

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 18 SEPTEMBER 1985**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**WEDNESDAY, 18 SEPTEMBER 1985**

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

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT****Delegation of Authority; Minister for Transport**

**Hon. Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (11.3 a.m.), by leave: I desire to inform the House that the Deputy Governor, for and on behalf of His Excellency the Governor, by virtue of the provisions of the Officials in Parliament Act 1896-1982, has authorised and empowered the Honourable Martin James Tenni, MLA, Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services, to perform and exercise all or any of the duties, powers and authorities imposed or conferred upon the Minister for Transport by any Act, rule, practice or ordinance on and from 17 September 1985, and during the absence of the Honourable Donald Frederick Lane, MLA.

**PAPERS**

The following paper was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed—

Report in respect of the Advanced Education System in Queensland for the year 1984.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Order in Council under the City of Brisbane Act 1924-1984 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Regulations under—

Public Service Act 1922-1978

Traffic Act 1949-1984

State Transport Act 1960-1981

Motor Vehicle Driving Instruction School Act 1969

Motor Vehicles Control Act 1975

Tow-truck Act 1973

Motor Vehicles Safety Act 1980

Report of the Central Queensland Racing Association for the year ended 30 June 1985.

**STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE****Report**

**Hon. C. A. WHARTON** (Burnett—Leader of the House): On behalf of the Standing Orders Committee, I lay on the table of the House the committee's report of proposed amendments to the Standing Orders from the meeting held on 13 August 1985, together with an explanation of the proposed amendments, and I move that the report be printed.

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

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

**Mr BURNS** (Lytton) (11.5 a.m.), by leave: Recently, in this House, I asked a question of the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer (Mr Gunn) on the level of foreign investment in Queensland.

The information that I quoted came from the annual report of the Foreign Investment Review Board. Unfortunately, in that document, the figures for South Australia and Queensland were transposed. The correction slip notifying the transposition was missing from the copy of the report that I used. I took the report at face value and I readily admit the mistake.

**Mr Gunn:** You had better apologise.

**Mr BURNS:** I will apologise, too. The Minister's turn is next.

I am surprised that the Deputy Premier should endeavour to score some political points on this issue, for a check of *Hansard* clearly shows that not only was he, as Minister Assisting the Treasurer, unaware of the facts on foreign investment, but also he set out to justify the poor figures by accusing the Foreign Investment Review Board of deliberately acting to prevent foreign investors from investing in Queensland and said that the trade commissioners were directed to send business to other States.

As the answers were based on incorrect figures that were quoted, I submit that the Deputy Premier's answer is doubly damning and proves his lack of knowledge of his portfolio.

**Mr Gunn** interjected.

**Mr BURNS:** The Deputy Premier should listen for a moment.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Lytton is making a personal explanation. Honourable members should listen to him.

**Mr BURNS:** Yesterday, in this House, the Deputy Premier (Mr Gunn) accused me of being gelded. Might I advise the House that I have not been gelded. However, if Mr Gunn is going to try to geld me in the same manner as he operates on his sheep, he might just bite off more than he can chew.

### QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

Questions submitted on notice were answered as follows—

#### 1. Applications for Land and Areas Over Water, Mourilyan Harbour

**Mr EATON** asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

What are the number and names of applicants for land or areas over water, in, over, or around Mourilyan Harbour for oyster leases?

*Answer—*

Two oyster bank licence applications have been received from—

(1) Mourilyan Oyster Farm (nominee Mrs V. A. Kippin) for an oyster bank at Walter Creek; and

(2) Mrs V. A. Kippin for an oyster bank at Armit Creek.

An existing oyster bank is currently licensed within Armit Creek to Mr L. Dexter.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I call the honourable member for Balonne.

**Mr NEAL:** I ask question No. 2.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I call the Deputy Premier.

**Mr GUNN:** Before I answer the question, I indicate that I have no intention of carrying the other business any further. There are more modern ways in which I carry out that job.

**2. Foreign Investment in Queensland**

Mr NEAL asked the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer—

With reference to a recent question by the member for Lytton on the subject of foreign investment—

Has a subsequent check of the relevant statistics shown that either the Labor member was attempting blatant deception or was incapable of interpreting the report accurately?

*Answer—*

Recently, the honourable member for Lytton informed the House that “new foreign investment in Queensland in 1983-84 amounted to a miserable \$2m—”

That was printed in every paper throughout Queensland. When it was corrected, the press did not correct the statement. That is why it must be adverted to in this House. He added—

“ while the figures for the other five States totalled \$1,874m.”

From this the Opposition concluded in its customary style of knocking Queensland—that is what it is good at—that there was almost a total failure on the part of foreign firms to invest in Queensland. The honourable member should have known that that was not correct.

This is another enormous blunder by the honourable member for Lytton and shows that the Opposition cannot rely on the information being fed to it by its Labor cronies in the south.

The source of the figures used by the Opposition was the 1983-84 report of the Foreign Investment Review Board. The board made a mistake in its report. The honourable member should have read the corrigendum, but obviously he did not read it. The report was corrected. However, the honourable member grabbed the report and could not get into this Chamber fast enough in an attempt to mislead honourable members.

The correct figure disclosed in the Foreign Investment Review Board report for new investment in Queensland for 1983-84 is \$499m, not \$2m as the honourable member for Lytton (Mr Burns) bandied around the House and in the press. The honourable member was only \$497m out. Queensland's \$499m represented 30 per cent of the total of \$1,689m for the six States and placed Queensland in a very favourable light indeed. Queensland, with only 16 per cent of the population, has 30 per cent of foreign investment. The miserable figure of \$2m new investment, which the honourable member for Lytton was using, applied to the Labor-governed State of South Australia.

The people of Queensland should note this example of just how careless the Opposition is in using figures, and the total lack of understanding by Opposition members of the underlying strength of the Queensland economy. It seems that members of the Opposition are hoping for and would be happy with an economic disaster in Queensland similar to that shown by the figures for the Labor States in Australia, with South Australia as the prime example. However, that will not happen in Queensland. As I said, foreign investment in Queensland is running at the rate of 30 per cent.

In future, the honourable member for Lytton should read and digest figures properly before stating them in this House.

**QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE****Ministerial Expenses**

Mr WARBURTON: In directing a question without notice to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to recently detailed statements regarding the expenses of Ministers which are tabled annually in this Parliament. Those statements were known as statements 1 and 3. For reasons that are obvious to most honourable members, Cabinet decided

to scrap the tabling of statements 1 and 3, and only totals appear in the Auditor-General's report.

Opposition members became aware that expenses incurred in Brisbane included claims for such things as entertainment. Included in that category was the cost of functions, liquor and other beverages. Special purposes claims included the purchase of office adornments, trophies and other items presented as gifts. Incidental expenses included club membership fees, the purchase of Christmas cards, photographic expenditure, cost of wreaths, laundry, dry-cleaning, and so on. That information was provided when those statements were tabled on the last occasion in this Parliament.

Has there been any change to the list of items for which expenses are claimed by Ministers when in Brisbane, and, if changes have been made, what items have been included or excluded from the list that was provided to Opposition members?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The honourable member for Sandgate (Mr Warburton) must think that I am a walking encyclopaedia and that I know in minute detail the expenses incurred by each Minister. I dare say that the Leader of the Opposition keeps a tab on Opposition members because he does not have much else to do. He would know that a few Opposition members still owe the Government a good deal of money.

**Mr Warburton:** If you do not have the answer, I will put it on notice.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier and Treasurer is answering the question.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The format for the tabling of ministerial expenses is identical to that in every Labor State in Australia.

**Mr Warburton:** That is not what I asked.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I know that is not what the honourable member asked me. However, that is what I am telling him. I thank the honourable member for providing me with the opportunity to point that out.

Yesterday, *The Courier-Mail* listed my expenses as being \$53,000, which includes overseas travel by myself and officers of my department who travel overseas organising bank loans and so on. That is less than half of the expense that Mr Hawke incurs in hire car expenses in a full year. Mr Hawke spends just on three-quarters of a million dollars——

**Mr Warburton:** You still spend public money on dry-cleaning and buying your suits at Freedmans.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I pay for my suits. The Leader of the Opposition might not.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I draw to the attention of honourable members that they cannot dictate to a Minister the way in which he will answer a question. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to listen to the answer. He will have an opportunity at a later date to ask further questions.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The Prime Minister's car expenses for a year are more than double the expenses incurred by me and my staff, who travel round the world. The Prime Minister spends almost \$612,000 in travel, not including aircraft expenses. If the Leader of the Opposition wants more detail, let him ask another question.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The second question.

**Mr WARBURTON:** I will do so, now that I have been invited.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition can be invited to ask a second question only by the Speaker of the House. I ask him to do so now.

**Brisbane Ministerial Expenses; Hon. R. J. Hinze and Hon. G. H. Muntz**

**Mr WARBURTON:** My second question is to the same Minister, who refuses to answer questions. I refer, of course, to the Premier and Treasurer. I refer him to Brisbane expenses incurred by the two big-spending Ministers, the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs (Mr Muntz) and the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze).

**Mr Hinze:** Cut it out!

**Mr WARBURTON:** That is the usual way they go on, trying to put off a serious matter.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WARBURTON:** Well, keep them quiet.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I remind the Minister that a question is being asked. I ask him to listen to it and then to reply, if necessary, or rise to a point of order.

**Mr Hinze:** Tell the truth.

**Mr WARBURTON:** If they are going to rort the system, they should do it quietly.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I rise to a point of order.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Leader of the Opposition to ask his question in the proper manner; otherwise I will not allow him to ask a question.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I rise to a point of order. The honourable member referred to a rort of the system. That is completely untrue and I ask that it be withdrawn.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier, on a point of order——

**Mr WARBURTON:** Yes, I withdraw, and I will continue with my question.

I refer to the Brisbane expenses incurred by the two big-spending Ministers, Mr Muntz and Mr Hinze. I emphasise that my interest is solely in what each of those Ministers expended almost \$23,000 on in the last financial year in Brisbane alone. The fact that they may have produced vouchers is irrelevant. I want to know on what they spent those incredible amounts of money. In the interests of accountability—and, after all, it is to be hoped that that is what members of Parliament are in favour of—I ask: Will he provide for each of the Ministers I have mentioned a complete break-down of the expenses incurred in Brisbane, showing what each Minister spent on entertainment, specific purposes and incidentals, just as he used to do before he tucked it away in the Auditor-General's report?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** No wonder members of the Opposition do not get anywhere. Their attitude is completely negative. Imagine wasting time with this. The Leader of the Opposition could write a letter, or something of that nature, if he wanted to obtain the information, or if he wanted to receive a reply.

Let me say that the Auditor-General makes a decision about whether the money has been spent as stated, fairly or otherwise. As honourable members know, every Minister has a heavy responsibility in his everyday activities. Every single day, a number of people come to see me. I take many people to luncheons. People are entertained at Cabinet luncheons and other activities. The expenses of our Ministers are very small compared with the expenses and activities of Labor Ministers in other States, if such a comparison were to be made.

The Government is bound by the Act under which the Auditor-General operates. An audit of each department vets every account and every activity of Ministers.

**Mr Warburton:** As long as the Minister puts a voucher in, you are happy.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The Leader of the Opposition is running up another dry gully. I do not know when he will wake up to himself, be positive, look ahead and raise something constructive.

#### **Legislation on Drug-trafficking**

**Mr NEAL:** In directing a question to the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police, I refer to media reports over the last week or two about activities of the Council for Civil Liberties and the Labor Lawyers Association relative to the proposed legislation on drug-trafficking to come before the House. I ask—

- (1) Is it correct, as claimed, that the public will have no knowledge of the contents of the legislation before it becomes law?
- (2) Will he give an assurance to the House that adequate time will be allowed for public perusal of the Bill's contents before it is debated in the Chamber?

