfortunately—or fortunately, depending on one's view of the world—that sort of thing cannot be stamped out by regulation. A legitimate enterprise cannot exist unless it looks after itself and observes the requirements of the Food Act and the Health Act. In short, from the time the product is delivered to the wharf through to the consumer, a system of licensing is unnecessary in this Act. It was refreshing to hear the member for Mourilyan (Mr Eaton) say that the costs of the licensing system are passed on to the consumer.

In this case the people who decided these things were the members of the authority. Although the authority acted with the best of intentions, it set up a system which, frankly, was hare-brained—ludicrous! The restaurateurs, fish processors and everyone else who would have been affected by the fees, which were totally unreasonable, reacted to the proposed introduction of the fees.

The organisation would probably say, "We are short of money. How do we raise money? We do it because we have the power to set licence fees. If we set fees we will leave a margin for error. We can increase the staff and do all sorts of things we would like to do." That is not satisfactory.

There is not enough social justification for a licensing system which covers the distribution of the product at large. The real argument is that which applies to the harvesting of the resource in the ocean. The bureaucracy cost something like \$1.5m. Half of that money went in salaries, a third of it went in research, a significant proportion of it went to the licensing at sea and the rest went to the policing on land. The question that must be asked is this: Is that policing on land necessary? As I have said already, there are other Acts which cover the quality of the product when it is on land. The idea of licence fees being payable by every fish shop and everybody who dealt with fish product in some way was ludicrous and unnecessary.

If an inspectorial system is set up it will certainly want to pay for itself and it will load the industry by setting the precepts or levies, and the industry will pass the cost on to the consumer. The responsible and experienced restaurateurs—who rely totally on their good name and repeat trade, like to buy fresh product and therefore buy direct from master fishermen—estimated that they would have to add something like 50c or \$1 to every meal, whether it was steak or fish, to finance the original crazy proposals. That demonstrated that things went off the rails. The Government and the former Minister acknowledged that, when the rationality, the hard common sense and the commercial reality of the trade fed back into the system and said that the new fees were crazy. Of course, the Government took it on board, recognised that the proposals were crazy and altered them.

There has not been sufficient social justification for this interference. We are still left, albeit with far more reasonable fees, with three levels. One is the processor/commercial buyer, class A, who will have to pay \$200 for the application fee and \$550 for the licence fee set by the authority, a total of \$750. There will have to be premises for an operation like that, so that is another \$150 for the registered premises, and at least \$50 for one registered vehicle. That is a total of \$950 with only one vehicle. In other words, another \$950 overhead goes straight onto the operation, and for what—the sort of person who has to deal in good quality fish and continues to supply good quality fish or go out of business. With the protection of the Health Act and the Food Act, it is just not necessary. The funds would be far better employed if they were put into fish research and helping to police at sea.

A restricted buyer, class C, with a Fish Board option only will have to pay a \$30 application fee. Again, he is likely to have a vehicle, so that is another \$50.

A class D buyer with an operation of under \$25,000 per annum, and a class E buyer with an operation of more than \$25,000 and less than \$100,000 per annum, will pay \$70, while a class A buyer with an operation of over \$100,000 will pay \$150 per annum.

The class B licence is very restricted. It is limited to isolated buyers and fishermen in selected areas. Cardwell is an example. They will pay a \$30 application fee, plus \$150 per annum, plus 5 per cent of the purchase price of the product.

If a bureaucracy is set up, surely it will feed itself and finance itself. But is it necessary? With due respect to the Minister, one would suggest that the money could be better spent in far more vital areas, and the warnings that were registered by me and others in this Chamber three or four years ago in fact have come to pass. That is not to denigrate the members of the authority. It is human nature. Set one up by legislative power and it looks as if society at large wanted something, and the bureaucracy has the obligations of the Act to administer. Personnel have to be appointed to the authority, and levies have to be set to finance the wages of those personnel.

The Fish Management Authority has important work to do. Its most important work is licensing at sea, inspection at sea and research into the industry. It would be far better if the other little bureaucracies were whittled down and the money applied to the important work to which I have just referred. Things change, and I suppose that they have changed remarkably in the fishing industry. At present, 50 per cent of the fish consumed in Queensland is imported.

Like the mud crab, the barramundi, which is a famous edible fish caught in Queensland, is one of the national jewels. Queensland makes a great contribution to the gastronomic world. The priorities have to be considered.

To move to another subject—I totally support what the honourable member for Lytton said about amateur fishermen. He is a keen amateur fisherman. What he said about the importance to the life of this State of amateur fishing as a recreational resource, and, indeed, as an industry itself, probably cannot be overstated. I understand

that even the purely industrial side of the industry finds common ground with amateur fishermen in regard to their sense of responsibility, the prestige of their organisation and the contribution that they can make in identifying the resource. Amateur fishermen should be represented on the boards and authorities that control the fishing industry in this State. The money that they represent is enormous. In their absence, the industry cannot be said to be properly represented.

I hope that the Minister will take on board what I have said. Obviously, he will not change the legislation at this time; but I urge him to review the social benefits and the real benefits that derive from the extended licencing system, which is, of necessity, cumbersome and which—I say this with great respect—cannot be justified in terms of social necessity.

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (4.58 p.m.): Most provisions in the legislation were covered first by the member for Lytton and then by other speakers in the debate. Those contributions have been considerable, far-ranging and also constructive. It behoves the Minister to consider the suggestions that have been put forward.

Unfortunately, when legislation to amend the Act was before this Assembly early last year, it was hurriedly pushed through, and as a result, many sections of it are being amended by this Bill.

Living in a major fishing area such as Mackay, I have had many constituents come to me and complain bitterly about some of the actions of the Fish Management Authority in imposing licencing fees, which were a major burden on the industry. Similar fees were not imposed upon the Kentucky Fried and Big Rooster organisations. I know that that matter has been adjusted, but I agree with other members who have said that the fees are still exorbitant and impose upon the fishing industry a burden that is not imposed upon other food industries.

I wish to bring before the Chamber a matter that is very important to Queensland. It is very relevant to this legislation. Last year I led a delegation of Labor members of this Assembly to Papua New Guinea. We studied in depth primary industries and other matters in that country. Following our return to Queensland, we presented a report to Parliament. I do not know whether Government members have taken the time to look at that report from the delegation. That report commented on the failure of the Government of Queensland to co-operate with the Government of Papua New Guinea on a joint fisheries resources scheme. That is very important. Because Queensland shares a boundary with Papua New Guinea, the Queensland Government should work in close co-operation with the Papua New Guinea Government on fishery matters.

Members of the delegation spent a considerable time with the Department of Primary Industries of Papua New Guinea, particularly the fisheries resources section, provincial Government officials and representatives from joint company ventures engaged in the fishing industry in Papua New Guinea. Members of the delegation were told the same story by each group of people. They all said that there seemed to be a barrier preventing contact with Queensland. That comment was made at government level and also at commercial level. Excellent investment opportunities exist for joint ventures in the fishing industry in Papua New Guinea. Its government would welcome an approach, especially from Queensland.

Tragically, row after row of tinned fish can be found in the village stores. The fish are caught off the shores of Papua New Guinea, taken to Japan or Taiwan and brought back in tins to be sold for local consumption. The people of Papua New Guinea are not getting fresh fish.

Queensland has a similar problem. On the islands in the Torres Strait, which forms our boundary with Papua New Guinea, tinned fish can be found in the trade stores of the Island Industries Board. That fish has been caught in Australian waters, taken elsewhere, canned and cooked, and brought back to be sold in the stores. Something must be done by the Queensland Government, through the Department of Primary Industries and the Fish Management Authority, about entering into co-operation with Papua New Guinea in the fishing industry.

Torres Strait is one of the major fishing grounds of the south-western Pacific area, and many people are employed in the industry there. Australia shares the fishing ground with Papua New Guinea. Quarantine problems could be overcome if Queensland engaged in joint ventures with Papua New Guinea.

Barramundi has been mentioned by previous speakers. Papua New Guinea, with its irregular stream flows, experiences problems similar to those in Queensland. The barramundi industry in Papua New Guinea will not become a major threat to Queensland's barramundi industry. It is important that material from research being carried out in Queensland on barramundi be exchanged with Papua New Guinea, because Papua New Guinea and Queensland are two of the few places in the world that have a barramundi fishing industry. It is in the interests of the industry that there be co-operation.

The lobster-fishing industry, as the Minister and members of the Fish Management Authority know, is one of the biggest industries in Torres Strait. It is the major source of employment for Torres Strait Islanders. However, too little research has been carried out on the lobster industry. Irrespective of national boundaries, lobsters migrate to and from their breeding ground across the ocean floor. Although a border treaty between Australia and Papua New Guinea was agreed to in 1978, it has not been ratified by the Australian Government, the Queensland Government or the Government of Papua New Guinea. The necessary legislation has not gone through Parliament. However, even after it does go through Parliament, a lobster cannot be told where the special fishing lines are on the sea-bed or where the international boundary is on the sea-bed. It certainly cannot be told that Queensland-based industries can take only 30 per cent and that Papua New Guinea can take 70 per cent, or vice versa. All those difficult aspects are part of the exchange agreement between Papua New Guinea and Queensland.

What is needed is much closer co-operation between the Governments of Queensland and Papua New Guinea concerning the lobster-fishing industry. Unfortunately, at present the only research that is being conducted into the industry is being carried out by contract to the Papua New Guinea Government. Amazingly, that research is being carried out by a Western Australian company. It was impossible to get someone in Queensland to conduct the research. The expertise that the Papua New Guinea Government is being given is being supplied by Western Australia. That is an indictment of the people of Queensland.

I am not laying the blame for that at any particular person's feet. However, Queenslanders must realise that we should co-operate and work with other people if we are to protect our share of the fishing industry in the Torres Strait area. We must realise also that unless we become involved we will miss out once again. If that happens, in a few years' time Queenslanders will be sitting back and growling because people from other areas are controlling our fishing industry. The Premier and some of his Ministers will criticise the Commonwealth Government because the control of lobster fishing in the Torres Strait area has been taken from Queensland. If Queenslanders continue to sit on their backsides and do nothing, that will happen. The Queensland Government must become involved, and it can become involved through the Fish Management Authority.

The same remarks apply to reef fishing in the Torres Strait area. A good deal of reef fishing is carried out on Bramble Cay and other areas in the top right-hand corner of Australia's national waters. Those areas are traditionally the fishing grounds for people from Papua New Guinea. If Australia does not move into those areas and take control, it will be faced with an increase in its quarantine problems, and the traditional fishing rights clause, which is in the agreement, will cause tremendous administrative problems for both Australia and Queensland.

In recent weeks, a great furore erupted over foot and mouth disease and other exotic diseases, which could enter Australia through Papua New Guinea. However, nobody has mentioned screw-worm fly, which can have just as disastrous effects on the stock industry of this great nation. Screw-worm fly exists already in Papua New Guinea. The members of our parliamentary delegation saw its effects. Boats that engage in traditional fishing in Torres Strait could carry screw-worm fly across the water into Queensland, so Queensland must become more deeply involved in activities in the area and in keeping an eye on what is happening between Queensland and Papua New Guinea.

The final point I make is similar to one made a few moments ago by the honourable member for Sherwood. He referred to the need for additional research overall into the fishing industry. I do not believe that anyone involved in the fishing industry in Queensland can present to us a proper paper on the future of the industry, the resources of the industry, the resources of the various breeding grounds and the breeding cycles within those breeding grounds. Insufficient research has been carried out. Greater research is needed, and, once again, the Fish Management Authority is the logical body to undertake that work. Additional funding may be required to enable the authority to carry out the necessary research and

pass that research on in the proper way to the industry, thereby bringing about greater investment in the fishing industry. After all, investment will not follow unless there is first proper research.

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) (5.10 p.m.), in reply: I thank all honourable members for their contributions in this lengthy and wide-reaching debate and for the points that they raised. The Fishing Industry Organization and Marketing Act was the answer to the unsatisfactory situation that had developed in this most important industry during the 1970s. As it came into the portfolio of Primary Industries, the Government committee of inquiry had recommended the consolidation of legislation and greater control in management and marketing. The present Act is a combination of the former Fish Supply Management Act and those sections of the Fisheries Act concerned with the catching operations and the wide range of fisheries in our extensive waters. This amending Bill is a continuation of that consolidation and transfer of several major functions from the Fisheries Act to the Fishing Industry Organization and Marketing Act.

Members will be aware that the principal Bill was debated extensively in the House in the early session of 1982. The Minister for Primary Industries at that time (Mr Ahern) assured the House that the views of industry would be considered and that amendments would be introduced as their value became evident. At that time, on the recommendation of Mr Blake, the former ALP member for Bundaberg, a representative of the fishermen's co-operatives was added to the membership of the authority.

The claims by the member for Lytton that the authority has been inflexible and autocratic is hardly borne out in fact. Officers of my department and of the authority have consulted extensively in this initial year of operation of the authority to ensure the management and marketing policies that have been adopted reflect good and sensible industry practice.

The following points are relevant to particular questions that have been asked and statements that have been made. The member for Lytton referred to the representation of amateur fishermen on the Fish Management Authority. A Recreational Fishing Advisory Committee has been set up to combine the interests of Government, the commercial sector, amateurs and the Boating and Fisheries Patrol. It will meet on 15 February under the chairmanship of my Director-General. I have called for a listing of matters on which they seek review. Three recreational fishermen have been appointed to the committee.

Steps that have been taken by the Queensland Fish Management Authority during its first year of operation suggest that it has consulted extensively with all sectors of the industry. 132 visits have been made to country centres on the catching sector of the industry. 122 visits were made to country centres on marketing licences. Clearly, the authority is servicing the industry and, although fees have been imposed, they are reasonable given the increased level of service. The marketing sector has accepted the actions of the Queensland Fish Management Authority. To date, the authority has issued licences to 32 processors/commercial buyers and 473 restricted (retailers) buyers. That is a sufficient indication of the acceptance of policies and fees of the authority.

Complaints by the marketing sector of unnecessary restrictions on activities are unfounded. The legislation provided for the Governor in Council to allow exemptions from provisions of the Act.

Mr Ahern and I have arranged for a range of exemptions for bait-sellers in certain instances and persons who sell frozen fish and fish products. The aims of the legislation were therefore being implemented. It is necessary to license all purchasers to ensure that top quality produce is being provided.

The letters quoted by the member for Lytton as coming from Mr Lynde are out of date. The authority has responded to those deputations and it has on file an agreement from Mr Lynde's group that the fee levels are now realistic and acceptable to retailers.

The membership of the authority is such that the industry has been made responsible for determining its own future. The catching sector has representatives; the processing sector is represented; the marketing sector, including co-operatives, has three representatives; the Government is represented by the Director-General of my department; and a senior officer of my department has been appointed as chairman for a three-year term.

Extensive consultations were held with the retailers during the initial year of operation. Surely the member for Lytton is not suggesting that no licence fee be charged for control of the catching and marketing sector.

Prior to the formation of the authority, fishermen were contributing \$750,000 towards licensing, administration and research. The authority must stand on its own feet financially. In 1983-84, an equivalent contribution from the marketing section has been budgeted by the authority. An amount of \$500,000 has been contributed from consolidated revenue to balance the budget in the early years of operation.

The member for Lytton spoke of the need for more boating patrol officers. I take that point on board. There is a need for additional funding in so many areas—police and teachers, to name but two. However, I make the point that that service comes directly under the Department of Harbours and Marine. A total of 17 trawlers has been apprehended since January 1982 for fishing “behind the fence” in closed areas. The boating patrol is active in policing such attacks on nursery areas.

The Commonwealth has not handed over to the QCFO control of its proclaimed waters. Its officers are consulting the Fish Management Authority and the Queensland industry. This matter comes under the terms of the offshore constitutional settlement, which will be administered by a joint authority comprised of the responsible Commonwealth fisheries Minister and the appropriate State fisheries Minister. Extensive consultations are being undertaken to set up the details of joint control.

The member for Lytton stated that no action had been taken over the small tailor and small John Dory on sale at the fish board. No minimum sizes are specified in legislation for those species. At present, some 40 species of fish have a minimum size listed. If honourable members opposite make representations about the sizes of those two species, I will be pleased to pass on their recommendations to the authority for review.

Mr Burns: I did.

Mr TURNER: I will pass them on again.

The amendments proposed in the new section 45AK list Australian bass. A bag limit may be put on that fish.

Concern has been expressed about the substitution of other varieties for high quality fish. This is a matter that comes within the jurisdiction of the Food Act. Prosecutions are in train. Publicity given to this problem in 1981 has resulted in the removal of the problem. All barramundi from the Northern Territory is now tested prior to dispatch to ensure that there is no substitution. The major thrust of the legislation for licensing of the marketing sector is to identify sales from legitimate fishermen to legitimate retailers. That will identify illegal and black market sales. The legislation also provides that dockets must be issued for all sales of seafood in Queensland.

Mr Casey: How do you identify the black market sales?

Mr TURNER: This is one way that will assist to identify them.

The speech of the member for Lytton dwelt at length on that side of the fishing industry. When the legislation is given a chance to operate and prove its effectiveness, the problems of illegal sale should disappear or be substantially reduced.