**Mr GLASSON:** I welcome the question asked by the honourable member for Balonne (Mr Neal), because it will give me the opportunity of putting the record straight. Legislation that will be introduced into the House is before the draftsman at present. It is designed to encompass and embody certain commitments and promises that were made by the Premier and Treasurer, prior to the last election, in terms of the Government's making every effort to combat the problem of use and abuse of drugs that confronts society in Queensland and the other States of Australia.

The Bill will be known as the Drugs Abuse Bill and will be introduced during this session. At this time, it is my intention to let the Bill lie on the table over the Christmas and New Year recess so that everyone will have the opportunity of examining it. More importantly, before the legislation is taken back to Cabinet, it will be submitted to the Bar Association of Queensland, which is the senior law enforcement authority in the State, and the views of that association will be sought on the legal aspects of the Bill. The Bill will be presented to the House after it has been examined by Cabinet, my committee and members of my party.

I give the assurance that ample opportunity will be given to people to vet the Bill before it is debated during the first sittings of Parliament in the New Year.

#### **Media Standards in Reporting Tragedies**

**Mr BURNS:** In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I draw attention to the front page of today's *Daily Sun*, which shows a picture of the blood-stained body of the victim of a murder that occurred at Taigum. I overheard someone say that it was disgusting, and that is absolutely true. I am sure that every honourable member would hate to see a photograph of either his father, brother or son displayed in such a terrible, despicable and distressing fashion on the front page of a newspaper. The memory would haunt the family of the deceased for years. I ask: Will the Premier and Treasurer take action to ensure that newspapers and media outlets in Queensland use ordinary standards of common decency in their treatment of the families involved in shocking incidents such as the one I have described? The parents of the victim, his wife and children, as well as all who are concerned about the increasing incidence of violence in the community, must be outraged by the use of this man's body in such a grossly indecent way for the purpose of selling newspapers. I also ask: Will the Premier and Treasurer intervene to ensure that such a disgraceful practice ceases?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I agree with the attitude adopted by the honourable member for Lytton and I can understand his disgust with the picture on the front page of the newspaper. It is regrettable that, at times, the media do such things to sell newspapers. Media companies are bound by certain requirements that lie outside my jurisdiction or that of the State Government. Certain ethical standards are adopted by members of the media, and I think it is up to newspaper company managers to stop

thinking in terms of what will sell newspapers or what profits can be made from an article or a picture. This is one of those very regrettable practices in which not one of us would wish to be engaged in order to make money or to sell products of the media. I think these practices are quite wrong, and through my answer to the honourable member's question I draw the attention of members of the media to my attitude.

### **Transport and Technology Museum**

**Mr BURNS:** In directing a further question, along more political lines, to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to his announcement in February 1984 that the Queensland Government would build a transport and technology museum on a 34 ha site on the Pacific Highway opposite Dreamworld at Coomera, and I remind him that the Queensland Transport and Technology Centre Act, passed in August 1984, provided in clause 4 part II for the establishment of a centre for the purpose of collecting, storing and exhibiting historical aircraft.

I now ask: Is the Premier and Treasurer aware that it has been reported in the media that a valuable collection of vintage aircraft which has been displayed at Tallebudgera Creek on the Gold Coast may be acquired by the city of Wangaratta in Victoria because no firm action has been taken by the Queensland Government to start this project, which was announced more than 18 months ago? Moreover, now that the aircraft will apparently fly south, as the birds do, will the Premier and Treasurer explain why the Government has failed to honour its promise, made in February 1984, to construct such a museum?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** If the honourable member for Lytton knew what was happening, he would know that legislation will be presented by the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts (Mr McKechnie) in the future. That proposal was discussed today in the party-room, and the project will be transferred into that Minister's department.

The Government felt that that was the right way to go about it to save setting up another organisation, as it were, outside the realm of Government activity. It was decided that the museum people, under the direction of the Minister, would take charge and bring the project to fruition. The matter is now proceeding along those lines.

The honourable member referred to aircraft. Those aircraft were inspected. The owner wanted to sell them to the Government as one parcel. He adopted an all-or-nothing attitude and would not sell only one, two or three aircraft. That was not acceptable to the Government. Not only did we not want all the aircraft, but also we considered that the cost involved would have been considerable. In addition, the Government has been offered aircraft from all over Australia and overseas. There will be no lack of aircraft of all types available when the buildings are completed. As I said, any number of aircraft are available and I understand that that is why the owner now intends to sell the aircraft to somebody in the south. I repeat that any number of other aircraft are available; far more than we believed could possibly have been available.

**Mr Burns:** When will it start?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** It has been started.

**Mr Burns:** When will it be completed?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** It is under way; there is no problem about it.

### **Financial Assistance to Sugar Industry**

**Mr MENZEL:** I ask the Premier and Treasurer: Is he aware that the Federal Labor Government has given a grant of \$500m to the steel and motor industries in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia; \$17m in the last Federal Budget for the America's Cup; \$6m for the Formula 1 Grand Prix in South Australia; and built a new sugar-mill for Bangladesh at a cost of possibly \$100m, and has given only \$15m in loans to the



sugar industry to be paid back by it, yet the Queensland Government has given \$31m in grants and loans to the sugar industry? Is the Premier also aware of statements by Mr Casey and other Labor members that the State Government has deceived the sugar industry by saying that it is giving \$20m in the latest State Budget, and is that true?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** One can bet one's life that there is not much substance in anything that the honourable member for Mackay (Mr Casey) says.

**Mr Casey:** That goes for you and him.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The honourable member used to be the Leader of the Opposition, but he was kicked out because he became involved with poker machine rackets. I know what to say about him.

**Mr Casey:** I wasn't involved in some of the things you have been in, that's for sure. No way in the world I ever would be, either.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Did I get under the honourable member's skin?

I am very much aware of what the Commonwealth has done for the Labor States and for the steel and car industries. It did not even ask the States whether they wanted to assist those industries. The problem in the sugar industry is on a much smaller scale, and it will be very interesting to see what the Commonwealth Government comes up with and what it is prepared to do for the sugar industry in the very near future.

As was indicated by the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) yesterday morning in this Chamber, the Queensland Government has done a great deal for the sugar industry. In his speech last night, Mr Campbell again completely misrepresented the position. He alleged that the Queensland Government had done nothing. He made a number of very outrageous charges. I will reiterate what the Minister said yesterday, that is, that this Government has given \$61.43m in assistance to the sugar industry since 1982-83.

#### Identification Cards

**Mr MENZEL:** I ask the Premier and Treasurer: Is he aware of the Federal Government's decision on identification cards? Will the State Government co-operate with the Federal Labor Government to introduce such cards, and does he believe that the Labor Government will file one's political views with the cards, in a similar fashion to the action of the former Labor Government in Queensland in numbering ballot-papers so that it could trace the way people voted?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** It is interesting to be reminded of what Labor people did in the days when they were in Government. It is true that the former Labor Government kept tabs on how every person voted. This Government rescinded that practice when it came to power. This Government will not support and will not be a party to the system of ID cards that has been proposed by the Federal Government.

As has been indicated to us, for a start the Federal Government will leave the photograph off the card, but that is only the beginning. That is the thin end of the wedge. Before very long, the Federal Government will have every detail on every individual in this State and nation—how he or she votes or does not vote. It will be all set out. All that the Federal Government will have to do is press a button and get the details on people. That is the system that it is trying to advocate. According to its own figures, the system will cost \$100m. Who wants to spend \$100m to give those people the right to have a tab on each and every one of the citizens of this nation? It is not on, and we will not support it.

**Mr Burns** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Lytton is getting carried away.

**Oxenford Totalisator Administration Board Subagency Licence**

**Mr GOSS:** In directing a question to the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing, I refer to his answer yesterday to a question from the member for Ipswich and to his not answering the question as to whether or not he, as Minister, attended a meeting of the Totalisator Administration Board at which the Oxenford TAB licence was discussed. I ask: Did the Minister at any time attend a meeting of the TAB when the Oxenford TAB subagency and/or the Junefair Pty Ltd application were/was discussed?

**Mr HINZE:** When this started, I said that it would be like *Blue Hills*. I have ample answers with me, which I can give by way of a ministerial statement. Mr Speaker, I do not know whether you want me to make it now or later. I will make it whenever it suits you. It is entirely up to you. Mr Speaker, if you agree, I would prefer to make a ministerial statement immediately after question-time.

**Mr SPEAKER:** If that is what the Minister wishes, that would be preferable.

**Mr GOSS:** I rise to a point of order.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I point out to the Minister that he has been asked a question. It is up to him how he replies. He will have an opportunity to speak in the Matters of Public Interest debate following question-time. It is up to him whether he replies now.

**Mr HINZE:** Mr Speaker, I propose——

**Mr Goss:** Put it on notice.

**Mr HINZE:** Oh, shut up! You asked a question.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I am sure that that is not what the Minister intended to say. I find it offensive in the Chamber, and I ask him to withdraw it.

**Mr HINZE:** I cannot say it in a much nicer way, but, Mr Speaker, at your request, I will certainly withdraw it.

The position is that I have a full reply for the honourable member in relation to all of the association that I have had at board meetings or in relation to board members. It is there to table. I will read it at the convenience of the House—whether it is now or later——

**Government Members:** Now.

**Mr HINZE:** Mr Speaker, I seek leave of the House to make a ministerial statement.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Is leave granted? Leave is granted.

**Mr Warburton:** I rise to a point of order. I suggest that it is contrary to the Standing Orders for the Minister to be allowed to make a ministerial statement in the middle of question-time.

**Government Members** interjected.

**Mr Warburton:** The Minister has sought leave to make a ministerial statement.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I shall seek some advice on this.

**Mr GOSS:** I rise to a point of order.

**Mr HINZE:** Mr Speaker, in reply to the honourable member's question——

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I call the member for Salisbury.

**Mr GOSS:** Mr Speaker, I thought that you intended to make a ruling on the Leader of the Opposition's point of order. Rather than take up question-time with a long-winded

answer, if the Minister cannot simply answer, "No", I am prepared to put my question on notice.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! As to the previous point of order—I suggest that, instead of making a ministerial statement, the Minister answer the question. If the Minister so wishes, he should do so.

**Mr HINZE:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your guidance. I bow to your wisdom. I am only too pleased to answer the question.

I refer again to the allegations made by the honourable member for Salisbury about the granting of the Oxenford TAB subagency licence. On Thursday, 5 September last, I tabled in this House a letter provided to me by the chairman of the TAB (Mr Ian Callinan, QC), which contained all of the board minutes referring to the Oxenford TAB subagency licence matter. Those official minutes, signed in all instances by either the former chairman or the present chairman as a true and accurate record, gave the lie to the honourable member's continuing allegation that I attended a meeting or meetings of the TAB to request or demand the Oxenford subagency licence for my family company, Junefair Pty Ltd.

The honourable member, in a desperate attempt to bolster his discredited and disgraceful allegation, resorted after that statement in this House to imply that I sought to influence board members away from an official meeting and in some back-door, secretive way.

*Hansard* reports the honourable member as saying—

"The Minister is unable to produce a statutory declaration from the then chairman and the board members that he did not try to argue the case for his family company"

I have received a number of statements from board members, which I now table.

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the documents on the table.*

I seek leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

24 Kuranda St  
Balmoral  
Brisbane

Statement.

I the undersigned member of the Totalisator Board of Queensland, do hereby affirm and declare by my signature hereunder that at no time did the Honourable R. J. Hinze MLA, Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing instruct or attempt to instruct, influence or attempt to influence me as a member of the aforesaid Totalisator Board of Queensland, to either refuse the application by the Friths for the agency licence or grant the licence to Junefair Pty Ltd.

signed  
John Houston

Witness.  
J. C. Houston, J.P.

Oaths Act 1867-1981

Statutory Declaration.

Queensland }  
To Wit }

I, John Standish Galwey of "Stuarts Creek", Roma, in the State of Queensland, do solemnly and sincerely declare that, I, the undersigned member of the Totalisator Administration Board of Queensland, do hereby affirm and declare by my signature hereunder that at no time did the Honourable R. J. Hinze MLA, Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing instruct or attempt to instruct, influence or attempt to influence

me as a member of the aforesaid Board to either refuse the application by the Friths for the agency licence or grant the licence to Junefair Pty Ltd.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the provisions of the Oaths Act 1867-1981.

Taken and Declared before me, at Roma this Sixth } John Galwey  
day of September 1985 }

(signature)

A Justice of the Peace.

#### Statement

I, the undersigned Member of the Totalizator Administration Board of Queensland, do hereby affirm and declare by my signature hereunder that at no time did the Honourable R. J. Hinze, M.L.A., Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing instruct or attempt to instruct, influence or attempt to influence me as a Member of the aforesaid Totalizator Administration Board, to either refuse the application by the Friths, for the Agency License or grant the License to Junefair Pty. Ltd.

Signed: C. Robertson  
(Mr. Carl Robertson)

Signed before me on 5th day of September, 1985.

L. Rosson  
(Justice of the Peace.)

#### Statement

I, the undersigned Member of the Totalizator Administration Board of Queensland, do hereby affirm and declare by my signature hereunder that at no time did the Honourable R. J. Hinze, M.L.A., Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing instruct or attempt to instruct, influence or attempt to influence me as a Member of the aforesaid Totalizator Administration Board, to either refuse the application by the Friths, for the Agency License or grant the License to Junefair Pty. Ltd.

Signed: P. J. Burge  
(Mr Peter Burge).

Signed before me on 5th day of September, 1985.

L. Rosson  
(Justice of the Peace).

#### Statement

I, the undersigned Member of the Totalizator Administration Board of Queensland, do hereby affirm and declare by my signature hereunder that at no time did the Honourable R. J. Hinze, M.L.A., Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing instruct or attempt to instruct, influence or attempt to influence me as a Member of the aforesaid Totalizator Administration Board, to either refuse the application by the Friths, for the Agency License or grant the License to Junefair Pty. Ltd.

Signed: J. Duffy  
(Dr John O'Duffy, M.B.B.S. Qld., F.R.C.P. (Edin.), F.R.A.C.P.).

Signed before me on 5th day of September, 1985.

(signature)  
(Justice of the Peace).

Queensland  
To Wit

I, Colin Lionel Krogh of 55 The Esplanade, Pallarenda, Townsville in the State of Queensland, Company Director do solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:

1. I am a member of the Totalizator Administration Board of Queensland.
2. At no time has the Honourable R. J. Hinze M.L.A., Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing instructed or attempted to instruct, influenced or attempted to influence me as a member of the said Board to:
  - (a) refuse or defer an Application by Friths for a sub-agency; or

(b) to grant such a license to Junefair Pty. Ltd.

3. All decisions made by me in relation to the above matters have been made independently and on the basis of the best available information after proper and due inquiry.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the provisions of the Oaths Act 1867-1981.

Declared and signed by the said Declarant at Townsville this 4th } C. Krogh  
day of September 1985 before me:

(signature)

Solicitor/A Justice of the Peace.

#### Statement

I, the undersigned Member of the Totalizator Administration Board of Queensland, do hereby affirm and declare by my signature hereunder that at no time did the Honourable R. J. Hinze, M.L.A., Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing instruct or attempt to instruct, influence or attempt to influence me as a Member of the aforesaid Totalizator Administration Board, to either refuse the application by the Friths, for the Agency License or grant the License to Junefair Pty. Ltd.

Signed: A. D. Hollindale  
(Mr Alan Hollindale).

Signed before me on 6th day of September, 1985.

(signature)  
(Justice of the Peace).

**Mr HINZE:** Seven members of the board have declared in their statements that I, as Minister, at no time did instruct, attempt to instruct, influence or attempt to influence them as individuals to either refuse the application by the Friths or grant the licence to Junefair Pty Ltd.

These gentlemen are citizens of the highest character, integrity and standing in the community and not even the honourable member for Salisbury can deny that. They include a former distinguished leader of the Labor Party in this Assembly.

I have also received a statement, dictated to a member of my staff by another board member, which is not signed.

I table that statement.

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the document on the table.*

I seek leave to have the document incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

#### Statement

I, Kevin King, as a Member of the Totalizator Administration Board of Queensland, do not consider that I should be obliged to make any comments or sign anything that reflects my personal opinion on matters that come before the Board, as an individual Member of the Board. For that reason I wish to add to this statement that if there has been any activity to influence the Board or any Member of it, then the Member concerned should express that to the Chairman, or the Board as a whole and have that communicated, if such is the case, by the Chairman to the appropriate authorities.

I wish to state that I will be making no further comments to the contrary and that I have not been responsible for leaking any documents to anybody.

Signed: Kevin King.

Statement relayed by telephone to Mr. G. Diggles, Private Secretary, at 8.30 a.m. on 5 September, 1985, by Mr King.

**Mr HINZE:** That statement from Mr Kevin King states that he does not feel obliged to make any comments or sign anything which reflects his personal opinion on matters which come before the board. That, of course, is his right, but the critical point

is that Mr King does not provide the honourable member for Salisbury with any joy or evidence.

The deputy chairman of the TAB (Mr Peter Gallagher) has communicated to my office that he had been approached by other parties, which he declined to identify, to sign a statement to the contrary of that signed by his fellow board members. He informed my office that he had refused and would not be making any statements suggesting that I, as Minister, had ever attempted at any time to instruct, attempt to instruct, influence or attempt to influence him in the matter of the Oxenford TAB subagency licence.

It will not come as any surprise to this House that I have not had any communication with the former chairman (Sir Edward Lyons) on this matter. However, even the honourable member for Salisbury would have to agree, unless he wants his futile campaign to descend into complete farce, that I would have been the last to try to influence the former chairman in this matter and that he would have been the last to even entertain such an approach.

It is a matter of public record that the seven members of the TAB who recommended the dismissal of the former chairman were the same seven members of the TAB who sought private legal opinion from Mr C. E. K. Hampson, QC. It is, therefore, their statements that are the most critical and it is those statements that are the most definite in rejecting totally the whole shoddy case mounted by the honourable member for Salisbury. I again call upon him to withdraw and apologise.

**Mr Goss:** You'll get no apology from me.

**Mr HINZE:** I do not mind if he does not apologise to me; it makes no difference. The honourable member has failed on every count and, because of that, as a man—I do not believe that he is a man—he should withdraw.

#### **Oxenford Totalisator Administration Board Subagency Licence**

**Mr GOSS:** In asking my second question of the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing, I refer to his previous answer and, in particular, to his repeated denials that he asked the board for the licence for his family company or that he attempted to influence the board. Leaving those allegations aside, I simply ask again: Was he present at a board meeting when the Oxenford licence or the Junefair application was discussed? Can he answer that question "Yes" or "No"?

**Mr HINZE:** I get the impression that the honourable member cannot understand. With his legal training, surely by now he would understand that everything that takes place at a board meeting goes into the board's minutes. There is nothing in the board's minutes that the honourable member can see or that I can see that——

**Mr Goss** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Salisbury has asked his question. He will listen to the answer.

**Mr Goss** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! As I have said before, an honourable member cannot insist upon an answer.

**Mr HINZE:** There is nothing in the minutes. There is evidence from all of the members who wished to sign. Seven members out of 10, including a former Leader of the Opposition in this House, signed.

Let the people of Queensland decide whether I attempted in any way to influence the decision. The honourable member for Salisbury knows as well as I do——

**Mr Goss:** Answer the question. Say it—"Yes" or "No"

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Salisbury under Standing Order No. 123A.

**Mr Burns** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Lytton will be given the same warning.

**Mr HINZE:** I wish to conclude by simply saying that I have answered the questions as plainly as I possibly can. The honourable member for Salisbury knows it, I know it, and it is in the records of the TAB. It is in letter form tabled by members in this House.

The honourable member for Salisbury knows as well as I do that I did not, and could not, influence the board. The honourable member for Salisbury can see that. I never attempted to influence board members. I have made the position quite clear.

### **Sarina Police Station**

**Mr RANDELL:** I ask the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police: Is he aware of the need to upgrade the facilities at the Sarina Police Station? In view of the increasing work-load in the area, will he tell the House of any future plans to provide improved office accommodation and amenities for the very fine, efficient officers stationed there?

**Mr GLASSON:** I am certainly aware of the need to upgrade the Sarina Police Station. On no fewer than two occasions, the member for Mirani (Mr Randell) has, during my presence in that area, requested me to pay a visit to that station. I am well aware of the position that confronts the officers at that police station.

Originally the upgrading of the Sarina Police Station was on the five-year program. The one building also accommodates officers of the Justice Department, who are under the control of my colleague the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General (Mr Harper). It was mooted that officers of the Justice Department would be removed from that building, thus allowing the Police Department to occupy the entire building. That decision by the Justice Department did not come to pass. However, recently a meeting was held between the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, the Minister for Works and Housing and me. Another meeting was held between officers of the respective departments. Those meetings endeavoured to solve the problem. I hope that the accommodation at the Sarina Police Station will be put back on the five-year program, which is continually being reassessed by the research and planning division of the Police Department. I am hopeful that, in this financial year, alternative arrangements can be made in the short term to alleviate the problems confronting officers there, even though in the long term those arrangements may not completely solve the problem. Like the honourable member for Mirani, I appreciate the service given by the police officers to the community from their confined working space. Everything will be done to try to solve the problem.

**Sir WILLIAM KNOX** having given notice of a question—

**Mr HARPER:** I ask the honourable member to place his question on notice for next Tuesday. The Opposition has agreed that I attend a meeting of Attorneys-General tomorrow.

**Sir WILLIAM KNOX:** I do so accordingly.

### **Alleged Breaches by Sir Edward Lyons of Totalisator Administration Board Legislation**

**Sir WILLIAM KNOX:** I ask the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General: In view of his answer to the honourable member for Yeronga (Mr Lee) yesterday regarding the fiduciary duty of Sir Edward Lyons to the TAB board that, on the advice he has received, he does not disagree with Mr Hampson's analysis of the fiduciary duty of a person holding a position on a statutory board, and in view of the information that has been

provided to the Minister in addition to the information that was provided to Mr Hampson, is he now in a position to make the inquiries that the Attorney-General should make in relation to these matters that have been brought to his attention?

**Mr HARPER:** I repeat what I have told the House previously, that is, that no criminal offence took place in these matters. I have said before that if it is considered that a civil breach has taken place, recourse can be had to the courts in a civil matter, as the honourable member realises.

All the advice that I had available to me previously and that I have presently available to me indicates that no criminal offence has taken place. Accordingly, no action will be taken in that regard.

**Mr GOSS:** I rise to a point of order. A short time ago, with the leave of the House, the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze), in answering a question asked by me, tabled a number of documents that were to be incorporated in *Hansard*. I have just sought a copy of those. One of the documents was subsequently taken back by the Minister, and I would like that document returned to the table so that I can obtain a copy of it or, alternatively, be given an explanation as to who judges whether or not documents can be taken back from the table after they have been tabled.