The honourable member for Lytton expressed concern about interference with the fish habitat reserve on Fraser Island. The matter has been examined in an environmental impact assessment in accordance with the requirements of the Act. Also in accordance with the Act, the proposal, together with the report, will be tabled for debate in the House in the future.

Questions have been asked about the impact of beam trawling on stocks in rivers, estuaries and on the foreshores. The efforts of Mr Blake, the former member for Bundaberg, were raised. The member for Lytton will be pleased to hear that the Queensland Fish Management Authority has instituted a policy of control on beam trawling in Queensland. There has been a freeze on the number of beam trawlers south of the Noosa River since 1979. In October 1983 a freeze was placed on the number of beam trawlers in four other zones covering the rest of the State. After extensive consultations in the Maryborough and Bundaberg districts, the number has been restricted to 60 fishermen overall. Discussions are now being held in the Gladstone and Yeppoon districts.

Mr Burns: They have written out the same answer they gave me six months ago.

Mr TURNER: The member for Lytton asked the question and I am answering it.

At present the maximum beam for beam trawlers in rivers is five metres.

The unitisation concept of the QCFO, which will be fully debated at a special State council meeting in February, is an attack on the problem of increasing effort in the fishery.

Mr Davis: Honestly, what would you know about fishing?

Mr TURNER: I certainly would not go to the honourable member for Brisbane Central if I wanted to glean knowledge on any subject.

I thank the honourable member for Cooroora for his contribution. He expressed concern at the absence of a Queensland and Australian presence in the areas outside the Great Barrier Reef and in the Australian fishing zone. My department has initiated action on that matter. To assist north Queensland fishermen, an officer has made a nine-month special study of the tuna market in Japan. He returned only recently. The Commonwealth and State fisheries biologists are combining in a special research program, costing \$350,000, into tuna in the Coral Sea, and this year a 12-month joint State/CSIRO study into the deep sea fish resources of the Gulf of Carpentaria will begin. That study group will address problems such as the distances to be travelled by Australian fishermen in those regions, the safety problems so far from shore, the high capital costs of vessels, increasing fuel costs and the variable value of the fish available.

The request made by the honourable member for Cooroora for a full explanation of the reasons for controls and management in the fishing industry has been noted. The authority has embarked on that program through the pages of the Queensland Fishermen's Journal and by visits to fishermen and marketing persons throughout the State. Use is being made of the several local publications of amateur fishermen, and increased attention will be given to that avenue.

The honourable member for Lytton (Mr Burns) mentioned Mr Pollock, who works in my department. I should refer to his important role in transferring information to the recreational fishing industry. The new recreational fishing advisory committee is another step in the right direction.

I assure the honourable member for Bundaberg (Mr Campbell) that the appointment of honorary rangers under the Act will be undertaken with discretion and considered only where there is an absence of effective Boating and Fisheries Patrol staff and local conditions warrant increased surveillance. As is always the case, appointments will be recommended only after thorough examination of the qualifications and suitability of the applicants. I remind him that the use of honorary rangers is not an innovation; it has been used in many, many other areas.

The member for Bundaberg claimed also that no consultation exists with recreational fishing groups on matters such as conservation and fishing effort. That is strongly refuted. During 1982 the then Minister established an advisory committee, including the Queensland Amateur Fishing Council, which met on some eight occasions. That committee was fully supportive of the research program undertaken by the local marine biologist. His report has been released and will be made available to local recreational fishermen within the coming month. The findings will be discussed at local meetings. The authority has not in the past, and never intends in the future, to hide behind a wall of silence. In Bundaberg, the history of extensive consultation with local groups on the new beam trawler freeze answers that charge.

The member for Cairns compared the level of Government support for the tobacco industry, the sugar industry and the fishing industry in the north and implied that the Government has neglected the fishing industry. Although he should be well aware of this fact, I point out that of the two major fishing research facilities that operate in this State, one is located in Cairns. That modern facility, which has come on stream in the last five years, has a staff of approximately 25 people and concentrates on mackerel, prawns, reef fish and barramundi. In addition, in 1982 a modern fisheries research vessel, costing approximately \$300,000 and specifically for work in north Queensland, was commissioned. A special fresh-water fish-research facility has been established at Walkamin, and extensions of the pond are now under way to further the research on Nile perch, which has been mentioned in this debate. Officers at both those centres would welcome a visit to them so that they could explain the extent and value of the research that is presently in hand in north Queensland.

As to fees for the marketing sector—I fail to see how the member for Cairns can claim that the authority will be sending a retailer bankrupt when the fee to be charged will probably be of the order of \$30 annually when the annual purchase value of the product is \$25,000 or less.

In reply to the honourable member for Mourilyan, I point out that one reference has been made to the operations of the Queensland Fish Board. I am pleased to report that, under the new management that the Government introduced, in the last financial year the trading position of the board improved significantly. I confidently expect that the effects of the rationalisation of plants and operations will continue in the coming year.

The member for Sherwood expressed concern about the need to license all links in the marketing chain. It was stated during the initial debate on this legislation that the Government sought to identify the source of all fish coming onto the market. That could be achieved only by using a docket system to identify consignments and then policing the system. It is that policy which the authority will implement and administer.

The fish resource of this State is a valuable asset. It is presently being heavily exploited by both commercial and recreational fishermen. The Government is committed to having that resource intact in the 1990s and into the next century. Close monitoring of the catching and marketing activities is necessary to achieve acceptable management. The licences that have been listed and the fees that have been proposed are considered reasonable to achieve those objectives.

As to the matters raised by the member for Mackay—I should point out that the area between Queensland and Papua New Guinea is the subject of an international treaty. The chairman of the authority visited Port Moresby in December 1982 with a senior Commonwealth fisheries officer. In February last year, three research officers from Papua New Guinea visited the Government's laboratory in Cairns. Again, in December last, the Director of Fisheries Research attended a special biologists' meeting in Port Moresby to prepare an expert report for the senior officers to plan management of the Torres Strait resources. Although the matters are essentially ones for international discussions between the Commonwealth and Papua New Guinea departments, Queensland officers have been extensively consulted on both research and management.

Motion (Mr Turner) agreed to.

Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Row, Hinchinbrook) in the chair; Hon. N. J. Turner (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short Title—

Mr TURNER (5.28 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

“At page 2, line 7, omit the expression—

‘1983’

and substitute the expression—

‘1984.’”

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3, as read, agreed to.

Clause 4—Citation—

Mr TURNER (5.29 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

“At page 2, line 36, omit the expression—

‘1983’

and substitute the expression—

‘1984.’”

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 5 and 6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7—Amendment of s. 6; Interpretation—

Mr BURNS (5.31 p.m.): I refer to the proposed definition of "keep". In the past, people engaged in the crabbing industry have had some fights with the officers of the Queensland Boating and Fisheries Patrol about crabs that have been caught in upside-down dillies, which are known as witches hats. They should clear their nets straight away, but if they are going home they do not do so. An officer from the Boating and Fisheries Patrol will come up beside their boat and say, "It is against the law to keep that undersized crab or Mary. It is in your possession, so you have broken the law."

I want to know how the definition of "keep" lines up with paragraph (b) of proposed new section 45AA, which states—

"(1) This Act does not apply to—

- (b) the unintentional having in possession of fish or marine products of any species of a less size than that prescribed in respect of that species or of fish or marine products that are otherwise protected by or under this Act where the person having in possession such fish or marine products has been unable owing to circumstances beyond his control to return them to the water immediately after he first had them in possession and has not in the meantime wilfully subjected them to injury;"

Does it mean that under the provision of paragraph (b) of proposed new section 45AA the crabbers in Moreton Bay will be able to return to land with undersized sand crabs or Marys and claim that they unintentionally have them in their possession? In the past, under the definition of "keep", an officer of the Boating and Fisheries Patrol has said to these crabbers, "If you have a Mary in your boat, you have kept it and you are guilty." It has been as black and white as that. If the definition of "keep" still refers to possession, I want to know how that lines up with paragraph (b) of proposed new section 45AA. That is one of the questions that Moreton Bay sand crabbers ask me regularly.

Mr TURNER: Common sense must prevail in this area. I assure the honourable member for Lytton that the intention of the Act is that no-one can take undersized species.

Mr BURNS: That is not really the point. We are passing an Act whose provisions will be argued by legal people. I know of instances in which officers of the Boating and Fisheries Patrol have pulled up beside crabbers, shortly after a net has lobbed in the boat, and said, "You have got an undersized fish. You are guilty. I am going to charge you." I can understand the need to overcome that problem. It was too black and white. But I can see some problems being created by paragraph (b) of proposed new section 45AA. Somewhere along the line a clear definition needs to be provided so that any fisherman knows how long he can keep an undersized fish unintentionally. Is it 20 minutes or half an hour? How long is he allowed to keep an undersized fish or Mary?

Mr TURNER: Paragraph (a) of proposed new section 45AA contains the words "fish or marine products so taken are returned immediately" Also, in December 1981, an agreement was reached between the authority, the Queensland Commercial Fishermen's Organisation and the Queensland Boating and Fisheries Patrol, and it was published in the journal.

Clause 7, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 12, as read, agreed to.

Clause 13—Amendment of s. 37; Powers of inspectors—

Mr BURNS (5.36 p.m.): This clause refers to powers of inspectors and specifically to inspectors confiscating gear and holding it for lengthy periods. It provides—

"The Minister shall, upon application being made in that behalf, pay to a person deprived of the use of a vessel by reason of the use of that vessel by an inspector pursuant to subsection (1) (oa) (iv) of this section such sum of money as he considers reasonable by way of compensation—

- (a) for loss sustained by that person in connection with that deprivation;
- (b) for damage, if any, caused to the vessel while it was being used by the inspector."

I believe that in some cases inspectors have kept a fisherman's gear for six or eight months knowing that no charges would be laid or that a conviction would be unlikely. The inspector has penalised the fisherman by confiscating his gear. The fishing industry has many battlers not one of whom can afford another set of nets or another boat and when his gear is confiscated, he is out of business. Although six months later his gear is returned to him, he has lost a good deal of money. The clause provides that the Minister may make a decision to pay the fisherman a sum of money that the Minister considers reasonable by way of compensation. If a man has not been charged but his boat and gear have been confiscated and he has lost money, it should be mandatory that he be entitled to compensation. It should be written into the Bill.

An inspector should not make the decision to take a fisherman's boat and his gear—and so deprive him of his chance of earning a living—and hold them for a period without charging him. A court should decide whether he is to be convicted and whether he should lose his gear. I do not believe that gear should be confiscated unless a man is put into a court the following day. If he is found guilty, the gear should be taken from him. The Bill provides for an inspector to confiscate a person's gear and to put him out of action for six months even though the inspector knows that the person cannot be convicted. That is not good enough.

Mr TURNER: Vessels are returned when hardship has been established and this is done speedily when a case is submitted for review. It is only done for offences committed inside nursery areas. The matter of retention of gear is always under consideration. The position now is that advice of seizure must be given to ensure detention for a reasonable period only.

Clause 13, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 14 to 19, as read, agreed to.

Clause 20—Citation—

Mr TURNER (5.39 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

“At page 20, line 26, omit the expression—

‘1983’

and substitute the expression—

‘1984.’”

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 20, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 21 to 29, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, with amendments.

Third Reading

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

PATRIOTIC FUNDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Patriotic Funds Act of 1942, as subsequently amended, in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Bjelke-Petersen, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (5.44 p.m.): I move—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

Honourable members would be aware that the Patriotic Funds Act Amendment Bill 1983 was introduced in August 1983. This Bill is the same as the Bill that was presented previously, so in the circumstances I do not propose to repeat in detail the contents of

the initial second-reading speech. However, I reiterate that the whole purpose of the amending Bill is to assist trustees to wind up their funds by enabling them to pay the balance of their assets to associations, other than patriotic funds, in the same area which have as one of their objects the benefits of the public.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Wright, adjourned.

GUIDE DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Guide Dogs Act 1972 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Harper, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (5.47 p.m.): I move—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

The Guide Dogs Act of 1972 made provision to allow dogs trained in guiding blind persons to be admitted to certain places open to or used by the public and in any vehicle used for the carriage of passengers, where otherwise the presence of dogs would be prohibited. In addition to providing such assistance to blind persons, dogs are now being trained to assist persons with hearing difficulties. The Bill makes provision for the Guide Dogs Act 1972 to be extended to dogs used for the purpose of assistance in hearing.

Hearing dogs serve the deaf by hearing and responding to the daily sounds which we so often take for granted. The hearing dog program was developed in Minnesota and Colorado under the sponsorship of the American Humane Association, and hundreds of dogs have now been made available throughout the many States of America and Canada.

The program was introduced into Australia in May 1981 by the Lions clubs of Australia and Papua New Guinea at their 1981 national convention. That is another example of a progressive move being initiated by the Lions clubs throughout Australia.

I take this opportunity to record my personal praise and admiration, and that of the Government, for the community service so freely given by Lions clubs throughout Australia. It is typified, I might add, by clubs such as that in my home town of Wandoan where numbers may not be large but where the spirit of service is very willing.

The principal objective of the Bill is to enable a deaf person, including a partially deaf person, accompanied by a hearing dog, to enter property open to or used by the public, and vehicles used for the carriage of passengers for hire or reward, without incurring penalties or restrictions under any Act.

Some degree of protection is contained in the Bill in that the guide dog must be registered as a dog suitably trained at an approved institution. In addition, to obtain the benefits of the Act, the dog must accompany its master.

When one considers the high degree of training to which a hearing dog is subjected before being allocated to a deaf person, the prime importance being given to cleanliness and hygiene of the dog, and the fact that it is the ears of its master, one finds it difficult to justify restrictions on the complete mobility of a person with hearing difficulties when he is accompanied by his guide dog.

The manner in which recognition is to be given to dogs trained as guide dogs is of importance. It is necessary to ensure that the proposed legislation benefits those persons having bona fide guide dogs.

This is achieved by making the provisions of the Act apply only where the guide dog has been trained at an institution which has been declared by Order in Council to be an approved institution. A certificate of an approved institution shall be taken as conclusive evidence of the matters contained therein in relation to the dog in respect of which it is produced.

Provision is made in the Guide Dogs Act 1972 for the Governor in Council, by Order in Council, to exclude certain places and vehicles from the application of the Act.

By Order in Council dated 11 July 1974, certain places were excluded from the operation of the Act, namely, all those parts of a hospital comprising labour wards, general in-patient wards, operating theatres, sterilisation areas, kitchens and other areas where food is prepared or served, as well as ambulance vehicles.

Loss of hearing is an invisible but very real handicap to active participation in many facets of our society. Although the use of hearing dogs will never replace the pleasure and joy associated with the sensation of sound, it will afford a degree of protection to those of our fellow citizens who are not able to enjoy pleasures personally.

I am sure that honourable members will realise the need and assistance which can be rendered by guide dogs in assisting their owners in moving to and from employment, in seeking employment or in just going about their everyday business—even relaxing at home—in the knowledge that ears other than their own are protecting them.

I commend the proposed amendment as a most humane measure. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, adjourned.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Criminal Code in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Harper, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (5.52 p.m.): I move—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

In 1968 a Bill was introduced into the House to provide a scheme for compensation for the victims of violent crime. For the first time consideration was given by Government to the financial problems which are encountered by the victims of violent crime. Injuries for which compensation was to be provided included bodily harm, pregnancy and mental and nervous shock. The provisions for that compensation are found in Chapter 65A of the Criminal Code.

The scheme which was established may best be described as one which did not intend to fully compensate the victim for the injury which resulted from the criminal act, but one which went some way towards compensating the victim for the injury sustained when the perpetrator of the crime did not have financial resources to meet the judgment given by the court. The maximum amount of compensation payable under the provisions of this chapter was originally determined at \$2,000. An amendment to the legislation in 1975 increased the amount to \$5,000.

Since the introduction of this legislation some 15 years ago, society has considered in greater detail the needs and requirements of the victims of violent crime. This particular trend has been observed not just in Australia but in many overseas jurisdictions as well, including Canada, the United States and many of the European nations.

The Criminal Code Amendment Bill will provide for a drastic increase in the upper amount of compensation which may be ordered by the court to \$42,390. The increase in the prescribed amount for criminal injuries is over 800 per cent and will be by far the most generous compensation scheme of this type provided for in Australia.

The maximum ex gratia payment will be linked to the lump-sum awards which may be made under the Workers' Compensation Act 1916-1983. The Bill will also provide that the maximum amount will be varied from time to time with variations which occur in that Act.

A second feature of the Bill is that it will provide a guide to the courts in determining what is an appropriate amount of compensation to be awarded. In this regard, the existing provisions of this chapter of the Criminal Code have been silent. For the most serious injuries, such as the loss of sight, the maximum amount provided for this type of injury with the workers' compensation scale will be awarded by the court to the applicant. Where the injury is not as serious, lesser amounts will be awarded.

The table from the Workers' Compensation Act has been applied for a number of reasons. The first is that it is a table which is designed to compensate for the long-term effects of a disability. It reflects not only the importance of making reparation in the short term for pain and suffering, but also in the long term where an injury inhibits the future prospects of a victim in employment.

With the wide range of injuries that result from violent crime, it is difficult to provide a table which relates to each different type of injury. However, in an attempt to assist the court, this Bill will provide that the court is required to consider the injury suffered in relation to, and by comparison with, the injuries that have been specified in the table. If it is not practical for the court to do so, it will not be required to follow that course.