**Mr HINZE:** Mr Speaker, the explanation is very simple. I took the papers out of my pocket. One of them had no relationship whatever to the question. I tabled the documents, and the Clerk of the Parliament put it on the table for me to take back. I went over and took the document back. It had nothing to do with the other document that I tabled.

**Mr GOSS:** In that case, Mr Speaker, if the Clerk of the Parliament has made a ruling, I accept it.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Is the honourable member not prepared to accept the explanation?

**Mr GOSS:** Mr Speaker, I said that I would accept that if it is the case that the Clerk of the Parliament made the ruling, which is what the Minister said. Is it the case that the Clerk of the Parliament made the ruling that the document was irrelevant and gave it back to the Minister?

**Mr SPEAKER:** I will take that into consideration and ask the Minister to show me the paper.

Honourable Members interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I assure the honourable member that it has nothing to do with the papers that were tabled.

#### **Electoral Redistribution Commissioners; Criticism by State President and State Secretary of Australian Labor Party**

**Mr ALISON:** I ask the Premier and Treasurer: Is he aware of the slur cast upon the integrity of the electoral redistribution commissioners by the State secretary of the Australian Labor Party, Peter Beattie, and the State president of the ALP, Ian McLean, during a recent fly-by-night visit to Maryborough? In relation to the slanderous statements made by Messrs Beattie and McLean about the division of the city of Maryborough into two electorates, is the Premier and Treasurer aware that the last Labor Government redistribution prior to 1957 placed a significant part of the city of Maryborough in the Gympie electorate—50 miles away—in order to make Gympie a safe Labor seat?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** First, the comments made by Peter Beattie and Ian McLean were a very severe and unjustified attack on the electoral redistribution



commissioners. Second, I am not aware—and I am sure that Peter Beattie would not be aware—of any justification for those comments. I am sure that it was just pure political propaganda by Mr Beattie and his colleague. Of course, it demonstrates the lengths to which ALP members are prepared to go to enhance their own images. Those two gentlemen tried to denigrate the commissioners without knowing what the decision of the commissioners would be. As the honourable member has already indicated in his question, it was Opposition members——

**Mr R. J. Gibbs:** Why don't you answer the question?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Wolston under Standing Order No. 123A.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I will answer the question. It was the Labor Party that divided Maryborough, placing part of that city in the Gympie electorate, so that Gympie would remain a Labor seat. That is the sort of thing that Opposition members do.

Until the release of the report by the commissioners, nobody will know whether or not Maryborough has been divided. I do not imagine that that would be a sensible proposition.

#### **Unemployment; Job Creation**

**Mr ALISON:** I ask the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs: In view of assertions by the Leader of the Opposition that the Queensland Government should do more to combat unemployment, will the Minister inform the House of the precise situation, following the release of the latest unemployment figures by the Australian Bureau of Statistics?

**Mr LESTER:** The Queensland Government has given a very high profile and top priority to job creation. In fact, the Government has become involved in Work Skill Australia, in which Queensland won the national titles. Group apprenticeships and careers displays were included, in which more than 50 000 people participated this year. That will enable young people to find out, with sophisticated and proper backing, the jobs that they would like to hold in the future.

In addition the Government has introduced craft competitions. It has set in motion a manpower-planning unit. The Government's self-employment venture schemes, for which many Labor Party members as well as National Party members have been grateful, have been very successful.

The Government has also moved into the area of traineeships. That program has been very successful. In the last 12 months, 39 400 new jobs have been created in Queensland. I remind honourable members that Queensland's population is only 16.1 per cent of Australia's total population, yet the total of jobs created in that time in Queensland is 21 per cent of the national total. Since February, 58.5 per cent of all new jobs created in Australia have been created in Queensland. Opposition members cannot deny those figures.

It must not be forgotten that the average net monthly migration to Queensland in the period from 1977-78 to 1983-84 was 1 663. In spite of having to find new jobs for all those people, the Queensland Government has led the employment recovery in the last 12 months. In fact, in the last month alone, more than 4 500 jobs have been created in Queensland. New South Wales and Victoria lost 18 000 jobs between them; so it is not difficult to ascertain the statistics.

The Queensland Government is determined to continue to lead the way in Australia in employment recovery.

### **Declaration of Thuringowa as a City**

**Mr McELLIGOTT:** I ask the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing: In view of the world-wide acclaim given to the local government concept of Greater Brisbane and the obvious success of the Gold Coast City Council, what special circumstances exist for creating a city out of the Thuringowa shire? Do those special circumstances exist in any other shires in Queensland? Is the decision on Thuringowa to be taken as a precedent for the establishment of more cities in Queensland? Or is it to be assumed that party political considerations apply to Thuringowa shire?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Is the question without notice?

**Mr McELLIGOTT:** It is without notice, but I will place it on notice if the Minister prefers.

**Mr HINZE:** The shire of Thuringowa meets all the criteria for city status. It has requested that the Government consider declaring it a city. Jealousy has been exhibited in the Townsville area, particularly by the mayor of Townsville. When he visited me, I explained that the same rights would be bestowed on his area if it were in similar circumstances.

Thuringowa is a very rapidly developing part of the State and is capably administered by a very sound administration team, which has allowed it to develop so quickly. The Government is favourably considering its being referred to as a city.

### **Criticism of Police by Professor Walker**

**Mr McPHIE:** In directing a question to the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police, I draw his attention to a statement in today's *Courier Mail* attributed to Professor Geoffrey Walker, a newly appointed professor of law at Queensland University, who claimed that widespread perjury and planting of guns and drugs by police is compromising Australia's legal system. I ask: Does he have any knowledge of that having been done in Queensland and will he give the House his assurance that he will have investigations made and will call on Professor Walker to state the basis on which he has made such serious claims?

**Mr GLASSON:** I welcome the question. The headline appearing in today's paper is, "Law expert criticises police" I wish to state the true position to the House and to the people of Queensland. The article most certainly caused me concern, as it did the Chairman of the Police Complaints Tribunal (Judge Pratt), who inquired whether Professor Walker, if he was concerned, would come before the tribunal and present his evidence so that it could be considered. I am pleased to say that the professor, when contacted by the secretary of the tribunal, stated that the article misrepresented him. Further, he personally had no concrete evidence, or any evidence, to support the headline, and had pointed that out to the journalist. Professor Walker advised the journalist that he was basing his statements on reports he had read of committees of inquiry in various States of Australia.

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

## **MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST**

### **Lone Parents**

**Mrs HARVEY (Greenslopes) (12 noon):** I refer to the amazing tirade delivered in the Chamber yesterday by the member for South Brisbane (Mr Fouras), who mounted an attack on the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs (Mr Muntz), based on a radio report that had concentrated on one small aspect of an interview, giving it a negative slant.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Row): Order! The Chamber will come to order. There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

**Mrs HARVEY:** The member treated us to an illogical and unproductive tirade, under the guise of defending sole parents. If he were genuinely interested in their well-being, he would take the time and trouble to inquire about the initiatives taken by the Minister. First was the very successful Year of the Family, which, I might add, he and his comrades scoffed at throughout the entire year.

The Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs (Mr Muntz) and members of the Year of the Family committee were very careful to include sole parents in the promotion of the theme as well as the activities undertaken. In my electorate alone, 10 per cent of the population are sole parents and they were included in the Year of the Family activities during the course of the Government's promotion. I am sure that that was done because, rather than regarding sole parents as a separate component of the community, as the honourable member for South Brisbane apparently does, members of the committee believe that sole parents are as much a part of the community as anybody else. More recently, with the Year of the Parent——

**Mr Hamill** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Row): Order! Such interjections will not be tolerated.

**Mrs HARVEY:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Opposition members tend to become excited when I speak, because they do not like to hear the truth.

Recently, the Year of the Parent was announced, and that will occur in 1986. As part of that theme, special emphasis has been placed on the role of the sole parent, as recognition of the additional support that is needed by the increasing sole-parent community. In addition to that, discussions between the Minister and me have already taken place with a view to conducting sole-parent seminars in 1986 to give sole parents an opportunity to voice their concerns and outline their needs. That will be a great deal more than any member on the Opposition side of the House will do for these people.

It is hoped that the new community centre in the Greenslopes electorate will be made available for these seminars, and I am grateful to the Minister for his enthusiastic support of this project. The CARE committee, that is, the Child Abuse Research and Education Committee, which was set up by the Minister and of which I am chairman, is also addressing the problem of child neglect brought about by economic constraints, frustration, and physical and emotional deprivation suffered by single parents who badly need both Government support and the support and understanding of members in the wider community.

I noticed that, when this worthwhile committee was set up, the honourable member for South Brisbane (Mr Fouras) lost no time in running to the press, claiming that the issue was being used for the purposes of political gain on my part. How political gain could be achieved by my attending intensive fortnightly, time-consuming committee meetings, each of three hours' duration, is something I fail to understand. However, I challenge the honourable member to put in the same hours and productivity, the details of which are recorded in the minutes of the meetings, and provide some solutions for these difficult and sensitive social problems. The only political gain went to the honourable member for South Brisbane, because he got on the bandwagon once again with his usual negative statements that he makes with monotonous regularity.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mrs HARVEY:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am becoming hoarse trying to shout over members of the Opposition, despite the fact that I am speaking into the microphone.

The honourable member for South Brisbane professes to be concerned for sole parents. However, I notice that he is not even present in the Chamber. I am not sure whether that is because he is embarrassed or because he is uninterested; but he is not here, and I think that that should be recorded. If the honourable member is so concerned about sole parents, he should at least bother to be present in the Chamber to hear what the Government proposes to do.

I suggest that one of the major concerns of the sole parent is the care and education of the child. It would be appropriate for members of the Opposition to listen for a change, instead of trying to shout me down. I do not think that they have ever listened to a speech that I have made in this House, and I am beginning to think that that must be because I talk a lot of sense.

**Mr Powell:** They want to shut you up.

**Mrs HARVEY:** Is that what the problem is? The socialists are trying to shut me up.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There is far too much audible conversation taking place in the Chamber. Unless it is reduced, I will continue to interrupt and use up the valuable time that has been set aside for matters of public interest. I ask all other honourable members in the Chamber to be quiet.

**Mr Muntz:** Has the hypocrisy of members of the Australian Labor Party been noticed when something positive is being done?

**Mrs HARVEY:** I have noticed that; I think it is a panic reaction. I ask: Where was the representation—

**Opposition Members interjected.**

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I have asked for silence in the Chamber. As soon as I resumed my seat, several members immediately defied my request. If the noise continues, I will very shortly warn some members and remove them from the Chamber.

**Mrs HARVEY:** I ask: Where was the representation from the member for South Brisbane on behalf of sole parents when his colleagues—or, rather, comrades—in the Federal socialist Government applied cut-backs to pre-school education? Surely he, like all members, must have received dozens of letters from kindergartens and pre-school centres imploring him to help. I do not remember ever hearing him speak in this House on behalf of those people or making a firm commitment that he will not rest until Canberra reinstates pre-school funding to its former level.

Actions speak louder than words. What has the member for South Brisbane, who is so quick to criticise, done for sole parents? I doubt whether he even knows what a sole parent is.

I will explain what it means to be a sole parent. It means wondering fearfully whether one's kids made it to school safely, because one has to be on one's way to work before schools starts. It means having to resign when the children get chicken-pox or the mumps, because no two children in the one family ever contract such illnesses in the same fortnight but drag them out for at least a month. It means worrying whether the children are OK after school, because they are too old for child-minding but old enough to get into all sorts of trouble. It means having to be in two places at once, because one child is due at cricket when the other child is due at ballet. I could go on about this subject for hours, but the 10-minute time-limit on my speech restricts me somewhat.