No doubt, in the future, this Bill will be looked upon as a piece of our more enlightened legislation. When one considers the practical operation of this chapter, and in particular the provisions of section 663C of the Criminal Code, the reason becomes quite clear. Although a number of orders are made by the court, almost invariably the offender is not in a position to make good the compensation which has been awarded against him. Section 663C provides that where an order is made by the court for the payment of a sum in excess of \$100, a person in whose favour an order has been made may apply in writing to the Minister for the approval of the Governor in Council for the payment to him of the sum, which has been ordered to be paid, from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of this State.

Particularly in these times of economic hardship, a major increase in the maximum amount which may be awarded under this scheme will result in substantial payments being made from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. It is intended that the scheme will not be funded by any levy on the community, any levy on fines or any other impost but purely from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the State. There are very sound reasons why the Government should have introduced some such form of tax or levy. I trust that the community will recognise that the Government has chosen not to do so. This is a low-tax Government, and yet again it demonstrates the truth of that claim.

Where the injury suffered by a victim is one of mental shock or nervous shock, a maximum amount of \$20,000 may be awarded under this chapter. This upper limit is, again, the most generous in Australia and will ensure that adequate awards may be made for mental as well as physical injuries sustained by the victim of a criminal offence.

In view of the increase in the maximum amount that may be ordered by the court, the Bill will prohibit the making of multiple awards against a convicted offender in favour of the one complainant. In many cases the one course of criminal conduct may result in a number of charges being laid against an accused, and consequently the making of multiple orders for compensation. Thus, where four charges are laid, under the existing provisions a maximum award of \$20,000 could be made. This has led to an inequitable situation where a complainant has suffered the same trauma from one particularly devastating offence as has another complainant from an attack involving four offences. In the former case an award could be for \$5,000 and, in the latter, four awards each of \$5,000. To embrace all offences in the one award will remove this inequity.

The scheme which is provided by this amending legislation will be one of great social advantage in the community. It will ensure that larger awards for compensation are made and that some measure of assistance is given to the courts in determining awards for compensation. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.]

CARRIAGE OF DANGEROUS GOODS BY ROAD BILL

Hon. D. F. LANE (Merthyr—Minister for Transport), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to provide for the carriage by road of dangerous goods and the duties of persons engaged therein and for related purposes.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Lane, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. D. F. LANE (Merthyr—Minister for Transport) (7.16 p.m.): I move—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

The Australian Transport Advisory Council, which is comprised of Commonwealth and State Ministers, has established special advisory committees within the council to examine and report on specific areas.

One such committee is the advisory committee on the transport of dangerous goods. The Commonwealth, eight State Governments and Territories, as well as the Australian Road Transport Federation, the Australian Chemical Industry Council, the petroleum industry and the Standards Association of Australia, are represented on that committee. Its function is to advise on a uniform code.

The committee, after years of developmental work, has prepared a code relating to classification, labelling and transport of dangerous goods within Australia. This code has been endorsed by the Australian Transport Advisory Council and accepted by all Australian States. The current edition was published in the Commonwealth of Australia Gazette on 24 February 1982, and will be periodically updated as new developments occur in the transport of hazardous substances.

Until now, the State Transport Act has been used as the method of controlling the road movement of hazardous substances in Queensland. However, in so far as such substances are concerned, the Act is inapplicable as regards interstate movement and those intrastate movements on journeys not in excess of 40 km in competition with rail.

The introduction of this Bill will overcome the abovementioned limitations in the State Transport Act and will enable the legislative application of the Australian code for the transport of dangerous goods to any road movement of hazardous substances within Queensland irrespective of whether the movement is interstate or intrastate in nature.

Honourable members will, no doubt, recall the Railways Act Amendment Act 1982 which was assented to in April 1982 and which adopted the Australian code for the transport of dangerous goods on Queensland's railway system as part of a similar adoption on railways throughout the nation.

I will now deal with the Bill's main aspects.

After six months from the date of proclamation, the carriage of dangerous goods, in Queensland, of a quantity in excess of the quantity specified in section 3 table 3.1 of the code, without a licence issued under this Act or a corresponding law of another State or Territory of the Commonwealth, will constitute an offence.

The period of six months grace will enable transport operators to become familiar with the various requirements and procedures contained in the code and will enable the development of the regulations pursuant to the proposed Act as well as the administrative procedures and documentation to be adopted.

In view of the importance of this legislation, the penalties for offences against the Act will be substantial.

Where an offence is committed by a corporate person, the maximum penalty will be \$50,000, whilst in the case of a natural person the maximum penalty will be \$10,000 plus imprisonment for 12 months.

Vehicles which are not suitable for carriage, having regard to the relevant commodity to be carried, or which are not the subject of a current certificate of inspection under the Motor Vehicles Safety Act 1980, will be prohibited from transporting dangerous goods. The driver of a vehicle transporting dangerous goods, irrespective of whether such goods are being transported for hire, will be required to carry, in the driving cabin of the vehicle,

a shipping document which truly classifies and describes the goods being carried on the vehicle for the whole of the particular journey, and shall produce such shipping document to an authorised officer upon request. This requirement is vital in the maintenance of public safety in the event of an escape of dangerous goods during road transport.

"The Courier-Mail", on Friday, 28 May 1982, reported an incident in the Australian Capital Territory where 30 people were treated for cyanide poisoning after a semi-trailer carrying a mixed load, including industrial fibreglass chemicals, jack-knifed and burst into flames.

Firemen at the scene were unaware that the truck was carrying drums of highly flammable, corrosive and poisonous chemicals. Because of the absence of documentation as to the contents of the load, water used for the purpose of extinguishing the blaze reacted with the escaping chemicals and increased the volume of escaping fumes. Firemen and police attending the accident were among those requiring medical treatment.

The Bill will also outlaw the mingling on a vehicle of any explosive substance with any substance capable of causing fire as well as poisonous, radioactive, corrosive or odoriferous substances with foodstuff and foodstuff empties. Standards for the segregation of commodities when dangerous goods are being carried on a vehicle are also provided for in the code.

Persons engaged in the road transport of dangerous goods will be required to be indemnified by insurance to the extent of \$500,000 or such other amount as may be prescribed in particular circumstances by Order in Council in respect of liability that may be incurred by the carrier as a result of death, bodily injury, damage or loss of property or costs incurred by or on behalf of a public authority as a result of the removal or cleaning up of dangerous goods which have escaped from the vehicle.

Where public safety or property could be endangered by the movement of dangerous goods, the Governor in Council will be empowered to prohibit or limit such carriage in the interests of public safety and the protection of property.

Other States, namely, New South Wales, Western Australia, South Australia and the Northern Territory, have enacted legislation to control the transport of dangerous goods and, although the legislation differs somewhat from State to State, uniformity has been achieved by the calling up of the Australian Code for the Transport of Dangerous Goods. This uniformity is essential in the control of the interstate movement of such goods. The code will, in fact, form the basis of the regulations provided for in the Bill.

Appropriate staff will be recruited, trained and charged with the responsibility of developing administrative procedures to be adopted and providing a source of information for industry in relation to the various requirements of the proposed legislation.

The transportation of hazardous materials is essential to the national economy and is increasing daily in communities across the nation. As accidents do occur during the transportation of these commodities, it is imperative that adequate prevention and enforcement programs be available to protect our citizens and mitigate long-term damage to our environment.

In view of the importance of this legislation, I am prepared to have further discussions with any interested organisations which have a special interest in this Bill. Should suggestions be forthcoming which will improve the proposed legislation, I will consider moving appropriate amendments at the Committee stage.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Casey, adjourned.

EXPO '88 BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 21 December (see p. 1073) on Mr Bjelke-Petersen's motion—
"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton—Leader of the Opposition) (7.24 p.m.): At the outset, I wish to place on the parliamentary record that Expo '88 has the support, in principle, of the parliamentary Labor Party. That needs to be said because on a previous occasion it was claimed by our opponents that the Labor Party was in opposition to the concept, and the matter needs to be clarified very quickly.

We recognise the importance of this event. We have considered very carefully the information that has been made available to Opposition members by the Government and, in particular, by Sir Llewellyn Edwards. We are very much aware that this will be a major international event. In fact, it will be the first international exhibition in Australia in 100 years—since 1888 when a similar type of exhibition was held in Melbourne.

This is a time when jobs need to be created, and Expo '88 will do just that. It has been projected that, by 1988, Expo will have created about 5 600 jobs. Using a multiplying factor of about three, about 15 000 to 18 000 jobs will be created. That is not a small number, and Queensland will benefit.

The total concept has enormous tourist potential. In briefing papers that I have received, it has been suggested that Queensland can expect somewhere between 500 000 and 2 million people from overseas and interstate to visit Expo. I suggest that those people, after seeing Queensland, will become fine ambassadors for this State and for Australia.

Expo will certainly boost the economy of Queensland. The Premier said in his second-reading speech that an injection of about \$400m into the economy was estimated. I do not know what that figure was based on, but I can well imagine that if 6 million to 8 million people, including Queenslanders, spend their money at such an exhibition as Expo, and if the construction costs are to be measured in hundreds of millions of dollars and with the flow-on advantages of such a construction project, the injection into the economy could well be in excess of the \$400m of which the Premier speaks. Expo will lay the foundation for Brisbane to become an internationally accepted convention and trade centre. That is important to Brisbane and to Queensland. Recently I spoke with a number of people involved in the tourist industry in Brisbane and they suggested the importance of finding the funds needed to develop a convention centre that could cater for 2 000 or more people at one time. It was suggested that Brisbane, rather than the Gold Coast or the North Coast, lends itself perfectly to such a development because it has the necessary accommodation and transportation facilities. A post-Expo project could be the construction of a convention centre that would be the equal of any similar centre in the world.

As a project, Expo has generated debate about how a modern community in the 1980s can update a capital city. There has been talk about a magic wand being waved and an older part of a city such as Brisbane being modernised at no cost to the tax-payer. I will return to that point later.

It has been suggested that flow-on advantages will arise from the expenditure that will take place. The present transport system throughout Brisbane must receive more consideration. A proper transport study should have been carried out before a decision was made about the Expo site. I have been told that such a study is being undertaken at the moment and it is finding some difficulties. I will comment on that later.

If the project reaches the heights that the Premier speaks of, it will have a major environmental impact and will change the quality of life of hundreds of thousands of Queenslanders in both the short term and the long term. Although it has caused disruption for many people who live in the Expo area as laid down in the legislation, ultimately the project will result in an improvement for many Queenslanders. Therefore, it must be supported. The project will be a catalyst for further developments in tourism and trade.

The overall economic benefits are somewhat difficult to measure. The project will result in the promotion of Queensland, and specifically Brisbane, throughout the world, because Expo '88 will be promoted in the 40 different countries that are signatories to the Bureau of International Expositions. Queensland must gain from that international advertising and promotion; it cannot lose from something such as that. When one considers the importance of the tourist dollar in any economy today, whether it be State or national, one quickly realises that Expo will have a major economic impact in Queensland and Australia, especially in the tourist area.

Probably for the first time since the Hawke Government took over the nation, there is clear evidence of co-operation between Canberra and Queensland instead of the ongoing confrontation that has been a characteristic of this Government's attitude to Canberra. The Hawke Government has been willing to contribute financially to Expo and to support the application in Paris by Queensland for Expo '88. That was recognised in the briefing

notes that have been presented. So it can be seen that confrontation does not have to exist and that much can be gained when Governments, irrespective of their political colour, come together with a willingness to co-operate and work together.

It is true also that State and local authorities can co-operate. It is very clear that, if this project is to be as successful as those who are behind it say it will be, there must be the fullest co-operation between the State Government of Queensland and the Brisbane City Council. However, the question must arise as to whether or not the State Government will be usurping such of the authority of the Brisbane City Council. That aspect will have to be monitored as time goes on.

Co-operation between the State Government and the city council—the city Government, if I might put it that way—is necessary, because the Expo site can be developed only through the provision of services such as water, sewerage and transport, all of which come back to the power and authority of local authorities.

The Government has put forward the proposition that, if the site is to achieve its potential, town-planning exemptions must be granted. Those exemptions will be possible only if there is co-operation between the State Government and the Brisbane City Council and support from the Brisbane City Council.

Mr Lingard: And the member for South Brisbane.

Mr WRIGHT: The member for South Brisbane has always given his support to the proposal in principle. Obviously, he wants to support the people in his electorate, and he realises the difficulties that would arise and the dislocation that would take place. People who over many years built up business were told suddenly that they were out. After all, the honourable member who interjected would be aware of his Government's record. It has not always compensated fairly. I can understand why the honourable member for South Brisbane was quick to stand up for his constituents. I am sure that he would be applauded and praised by all whom he has tried to help.

I make the point that the success of the post-Expo enhancement of the site will depend greatly on the Brisbane City Council.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: Do you say we would not pay them fair compensation?

Mr WRIGHT: No. In a moment I will raise the point about the acquisition Act. In the past, constant criticism has been levelled at various Governments when they have acquired land. The Premier would know that in his electorate and throughout Queensland many people in the grazing industry and others in towns have not been satisfied with the compensation that Governments generally have given when they acquire land.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: Senator Walsh is saying that we just have to resume the land for the Burdekin Dam. He does not want to pay compensation for it.

Mr WRIGHT: A very strong principle is involved here. If a Government acquires land for the good of the community, the community must pay.

Mr Prest: Joh, who is the relative of Vicki Kippin who is going to get all the money from the Burdekin Dam?

Mr WRIGHT: If the honourable member for Port Curtis asks me that question, I will put the answer in "Hansard". I am quite concerned about the allegation that has constantly been made. I believe it to be factual. However, that is another issue.

I get back to the very important issue of compensation. It is important that those people who lose their leases or their properties, or who jeopardise their businesses, be compensated fairly. All I am asking for is fairness. The Premier, in his second-reading speech, gave an undertaking that it would be fair.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: Senator Walsh will turn a somersault when he reads your speech about fairness.

Mr WRIGHT: I believe in fairness. I hope that the Premier and his Government exhibit fairness when the issue of compensation arises. If people whose property is acquired are not satisfied with the authority's decision, their right of appeal and other avenues of redress will be tested.

It is important to note that total and absolute power is being given to the authority. We as members of Parliament will not be able to intervene. We will not be able to come into this Chamber to beg the Premier to intervene in order to protect someone.

As I read the legislation, it provides that the authority shall negotiate and shall have the power to buy and sell land. Whether the purchase price is satisfactory will be a matter for consideration. No doubt people whose property is acquired will want to be compensated, because they will be dislocated and will need to be relocated.

As I mentioned before, we have seen proof of co-operation between the State Government and the Federal Government and between the State Government and the local authority. There is proof that State Governments can co-operate with the Opposition. That is far from the point that was made by the Minister for Welfare Services and Ethnic Affairs when he tried to make out that there is no room for Opposition involvement when it comes to Government spending or Government administration. I totally discount his argument, which I shall pursue at a later date.

The proof that the Government and the Opposition can work together was shown by the former Deputy Premier and Treasurer (Sir Llewellyn Edwards) when he forwarded to me as Leader of the Opposition a complete brief of what was proposed. He was totally open and honest about it. He presented to me financial aspects of the proposal. He outlined very clearly that many proposals were based on assumptions. It was on those assumptions that the success of the project was based. He did not beat around the bush and proclaim that everything was wonderful. He pointed out very clearly that if it was to proceed and be the success that he, the Queensland Government and the people of Queensland wanted, it would have to be accepted that a risk was involved. I thank him for that.

Mr Alison: Tell us what the member for South Brisbane said on television.

Mr WRIGHT: I suggest to the honourable member who keeps interjecting that he might have the courage to make a speech. The only occasion on which he has spoken during this session was when he asked someone to close a window. He should stand up for his electorate and fight for his constituents, as the member for South Brisbane has done.

I am pleased that the former Deputy Premier and Treasurer (Sir Llewellyn Edwards) was able to provide me with that brief. It gave me a chance to contact the Brisbane City Council and to speak with it and with Federal representatives to follow the issue through, and to investigate the issue by going to the site and speaking to business people. I must admit that at that time I was very concerned that the proposed site was not the best one. Unfortunately, it has gone too far. Although I believe that alternative sites were available, matters have proceeded too far down the track. I do not think that that decision can be reversed. I appreciate that the site has many advantages. That has been acknowledged.

Mr Davis: You wouldn't want heavy rain.

Mr WRIGHT: I am not aware of the difficulties.

Mr Davis: The whole area flooded in 1974.

Mr WRIGHT: The whole area that has been selected?

Mr Davis: Yes.

Mr WRIGHT: That will create a problem. I am pleased that the member for Brisbane Central has brought that matter to the attention of the House.

The former Treasurer said in his briefing that the area was centrally located. Although it is not in his briefing notes, I think he was saying that what was needed was a site that would take advantage of the facilities that already existed. If up to two million people are coming to Brisbane from interstate and overseas, accommodation must be provided for them. I am not referring to accommodation at Expo '88; I am referring to accommodation in hotels and in motel units. I can understand why the site must be in reasonable proximity to the major areas of accommodation of the capital city. Therefore, the site on the southside of Brisbane would be suitable because it is close to the major accommodation facilities on the northside.