I bring all those points to the attention of the member for South Brisbane to give him an opportunity to do something worth while and concrete for sole parents, just as so many other people in the community are doing and just as this Government is doing.

The honourable member for South Brisbane could help set up more adopt-a-grandparent schemes. He could help provide home-aid for sole parents. He could help set up sole parent organisations of different types catering to a variety of needs. But what will he really do? I expect that once again he will sit back and wait for the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs (Mr Muntz) and the Government to tackle the real problems and then run to the press with an unjust and irrational tirade of criticism in order to gain a cheaply earned headline or two. When the Year of the Parent was announced, the member for South Brisbane and his colleagues did nothing but scoff; but if this project did not meet with his approval, he certainly had every opportunity to propose an alternative. But that, of course, would take some thought, effort and a genuine desire to see something constructive achieved for the community. It is easier, however, to be a true shadow Minister and walk in the shadow of something positive being done by the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs and this Government, and to distort many admirable and worthwhile projects with baseless and irrational tirades of criticism aimed purely at grandstanding and easy press.

As a member of the committee of the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs, I am well aware of the initiatives taken by the Minister and his department. I am sure that if the member for South Brisbane took the trouble to ask he would also be informed of what positive action is in progress for both sole parents and other members of the community. Today I issue a challenge to him to do more than just simply run round criticising what other people are doing and the hard work they put in. I challenge him to do more than just go in for the cheap punchline every time he speaks. I challenge him to do something positive, to come up with a constructive program or project. I know that that is not the attitude adopted by the Opposition. Opposition members do not see their role as being anything other than offering criticism, whether there is any basis for it or not, but I would like to see them adopt a positive approach to welfare, upon which the well-being of so many people depends.

*Time expired.*

### Milk Quotas

**Mr KRUGER** (Murrumba) (12.9 p.m.): The Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) and former Ministers have set out to mislead this Assembly in order to cover up for people in high places in connection with the milk industry. In an article in *Queensland Country Life* this week, headed "Milk quota move", the following article appeared—

"The State Government has moved to stop a racket where dairy farms are bought specifically for their quota and the land sold again.

It is also considering changes to favour smaller producers in the laws covering the sale of milk entitlement."

That is a clear indication and admission that the Government has in fact been allowing people to play round with milk quota entitlements.

The new scheme that is envisaged will allow for dairy farms to be sold as going concerns retaining entitlements, with drop-outs going to the pool. That was always the intention but, unfortunately, because of the rorts that were going on, that did not happen.

Under the new scheme, producers with an entitlement of less than 750 litres a day will be able to purchase an entitlement without purchasing the land. The land will then be sold or used for other purposes. Producers with entitlements in excess of 750 litres a day will be excluded from purchasing in that way. A purchaser buying an entitlement of less than 750 litres a day will forfeit to the pool 20 per cent of the entitlement free of charge. A purchaser buying more than 750 litres a day will forfeit to the pool 40 per cent of the entitlement free of charge. The scheme will reduce the amount of drop-out that goes to the pool, a matter that is worrying me.

Of course, the scheme is being introduced to prevent a racket. That is what the media said, and there is no other way of describing it. In 1983, I raised this racket in this Parliament during the debate on the Milk Supply Act Amendment Bill, and I have raised it on several occasions since.

Let us look at the denial of the previous Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Ahern) that deals were going on. In *Hansard* of 30 March 1983, the previous Minister is reported as saying—

“In my capacity as Minister for Primary Industries I have been associated with industry representatives for 2½ years. I reject completely any suggestion of rorts, shonky deals or frauds and any other reflections on the people associated with any administration or that of the administration of the industry. I reject such accusations because I believe that they cannot be substantiated by facts.”

They have been substantiated, and I shall say more about that shortly.

The previous Minister for Primary Industries was quoted in the *Queensland Country Life* of 26 May 1983 as saying—

“Publication of milk entitlements and any transfers as well as defaults of farm sales has been ordered.”

The article said that, to end any suggestion of secrecy in transactions, the Minister would direct the Milk Entitlements Committee to make the information public. The previous Minister did not do what he said he would do, and that is unfortunate.

On 1 December 1983, I asked the Minister for Primary Industries the following question—

“How many amalgamations of milk entitlements were effected by the Milk Entitlements Committee in the period from June 1980 to July 1983?”

He replied—

“The Milk Entitlements Committee did not keep records of amalgamations until March/April 1983 . . .”

It will be recalled that the amendments to the Milk Supply Act were introduced in March 1983. That shows quite clearly that, before those matters were raised in this Parliament, there was no intention of keeping any records.

The old validating legislation trick was used again. Legislation was introduced to validate the sorts of things that were going on.

In this Chamber yesterday, the present Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) said—

“All dairy farm transactions from standard walk-in, walk-out sales through to various forms of property amalgamations have been thoroughly checked by my department and the Milk Entitlements Committee. The formal legal advice obtained in relation to these transactions involving amalgamations has been, and remains, that they are commercially and legally valid.”

That is not correct. They may have been valid but they certainly were not legal.

The transcript of the hearing of the disputes tribunal reveals that the tribunal mentioned that many of the deals were suspect. The most glaring examples related to people by the name of White somewhere on the Gold Coast and to a firm under the control of Russell James Hinze. Of course, that involves the Maralinga affair, of which we are all well aware.

Yesterday, the Minister also said—

“ I have imposed, on and as from 9 September 1985, a freeze on those dairy property transactions which intend to apply the principle of amalgamation of the operations. This freeze will apply until new legislation has been enacted and its detailed implementation finalised and put into effect by the Milk Entitlements Committee.”

That shows quite clearly that the Government has known all along that there has been a problem with these amalgamations. They have not been legal. If the validating legislation had not been introduced, a good deal more would have been done about the matter.

The disputes tribunal was told of the amalgamation problems, and there is no good point to be served in going any further with that matter.

**Mr Ahern** interjected.

**Mr KRUGER:** I am not confused; the Government has set out to confuse the people. I know what happened, as does the Minister. If he had been the least bit honest about it, he would have stopped it. If the Minister wants to be reminded of the bigwigs, I will tell him who they were.

**Mr AHERN:** I rise to a point of order. The honourable member has reflected on my honesty. I take exception to that, and I ask him to withdraw.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Row): Order! I take the Minister's point of order. The honourable member for Murrumbidgee has reflected on the Minister and has come very close to impugning the veracity of other members of this House. I ask him to withdraw the comment and remind him not to make similar comments.

**Mr KRUGER:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I withdraw the comment that has worried the Minister.

On 3 August 1983, during the debate in this Chamber on matters of public interest, I referred to statements made by the then Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Ahern) during the debate on the Milk Supply Act Amendment Bill and to a subsequent article that appeared in the press, which read as follows—

“A bid by a family company of Local Government Minister Mr Hinze to acquire the milk quota of a dairy farm it purchased in part is expected to fail.

The Primary Industries Minister, Mr Ahern, said yesterday he expected the entitlement transfer application by Maralinga Pty Ltd would be rejected by the Milk Entitlements Committee.

Mr Ahern said the sale had been negotiated before the introduction of new guide-lines outlawing the transfer of a dairy's milk quota to a subdivision of the farm.”

Previously it was claimed that the deal may have been acceptable because the 30 ha purchased was the main source of supply of the farm. When I inspected the property shortly after, I discovered that that part of the property was not being used for dairy-farming. I was not attempting to cast aspersions against the Minister, but that was what he said at the time. When I checked out the property it was not being used as a dairy, although the amalgamation had taken place and Mr Hinze and his family were selling through two vats to the Gold Coast and to QUF Industries Ltd. I wanted answers to those questions then and, now that the issue has arisen again a few years later, an attempt should be made to get some sanity into the situation.

It is astonishing that the people who were involved in these deals——

**Mr Ahern:** Mr Kruger, I will answer all your allegations when the legislation is debated in this House.

**Mr KRUGER:** That will be all right; I do not mind.

The top 15 producers of milk in this State hold or have held top positions in processor groups, producer groups, the Milk Entitlements Committee, the Queensland Dairymen's Organisation and Metro Milk. These people are all very heavily associated with the National Party, and I refer to Charlie Holm, the Hollindales, the Hinzes and the Rowleys. I have mentioned them all before.

Referring again to my original statement——

**Mr Ahern:** That was three years ago.

**Mr KRUGER:** Yes, it was three years ago, but what I am saying is that, since that time, this Government has denied that those transactions were happening, yet now it is taking steps to stop them happening. The Government has always claimed that these deals or transactions did not take place. If that is the case, why is it to legislate to outlaw such transactions? That does not make sense. Unless the Government knew that it was happening, the present Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) would not be trying to change the legislation. I tried to get the Government to change the legislation before, but it stood up for its friends and denied that the transactions were taking place. The transcript of the proceedings before the appeals tribunal reveals conclusively that transactions that were contrary to the intent of the legislation had occurred. In fact, three or four of the transactions were considered to be illegal.

*Time expired.*

### **Industrial Demands by Federated Liquor and Allied Industries Employees Union**

**Mr BAILEY (Toowong)** (12.19 p.m.): One can only wonder at the lengths to which some union-leaders will go to destroy the employers who provide their members' jobs. They attempt not to achieve better conditions for their members but to improve their own positions within the union hierarchy. The trade union movement in Queensland seems to have a death wish. The power industry unions, led so ably from the rear by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton) and his other former Electrical Trades Union executives proved that lemmings were the animals of the year as they led the South East Queensland Electricity Board workers over the industrial cliff. It was a death wish second only to the religious suicides at Jonestown, Guyana.

In an endeavour by three young turks to become kings of the castle of the Australian Council of Trade Unions in Queensland, once again unions are flexing their industrial muscles. I am speaking about the Federated Liquor and Allied Industries Employees Union, which has sent to all hotels and clubs in Queensland copies of a letter, which I hold in my hand. I wish to read part of it to the House and also to lay it on the table and have it incorporated in *Hansard*.

This letter is the most blatant case of industrial blackmail ever seen in this State. It deals with laws that do not relate to this union, which operates under a Federal award. Yet, if the clubs and hotels do not reply in the affirmative within 14 days, this union is threatening to take industrial action. The letter is signed by Mr Brian Elton, who is the so-called acting state secretary of the Federated Liquor and Allied Industries Employees Union. He writes, in a letter dated 11 September—

“Dear Employer

I enclose a copy of an agreement which we request that you have signed and returned to this Office within fourteen (14) days of the above date.

The crux of the agreement is that this union is willing to give an exemption to your organisation and members employed by your organisation, in relation to a general stoppage of this Union's members or the trade union movement generally, on the question of abolition of penalty rates or contract labour. In return we ask for a guarantee that despite any forthcoming legislation by the State Government on these issues you are prepared to continue to abide by the existing award structures.

It is hoped that you will appreciate that this Union has taken this action in an attempt to protect the living standards of its members without involving our industry in a massive industrial confrontation.”

Because their employees would not go out on strike on the so-called SEQEB day, the union has already taken some of the hotels to task. A number of hotels have been declared black—including Gary Balkin's hotel. Over the years, Gary Balkin has been a



great Labor Party supporter and has made sure that everything is done under the appropriate awards. I am quite surprised that the union declared his hotel black.

A resolution passed at a meeting of combined shop stewards and delegates held on 11 September 1985 reads—

“That this meeting of Delegates of the Federated Liquor and Allied Industries Employees Union expresses extreme concern at attempts by the Queensland Government to abolish penalty rates.”

The resolution went on to list three demands that the union wants the employers to agree to, and continues—

“This meeting determines that a document be circulated to all establishments, within this Union coverage, seeking written guarantees in respect to the following:

1. That the employer undertake not to support State Government moves to abolish penalty rates.

2. That the employer undertakes not to utilise State Government legislation seeking to abolish penalty rates.

3. That the employer provide an undertaking that irrespective of any State Government legislation, that they will not enter into a system of individual contracts with their employees but will continue to abide by current Award conditions and standards.”

What is extraordinary about these demands is that this union operates under Federal awards, so it would not be affected in any way by any agreement reached in this State. That does not appear to make much difference to this union. In 14 days' time, it intends to flex its industrial muscle and not supply any liquor to any of the hotels and clubs that do not agree to its demands in 14 days.

**Mrs Chapman:** I have received many complaints about this matter. Some employees have received threatening telephone calls.

**Mr BAILEY:** I gather that there has been much abuse to individual unionists.

**Mr Elliott:** They are standover tactics.

**Mr BAILEY:** Yes, indeed.

The first of the three young turks responsible for this industrial thuggery is Brian Elton, the so-called acting secretary of the union. He is actually the assistant secretary but has moved in quickly before Jimmy Hamilton is dead and buried. I understand that Brian Elton has ambitions to be both secretary of the Communist Party and a member of Parliament—an odd combination.

**Mr Stoneman:** He would fit on the other side all right.

**Mr BAILEY:** Yes. He would fit in very well with members of the Opposition. He would have many good friends there.

**Mr Littleproud:** He would have a couple of friends over there.

**Mr BAILEY:** Yes. He would have a couple of friends over there.

The second is Tony Shelton, the disputes officer of that union. That is an appropriate title. He is a cause of disputes; he does not solve them.

The third young Turk is a fellow named Col Hardy, from the Gold Coast. This triumvirate threatens the whole hospitality industry for its own ambitions. The hotels will not succumb. I am sure that the clubs will not succumb. In 14 days' time they intend to take on the public by halting supplies. Their own members have already indicated that they will not strike. All that these three persons can do is cut the supplies. I hope that they can be dealt with under the existing legislation.

How many unionists are really interested in such action? A group that calls itself the "Concerned Hospitality Industry Workers" wrote the following letter headed "What's happening to our union?" It is written by the people who are concerned, not by the thugs who run the union. Once again, Brian Elton is mentioned. He is obviously one of the more popular members of the union. The letter states—

"Brian Elton, Assistant Secretary, bans us, calls us 'scabs' and then blames the brewery workers.

Who is this committee who thinks they can make decisions for the vast majority of union members?

Brewery workers are the minority—3% of the membership.

Why should they think they can control us?

But is it them or is it Elton and his team (gang)?

Elton says he and his team are doing more of a job than was done by the previous union administration.

Doing a job on us for sure!"

**Mr Littleproud:** The word "job" would be in inverted commas, wouldn't it?

**Mr BAILEY:** The honourable member is correct.

The letter further states—

"He told us that he wants to be secretary of the union."

As these concerned hospitality industry workers put it—

"Who wants a secretary who can't be trusted to tell the truth to the members?  
Who wants a secretary who blames everyone else for his mistakes?

Now he tells us we're gearing up for war. What war?

The only war he wants is for his own personal benefit.

Are we to be pawns that he thinks he can manipulate for his own political future?

Are we going to be victims of his war or do we tell him and his 'new team' where to get off?"

That would be the most sensible thing that the members of this union could do—get rid of these three fellows as fast as possible before they once again bring the hospitality industry in this State to its knees.

The letter continues—

"Now they propose to increase our fees by \$20 per year."

I understand that the officers of the union are having a good time. Each of approximately 16 000 members of the union pays \$70 per year membership fees. The total is an enormous sum of money. Fees are to be increased by \$20 per annum. I understand that the additional revenue collected will go towards buying \$170,000 worth of new cars, and that union officers will pay themselves \$50 per meeting instead of the \$10 paid at present. Union fees will be raised in this beautifully democratic fashion to pay for the lurks and perks of its officers.

Honourable members keep hearing things about lurks and perks. The union movement and the "Mr Cleans" on the other side of the House are for ever accusing the Queensland Government of misspending. Opposition members have their own people running around rorting. It cannot be described in any other way. At the same time they threaten to bring this State to heel over an award that has absolutely no relevance to them. That is absolutely extraordinary.

I table both documents and seek leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard*.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Row): Order! The honourable member wishes to table documents——

**Mr Mackenroth:** And incorporate them in *Hansard*.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Is permission granted?

**Honourable Members:** Aye!

**Mr BAILEY:** The exercise that we are trying to combat today is this most extraordinary situation in which a State could be brought to rack and ruin because unions have members with political aspirations.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Did the honourable member for Toowong ask for the documents to be incorporated in *Hansard*?

**Mr BAILEY:** Yes.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That is not possible unless I have seen the documents. The honourable member may table them only.

**Mr BAILEY:** The realities are that, 14 days from the date of the letter, unless the conditions are met by the industry, strike action will be taken.

*Time expired.*

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

#### **Hilton Hotels Corporation USA**

**Mr MACKENROTH** (Chatsworth) (12.30 p.m.): During the Address in Reply debate, I raised certain matters regarding alleged links with Hilton Hotels America and organised crime.

On that occasion I raised matters relating to a hearing in New Jersey and the findings of the commission in relation to that hearing. Time did not allow me on that occasion to raise other matters in relation to this subject.

Members would be aware that Jupiters held its annual general meeting on Monday of this week. At that meeting, and in the annual report sent to share-holders, the directors attempted to explain the allegations of links with organised crime.

The annual report contained an open letter to all share-holders reaffirming the confidence of Jupiters in Hilton Hotels Corporation USA. Part of the letter reads—

“Jupiters Management Limited, as Manager of Jupiters Trust, advises that both the Jupiters Board and the Queensland Government have kept abreast of the U.S. matters since the beginning and are satisfied as to the integrity of Conrad International Hotels Corporation and Hilton Hotels Corporation as Operator so as to ensure the issuance of a licence to the Trustee as originally intended.”

The letter to which I refer was signed by two directors; Sir Roderick Proctor, chairman of Jupiters Management Limited, and Gregory R. Dillon, director of Jupiters Management Limited and Executive Vice-President of Hilton Hotels Corporation USA. Mr Dillon is also a director of Conrad International Hotels Corporation.

So Mr Dillon has told share-holders in Jupiters that, as a director of Jupiters, he is satisfied as to the integrity of Conrad International and Hilton Hotels Corporation when, in fact, he is a director of both those companies. It is a sham that that person told people that he was satisfied with those companies when in fact he was talking about himself.

The letter that I have referred to contains a background briefing on Hilton Hotels Corporation USA's New Jersey developments. Part of that background briefing stated—

“Two reasons were given by the commissioners for denial: (1) The relationship with Sidney Korshak, the labour attorney, whose firm Hilton had retained for labour

matters, was unacceptable. Neither Mr Korshak nor his firm is now retained by Hilton. Though Mr Korshak was controversial, the fact is that virtually all the work was provided by two other members of his firm—both well regarded, both members of the Illinois bar.”

The statement by Proctor and Dillon is a complete misrepresentation of the truth and an attempt by them to pull the wool over the eyes of share-holders.

To prove that what I am saying is correct, I quote from the findings by Commissioner Joel Jacobson of the New Jersey Gaming Commission the following passage—

“Hilton asserted that its association with Korshak was perfectly innocent and points to the legal work performed by Donald Peters, Jr., and David Mendelsohn under the retainer agreement on behalf of the Korshak law firm.

Neither Peters nor Mendelsohn were members of the Korshak law firm. They were hired by Korshak as independent contractors. Hilton officials repeatedly praised the work of Peters and Mendelsohn in the field of labor law, and cited this reason as to why they continued to retain Korshak.

Had Hilton dropped its retainer agreement with Korshak, it could have easily continued to utilize the services of Peters and Mendelsohn, inasmuch as both men were engaged in the private practice of law outside the Korshak firm.

Rather, Hilton continued the retainer payments to Korshak for sums ranging as high as \$65,000 a year, for few identifiable legal services.”

Honourable members can see quite clearly from that statement that Peters and Mendelsohn were not members of Korshak’s firm, and I believe that all honourable members should question why Hilton continued to pay Korshak when, in fact, it could have employed Peters and Mendelsohn directly. Honourable members should also question why Proctor and Dillon told share-holders that those people were in fact employees of Korshak.

The background briefing continues—

“The second source relied on by one commissioner in denying licensure was a recital of past allegations contained in a 1979 Hilton internal report prepared by Hilton’s then head of security, Mr Chester St. Vincent.

Late in the hearings before the Casino Control Commission, Hilton learned for the first time that the Commission had requested that Mr St. Vincent’s report be submitted to it as evidence.”

I will not canvass the contents of the report at this stage, but it is obvious from the statement by Proctor and Dillon that they want share-holders to believe that Hilton was unaware that the commission wanted the St. Vincent report. That statement is another attempt to mislead share-holders and, as proof of that, I quote from the findings by Commissioner Carl Zeitz—

“I submit that after reviewing the record in the past week—a review that included rereading much or all of the testimony of Barron Hilton, Henri Lewin and William Edwards—one issue apart from Sidney Korshak and the previously enumerated issues is of particular concern. I found it to be of particular concern because it is illustrative of how Hilton deals with such issues and how it has responded to the statutory requirements of this hearing. That concern revolves around the issues regarding Henri Lewin, and in particular a document submitted in evidence as C-1, comprising a report compiled from November 1976 to mid-January 1977 by Chester St. Vincent, then the Director of Corporate Security for Hilton Hotels. St. Vincent’s report summarized in raw form his investigation of allegations of improprieties and possible violations of law at the San Francisco Hilton. The investigation was spurred by the receipt of an anonymous letter.

My concern relates not only to the substantive issues raised by it, many of which are alluded to in various Division of Gaming Enforcement exhibits, but also to the failure to bring this document to the Commission as evidence in the hearing.

If Henri Lewin had not referred to it in his testimony on September 17, 1984, the Commission would never have been aware of it.

Once alerted, the Commission, through the diligence of its members and staff and through further limited testimony elicited from Hilton witnesses, reached a moment when its staff asked that the St. Vincent report be entered into evidence.

Under Section 86 (b) of the Casino Control Act, 'Failure of the applicant to provide information, documentation and assurances required by the act or requested by the commission, or failure of the applicant to reveal any fact material to qualification, or the supplying of information which is untrue or misleading as to a material fact pertaining to the qualification criteria' shall be cause for denial of a license.

Certainly the St. Vincent report, in evidence as C-1, is such a material fact and certainly it was not provided by the applicant to the Commission until requested by the Commission. There is no need, however, to decide whether an actual Section 86 (b) disqualification occurred. Rather, what is important is the insight the handling of this most pertinent evidence provides as to Hilton's attitude toward allegations of internal wrongdoing and to the regulatory process in which we have all been engaged. Because of the sparsity of the record on this point I do not know whether it was provided to the Division by the applicant or whether it was obtained from other sources. But it was obtained and the record will show that rather than putting it before the Commission it was argued the Commission should not see it."

Certainly that is not what Proctor and Dillon would have share-holders believe.

The second point I wish to raise today is the blow-out in the budget for Jupiters casino.

**Mr Borbidge:** Why are you trying to destroy the project?

**Mr MACKENROTH:** The boy from Surfers Paradise should sit back and cop it.

On Monday of this week, share-holders were told that the completed cost of the casino had escalated, principally because of the addition of two floors to the main building. What they were not told was that, owing to the incompetence of the State Government, Jupiters would have to spend an additional amount of between \$2m and \$4m. Whether that incompetence was deliberate or otherwise, we will leave the Government to explain.