It was pointed out that the site has the potential for development from a run-down, unattractive area into one of the most attractive and valuable precincts in Brisbane. I am

not sure whether the people who live there would say that the area is unattractive and run-down. Undoubtedly, it is their home. The Opposition accepts that environmental advantages are to be gained by the project going ahead.

The brief refers also to the general suitability of the site for an event such as Expo. However, there was no elaboration of that comment. I accept that there are advantages. I understand why the proposed site has been selected. I still believe that further investigation should be carried out in other areas. However, as I have said, it is too late.

Mr Simpson: Where do you favour?

Mr WRIGHT: It does not matter now, but I was looking at an area in the New Farm region. Some honourable members may be familiar with the huge buildings in that area. A railway facility already exists there. The site is on the river. It has an attractive outlook. It was something that the Opposition had examined. Had the Opposition gained office at the last election, that would have been a matter for renegotiation. However, the people decided differently.

Mr Lingard: What about Kuraby and Beenleigh, like your mate suggested?

Mr WRIGHT: I am sure that there will be many suggestions. I know that the member for Callide put forward some proposals. He suggested that Expo '88 should be located somewhere else.

Undoubtedly, the members representing northern electorates would have liked to see something in Townsville. The member for Mt Isa, who is a fighter for the north, would have liked to see something in his electorate. The member for Barron River undoubtedly would have liked to see something in the Cairns region.

Mr Yewdale interjected.

Mr WRIGHT: I do not know much about what he is doing about crocodiles. However, I know that most members were concerned about the site. They were willing, at least, to consider it. However, that is now not a matter for consideration, because it is a fait accompli.

I mentioned earlier that there could be traffic problems because of the site selected. I ask the Premier, when he replies, whether it be tonight or tomorrow, to outline what consideration has been given to those problems. It has been suggested that there will be congestion at the site selected and that enormous difficulties will be created for the city proper. People from the north of Brisbane will be using the William Jolly Bridge and the Victoria Bridge, and that will be almost calamitous for the city itself. There will be major parking difficulties and commuting difficulties. I made the point that no traffic control plan was formulated before the site was selected or before the application was lodged. Although it is suggested that it is being done now, there are some difficulties.

At the same time as asking the Premier what he will do about that, I ask him to explain what consideration is being given to making better use of the Brisbane River as a route of entry. I see Expo as an ideal experimental time to expand upon and develop the Brisbane River as a commuting route. It would appear to me, after discussing this with other Brisbane members of the Opposition, that the Brisbane River services the city in an exceptional way, whether from the bottom reaches of the river or the far-flung western areas. Commuting ferries could service the site that has been selected, and at low cost. Should some sort of ferry service prove successful, no doubt the system could be continued into the future.

I pose some questions about the amount of money involved. It has been claimed constantly by the Premier that Expo '88 will cost Queensland people nothing. I refer to an article that appeared in the "Daily Sun" on 3 December 1983. This statement is attributed to the Premier—

" . . . Queensland taxpayers will not have to foot the bill for the \$179 million Expo, which is expected to be self-funding and even return a small profit."

I accept his general statement. The briefing forwarded to me by the former Treasurer contains a break-down which shows an ultimate profit of a couple of million dollars. I note also, however, that there is to be considerable expenditure by the Government. Even in 1983 dollar terms, it is expected that the Government will spend about \$25m on the pavilion and \$11m on exhibits. As we go through the document, setting aside inflationary factors,

we are probably talking about at least \$33m. I appreciate that the Government intends to make a considerable profit of \$42m from land resale. However, that is part of the risk involved. It will depend on that land selling. Although about \$10m has been provided in the Budget, it will cost almost \$200m to ensure that Expo works. Where will the money come from? Is it to be borrowed? Is interest to be earned on money to be made available in the Budget? If interest is not being earned on it, the people are forfeiting the interest advantage. Therefore, the tax-payers will be paying.

Although reasonably detailed information has been given, the Premier, who is now Treasurer of the State, has an obligation to say clearly what the people are up for. It needs to be said also that it is stated in the document that it will take 17 years for the scheme to be self-funding.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: It will depend a lot on what Mr Hawke pays, too, don't forget.

Mr WRIGHT: It seems that this Government does everything on the proviso of what the Hawke Government might do. The Premier introduced a Budget and said, "This is our Budget, but I may have to change it next year if the Hawke Labor Government does not overcome the problem with Medicare that we have put forward." However, two weeks after that the Government out of the blue agreed to spend \$30m on the stabilisation of the Southport bar. The Government does it time and time again. It pulls money out of the hat at any time it wants to. However, we ought to have an explanation of where the \$179m will come from and a clear demonstration that the tax-payers are not to pay for it.

I might add that I do not mind if Queensland contributes, because the benefit will be for Queenslanders. However, on the one hand the Premier says that no payment will be made, but that does not seem feasible. It is difficult to accept that that will be the case. After all, in 1983 dollar terms the minimum figure is \$179m. Surely the projected figure must be over \$200m. How will it be self-funded over these 17 years? Do we expect that people will continue to pay royalties on products sold over that period? To me, that seems ridiculous. Is it that the Government expects that the land will not be sold for 17 years?

The Bill provides that the authority will act for the Crown, which means that the Crown or the Parliament—that is, the people—will carry the debts incurred. The people, not the authority, comprising eight people, three of whom are public servants and five appointed by the Premier, will be responsible for the debts. The members of the authority will not be individually and personally liable for debts incurred; it will be the authority and, in turn, the Government, the Parliament and the people who will be liable. The people of Queensland need to know much more about it.

That does not take away my support for the proposal, because I believe in the concept of risk and reward. If Queensland is to reap the reward, it must take the risk. I again suggest that the reward could be enormous. However, the risk is not exactly a minor one, a point which was made fairly clear in the statement of Sir Lewellyn Edwards, which mentioned assumptions.

I turn to another point of finance. What the Bill really sets up is a quango, and when such a body has power to handle such enormous amounts of money there must be a high degree of accountability. One would have thought that this was the ideal time for the Government to put into practice what it has been claiming to be its principles in dealing with quasi-autonomous non-governmental organisations.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: You are off the track a bit.

Mr WRIGHT: Tell me how I am off the track.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: You are a long way off the track. You are out in the bushes.

Mr WRIGHT: No, I am not.

I see it as an authority that will have enormous power and deal with tax-payers' money. Yet the Bill provides that the authority will have to report to Parliament only once every 12 months. Surely if an authority is given such power, will be responsible for almost \$200m, and its powers will be spread out to the year 2000—I know some sort of sunset clause will provide for the conclusion of the operation, but that is when the self-

funding program has continued for 17 years to the year 2000—there should be ongoing and absolute accountability. That this authority report to the Minister and then a report be laid upon the table of the Parliament only once every 12 months is not good enough. Because of its importance, the authority should report at least half-yearly and, preferably, from my point of view, quarterly. There should be ongoing reports, not only so that there is proper accountability but also so that the authority has the ongoing support of the Parliament.

After all, it is a Queensland project; it is not a National Party project. It was originally put forward by the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce. In 1978 it had the support, in part, of the Fraser Government. Because of some uncertainties, Mr Fraser did not continue with that support and, even though it provided some funding, this Government did not continue with its support. The project now has the support of the Hawke Labor Government and, no doubt because it is part of the agreement, money will be forthcoming. Tax-payers' money, whether it be at Federal Government, State Government or local government level, will be used to provide the water supply, sewerage and transportation services. Because of that, there has to be that ultimate degree of accountability. From the provisions of the Bill, I do not see that that will be forthcoming.

One of the clauses of the Bill provides that a quorum for a meeting of the authority need be only four of the eight members. Surely if eight people are appointed to an authority that will handle millions of dollars of tax-payers' money and it has the power to negotiate and to take away a person's livelihood—the authority will be resuming businesses and lands, wiping out leases and all those types of things—there has to be further accountability, so I do not see that a quorum of only four of the eight is good enough. That is not even a majority of the members. One also notes that the annual report of the authority will go to the Governor in Council—that is Cabinet—and back to the Parliament only once per year.

Whether this authority is called a quango or some other name, it is a powerful organisation set up by this Parliament, which has delegated authority to it. If members want to see what powers are to be given, I urge them to go through the Bill. Listed from (a) to (p) they cover the right to accept the grant into its name of all lands within the site acquired before the establishment of the authority, the right to acquire personal property, the right to negotiate with and make agreements for any public purpose, the right to negotiate with the owners and occupiers of land and businesses—therefore those who have leases—the right to temporarily close roads within the site and to divert traffic, the right to negotiate to make agreements concerning the airspace over the land, the right to negotiate with and make agreements with the Brisbane City Council about the amalgamation and subdivision of land and then, importantly, the right to dispose of lands within the site being lands that are the property of the authority, to dispose of personal property acquired by the authority, to enter into tenancy agreements, and so it goes on and on. Paragraphs (a) to (p) confer all of those different powers, yet this Government says that it is good enough for only four out of eight members to constitute a quorum—not even a majority—and for the eight members to report back to the Parliament once every year if it suits them. That is what it comes down to. How often are reports presented when Parliament is not sitting? Because of the calibre of the persons already named by way of their offices—the Co-ordinator-General, the Under Treasurer and the Chief Commissioner and Chairman of the Land Administration Commission—I hope that we will not have any doubt about the operations of the authority. But five persons are to be appointed by the Minister. In fact, anyone could be appointed. I know that the Premier said that one shall be Sir Llewellyn Edwards, so it gets back to the four others. It could well be that four people make the decisions for this Parliament. That is what is happening. This Parliament is delegating the authority to these people. They will make the decisions about this land and spend all that money. I ask that the Premier give consideration to the provisions of ongoing and regular reports of the activities of the authority.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: Naturally they report to the Government, to me as Premier. We know what is going on. It is not like the Labor Party which does not know what is going on.

Mr WRIGHT: The Premier is always trying to score, which is a pity. We try to be sensible about these things. The Premier wants public support—

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: Why do you always talk such a load of rubbish?

Mr WRIGHT: It is not a load of rubbish, and the Premier knows that. It is clearly shown in the Bill that he does not want accountability. He has never wanted accountability, and he is making sure that in this new organisation he is setting up, the first one for 1984, there will not be proper accountability.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr WRIGHT: We will be pressing to ensure that this organisation is watched over very carefully because it is dealing with the lives of people. Even the Premier said that something like 5 600 people will be employed, so the organisation will be an employer as well. It will be dealing with the lives of people; dispossessing them of their property, with proper compensation, I hope.

We know what happens when quangos rule unfettered. We have seen it with the Peanut Marketing Board and we now see it with the fire brigades where there has not been proper control and a lack of reporting. The Premier required the 687 quangos in the State to report to the Government before the end of last year. I believe the figure has now blown out to about 900. I do not know how the increase came about, but one report said that there are now 900 quangos in Queensland. I would like to know how many have reported. I doubt whether they all have. Certainly the Auditor-General could not cope with half of them. I doubt whether he has control over them, anyway. Certainly the Ministers do not. So who will control this organisation? Unless there is ongoing and regular reporting to the Parliament we will not know what is going on. We have already seen the problems with the Peanut Marketing Board. There is a need for the Government to ensure that the people appointed are responsible for their actions, not in the legal sense that they have to pay off any debts incurred, but responsible in such a way that they will report to the proper, elected body. This is the proper, elected body, not some authority appointed by a Minister, as is the situation today. This is the proper, elected body—

Mr Prest: It looks as if it is going to be a job for Mike Evans.

Mr WRIGHT: I doubt that he would be appointed. I know that the Government would be very careful to appoint people who will do their bidding. It is time that consideration was given to the introduction of new laws in Queensland controlling public bodies—

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! Cross-firing in the Chamber will not be tolerated by the Chair.

Mr WRIGHT: I have said publicly, and I repeat here, that there needs to be a public bodies Act that will embrace this authority and other organisations. Accountability of the highest order is necessary and not only because of the amount of money involved.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have asked honourable members not to engage in cross-fire while the Leader of the Opposition is speaking. If it happens again, I shall warn the members concerned.

Mr WRIGHT: One also notes that some clauses in the legislation waive existing law. I refer to the City of Brisbane Town Planning Act 1964-1982. Expo will not be bound by that law. It will also be exempt from section 41 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1967-1977. This body is to be given exemption from existing law. It will have power over people—the employees, the tenants, the thousands of people who are presently associated with the Expo site and the tens of thousands of people who will be involved in the actual event. It is important that there be ongoing control.

Despite that, the Opposition acknowledges the immensity of the project. It welcomes the fact that Expo is going ahead. It acknowledges also that there is here the concept of risk and reward. As I said before, the risk could be great, but the reward could be enormous. Despite our concern, we are prepared to accept what the Government proposes here; but, unless proper explanation is given, there are aspects that we cannot accept.

When the Commonwealth Games Act was being proposed, there was wide debate about the excessive powers being given to the police and about the delegated powers being given to other people.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: It all turned out to be quite unnecessary.

Mr WRIGHT: I think that the Premier and Treasurer has just given us the admission that we wanted. That legislation was shown to be totally unnecessary.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: You worry too much.

Mr WRIGHT: No. The Premier and Treasurer said that the Commonwealth Games legislation was unnecessary, and that is exactly the point that I wanted him to make. So why include in this legislation provisions that allow for arrest without warrant and for delegated authority to be used to evict people from the site area? I refer briefly to clauses 45 to 48. I shall explain what I mean when I refer to the site area. I am not sure that the Premier and Treasurer knows exactly what that covers. I point out to him that it covers the river-bank area and also Musgrave Park.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: I knew that is what you were on about.

Mr WRIGHT: That is what I am coming to.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen interjected.

Mr WRIGHT: If this Government were providing proper facilities and care for the handicapped and underprivileged in this State, we would not have the situation in Musgrave Park. That area is used by citizens from every walk of life. Families use the park area, as they use the area along the banks of the river.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: You have never been over there.

Mr WRIGHT: I have been over there.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr WRIGHT: I think it has been stated that that area will be used for additional parking. I think that that matter could be explained further.

Why have provisions covering the total site area? Why include the banks of the Brisbane River? Does the Government intend to arrest people for no reason whatsoever? We have a right to know what the Government is about. Provisions are needed to protect the exhibitors and the people who visit the site, but those provisions are already provided in existing law. If a person does the wrong thing and resists arrest, he can be charged under the Criminal Code. Those provisions already exist.

This Parliament deserves an explanation of why this legislation contains certain excessive provisions that will allow, for instance, arrest without warrant and the delegation of arresting powers. If that person to whom the power is delegated is trained properly, many members of Parliament would accept that, but we have a right to know the reasons for including these provisions in the legislation. No doubt that matter will be dealt with further at the Committee stage.

I shall sum up my remarks by asking some questions. I am not sure whether the Premier and Treasurer will answer them tonight or tomorrow. By asking these questions now, I will give him an opportunity to consider them and to discuss them with his advisers. I wish to know the total amount of money for which the people of Queensland are responsible by way of grants and loans. The people of Queensland, as well as members of this Assembly, have a right to know that.

What protection is there for the owners of businesses who have leased properties in the area? The Bill provides that compensation will be available to people who own properties and businesses; but I would like to know the rights of people who merely lease premises. It seems that the Acquisition of Land Act does not prevail with regard to leases, and this legislation provides for the authority to take over leases and to sever the livelihoods of many people. What right of appeal and means of redress do owners and occupiers of properties have if they are not satisfied with the compensation offered?

Section 41 of the Acquisition of Land Act provides that a person dispossessed of land may have the first option to buy it back if the Government or the acquirer does not require it within a seven-year period. I would like to know why they do not have the right to bid for the land and buy it back at the current market price. I believe that that is what the law says.

Although it is only a minor matter, an explanation should be given of the difference in the estimated number of visitors to Expo. The Premier said in his second-reading speech that over 500 000 overseas and interstate visitors will attend. Under the heading "General",

on page 7 of the briefing notes that I received—no doubt other members received them, too—the then Treasurer said that the number of overseas and interstate visitors to Expo had been estimated at 2 million. I am prepared to make the briefing notes available. In August last year the estimate was 2 million overseas and interstate visitors; in December, when the Premier introduced this legislation, the estimate was reduced to 500 000. That is a reduction of 75 per cent. It is a very valid point. The assumption is that people will come to see this Exposition. The estimated attendance is 7.2 million, with a minimum/maximum range of 6.5 million to 8 million. If the attendances fall to a minimum of 6.5 million, the effect will be a net reduction of \$7m, in 1983 dollar terms, in the operating result.

The Premier said that he expects only 500 000 visitors from overseas and interstate; but the former Treasurer estimated 2 million visitors. That is a massive drop of one and a half million people. Millions upon millions of dollars over the estimated operating result will be spent. Members of this Assembly, especially the Opposition, require an explanation.

Mr Eaton: You are getting it now in the lobby.

Mr WRIGHT: That is reasonable, because the Premier said one thing and the former Treasurer said another.

The Opposition wants to give full encouragement and support to this project, but it has a responsibility to pursue issues with which it is not satisfied. Answers should be given to the questions that I have raised.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (8.4 p.m.): The legislation should be welcomed by members of this Assembly, and I hope that it will be unanimously supported. The Leader of the Opposition indicated that it will be supported by members of his party, and members of the Liberal Party will give it their support.

It is a big step forward for Brisbane and Queensland. A number of agencies and services are involved in providing the displays that are required for an Exposition of this type.