The matter to which I refer is this: earlier this year, Jennings Construction Company signed a contract with an Australian company for the supply of video gaming machines. Part of the terms of the conditional contract was that the machines to be installed must have been approved by the New Jersey or Las Vegas gaming authorities and to be to the specification or standard of either one of those authorities. The Director of the Queensland Gaming Control Board, Mr Kevin Leyshon, was to use the board's best offices to have the machines approved in adequate time. In fact, however, Mr Leyshon, right up till 2 August, made no formal request to either the preferred party, the New Jersey Authorities, or the Nevada authorities.

Leyshon has referred to the need to meet various requirements or standards, but in fact he has not been able to provide those standards. It has been impossible for the firm to get the machines from either New Jersey or Nevada. In other words, prospective suppliers have been asked to comply with standards that have not been specified to any party, and by a date (31 July) which obviously could not be met, in view of the lack of information on the required standards and lack of an undertaking by an American authority—New Jersey or Nevada—that it would inspect and approve machines by a given date.

Seeking to avoid the bottle-neck relative to approval to an undefined standard, the Australian manufacturer put forward to the Queensland Government Uniquet of Queensland University as a potential testing laboratory, with a view to having licensing qualifications established, on the one hand, and, on the other, to providing Queensland with a local testing authority rather than depending on overseas laboratories which could

not or would not provide a specification. The Casino Control Division declined to either accept or reject the proposal for the laboratory, which included leading academics such as Professor Morris W. Gunn and Dr Larry Skattesbol of the university's department of electrical engineering.

Surely a case involving many millions of dollars in overseas exchange funds, resulting in increased costs for the casino, the employment of Australians and furthering the development of an important technical and export income, is worth while and called for a little more flexibility on the part of the Casino Control Division and the Government.

The Government of Queensland should tell the share-holders of Jupiters why it has put that company to the additional expense of between \$2m and \$4m to buy its gaming machines overseas, thereby exporting jobs out of Australia. In a previous speech, I spoke about pay-offs and organised crime. Is this the first indication of organised crime gaining a toe-hold in casinos in Queensland?

### Federal Cabinet Meeting in Townsville

Mr STONEMAN (Burdekin) (12.40 p.m.): Next Monday, the Prime Minister (Mr Hawke) brings his Cabinet to Townsville. The people of north Queensland will have many questions to ask him and his group of taxation raiders. Principal among the questions will be why so many promises have been broken. I refer to promises relating to—

- the sugar industry;
- capital gains tax;
- sales tax on freight;
- the Australian Broadcasting Corporation;
- coastal surveillance;
- water storage programs;
- no-frills air services; and
- patrol boats.

If time permits, I will deal with those promises in detail later.

The people of Townsville will also be asking questions about meat inspection charges, superannuation, natural disaster relief, transport matters, and so on. Some people will also want to ask Mr Hawke to clarify several other issues of major concern, and I instance Aboriginal land rights.

The Hawke Government has sought to appease left-wing members and trendies such as Senator Margaret Reynolds and Mr Clyde Holding. I refer to an editorial published in the *Townsville Bulletin* on 2 September. It is headed "Hawke faces a white backlash", and it reads, in part—

"The Hawke Government, in a massive over-reaction to historical injustices against Aborigines, is now selling Australia down the river at breakneck speed. Last week it was revealed that the Government is preparing land rights legislation which could ultimately give Aborigines claim to 25 per cent of the continent. Under that land is much of the resources which would ensure the country's prosperity for many years.

Mr Hawke cannot reasonably believe that Australians would want to give their own country away.

Mr Hawke cannot give land rights to the underprivileged Aborigines under the guise of equality, without doing likewise for other underprivileged Australians.

This Government must call a halt to its mad rush towards racial violence. For Australia's sake, if not for the Government's own sake."

The Federal Government's policy on uranium is another matter about which people will want to ask questions. I point out that Townsville is very close to a veritable pot of gold in the form of the Ben Lomond uranium mine, which is situated in my electorate. Approval of the Total Mining Company's application will result in many millions of dollars being brought into the region for the benefit of the State and the nation. Moreover, it is expected that 1 000 jobs will be created.

Only by not denying them jobs and income opportunity will Mr Hawke convince the people of north Queensland that his Government has the interests of that region at heart.

Threats made by unions to export industries will be another matter about which people will want to question Mr Hawke. In an area that is almost totally dependent upon exports such as sugar, beef and mining products, it is vitally important that the Prime Minister make a commitment that will ensure that the region is protected from actions of the Transport Workers Union that are under way. The Prime Minister must make the position clear.

I again refer to an editorial that appeared two or three days ago in *The Australian*. It was headed, "Selfish destruction of export industries", and it reads—

"The action by the Transport Workers Union in stopping all air shipments of meat from Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane in support of a 38-hour week is the latest in a series of completely unacceptable moves by Australian trade unions which threaten the prosperity of the nation and in the long run would endanger the union movement itself.

It is another example of union militancy destroying a vital and competitive export industry.

But how cruel it is for Australia's meat producers to see their efforts come to nothing because of this industrial action, to see valuable, hard-won export markets sacrificed on the altar of union power.

The National Farmers Federation, the Cattle Council of Australia and the United Graziers Association have called on the Prime Minister to intervene in this dispute. It is a call which Mr Hawke should not ignore. The Government must not shirk its responsibility to all Australians by allowing this irresponsible industrial action to continue."

The editorial concludes with the following statement—and I emphasise it—

"The selfishness of a section of the trade union movement must not be allowed to destroy our all too precious, and all too few, export markets."

As I said previously, the Prime Minister must make his position clear so that the people can make a judgment.

Another matter that is likely to be raised is the threat of a capital gains tax and its effect on the long-term viability of thousands of farms and business enterprises throughout Australia. That raises questions that need to be answered by Mr Hawke.

Most important of all is the fact that an estimated 1 000 farmers are expected to converge on Townsville and ask the Prime Minister and the Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin) what they intend to do for the beleaguered sugar industry. The Federal Government's ludicrous suggestion that the Queensland Government should match its level of industry support is highlighted by an editorial that appeared some weeks ago in the *Townsville Bulletin*. It is headed "Hawke must keep pledge" and states—

"What is quite clear is that the State Government isn't going to, and should not, accept the 50-50 deal that Federal sources are touting. The State will argue

that the Federal Government should foot the vast majority of the estimated \$145 million three-year price support structure.

And Queensland will be on very stong ground in its argument.

And although it supplies the ports and other facilities it certainly doesn't receive 50 per cent back from the taxation revenue earned by sugar.

It will then argue again with Justice, that there is no basic difference between help for Queensland's sugar industry and help for the southern States' steel and motor vehicle industries. To date, the Labor Government has sunk some \$500 million into aid for the steel industry in New South Wales and the car industry in Victoria and South Australia. And no significant State input there was required."

Northern Australia must not only be supported by the tax-gatherers of the nation, but it also must be seen to be supported. Promises have been made and broken. More promises will not be accepted. The track record of the Hawke Government can only be patched up by positive and definite statements and actions that are put into effect immediately.

The sugar industry needs answers, not rhetoric and sweet-talk. It needs money, not procrastination. So, for the sake of north Queensland, I ask Mr Hawke to answer this question: Will he stand by his 1983 commitment that, "This Government will not introduce a capital gains tax" or is he going to hide behind the election held 20 months after he first came to office, and call all bets off? Finally, I say to Mr Hawke: If he continues to insist that the Queensland Government give support to the sugar industry equal to that given by the Commonwealth, will he tell north Queensland farmers why the millions of tax dollars the industry has paid through farmers, sugar-millers, PAYE tax, tax generated by the thousands of industry-support businesses, Federal excise charges, fuel taxes and sales taxes should not be the total support base for a national industry and why, for the first time, such an industry is being used as the meat in the sandwich for his blatant vendetta against the Queensland Government?

I will now underline some of Mr Hawke's promises. In relation to the sugar industry he said—

"We will give sympathetic consideration to an industry loan to the Queensland and New South Wales sugar industries. We will work to improve the present domestic price formula to allow for international prices and variable costs to be taken into account."

What a lot of rot! He should ask the farmers battling in the bush just what has happened.

The 1983 policy speech pledged not to introduce a capital gains tax. Now the Federal Labor Government is committed under the prices and incomes accord to an effective capital gains tax.

In relation to sales tax on freight, he promised that—

"Sales tax will be removed from the freight element of goods delivered to North Queensland. This should provide a substantial cost saving to your industries, your retailers and ultimately, your consumers."

No action has been taken in regard to that promise.

Let me turn next to the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, about which this promise was made—

"A Labor Government will make a grant to the ABC to immediately start on the upgrading of its services for North Queensland."

I suggest that the Prime Minister ask any person in northern and inland Australia what he thinks of the upgrading of ABC services.

This promise was made in relation to coastal serveillance—

"We will ask the Royal Australian Navy to retain its fixed wing capability and to station immediately, three tracker aircraft at either Townsville or Cairns for



coastal patrols, in addition to those aircraft already patrolling on Government contracts."

What happened? Nothing!

Proposed water programs have been swept aside.

*Time expired.*

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** I call the honourable member for Townsville.

**Mr R. J. Gibbs** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Wolston might like to join his colleagues, who are now leaving the Chamber, in an early lunch. He has already been warned under Standing Order No. 123A.

### Death of Nicholas Bowkett

**Mr McELLIGOTT (Townsville) (12.50 p.m.):** In the Chamber yesterday members witnessed the most extraordinary attack by the Minister for Health (Mr Austin) on the grieving mother of the child, Nicholas Bowkett, who died whilst a patient in the Royal Children's Hospital. The Minister extended that attack to include the ALP Opposition and two employees of the Queensland Nurses Union.

The cause of the Minister's outburst was a front-page article in *The Sunday Mail* headed "Mother Pleads for a Better Hospital System", which the Minister described as "a gross distortion and misrepresentation of the facts of this case." In other words, the Minister called Mrs Bowkett a liar, and he repeated that assertion on the *State Affair* program last evening.

I submit that the diary of events contained in *The Sunday Mail* article are of sufficient substance to demand some public accounting. Mrs Bowkett was kind enough to say that she was not critical of the doctors or nurses at the Royal Children's Hospital, but her crime, in the eyes of the Minister for Health, is that she did suggest that a contributing factor to her son's death was gross understaffing and consequent overwork of staff in our hospitals.

It is reasonable to assume that a responsible Minister would have taken the trouble to initiate a full inquiry into this tragic case. The sad fact, which has not been acknowledged by the Minister, is that Nicholas Bowkett's condition was not diagnosed, despite his receiving attention over a period of about two years.

Surely, in the interests of the advancement of our health-care services, this curious case should be totally investigated to try to ensure that if mistakes were made they do not occur again. I am not interested in recriminations; nor, I suspect, are the Bowketts. If the Minister will assure this House that a full inquiry has been or will be made, I, for one, will be satisfied.

However, we have grown used to this particular Minister reacting to criticism by engaging in name-calling and character assassination. We well recall his hysterical attack on the secretary of the Queensland Nurses Union some time ago, which led to an apology from the Minister.

I understand that the Minister for Health had some experience as a rugby league hooker. I, too, played rugby league, and in my experience there are two kinds of hookers. There are those who, when they find they are not winning the ball from the scrum, find out why the scrum is not working and make the necessary adjustments. Then there are those who whinge and scream about the referee, the rules and anything else they can think of. The Minister for Health is a whinger and a screamer.