I first became involved in the project some years ago, when the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce approached the Government to provide a brief that was to go to Paris. That brief was about the possibility of an Expo being held in Brisbane. There are various types and sizes of Expositions. That proposal was much bigger than the present one and it did not find a great deal of favour with those in Australia and around the world whose support was necessary for its success. Nevertheless, an attempt was made.

Honourable members may recall that several other cities in Australia could well have had the opportunity to provide this exhibition and, for various reasons, declined. It is to the credit of the Government and in particular the Premier and the former Treasurer that they put their act together to have Expo '88 in the year of the bicentenary and at a size that is acceptable to the community and can be supported by the resources of the State and the local authorities. I give it my whole-hearted support. After the wonderful display that Queensland and Brisbane put on for the Commonwealth Games, I am quite confident that Expo, too, will be a great success.

In past years, other Australian cities have put on exhibitions of this magnitude. In fact, many years ago, such exhibitions were put on when cities in Australia were very much smaller than Brisbane is today. In the last century, of course, Melbourne put on a world exhibition. At that time its population was considerably less than Brisbane's is today. The resources that are now available to support an exhibition of this type are very extensive. It is appropriate that this exhibition should be held in Brisbane in 1988.

Expo, of course, requires a good deal of work and energy on the part of a large number of people. The Premier and Treasurer, for one, is to be complimented. He went to Paris and put the case before the committee. That case was supported by documentation, which was accepted. I am sure that all honourable members are delighted that that is so.

What must be understood, however, is that this legislation is not creating a statutory authority in the true sense of that term as we in this Chamber understand it. Mention has been made of quangos. I do not think that the authority envisaged by the legislation is in the same category as quangos as we understand them to be. This authority is being set up by this legislature to handle a problem that could not otherwise be handled

successfully by any other body. The setting up of the authority is a very correct and intelligent move. Its existence will be limited and it will be responsible for the disposal of the site.

In the process, of course, the site has to be acquired. Processes that are not usually accepted by the community have to be accepted on this occasion. The authority will be virtually a private enterprise set up with the sanction of this Assembly. However, in order to establish that private enterprise, it is necessary for the authority to put out of business, and to resume property owned by, private enterprise that exists on the site. That raises some very important points that should be aired in this Chamber. I hope that they will be dealt with later.

Mr Davis: I hope they get a better deal than all the people—

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The first occasion in recent years on which I can recall an authority acquiring property for other than public purposes was when the Brisbane City Council acquired extra property associated with Anzac Square. The honourable member for Brisbane Central may recall that the Brisbane City Council wished to acquire a number of shops and buildings in order to redevelop Anzac Square for private purposes, not for public purposes. He may recall the lengthy arguments that ensued. Parliament took some action on the matter, as did the executive Government, to ensure that the people in private enterprise whose properties were to be acquired and who were to gain no benefit from the redevelopment of Anzac Square were adequately compensated. The Acquisition of Land Act does not provide for that; nor do the powers of local authorities.

The question of adequate compensation to existing land-owners and business-proprietors in the area must be considered seriously. In addition to losing property, they will lose the ability to earn money for their enterprises and to keep people employed. For some of the enterprises in the area, the mere acquisition of the land and the compensation that goes with the acquisition of land will virtually put them out of business. They have to shift an enormous amount of equipment, they have to relocate themselves and they have to re-establish their businesses—for all of which the Acquisition of Land Act makes no provision. It is not merely a matter of acquiring land in the usual way. For example, the land is not being acquired for public thoroughfares. It is not being acquired for dams, schools, hospitals or recreation areas. It is not being acquired for the public at all; it is being acquired for private enterprise for the purposes of the Exposition.

When the Exposition is over, the land and buildings will be disposed of to private enterprise. The people who would have lost the benefits of those sites will not be in a position to reacquire the benefits. It is not good enough to refer to those owners of property having first option to buy back the land because the land will be valueless to them at that time; whereas the land at the moment is very valuable to them. In one instance, millions of dollars worth of printing press material and the property associated with it is involved. In another instance, the handling facilities of a sand and gravel company that operates on that side of the river are involved.

Mr Fouras: Will they be compensated for shifting?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: No. The Bill does not provide for that. I want to bring that matter to the Premier's attention. Undoubtedly, it has been brought to his attention by other persons. This legislation should provide for that. If the property was being acquired for a road, a dam or something of that nature, it would be acquired for public use and public benefit. Of course, it would not be necessary to provide compensation in that case because the whole community would benefit.

When the exposition is over, a number of private entrepreneurs will benefit from the availability of the site. They will not be the original land-holders or proprietors of businesses in that area. It is an essential ingredient of this legislation that those matters be taken into account.

I shall outline some of the problems faced by the Moreton Tug & Barge Co. Pty Ltd, which has been located at its present site for well over 100 years.

Mr Davis: It is an eyesore.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: It may be an eyesore.

The company is anxious to move, but under proper conditions. It has acquired a site on the upstream side of the Grey Street Bridge for that purpose. To be forced out before it is ready to make that move will cost it several million dollars. The compensation that is due to the company for the land that it presently occupies will be insignificant.

Although the jobs of 450 persons employed in the nearby glassworks which is serviced by the company will not be in jeopardy, difficulties will be encountered by the glassworks because of increased costs as a result of this particular enterprise. The resumption of the site occupied by Moreton Tug & Barge will create special problems. All of its facilities must be shifted. Some new facilities must be built. That, of course, is not covered by the legislation.

There is an urgent need for not only co-operation between the Government and the owners of property in that area in which businesses are established but also understanding negotiation. As I understand the situation, the Land Acquisition Act does not provide for that sort of negotiation to take place. The valuation of the land and buildings on many of the sites in the Expo area is very small indeed. There is need for co-operation between the Government, the local authority, the Co-ordinator-General's Department and others to enable a smooth transfer to take place and for adequate compensation to be paid.

The operation requires re-establishment costs to be met. I understand that Watson Ferguson and Co. will need to spend many millions of dollars to shift its printing presses and other equipment to a new location. Several other establishments in the area are in a similar position.

It is essential for Moreton Tug & Barge to have a waterfront site. It is essential also for the company to be close to the glassworks, to which it provides silica. It is difficult for that to be done without great cost. In fact, the new site that has been acquired—this House passed special legislation to assist in the negotiations with the Brisbane City Council—requires the additional cost of an underpass to reach the glassworks.

All the people who are faced with such predicaments in the Expo site area should receive an assurance from the Government that their re-establishment problems will be taken into consideration. On all the advice I have received to this moment, it appears that, unfortunately, no provision is contained in the legislation for that to happen. It may be possible for the Government or the Governor in Council to make grace and favour payments. However, that could be dangerous because, if they were challenged, there would be no authority in the legislation for such negotiations to take place. I do counsel the Premier and his advisers to consider that very closely.

At the Committee stage, I propose to move an amendment to clause 24 to allow the matters I have mentioned to be taken into consideration. In all fairness to the proprietors of business in that area, that is the proper course to take. The benefits such as they are after the exhibition is over will not flow to those people. There will be enormous benefits to the new entrepreneurs—the new land-owners in the area—while existing owners will have made enormous sacrifices, which in several instances will lead to winding up and the closure of businesses that have been in existence in the area for many years—some of them for over 100 years.

Mr DAVIS (Brisbane Central) (8.18 p.m.): I differ from my leader in that I am not in favour of the South Brisbane site. After considering the Premier's statements and the publications that have been issued, I think it is a pretty poor site. In 1974 I represented that area. During the 1974 floods, a person would have had to wear a diving suit to get anywhere near that site. There was water eight or nine feet deep all the way through to West End. Wouldn't it be lovely, in Australia's bicentennial year, to see the Expo site under that depth of water?

The Leader of the Opposition referred to the traffic problems. In the Bill the Premier has not outlined much of the machinery for what will occur in the area. First, there will be the closure of roads. The main roads leading from the Victoria and William Jolly Bridges to the western and southern suburbs will probably be closed. That will create many problems for people going to western, southern and eastern suburbs.

I have not received satisfactory explanations from the Minister for Transport about whether or not the interstate railway station at South Brisbane is to be closed. My information from people in the Railway Department is that the cost of moving the

operation to Roma Street would be prohibitive. Current estimates are that the cost of shifting would be at least \$8m. I am sure that is merely pie in the sky and that, as time goes on, that area certainly will not be developed.

One clause of the Bill that has not yet been mentioned deals with compliance with international requirements. The Australian Labor Party Opposition, which represents trade unions, is very much concerned that industrial awards or agreements will not cover the employment of citizens of countries other than Australia represented by an official participant who have come to Australia specifically to be so employed. People who come from overseas to work on their own company's exhibit do not concern me; their employment will be fair enough. However, I am concerned that some Queensland or Australian exhibitors might use this provision to employ people without award coverage. I am sure that the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs will consider that aspect very closely.

I was amazed that the member for Nundah cried about the compensation to be given to some of his industrial friends from that area. Naturally, the Opposition supports adequate compensation. However, the member for Nundah was part of the Government that in the past provided very poor compensation to people who were dislodged by Government projects. Once again, I highlight the miserable and pitiful compensation that was given to people who were dislodged for the proposed northern freeway, which is now defunct. The hundreds of residents in my electorate who were virtually pushed out did not get anywhere near adequate compensation. I am sure all honourable members remember the protest meetings held in 1972, just after the State election.

If this project does go ahead, members on the Opposition benches want to see that the business houses and others who will be affected by Expo '88 will be compensated adequately.

I now cite another reason why the proposed site is not suitable for Expo '88. Over the years, the Brisbane City Council, in the face of a great deal of opposition, has been trying to develop a riverside drive. The rate-payers of Brisbane have contributed a great deal of money to the development of the south bank of the river. Any honourable member who has an office that overlooks the south bank of the river has a very beautiful view, except for the glaringly bad example of the sand and gravel works. Expo '88 will mean the end of any riverside drive. That will be a tragedy. It will be against the wishes of the Brisbane City Council, which has tried to construct a riverside drive from Hill End to Kangaroo Point. The Government could certainly have found a much better site for Expo '88.

I want the Premier to tell the House why Musgrave Park is included in the schedule to the Bill. The coloured brochure that all honourable members received did not include Musgrave Park. By way of interjection, I have been told that it will be for parking.

It is amazing how times have changed. Older members and members who were once aldermen on the Brisbane City Council will recall the great public outcry by members of the Liberal Party, the then Country Party and just about every other conservative body in this city when the Lord Mayor of Brisbane, Clem Jones, indicated that he might approve the fencing of Musgrave Park and its being handed over to the Queensland Rugby Union to be used as its main field. Protest meetings were held. One Liberal member after another rose in this House and cried foul. They objected to public land being fenced off. As I said, most older members will recall the hue and cry.

I would like the Premier and Treasurer to tell us why he wants Musgrave Park. It would be a shocking use of power if it were to be closed off and used purely and simply for parking.

An Opposition Member: It wouldn't have to be in the schedule.

Mr DAVIS: No, it would not. Is it because Aborigines are involved? I believe that the Premier, members of the National Party and other conservative interests think that there is a stigma attached to the presence of Aborigines in the area. If members refer to the schedule they will see that the area round Glenelg Street will not be affected, yet Musgrave Park, which adjoins the area, is to be taken over. Surely members of the Liberal Party, in particular, should be among the first to rise in this place and say, "We do not want any public land to be fenced. We do not want to use parkland purely and simply for parking." If that occurs, the park will be out of commission for up to six months, or even more.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: Is it out of commission now, by the way?

Mr DAVIS: It is not out of commission now.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: Of course it is.

Mr DAVIS: Perhaps the Premier would tell me why it is out of commission.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: Children cannot play there now, and you know that.

Mr DAVIS: I do not know that. The Premier says that children cannot play there. I represented that area from 1972 to 1974, and I was quite happy to walk through the park. I am still quite happy to do so. Perhaps the Premier is frightened to walk through the park, but I certainly am not.

I want the Premier to tell us why he wants Musgrave Park to be part of this scheme even though it is separate from the other areas to be taken over.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen interjected.

Mr DAVIS: No, the Premier has to tell us. We want to know.

In closing I want to say that I am opposed to the use of the South Brisbane site for Expo because I think it is the wrong area. I am not opposed to the Expo itself—

Mr Borbidge: You are just knocking it.

Mr DAVIS: I am not. I would not have minded if Expo had been held at Surfers Paradise. We know that the honourable member for Surfers Paradise does not worry about that area. All he does is profit from the sale of units in the area.

I believe that South Brisbane is a bad choice. It is a flood-prone area, and there will be a great deal of traffic congestion. I do not believe that the people in the area will be adequately compensated, particularly considering this Government's actions in the past.

Mr CAHILL (Aspley) (8.29 p.m.): Apart from all other considerations, this specialised exhibition to be staged on the south bank of the Brisbane River in 1988 will bring with it a great deal of leisure activity. That is to be applauded, because these days one hears a call for more and more leisure activities or a greater chance to enjoy the leisure-time that this age of technology has given us. We have an exciting time ahead of us in the years leading up to 1988 with the construction of the various buildings to house the national and corporate exhibitions. It is something we ought to look forward to.

Tonight we have heard the accusation about lack of compensation. This Government does not have a bad record in the field of compensating people when their land or whatever it is has to be taken from them for the good of the State. We have just heard words about the resumption of land for the northern freeway; but no-one quoted the compensation that was paid to the people whose farming land was taken from them for dams, because their compensation was more than adequate.

There have been very few, if any, complaints about this Government when land worked by people for some generations had to be taken from them for the good of the State. Naturally, we hear all about some other situation that does not suit the Opposition. The Opposition will not quote the cases of people who have been adequately compensated. We are assured by the Government that there will be adequate compensation for the people in the South Brisbane area.

Mr Wright: What do they do if they are not satisfied? What area of redress have they got under this Bill?

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: I will tell you about it tomorrow, if you wait.

Mr Wright: Let him tell me.

Mr CAHILL: I am glad of the private debate that has gone on.

This Government has never been backward when it has been approached along reasonable lines; when a reasonable approach for adequate compensation has been made. Some people will indeed lose their livelihood temporarily, their shops or their areas, but they will be resited and relocated. Even now, the groups are forming over in South Brisbane to make sure that the Government can be properly approached, and they are not frightened because they know that when they do approach the Government it will listen. The Government is well aware that the people who have their shops across the river are part of this State and will want to be part of it when Expo, as such, is all over.

The Government, for all the accusations made about it, is very rarely, if ever, foolish about the prosperity of this State, and the people on the south side, like the people all over the State, make up its prosperity. So the Government is hardly likely to pick out a couple of hundred acres and say, "We don't want to know about you any more." Of course the Government will not do that, and it is foolish to suggest that that could happen.

One of the good things about Expo that seems not to have had a great deal of mention is the employment that will be created, not just in 1988 but in a few months from now. We have had all sorts of problems with unemployment in Australia—we have them now—but hundreds and hundreds of people will get jobs. Why do not people, irrespective of their party affiliations, stop knocking this project and get on with it? If it has to be refined, if it has to have various angles taken off it and others added, let us do that; but let us stop saying that it is not a good idea. I am not suggesting that every member of the Opposition has said that, but there is carping criticism all the time. Instead of saying that, why do we not, as a State, make a point of getting on with the job?

The benefits accruing from Expo will be many and varied. I have mentioned the construction phase. I also mention the boost to employment and to the local economy, and related projects.

Mr Borbidge: Tourism.

Mr CAHILL: I thank the member for Surfers Paradise for his interjection. Tourism will get a tremendous boost from Expo '88. Then there will be the continued use of the facilities. We are not building Quonset huts that will be torn down in 1989; we are constructing some magnificent buildings.

Mr Fouras interjected.

Mr CAHILL: If the honourable member for South Brisbane had his destructive way, no doubt the buildings would be torn down. They will not be torn down because they will be magnificent structures. They will be an asset to the city, to the State and, because the Federal Government has now decided that Expo is a good idea to the nation.

Mr Fouras: Will you take an interjection?

Mr CAHILL: The member for South Brisbane asks me to take an interjection: I will be delighted to do so.

Mr Fouras: The only permanent buildings will be the State pavilion and the Commonwealth pavilion. The other buildings will be torn down after Expo. They will not be permanent structures. The only permanent structures are those that I mentioned. The honourable member should not be silly about it.

Mr CAHILL: I accepted the honourable member's question by way of interjection. I did not think I would get a three-act play. Some permanent buildings are to be built on the site and they will remain there when Expo is over.

Mr Fouras interjected.

Mr CAHILL: Everybody is out of step except the honourable member for South Brisbane.

There will be national days so that the proud heritage of the member for South Brisbane will be on display in his own electorate. He will be proud of what his nation has contributed to the multiculturalism of this nation.

As the honourable member for Nundah said, this site was not chosen overnight or by accident. It has taken a great deal of time to get the project to this point. I was interested to hear the honourable member for Brisbane Central say that the site was on a flood plain. Does he think that it should be built on Mt Coot-tha? If that is the only criticism of the project by the member for Brisbane Central, I presume that he is totally in favour of it.

Expo '88 will cost money but it will bring in a great deal more. The project has many obvious advantages. A major one is the pride that it will generate in Queensland. One or two members have commented about the pride that was exhibited by Queenslanders during the Commonwealth Games. During the Games Queensland went on the map of the world. Even more countries will be interested in an international Exposition such as this one

because the Commonwealth Games were restricted to Commonwealth nations. In 1988, nations not part of the Commonwealth will come to Brisbane and display their exhibits and national pride.

Expo will run from April to October. Comments have been made about how many people will pass which door on which specific day. Nobody will stand at the front door with a computer and say, "Well, he said 500 000. It is 499 000, so he is out by a thousand." To my knowledge, no well organised Exposition, properly sited in good buildings as this one will be, has failed. There is no reason to suggest that Queensland's Expo will fail. The only possible way it can fail is if Queensland is not encouraged to get behind it. There were several knockers when, in the early 1970s, it was decided to hold the Commonwealth Games in Brisbane.

Mr Fouras: There were a few on that side of the Chamber, too.

Mr CAHILL: The honourable member for South Brisbane picked the wrong person upon whom to interject when he said that there were a few knockers on this side of the Chamber. I was on one of the original committees that got the Games for Brisbane and defied half the city fathers, who claimed that we would not make a success of them. So let the honourable member tell somebody else.

Mr Fouras: Clem Jones got the Games for Brisbane, and you know it.

Mr CAHILL: Clem Jones gets full credit for heading a committee that had the vision to want the Games for Brisbane. He was followed by several other successful people, including Frank Sleeman, who was Lord Mayor and deserves a great deal of credit. There were knockers from everywhere, including the ALP and, no doubt, this side of the Chamber.

The point I make, however, is that when the Commonwealth Games were held and when Brisbane went on display to the world, by George everybody thought it was a great idea! And that is what will happen in 1988. All the knockers will suddenly disappear. Queensland will go on the map again. Queensland will show itself as the greatest State in the greatest nation. Queensland can do it, and Queensland will do it, provided we all decide that we want to do it instead of carping and knocking. If the concept has some faults—perhaps it has—let us put our ideas together to try to overcome them.

Mr McLean: What about Medicare? Can we do the same with that?

Mr CAHILL: I really would like to hear the honourable member. I am sure that all sorts of care will be provided for people at Expo '88, because one of the reasons that we on this side of the Chamber want Expo '88 is that by Expo we will be able to show that this Government does indeed care for Queensland.

Mr SHAW (Wynnum) (8.43 p.m.): I am very pleased to follow the member who has just resumed his seat, because he hit on one of the aspects that are to be feared in the present proposal. He said quite correctly that when the proposal to hold the Commonwealth Games was put forward there were quite a number of knockers. He seems to have conveniently forgotten that one of the most outspoken and vehement knockers was the Premier. Certainly he had a good deal of company at that time, because the majority of people adopted a questioning attitude. They asked, "Can we do it? Can we make a success of it?"

On this occasion, the situation is the reverse. Because a great number of knockers of the Commonwealth Games finished up with egg on their face, today it is not fashionable to question the proposal to hold Expo in Brisbane. Anyone who asks questions today is looked upon as a knocker.

Tonight I submit that the whole proposal needs not knockers but some constructive criticism. Queensland is not in the same position as it was when it applied for the Commonwealth Games. I will expand on that aspect later.

Questions are not being asked because people are frightened of being branded as knockers or as not promoting Queensland. That is not the attitude adopted by the Opposition.

I believe that the proposal to hold Expo in Brisbane is a worthwhile one. It can do a great deal for Queensland. It can put Queensland on the map and it can do so in a very positive way. However, if the exercise is not carried out properly, it could put Queensland on the map as a joke.

Many of the questions that need to be answered are not even being asked. Government members have said that all of us should get behind the proposal and support it whole-heartedly. I am sure that all of us would do that quite enthusiastically. However, before we can do that we must have the information. Speaking personally, I have not been given answers to the questions that I asked; they simply are not available. As I said, we need to have people asking questions and we need to have constructive criticism of the proposal.

It is not correct to say that there has never been an unsuccessful Expo. It depends upon how one regards the term "successful". It is certainly true to say that many Expos have lost a great deal of money. It is also true to say that following a large number of Expositions, all of the facilities that were hailed at that time as being of great benefit to the city in which the Exposition was held were found to be worthless and subsequently removed and replaced with other forms of development. If the project is not approached in the right manner, many mistakes can be made. The recipe for success and the proper way to go about preparing for the Expo is to begin planning at an early stage.

Many persons have compared the proposed Expo with the conduct of the Commonwealth Games. In a little over four years' time the Expo will be held. We have been told that it is a much larger proposal than the Commonwealth Games. I would agree with that. Let me remind honourable members of the situation in which Queensland was placed four years before the Commonwealth Games were held. The plans were not in the conceptual stage, as they are with Expo '88. Four years before the commencement of the Commonwealth Games half of the buildings were built. That is very important, because many problems can be encountered with contractors being held to ransom on building construction and with shortage of supplies. There is a whole host of problems, including the shortage of manpower. Those problems are encountered with an early deadline. It would appear that we are heading towards that position in the present instance. Four years before the Commonwealth Games were held all the necessary land had been acquired. At that stage there was no talk about resuming land and obtaining special powers.

While I am referring to the Government's wonderful record relative to compensation, I point out that further restrictions on the compensation that can be paid are being introduced. The public is entitled to ask why that is being done. The Queensland Government is not nearly in the fortuitous position that it was in four years before the Commonwealth Games. Expo '88 is a much larger exercise. The planning is not as far advanced as it was with the Commonwealth Games.

The Government seems to be going forward with a few concepts in mind, saying, "Perhaps we could do this. This would look nice if we could do that." There is a great deal of confidence that it will be all right on the day and that it will turn out well in the end. I hope that it will, and I think that it will. However, it will not be successful unless some hard planning and homework is done instead of simply adopting an air of great confidence. There is no time to spare in getting the Exposition prepared.

Within the Government's staff there are many officers who realise that. They do not share the optimism expressed by some politicians. They say that a great deal of work must be done. One can detect an air of panic in some of those persons. There is a very short time schedule in which to achieve all the things that need to be done.

The promotion of Brisbane and Expo '88 must be carried out properly in overseas countries. That should be carried out now. It should be borne in mind that the people who will come to Expo '88 will come from overseas. They will make the decision to come here approximately two years before they arrive. In two years' time they will be making a decision whether to come or not. The Government has only two years in which to decide how to promote the Expo in the critical period leading up to the two-year deadline to which I have referred. Time is of the essence if we are to attract people to Brisbane. Many statements that have been made do not give us any cause for confidence that those things are being done. It is fair to say that many of the matters referred to by the Premier in his speech raise a great number of questions. They do not provide the answers that are needed; in fact, they increase our concern. I will deal with a couple of them.

The first—it is probably of least importance and creates interest rather than concern—is the statement that Sir Llewellyn Edwards will be the first chairman of the authority. It does not indicate who will be the second chairman, but it raises the question of where Sir Llewellyn Edwards will be when Expo '88 is held. Obviously, it is expected that he will not be the chairman when it is finished.

What causes me a great deal of concern is that the authority will have, to use the terms of the Bill, the full shield of the Crown. Translating that into layman's language, it means that it is virtually above the law and will not be subject to the normal requirements of the Building Acts, the Health Acts and all the other provisions that control developers and entrepreneurs generally. They will be able to do virtually as they please. There is not much protection for the land-holders. In particular, I am concerned about people who will not be selling land and will not have their land acquired by the authority but who will make an arrangement under which they will retain their own land and proceed with a development that will be used for the Exposition and revert to them after it. Development that takes place during the next four years will not be subject to town-planning laws, building laws and all the other developmental requirements. Therefore, there will be wide opportunity for bad developments, and for future problems. In particular, a provision specifically spells out that the area is not subject to the town plan. The Government assures members that the authority will work in co-operation with the Brisbane City Council. However, it spells it out very clearly that the authority has the right to impose its will on any local authority, the Brisbane City Council included. In short, the authority will have tremendous powers.

Anyone dealing with the authority will have to rely on the sense of fair play of the people involved. That might be all very well under normal circumstances. However, look at the very purpose for which the authority exists. It exists to take over land in the area and to resell it at a profit. The authority is a Government speculator. It will make a profit from manipulating zoning laws, manipulating the normal local government laws and, I suppose it would be fair to say, by short-sheeting the present owners. It cannot make its profit in any other way.

The Government says that the present owners will receive fair compensation. However, there is a specific provision that they do not have the opportunity to buy back, as usually applies in resumption, because it is expected that, by rezoning and upgrading the land, profits will be made out of which the whole Exposition will be funded. It follows that those land-owners will be making a disproportionate contribution towards the success of Expo '88. There will be no opportunity for them to make profits, whether windfall or not. The opportunities that are available to every other land-owner in Queensland will not be available to those people.

The authority is a developer. In fact, it is more than a developer; it is a speculator. It will have the power and the protection of the Crown. Therefore, this whole exercise is speculation by legislation. The Government is not setting out to make a profit by the usual means. Everything contained in the Bill ought to be viewed in the light of profiting by speculation.

Any developer who has investigated the opportunities that exist in this must be rubbing his hands in glee. In fact, it is a developer's and land-dealer's picnic. I am sure real estate agents will be very impressed.

Government members keep saying that fair compensation will be paid. However, they cannot get away from the fact that in this case compensation is restricted to a lower than normal level. That has been done purely with the aim of assisting the authority to make a profit on its land dealings.

I now wish to raise an issue that I hope a member of the Government will answer, but, I am sure that none of them will. Some years ago, in the late hours of the day, Parliament rushed through an amendment to, I think, the City of Brisbane Town Planning Act, to provide for extra compensation of \$2m to the Moreton Tug & Barge Co. Pty Ltd by the rate-payers of this city. I remember the member for Sherwood defending the legislation.

Mr Innes: It was to give the company the basis for compensation.

Mr SHAW: It provided the company with \$2m more than it was entitled to under the usual terms of resumption.

I now raise the question of whether that company will still get the extra \$2m. Will it be treated differently from all the other land-holders who will be affected by the plan or, because compensation will no longer be paid by the rate-payers of the city but by the authority, will that company have the same conditions applied to it as apply to all other land-holders? That is a very interesting question.

Sir William Knox: The company will not be compensated twice.

Mr Innes: They will be compensated on the same basis.

Mr SHAW: I now have two answers from the Liberal Party, but the interesting answer will come from the Government.

The land owned by that company comes under the ambit of the Bill and is therefore subject to restricted conditions of resumption. That company was previously given very preferential treatment. Will that company be treated the same as the other land-holders or will it receive special consideration?

I am concerned at the use of the public land—the parks—in the area because over many years the south bank of the river has been improved at the rate-payers' expense. As the member for Nudgee said, it is a very beautiful area and a great asset to the city. The fear has been expressed that as a result of this development buildings will be erected on that parkland. I do not believe that is true. Not even the hungriest of developers or the hungriest of Government members would allow that to happen. However, what is certainly true is that that beautiful asset paid for out of the public purse will be used to upgrade riverfront properties. Developers who buy properties on the riverfront will not be asked to contribute to the cost of that parkland but they will have its benefit when providing first-class residential developments. That is another example of the fact, as the Leader of the Opposition said, that it is not true to say that public money will not be used in the development. Public money will go into the development in ways that are not clearly visible. That will be of great benefit later on if the parkland is developed. The questions raised by the member for Brisbane Central about what is to happen to Musgrave Park have not been answered.

I will now deal with the estimate of the income to be derived from overseas visitors. Promotion has not yet begun, whereas at a similar point in the staging of the Commonwealth Games, promotion and selling overseas had begun. The estimates seem to me to be very optimistic. The Premier said that he anticipates there will be 500 000 visitors. Even that seems to be an optimistic figure—

Mr Fouras interjected.

Mr SHAW: The Premier referred to 500 000 visitors.

Mr Fouras: There is a sharp drop between what the former Treasurer (Sir Llewellyn Edwards) said and what the Premier said.

Mr SHAW: The estimates seem to be based on the figure of 2 million and not on the 500 000 which is now being used. The Premier also referred to each visitor spending a minimum of \$800 at the Expo or, at least, in Queensland. It is not unreasonable to expect a person visiting a country to spend \$1,000 overall, but it is highly unlikely and very optimistic to think that people will spend \$800 a head in Brisbane.

No estimate has been given of the profits expected to be made on admission charges paid by overseas visitors. The fees paid by local people should be regarded as a contribution by Queenslanders, even though it has not been raised through taxation.

I will not go over the points raised by the member for Brisbane Central relative to the Opposition's concern about not paying award wages to overseas people employed at Expo, but I see that as a very negative aspect of planning for Expo. One thing that would attract people, particularly Americans who have been brought up on the system of tipping, would be to enforce the payment of award wages as a right for doing a job properly, particularly for people employed in the hospitality industry, and to ban tipping. If the Government introduced legislation making tipping illegal it would do more than anything else to put this place on the tourist map. I invite Government members who have any doubts on that assertion to question any American tourists they meet about what they think of tipping and what it leads to. The system the Government is seeking to promote leads to bad service. If people are not paid the wages due to them, they will not provide service. For instance, clean towels will not be provided in hotel rooms to force guests to ring up and say that the towels have been forgotten. The towels will then have to be delivered and a tip will be collected. In Australia, tipping discourages tourists because they do not know the value of the currency and do not know what is a fair thing. How would they know what to tip a porter? It is a bad system. If the Government wants to be positive in encouraging visitors and ensuring the success of Expo, it should include a clause guaranteeing the payment of award wages.

I wish to take up the point about the planning for transport to and from Expo, which was raised by my leader. I have heard little about that matter. Certainly a great deal of planning has to be done. I think I heard somebody suggest that it would be timely to reintroduce electric trams, at least on a limited basis. Certainly that is something that I would support.

It must be remembered in all of the planning for Expo that there will be no automatic residual benefit. Government members continue to compare Expo with the Commonwealth Games. Sure, the Games cost \$90m, but after they were over we were left with facilities that are worth more and more each year. We have a world-class swimming-pool and velodrome. That argument does not apply to Expo. We will be left with no residual facilities.

Mr Fouras: We are getting a convention centre.

Mr SHAW: Perhaps we are; but there are several plans for convention centres throughout the State. I have heard that argument advanced in many other cities. Montreal is a case in point. It was said that the people would have a wonderful convention centre. It was pulled down and the historic buildings that had been pulled down were rebuilt. The point that I am trying to make is that it is not sufficient to say that we will have a convention centre.

Mr Fouras: If I thought that the Government would do the same in South Brisbane, I would fully support the use of the site. I know what it will do. It will be a speculators' paradise.

Mr SHAW: That is what we fear will happen.

We will not necessarily be able to say, "Because we have Expo we will have a great benefit." I, like most members on the Opposition side, support Expo and want to get behind the great project, but many questions have to be answered.

Mr Borbidge: You want it, but you don't want it.

Mr SHAW: No. The Opposition wants Expo. It is unfair for the Premier and Treasurer to say, "Get behind it, support us, and it will be all right. We will tell you what is going to happen later on." All we are saying is, "You tell us what is happening and we will get behind you."

Mr BAILEY (Toowong) (9.8 p.m.): It seems that one of the problems we have with this debate is the negativity of the Opposition towards the whole Expo scheme. That is rather surprising in many ways when it is probably one of the most exciting schemes that has been proposed in this State and in this country for many years.

Mr Hooper: Almost as good as "Bailey at Three"

Mr BAILEY: Probably better, actually, even though the member for Archerfield was one of its avid viewers. That is how he got his red face.

The surprising thing is that many Opposition members who were, I am sure, supporters of the Commonwealth Games are becoming negative about a project that is far more exciting.

Mr Hooper: If you were to take on a job as compere, that would not be an office of profit under the Crown?

Mr BAILEY: Compere of what?

Mr Hooper: Of Expo.

Mr BAILEY: I haven't heard that yet.

Mr Hooper: The Premier is bandying it round the lobbies.

Mr BAILEY: I am delighted to hear that.

I can understand why the member for South Brisbane has some concern; his constituents are involved in the compensatory area. If he looks at what has happened since the South Brisbane area has been improved, I am sure that even he would agree that it looks a lot better and is utilised in a much better fashion. As long as there is adequate compensation—and the honourable member understands that it will be

fair—surely the pulling down of some of those buildings will be an improvement. Yet we have all these negative vibes from the Opposition. I know that Oppositions are meant to oppose, but they are not meant to be totally negative.

A French restaurateur, who has a restaurant in Mooloolaba, symbolises the excitement of people from overseas about a function like Expo. That man wants to know whether it is possible to get a site not necessarily in Expo but near Expo because of the amount of money that will be generated in Queensland and Brisbane when Expo starts.

I am sure that the member for South Brisbane agrees that that part of South Brisbane needs redevelopment. I am excluding Musgrave Park, which is a sensitive issue.

Mr Fouras: It is happening anyway.

Mr BAILEY: But it will happen a lot faster and in a much better way, which is what we are talking about. Why knock something that will be an improvement?

The chosen area is superb. Possibly it is one of the best areas in the suburb, yet people are trying to negate the development of an attractive environment which will bring people to Queensland. The Government has been trying to improve the area for years, and now that it is about to do it, the scheme is being knocked. The Labor City Council, I am sure, is backing it, but the Opposition cannot find anything complimentary to say about it. The project will ensure ideal usage of an unused site with ugly, low-rise buildings. The development of the site has been condemned because some of the proposed buildings eventually will be pulled down. Only the better buildings will be retained. Because some of the older hotels and more attractive buildings, which are few and far between, are to be retained and used as function centres, the history of the area will not be lost.

This scheme has been seriously thought out and that approach will continue. The project will enhance the south side of the river in particular and the whole of Brisbane in general. The issues of resumption and compensation have been carefully worked out. Despite what the press has said and what members of the Opposition have implied, I am sure that compensation will be fair and more than adequate. I hope that none of the people with businesses in the area and those who reside in South Brisbane will be worried about the furphy that they will not be treated fairly. The Government has a good record for being fair and impartial in regard to compensation matters.

It has been said that some things work out all right on the day. Somebody made the same comment about the Commonwealth Games. That was certainly true because it was a magnificent achievement. One of the problems with the Games was that it was supported mainly by Queenslanders and some Australians but was not supported on a large scale internationally. Expo '88 will attract an enormous number of overseas visitors who will spend a great deal of money here. It will be more exciting for them than the Commonwealth Games. Overseas businessmen will be here trying to sell products, concepts and tourism. The Queensland Government has the same attitude, so the project will work. It is not the same sort of exercise as the Commonwealth Games, which were not supported as strongly as I would have hoped by other Commonwealth nations and Australians generally. Expo '88 will attract international attention.

The Premier said that 500 000 overseas and interstate visitors will inject almost \$400m into an economy. No-one should be negative about that. The concept should be encouraged, and Queenslanders should be excited about it. They should be encouraged to become involved with Expo so that investment comes as much from Queenslanders as from interstate and overseas visitors. Queenslanders are probably influenced by the negative stance of the Opposition members who are saying that Expo may not happen, that it may not work and that it may not be worth while getting involved with. It saddens me that members of the Opposition cannot see the positive side of a project on this scale.

Sir Llewellyn Edwards has been mentioned. He is probably one of the best men for the job. Whether he remains in the job or not is highly speculative, but I assume that he will carry the job through to its conclusion.

Montreal held a world Expo on a much larger scale. This one is a specific Exposition aimed at the tourist industry. Tourism is an industry that is very well understood in Queensland even though in the last few days some criticism has been levelled at the expansion of the style of industry in this State. Tourism is enormously important to Queensland and to its future.

This Government, by having the guts to undertake the staging of Expo, will do a tremendous amount for Queensland in a way that probably is not appreciated now. However, in 1988, Australia's bicentennial year, when Australians will be even more proud of Australia than they are at present, it will be seen that the Queensland National Party Government is an exciting form of government. It will be seen that, in spite of the negativity from members of the Opposition, this Government had the guts to put forward something such as Expo. It is a shame that members of the Opposition, instead of encouraging the Government to go ahead with something that will benefit the State and the country, have adopted a negative attitude.

Mr FOURAS (South Brisbane) (9.16 p.m.): The honourable member who has just resumed his seat claimed that members of the Opposition, by offering constructive criticism, were knocking. It is sad that apparently he does not allow people to express their concern or their misgivings.

On a number of occasions I have spoken in this Chamber about Expo. My concern has centred on the siting of Expo. I believe that the site that has been chosen is not the correct one. However, as I support Expo, all I can do is try to ensure that adequate compensation is paid and that the site is redeveloped in the best interests of my constituents.

It is interesting to note that the process involved in the selection of the site began in 1978, when the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce sought and obtained the Government's support and approval for a feasibility study. Because the Chamber of Commerce was given no indication that the Government would commit itself to the project, the study did not take place. So, obviously, in 1978 the Government adopted a somewhat negative attitude to Expo.

The concept was raised again in 1981, when Cameron, McNamara Pty Ltd, a firm of consultants, was commissioned to undertake a detailed study. That firm looked at sites at Kuraby and Beenleigh as well as at South Brisbane. It decided on South Brisbane. It was asked whether any one of those sites could be used to provide an Exposition at a cost of under \$200m.

The study concluded that facilities at Kuraby and Beenleigh would allow that to be done and that the site at South Brisbane would cost \$255m. So the two other sites would have been cheaper than that at South Brisbane.

In 1982 there was a change of heart. It appears that certain people made representations to the Government, following which the suitability of the South Brisbane site was enhanced.

The honourable member for Wynnum referred to the speculative part of the equation and the rationale behind the concept. The choice of South Brisbane represents nothing more than an attempt to bring the city across the river and to allow large speculative gains to be made. South Brisbane is not the most suitable site. Serious traffic problems will be created.

However, as I said before, I do not intend to argue about the site. It is fait accompli. I want to be constructive and positive in examining some of the issues that will affect people. As the member representing the electorate in which Expo will be held, I have a responsibility to examine those issues.

I want to quote from a letter that I received. It expresses concern in regard to the compensation that may be received. It states—

"I am writing to you to put my particular case of having to give up my business in the Expo area and my hardships and inconvenience caused by this. I am concerned with regard to compensation benefits available to me as a small businessman leasing a workshop and employing ten persons (mechanics and office staff).

It appears that current legislation is inadequate for the area affected and myself and others in the Expo site would like to be reassured that not only large businesses and property owners are fairly compensated but small business owners are also given fair consideration.

This business has been in South Brisbane servicing and repairing motor vehicles for 43 years and most of our customers are local or city people or business concerns and to have to relocate to another area would spell disaster as we could not expect our clientele to follow us to a location further afield which would make it difficult to travel to their place of employment or business.

To endeavour to obtain premises in close proximity to our existing shop, not only finding another building suitable, but in similar rent proportions is not possible as I have done this exercise and was shocked by the results. When one thinks about relocating costs it is quite frightening as things like stationery, signs, advertising, telephones, electricity etc., plus moving of hoists, machinery etc., business loss during such a move would cost quite a considerable amount of money.

Trusting that when legislation is drawn up that my concern will not be necessary and small businesses like mine and others will be adequately compensated."

I can state clearly and without equivocation that the Bill does not provide for such compensation. The Bill contains very restrictive resumption conditions. In fact, the costs to which I have referred would not be allowed. In terms of equity, the Government ought to be looking not at equal compensation per square metre of land but at equal opportunity in business. It should be looking not only at land values but also at relocation and re-establishment costs, the loss of livelihood of workers and owners, the loss of business opportunity, the destruction of businesses and business in rental premises. All those people will pay a price. I do not believe that that is morally supportable. Even without compensation of some type being available to, for example, people who are leasing and whose costs will not be met, the equation for a self-funding Expo is that compensation of \$73.2m, in 1983 dollar terms, will be made for the buildings and the land and that the land, but not the buildings, will be sold for \$115.2m, in 1983 dollar terms. That will mean that a profit of \$42m will be made. I question the morality of having inadequate compensation provisions in a Bill when a profit will be made on the resale of the land.

As the member for Wynnum said, a speculator's paradise will be created. In his second-reading speech, the Premier stated—

"The authority is empowered to dispose of lands acquired within the site for the purpose of the Exposition. To enable enhancement to be achieved, it is proposed that the authority should not be required to be bound by the provisions of section 41 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1967-1977, which requires that, if land so acquired is disposed of within seven years from the date of acquisition, it shall first be offered back to the previous owner at current market value."

Why would such a provision be inserted in the legislation when the Government will take away—

Sir William Knox: In the case of Moreton Tug & Barge, after the Exposition the land will not be available at all; it will be parkland.

Mr FOURAS: That is a different argument. I am concerned that, because the amount received from the sale of the land will need to be maximised, there could be some degree of alienation of what is now parkland. The temptation could be very great for buildings to be constructed much closer than they are presently constructed. It is highly likely that that will happen. I must admit that I was very impressed by the speech made by the leader of the Liberal Party when he brought that issue to the fore. He stated the situation objectively. He understood the Bill. Contrary to what the member for Toowong and the member for Aspley said about fairness and the Government's sense of equity, it can be seen quite bluntly and clearly that the Bill does not provide for such compensation.

The Bill imposes much more restrictive resumption provisions. However, I have laboured that point sufficiently. I do not know what those people will do. They will be the losers. As kids, we said that the winners can laugh and the losers can darned well please themselves. I suppose that is all that those people will have to do. When the penny drops, they will be very offended by this so-called free enterprise Government benefiting at their cost.

I am concerned about what will happen to the site after Expo is finished. That is an issue very dear to my heart. I have spoken to town-planners and architects. I was impressed by the statement of the member for Wynnum about what happened in Montreal. After the monstrosities had been used for Expo, an attempt was made to re-establish the old area.

The rationale for holding the Expo at South Brisbane is that the area is run down and in need of redevelopment. Better development would have resulted had it been allowed to happen slowly rather than in the mad, helter-skelter way that will occur under this

proposal. People realise, because of its proximity to the city, how valuable the area is. We should have had a much more desirable development—a development subject to city council guide-lines.

Under the Bill the Crown is given total authority to do as it pleases. It has total power to redevelop the site. I am concerned because it is highly likely that what I saw on television one evening will come to pass. Large high-rise buildings—office blocks and apartments—will be facing the people of Brisbane as they look across the river. It will not be a handsome sight at all. In fact, the history of large-scale redevelopment is that it has been an absolute, dismal failure.

The Government ought not to misrepresent and misconstrue the views of the Opposition. We support Expo, but we are asking that there be fair and adequate compensation. We are saying quite clearly that we are concerned about the type of redevelopment that will take place. The concept of allowing 40 ha to be redeveloped by a group of developers must be a developer's paradise.

I turn to another point that I have been stressing over and over again—the statement by the Government that Expo will be self-financing. We were told by the former Treasurer that it would be self-financing on the basis of funds received from admission fees, rentals and the sale of assets. I will deal with those three factors and the assumptions that will have to be made for the premise to be sound. As pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, the statement about its being self-financing does not include the cost that Queensland will incur for its pavilion. Let me hasten to add that the Opposition is not concerned that Expo may cost money. The Opposition appreciates the benefits of job creation and tourism. However, I am concerned to dispel the myth that Expo will be self-financing. There is a difference between the former Treasurer's statement and what has been said by the Premier. In referring to the assumptions on which the self-financing statement is made, I quote from the Premier's report—

“In accepting the findings of the consultants, it was recognised that a number of assumptions used in the assessment would be critical to the actual outcome of the project. The principal of these are—

(a) Attendances—on which the failure or success of the Expo must depend.”

Some months ago we were told that there would be 2 million visitors from overseas and interstate. The Premier is now telling us that there will be only 500 000. Honourable members have been told that 7.2 million people will have to visit the Expo before the financial break-even point is reached. If only 500 000 overseas and interstate visitors are estimated to visit it, 6.7 million Queenslanders will have to visit the Expo. That means that Queenslanders will have to go three times.

I estimate that the entrance cost will be at least \$10 per head in today's terms. What family can afford to visit the Expo three times at that price? Surely not more than 40 000 people a day will visit the Expo. The opening of the Commonwealth Games attracted only 65 000 people. The Government should not try to con the people of Queensland. People should be told that they will get what they pay for. The Government should not be so glib. It should not promote that free-lunch mentality, which is something like a cargo cult. The Government is being false and hypocritical. It should put the whole proposal into perspective.

Mr Borbidge: You are knocking it.

Mr FOURAS: I am not knocking it. I am simply saying that it is highly unlikely that every man and woman in the State of Queensland will pay the price to visit the Expo at least three times. That argument should be demolished.

Another factor that should be investigated is that the figures have been related to inflation and interest costs. Since the report was compiled, inflation has fallen at a much faster rate than interest rates. That will militate against the assumptions made in the document prepared by the former Treasurer. The issue is not really whether the Expo can be run on a break-even financial basis. The people should be told that it will cost money because they will be the recipients of the benefits in construction and the provision of jobs.

Mr Borbidge: There will be overseas visitors, too.

Mr FOURAS: Yes, the Premier has said that there will be 500 000 visitors from interstate and overseas. That is not the 2 million that was mentioned a few months ago. In fact, it is only 25 per cent. However, those visitors will spend money. On my rough

calculations, taking into account that \$17m will be spent on the interstate pavilion and that it is highly unlikely that more than 4 million visitors will visit the Expo, the staging of the Expo will cost approximately \$57m. The Government should be cognisant of that fact and not try to con the people.

I now turn to another of my concerns, which is the problem of traffic. It is of great interest to my constituents. It is all very well for members who live on the Gold Coast, at Maryborough, at Mt Isa or anywhere else to be very glib about the Expo being held in the electorate of another honourable member. If approximately 45 000 people per day visit the Expo, I cannot comprehend the traffic problems that will be created in this city, whose streets are set out in a radial fashion. The problems will be absolutely horrendous. My information is that after the Government chose the site it engaged consultants to investigate how the people could be transported into and out of the site. The original report was that the traffic problems were insurmountable and that there would be extreme difficulty in solving the problems. There has been some talk of running bus lines on the other side of the present train lines. At present, on a wet day, when there is a bit of congestion in the city, it takes a long time to travel across the river and through that part of South Brisbane. When a large number of people from the north side of Brisbane are trying to get into that area, the problems will be very serious.

I support the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition about the extensive use of the river. In many ways it would be fun for people to travel to the site via the river. Many Brisbane people have never been on the river. It would be very much a fun thing for them.

Although I am concerned about the traffic problems, overall, I have to be a realist, and I am. I accept that Expo is a fact of life. I accept the benefits, but—

A Government Member: Take two bob each way.

Mr FOURAS: No. I am concerned that people will not be adequately compensated, which is very sad. There is a prospect of mad development, of a speculation nightmare. I hope that I am proven wrong in my belief that the site will be ugly. I also believe that the people ought to be told that, on my calculations, Expo will cost them some \$57m.

Hon. W. D. LICKISS (Mt Coot-tha) (9.36 p.m.): I think we are all in favour of Expo '88—at least I am. This is very interesting legislation because it deals with a means of acquisition, management, planning, development and, ultimately, the final disposal of land, possibly most of it by private treaty. So it is not an acquisition for public purposes in the true sense of the term. We have before us a commercial proposition. It has been recognised as a public purpose by virtue of this legislation and that enables the use of the Acquisition of Land Act.

The honourable member for Nundah mentioned the provision of compensation extending normally beyond the heads of compensation as provided by the Acquisition of Land Act. Those heads have been well and truly established over the years by court decision and by practice. I invite the honourable member for Aspley to note that the matter of an extra quantum of compensation for the purpose of re-establishment will not be found in the provisions of the Acquisition of Land Act. So what we are really setting out to do tonight is to ensure that those people who have no control over their destiny be given some further consideration. Those people who have to re-establish do not want to do so. Some businesses have been operating in the area for decades, for 120 years, but because the Government wants to mount Expo '88—I believe it is a worthy cause—they have to up anchor and go. Every consideration should be given to them to enable them to re-establish. When the Government is dealing with these matters it could do so on the before and after principle. These people should be reinstated as they are now so that they do not suffer any monetary loss.

This is clearly not a development of land but a redevelopment of land that has been in commercial use since the inception of Brisbane. It is very valuable because of its close proximity to the city heart. In fact, the Government is demonstrating the value of the land by the edifices that it is erecting in the area for public purposes. We are looking at a situation different from that which we would be looking at for a normal acquisition for a public purpose.

I support what Sir William Knox said tonight in relation to that special consideration, or the extra head of compensation, but I want to take the matter a little further.

The proposed redevelopment of the area for the purposes of Expo '88 will not only have a profound effect on adjacent areas; the effect could spread well away from the Expo site. That will pose a problem for those businesses that wish to re-establish in reasonable proximity to where they have been providing a public service for many years. It will involve special consideration being given to certain aspects of the City of Brisbane Town Planning Act. It might be that some of those businesses will have to be allowed to re-establish in reasonable proximity to where they have been providing services for the people of the area. If it can be shown that by doing that no great detriment is done to the town planning principles, every consideration ought to be given to expediting town planning amendments to enable them to so relocate. The time consumed by bureaucracy in allowing such businesses to re-establish should be reduced to an absolute minimum. I hope that the Government will look at that aspect.

In moving towards the establishment of legislation for Expo '88, and bearing in mind the tremendous benefits that will ultimately accrue and the optimum use to which the land will be put at the conclusion of Expo '88, we should be thinking now of those people who will make the necessary sacrifices by losing control of their businesses, some at a time of life when they would not otherwise wish to relocate. Special consideration should be given to them.

Debate, on motion of Mr Wharton, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—
“That the House do now adjourn.”

Progress in Queensland

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (9.42 p.m.): It has been stated on many occasions that Queensland is not keeping up with the other States, and that in some areas it is actually falling behind. People who make those statements do not take any notice of the progress that is being made in so many areas in Queensland. I refer, firstly, to the movement of people to Queensland from interstate. Perhaps they could be called migrants, but no honourable member likes to use that word when referring to them.

Mr Yewdale: They will have to pay for their medical treatment.

Mr STEPHAN: That is another matter. Considering the treatment that is being meted out to Queensland by the Hawke Government, I do not think that Opposition members should talk about medical treatment. Queensland should be recompensed for the Medicare levy that Queenslanders will have to pay.

Closely associated with the growth in the population of Queensland is the increase in the number of new vehicles being purchased by Queenslanders. On a number of occasions I have referred to the safety aspects of motor vehicles and to the driver-training centre in Gympie. People should be made aware of the skill that is required in handling motor vehicles.

It is interesting to note that in the past 12 months far more new vehicles were bought by Queenslanders than by people in other States. In Queensland, 120 151 new vehicles were registered from a population of two and a half million. As a figure per thousand people, that is 50 vehicles. In New South Wales, 214 000 new vehicles were registered in the same period from a population of 5.3 million. That is 40 vehicles per thousand people, which is ten vehicles fewer than the Queensland figure. In Victoria, there were 147 000 new vehicle registrations from nearly 4 million people, which is 37 vehicles per thousand. In South Australia, 38 new vehicles were registered per thousand people, and in Western Australia, 42 new vehicles were registered per thousand people. The comparative per capita figures are: Queensland 1 in 20; New South Wales 1 in 25; Victoria 1 in 27; South Australia 1 in 26; and Western Australia 1 in 24.

Those figures can be dissected further into an age-group figure. Most people buy or drive cars in the 17 to 70 years age group. The number of new vehicles per thousand people is 76 in Queensland, 60 in New South Wales, 56 in Victoria, 57 in South Australia and 65 in Western Australia. The per capita figure for Queensland is 1 in 13, in New South Wales it is 1 in 17, in Victoria it is 1 in 18, in South Australia it is approximately the same as Victoria's and in Western Australia it is 1 in 15. The Western Australian figure of 1 in 15 is the closest to the Queensland figure of 1 in 13.

The figures indicate that Queensland leads the nation in new vehicle registrations. If Queenslanders are willing and able to purchase new vehicles, it is an indication of the confidence that they have in their community, their jobs and the State's financial position. There is a serious doubt about the viability of the economic structure of the rest of Australia.

(Time expired.)

Queensland Prison System; Banning of Opposition Members from Brisbane Prison Complex

Mr HOOPER (Archerfield) (9.47 p.m.): The Queensland prison system is crumbling down round the Government's ears. Twenty-seven years of ministerial neglect have resulted in the public service bureaucracy running Queensland prisons as it sees fit under an archaic Prisons Act that has not been revised since 1958. There is no one within the Prisons Department with the expertise and knowledge to draft a new Act. In the running of his portfolio, the Minister for Welfare Services and Ethnic Affairs leaves a lot to be desired. He is merely a clone of the Premier. He gets his riding instructions from him and if anything happened to the Premier, the Minister would be bereft.

Government Members interjected.

Mr HOOPER: I can hear the howls from the jackals on the Government side. My comments must be stinging them. Because I have only five minutes, I will not waste my time taking inane interjections.

The present top echelon in the prison system should be replaced by a board of management. The appointment of that board is long overdue.

In the past four years, the Opposition has been able to expose the anomalies and inadequacies in the Queensland prison system. It has managed to lift the veil of secrecy that has shrouded the prisons since 1957 when the Country-Liberal Government was elected. But the straw that broke the camel's back was the recent riots at the Brisbane Prison Complex, which caught the Government with its administrative pants down. They could have been avoided had the Minister exercised some common sense and listened to the advice of some of the officers in his department. However, despite warnings from the Prisoners Action Society and me, nothing was done. Riots at Brisbane Prison Complex caused damage amounting to approximately \$1m. The Minister should come clean, as Queensland tax-payers have to pick up the tab. Surely they have the right to know for what they are paying.

An Opposition Member: The Minister should resign.

Mr HOOPER: The Minister should never have been appointed. However, now that he has been appointed, he should resign because of his incompetence. His handling of the situation was incredibly stupid and incompetent. The riots could have and should have been nipped in the bud. Instead, the Minister in charge of prisons, Herr Muntz, acted like the Klaus Barbie of Boggo Road.

Members of the Opposition and the media should have been allowed to inspect the damage caused in the riots. Like Government members, Opposition members represent the tax-payers.

The Minister's reaction to constructive criticism was incredible. He adopted a completely hard line and ignored criticism and pleas by the media and the clergy to allow people into the prison to inspect it. But like all Bjelke-Petersen Ministers, he considers himself the fount of all knowledge.

The decision to recommend to Cabinet that members of the Opposition and the media be barred from prisons and that recommendation's subsequent endorsement by Cabinet are further examples of totalitarian government, Bjelke-Petersen style. The public were outraged by this scandalous decision of Cabinet to further curtail democracy in Queensland. The decision is reminiscent of the manner in which the late and unlamented Adolf Hitler ran the concentration camps in Nazi Germany.

Government Members interjected.

Mr HOOPER: Government members laugh. What I have said is true.

Last week-end, the Federal Foreign Minister (Mr Hayden) was allowed to visit a Palestinian Liberation Organisation camp in the Middle East. No doubt the Queensland Minister in charge of prisons, Herr Muntz, would regard Mr Hayden as a political enemy and would therefore refuse him permission to visit a federal prisoner who was unlucky enough to be an inmate in a Queensland prison.

Just how far does this ban extend? Does it mean that the Federal Minister for Immigration, who the Minister in charge of prisons clearly sees as a political opponent, could not visit a prisoner detained in a Queensland goal on immigration matters?

My personal opinion is that the monstrous decision to ban members of the Opposition from visiting Queensland prisons would not stand up in a court of law. Earlier today I heard my leader say that the decision should be challenged in court. I agree. I believe that if it was challenged it would be overturned.

I remember quite vividly that when I was banned from the prison eight months ago there was no outcry. However, now that all members of the Opposition have been banned, everyone is raising a hue and cry. But that is something like closing the stable door after the horse has bolted.

The decision by the Minister to allow the six Liberal members to visit the prison while at the same time denying the same right to members of the Opposition is nothing short of scandalous. Already a rift has been caused in the depleted ranks of the Liberal Party, whose members sit so forlornly on the back benches and look like stunned mullet. The member for Redcliffe takes the view that all members should be allowed to visit the prison, whereas Sir William Knox, by supporting the Government's decision to ban members of the Opposition, is toadying to the Premier.

Members of the Opposition will continue to raise the undemocratic banning of non-Government members of Parliament until such time as public opinion forces the Government to rescind its totalitarian decision.

National Household Expenditure Survey

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise) (9.52 p.m.): I rise to express my grave concern at the attempts by the Federal Government, through the Australian Bureau of Statistics, to accumulate a massive data base on the daily affairs of Australians.

I draw the attention of honourable members to the fact that from January to December this year the Australian Bureau of Statistics will be conducting a national household expenditure survey. The Queensland segment of the survey will involve approaches over that 12-month period to approximately 1 900 house-holders.

Expenditure data for a household will be collected by asking about major and regular costs such as house and car repayments, local government rates and charges, electricity bills, health costs, hire-purchase payments and a host of other personal financial data and information. In addition, each person aged 15 years or more will be asked to keep a diary, for two weeks in urban areas and for four weeks in rural areas, of all daily expenditure. Income data for the household will be obtained, as a household's income is the main determinant of its expenditure pattern.

Very serious questions need to be asked about the need for that survey and about the reasons for it. I note that the civil liberties people, the Federal Attorney-General (Senator Evans), and the great proponents of civil liberties in this House are remarkably silent when the Federal Government begins to involve itself in such a scheme. As my friend from Maryborough said, "Not a word!"

We are witnessing what amounts to a gross invasion of privacy and an unnecessary intrusion into the family and personal affairs of some 1 900 Queensland families. It is another example of the Australian Bureau of Statistics exceeding its charter and abusing its authority, hiding behind legislation that was passed by the Federal Parliament in 1905 and now accumulating a massive data base far beyond justified requirements. I do not think that any member of this Chamber would disagree that, from time to time, the Federal Government, State Governments and local authorities, through the Australian Bureau of Statistics, need to accumulate information that can be justifiably required for the provision of Government services and for future planning requirements. The Australian Bureau of Statistics is being used by the Federal Government as a vehicle to gain information that should be regarded as private and confidential.

I personally take exception to the considerable inconvenience and disruption that this survey will cause. People have more to do than supply confidential information to Canberra bureaucrats, one of whom, recently, in a Queensland newspaper, quite happily threatened people with a fine of up to \$100 per day if they did not comply with the dictates of the Australian Bureau of Statistics and its masters in Canberra. It is high time that the Australian Bureau of Statistics was subjected to a little public scrutiny. It undoubtedly plays an important role in providing data for Government services. However, it is continuing to adopt a Big Brother attitude that is leading to excessive intrusion into people's affairs and the day-to-day lives of Queenslanders and Australians.

The type of questions that are asked in the national household expenditure survey and the requirement for detailed records to be kept will clearly inconvenience and offend many people, particularly business people, the aged and the infirm. I have no doubt that the cost to business of complying with the dictates of that Canberra-based bureaucracy will be substantial. We, as members of this Parliament, and our colleagues in other places, should be looking very closely at what that organisation is doing as a vehicle for the Federal Government in intruding into the lives of the people whom we represent.

I remain of the view that it is important that the activities and functions of the Australian Bureau of Statistics should be reviewed as a matter of urgency. Inherent dangers exist to the rights of Australians if that organisation is permitted to continue its present course of investigation unchecked, aided and abetted by the present Federal Government. If people have the audacity to question or even fail to comply with the requirements that are set down, they run the risk of massive fines by bureaucrats in Canberra.

(Time expired.)

New Hope and Southern Cross Collieries

Mr HAMILL (Ipswich) (9.59 p.m.): I want to raise the awareness of the House to the disgraceful and shabby treatment being meted out to the coal-miners on the Ipswich field, particularly at the New Hope and Southern Cross collieries.

Members may well be reminded of the issue that surfaced during the State election campaign on the West Moreton coal-fields in relation to Southern Cross Collieries and the sit-in by miners at that colliery from 11 October to 21 October, a sit-in which, I might add, came to a conclusion because of certain undertakings given to the miners, their families and supporters by no less a person than the Premier of this State, the Honourable Joh Bjelke-Petersen. It is worth remembering the undertakings given to the miners by the Premier at that time. Let me remind honourable members of them.

The first undertaking was that no retrenchments would occur at the colliery in the 12 months from January 1984. Secondly, a feasibility study would be undertaken to assess the future production of the West Moreton coalfields and the relationship of consumption of coal at the Swanbank Power Station. I am pleased that that feasibility study is presently being undertaken. The Minister for Mines and Energy told the House, in response to a question I asked prior to the recess, that the report resulting from the feasibility study will be available by the middle of this year. The third undertaking by the Premier was that 150 000 tonnes of coal would be allocated to the Southern Cross Collieries. In addition, Southern Cross Collieries would endeavour to sell another 50 000 tonnes of coal on the export market. The Government's 150 000 tonnes of coal was to guarantee the jobs of the miners currently employed at Southern Cross.

The House must realise that those undertakings have not been met by the Government. Its performance has been dismal. I will deal with the undertakings one by one and show how the Government has failed the confidence of the miners who sat in at the Southern Cross Collieries in October last year.

I deal first with the guarantee of job security. At the time the Southern Cross crisis first emerged as a public issue, 190 miners were employed at the colliery. Now there are 130. That is the result of redeployment of the work-force that has occurred over the last three or four months. However, the remaining 130 miners are presently faced with the prospect of retrenchment. That is of major concern to them, their families and the entire business community in Ipswich, because for every miner involved in underground work five others in the work-force are directly affected. The average income of a miner engaged in underground mining on the West Moreton field is something like \$30,000. One does not need to be a mathematician to calculate the economic impact of such massive loss of employment in the West Moreton.

What of the much-vaunted feasibility study? Although the Government promised that it would be undertaken, at the same time the Government is pressing forward with the demand that coal production for Swanbank be cut back in the new year. There will be 20 per cent cut-backs in the allocation of coal to Swanbank. Is that not putting the cart before the horse? No opportunity is being given for the report from the feasibility study to make recommendations to the Government on the future of the West Moreton coal-fields and the Swanbank Power Station.

Finally, I deal with the 150 000 tonnes promised. Suddenly, the Government has added a whole range of conditions, including the condition that litigation be dropped by New Hope Collieries in relation to a compensation claim of some years ago. The point is that the Southern Cross Colliery, linked as it is with New Hope, is being jeopardised because of a legitimate compensation claim. However, the Government is being hypocritical, because it is presiding over a situation in which the electricity authorities are taking New Hope to the Privy Council. How can litigation cease when the Government itself is continuing litigation on legitimate claims that have been upheld by Queensland courts on two occasions?

I ask the Government to recognise its responsibility and honour the promises given to West Moreton producers, particularly to New Hope and Southern Cross. There are two separate issues. First, Southern Cross is entitled to 150 000 tonnes.

(Time expired.)

Macalister-Dalby Section, Warrego Highway

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Condamine) (10.4 p.m.): I draw to the attention of the House the need to reroute part of the Warrego Highway. The section of road to which I refer is that from Macalister to Dalby. The proposal has been put forward before, but the work needs a higher priority.

The existing road is subject to flooding. In recent months it has been cut four or five times. The safety of those who use the road is at risk. In many places the road is constructed to allow water to flow across the pavement during times of flood. Motorists who are unaware of those hazards have to brake suddenly and often vehicles have aquaplaned out of control, resulting in serious injury. The water that rushes across the road causes pot-holes, and many cars are seriously damaged, some to the extent that their front suspension is completely wrecked or at least the front tyres blow out.

The existing route from Macalister to Dalby is approximately 18km. To make that road flood free would be very expensive. To put in box culverts and to raise the level of the pavement sufficiently above flood level would be very expensive indeed. To make matters worse, this is a national highway that provides access to Darwin, Mt Isa, the central west around Longreach, the central Queensland coal-fields, the far west of Cunnamulla and Charleville, the Maranoa district and the western Darling Downs, where I live.

The alternative is to reroute the road via the district of Yarrala. That alternative route, which is now a gravel road, is shorter than the existing road, being only 13km. As well as being shorter, it has fewer culverts. Certainly at present the culverts are subject to flooding, but if the level of the pavement were raised above flood level, it would be a flood-free road. It is further away from the river and the river flats. It could service grain-growers along that 13km section by providing them with an all-weather bitumen road to transport their grain.

I commend to the Government that it put the rerouting of this particular part of the Warrego Highway higher in the priorities of main road expenditures.

Road Transport of Sugar

Mr De LACY (Cairns) (10.7 p.m.): I wish to speak about the road transport of sugar. I am pleased to see that the Minister for Transport has returned to the Chamber, because much of my comment will be directed to him. At the end of last year the 20-year agreement between the Railway Department and the sugar-mills concluded and the mills decided that they would transport bulk sugar by road. Because many people could see the consequences, the decision became a big political issue, particularly before the last election. The Government got cold feet and decided, as a sop to the public and because of its pre-election nerves, to announce a Cabinet committee of inquiry. For a short time that appeased the public. After the National Party was returned to Government at the election, the committee was duly convened and its members deliberated on the issue.

Out of the blue the Minister for Transport announced that the road transport of sugar had been approved. I say "out of the blue" because at that stage the committee was still deliberating on the issue and had not reached a decision. I know for a fact that members of the committee were taking the matter very seriously and were looking at the alternatives and consequences. The Minister for Transport demonstrated his contempt for the public, for which he is becoming famous.

The Minister's statement engendered a great deal of bitterness and cynicism in the area. It is no wonder that in general the public holds politicians in low regard. If the Minister for Transport believes that this problem will simply go away, he has miscalculated because the consequences of the decision will be around for a long time to come. I might add that the National Party will continue to suffer the odium. The consequences are already being felt. I am aware that, as a direct result of the decision to transport sugar by road, 18 railway workers have been served with redundancy notices, as being surplus to requirements.

However, the biggest consequences are traffic problems of unprecedented magnitude, which will centre on the small township of Edmonton. As an example, let me try to describe what will happen. Trucks coming down Mill Road from the CSR Hambleton Mill will join the Bruce Highway at a point where they will meet the trucks coming from the Babinda and Mulgrave Mills. At exactly that same point two railway lines cross the road. One is a tramline carrying stick sugar and the other is a full railway line. The trucks hauling dog trailers down Mill Road will be required to swing out wide onto the far lane of the Bruce Highway to get around the hotel, which is built very close to the road.

Any resolution of this problem will require the co-ordination and co-operation of at least four different bodies, that is, the Mulgrave Shire Council, the Main Roads Department, the CSR Hambleton Mill and the Railway Department. It will be a very big job to get those bodies to agree on who will foot the bill, let alone do what is required to solve the problem.

Quite a few other questions must be raised. Who, for instance, will maintain Mill Road? It was not constructed to carry heavy traffic, let alone the 90 000 tonnes of sugar that will be carted over it next year. I am advised that during the wet season even a small truck travelling along it creates a lot of pot-holes. Should the Mulgrave Shire Council be asked to foot the bill when it was not asked about the decision to change to road transport of sugar? Should the ordinary rate-payers who were not in favour of the change be asked to foot the bill? A suggestion has been made that the trucks be re-routed completely on an access road called McLaughlan Road, directly onto the Bruce Highway, thereby missing the town of Edmonton altogether. But there, again, substantial road-works would be required. Who would construct the road? Because it is not a main road, perhaps we could not expect the Main Roads Department to do it. The point I am making is that it is incumbent upon this Government, the Department of Transport and the Minister for Transport, who were responsible for the decision, to provide the co-ordination and the wherewithal to solve this very difficult problem.

(Time expired.)

Motion (Mr Wharton) agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.12 p.m.