Rather than accept that something just might have gone wrong at the Royal Children's Hospital, he invented this contemptible story about a conspiracy. He has named as the

perpetrators of this conspiracy Mr Deane Wells, the project officer, and Ms Lee McGlynn, the media information officer, both employed by the Queensland Nurses Union.

The Minister claims to have been reliably informed that those two employees of the Queensland Nurses Union had been pushing *The Sunday Mail* story round the Brisbane media for several weeks. The fact is that the Minister's reliable informer, a female journalist from a rival newspaper, is wrong, and the Minister lied to this House. He is guilty of the very thing that he accused Mr and Mrs Bowkett of doing. He has made statements without first checking the facts.

I have in my possession statutory declarations from Mr Wells and Ms McGlynn, which clearly show that Mr Wells was totally unaware of this whole tragic story until he read it in *The Sunday Mail* and that Ms McGlynn's only involvement was to refer Mrs Bowkett to the journalist at *The Sunday Mail*.

The Minister should immediately apologise to Mr Wells, Ms McGlynn and the Bowketts for his unwarranted attacks on their characters. Neither I nor any other member of the Opposition was aware of this tragic case until we read about it in *The Sunday Mail*.

I table those statutory declarations.

*Whereupon the honourable member laid the documents on the table.*

Unfortunately, in Queensland we have a situation which would not be tolerated in any other Government. We have a Minister for Health with a total hatred of the body that represents nurses in the hospitals for which he has ministerial responsibility. His paranoia against the union and its employees and officers is well illustrated by his unfortunate outburst in this place yesterday. It is further illustrated by his refusal to address or even attend the union's annual conference, or to receive deputations or to reply to correspondence from the union. It should be borne in mind that this union represents nurses who are complaining bitterly about working conditions, understaffing and other matters in our hospitals.

That situation cannot be tolerated. In my opinion, it is as well that the Minister for Health is seeking a change from that portfolio. Obviously, he wants to get out of the Health portfolio because he knows that his maladministration has brought the whole public health system to crisis point. The Australian Medical Association says so, the nurses say so and patients say so. Because of grave staff shortages, our hospitals are in a mess, and it is deceitful of the Minister to claim otherwise.

The Minister has continually tried to assert that no figures have ever been presented to him which would indicate that staff shortages do in fact exist at any Queensland hospital. I am aware that, prior to the formulation of the 1985-86 State Budget, very detailed submissions were made to the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer (Mr Gunn) and the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) by the Combined Professional Emergency Services Organisation, and I am also aware of submissions compiled by the nursing staff of various hospitals throughout the State for consideration by their hospitals boards.

Three of those submissions are in my possession. They are very comprehensive and indicate clearly the staffing situations in the hospitals to which they refer. If that information has not been brought to the notice of the Minister for Health, heads should roll in the Health Department. The submissions are well documented and well researched, and contain vital information. If the Minister has received the information but has chosen to ignore it, he has not done his duty as Minister for Health in Queensland.

The three submissions in my possession refer to the Townsville Base Hospital, the Cairns Base Hospital and the Innisfail Base Hospital respectively. The latest of those submissions relating to the Innisfail Base Hospital was compiled only last month by nursing staff for the consideration of the board, and is dated September 1985. I will

quote from the submissions, which honourable members will find illuminating, as follows—

“Ward 1—The nursing care of the Ward 1 patients is often left entirely to the discretion of the rostered nurse be it Enrolled Nurse or Pupil Nurse. The pupil nurse may have only 4-6 weeks nursing experience.

Ward 2—Ward 2 receives the overflow of patients from Ward 3 and Ward 7 until beds are made available in those wards and this means that there are adults and children all together in one ward. These patients can be surgical, medical, geriatric, paediatric or terminal.

Ward 4 (Male Public Ward)—Presently Enrolled Nurses are not working on both the morning and evening shifts which leaves a pupil nurse in that ward which sometimes has some critically ill patients.

Ward 5 (Maternity)—It should be noted that the establishment for this ward already has provision for a Charge Nurse, but because this position relieves for the Deputy and Nursing Superintendent, the registered nurse is rarely available for ward duties.

Ward 6 (Female Nursing Home)—On the night shift, one Pupil Nurse with six months' training will be in charge of 29 patients.”

That is the situation in just one Queensland hospital. I have no doubt that it is repeated throughout the State; yet the Minister insists on denying that the hospital system is faced with grave staffing shortages. The Minister for Health should spend more time examining hospitals in Queensland and less time running up massive bills interstate and overseas. The report of the Auditor-General that was tabled yesterday indicated that the Minister for Health was the highest-spending Minister in the Government, running up bills amounting to \$55,733.

The Minister should go into the Queensland hospitals to look at the problems that are so evident. Anyone who has the time, inclination and the concern would go and see the conditions for himself. The Minister should talk to the Queensland Nurses Union and others who have taken the trouble to investigate thoroughly and properly the shortages in the system and where they exist. The Minister should acknowledge that the additional 270 positions provided in the Budget will not go anywhere near eliminating the problems that exist. They will not help in the staffing of new hospital developments, such as the Kirwan Hospital, which is unstaffed, nor will they overcome the backlog that has occurred at the cardiac unit in the Cairns Hospital, for example.

Very serious demands are being placed on the hospital system. Despite what the Minister for Health said, the article in *The Sunday Mail* last Sunday indicated clearly that problems do exist. Patients are concerned, and some are dying because of those problems. It is shameful that the Minister hides behind the argument that there is a conspiracy against him. He should apologise to the people whose characters he has blemished. Information is contained within the statutory declarations that have been tabled, and an apology is expected.

*Sitting suspended from 12.59 to 3 p.m.*

## TOBACCO INDUSTRY PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 21 August (see p. 53) on Mr Turner's motion—

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

**Mr KRUGER** (Murrumba) (3 p.m.): The Opposition does not have many complaints about the Bill but, in the circumstances, it is only natural that some members of the Opposition wish to speak about the perils and problems of smoking.

As they affect the tobacco industry, the amendments are basically of a machinery nature. They update the monetary value of penalties that might be levied for offences committed under the Act. I am sure all honourable members understand that penalties were inserted into the legislation to force growers to control the spread of disease. Certainly the Opposition has no qualms about trying to stop the spread of disease in plants. I must say that the Labor Party introduced much of the legislation that introduced those sorts of controls. Certainly we still back them to the hilt.

The Bill amends the penalties, which are still expressed in pounds. I have mentioned to the Minister that the Act was reprinted on 1 September 1983 and the amounts are shown in dollars, not pounds. I do not know whether there has been a slip-up there.

**Mr Turner:** The Decimal Currency Act of 1965 enabled amounts of money to be referred to in decimal currency. It does not alter the wording of the original Act.

**Mr KRUGER:** I wanted to clarify that point. I wanted to make sure that the procedures had not overlapped.

The legislation was introduced to control the spread of pests and diseases by preventing the transfer of pests and diseases and preventing the supply of affected seeds and seedlings. That makes good common sense and has applied to many of the plants that are grown commercially in this State. An interesting fact is that many of the ornamental plants grown in home gardens can contribute to the spread of disease in plants grown commercially. That problem must be kept under close scrutiny. I am sure that those responsible for plant quarantine are doing their utmost to prevent that problem arising.

Most honourable members would be aware that many of the diseases that appear in the field are in fact bred in the seed-bed. It is at that stage that some control can be exercised. The *Agricultural Journal* mentions good husbandry in tobacco plant production as well as seedlings and seed-beds generally. By use of modern sprays, a fair degree of control can be exercised to ensure that the pests that were a problem in the field in the past are no longer a problem.

Good hygiene is also very much in need. One of the problems that the tobacco industry faced for many, many years was caused by the mosaic virus, which was spread readily by the smoking of cigarettes by people working in the plant production process. Not only does the mosaic virus affect tobacco, but also it is very prevalent in cucurbits. One of the first things that has to be learnt in the production of seedlings is good hygiene so that pests and diseases, which may become a major problem, are not spread unnecessarily. Mosaic virus stunts, disfigures and discolours the leaves of plants. Other seed-bed diseases are blue mould, damping off, potato virus, wildfire, botrytis and blackleg. To control those pests, several varieties of systemic sprays can be used.

**Mr R. J. Gibbs:** Mr Jennings could do with a dousing with one of those sprays.

**Mr KRUGER:** Yes. He would be well controlled by some of the sprays, but I do not think they should be used on him.

The application of several of these types of fungicidal sprays has become commonplace. As I have said before, with tobacco and other seedlings, control at the seed-bed stage means that the fungicidal problem is not transmitted to the field. The Bill deals mainly with transmitting diseases into the field.

In the past, farmers had more free time and all plants that may have been left over from a crop were ploughed in. A certain time had to be allowed for the surplus plant material to break down. One of the best ways in which disease problems can be overcome is by allowing that plant material to break down naturally. Those problems can be eliminated by using the right type of cultivation. If that is done, fewer problems will be encountered in controlling the diseases in the following crop.

Most farmers would be aware that, by breaking down the plant material and overcoming the spread of disease in a natural way, the control of diseases will be much cheaper. The farmer will not encounter diseases in his crops, because he will have eradicated them in a natural way. That is an important practice to be adopted, and I think that most farmers are well aware of it.

I have read some articles about the problems experienced in the control of diseases. Over the years, some people have become complacent and some farmers have neglected their role. The Tobacco Industry Protection Act was introduced in 1965 to control diseases. Some farmers believe that, because they had used Ridomil and other sprays for a few years, they did not need to worry about blue mould. Of course, blue mould is one of the most significant diseases that affect the tobacco industry.

If the old deterrents in the form of small fines imposed by inspectors are maintained, more and more people will become complacent. I understand that the intention of the Bill is to increase the fines in the Act from \$200 to \$1,000.

**Mr De Lacy:** You have 84 minutes to go.

**Mr KRUGER:** I would think that within 84 minutes I could almost clear it up.

**An Opposition Member:** It is an important industry, isn't it?

**Mr KRUGER:** It is certainly an important industry. The tobacco industry engages in a great deal of advertising, and many complaints are made about smokers and the effects of smoking on people's health. However, many people derive a great deal of relaxation from smoking, whether it be of cigarettes, cigars or pipes. The tobacco industry is recognised in Queensland and in the northern area of New South Wales as a significant industry. Although a number of complaints are made about cigarette-smoking and the problems with tobacco, many people derive a form of relaxation from smoking. An industry of some significance has been created in this State.

It is pertinent to mention that numerous sporting organisations benefit from advertising fees paid by tobacco firms. Because of the publicity about tobacco and its effects, a large number of people have mixed feelings about it. For many years my father smoked a pipe. He did not seem to experience any trouble from smoking tobacco. However, once he had his teeth removed and started smoking cigarettes, he ran into all sorts of problems. His age may have had something to do with the matter.

I am not going to say whether I support smoking. I believe that the honourable member for Wynnum (Mr Shaw) will give honourable members a treat about the ills associated with smoking. However, I do not want to become involved in that argument.

I believe that the tobacco industry generally will benefit from the Bill. The Bill provides for an increase in penalties. Nearly every clause of the Bill refers to upgrading the fines to bring them into line with present-day values. Some penalties have not been increased since 1965. If the value of \$200 in 1965 is compared with the value of \$1,000 today, it cannot be regarded as a massive increase. However, the penalties are being brought into line with present-day values and will overcome the complacency adopted by some farmers in failing to get rid of the residue crop and not ploughing under for natural break-down those plants that may be affected by blue mould.

As I said before, blue mould is the most significant of all. In other parts of the world, it has been found that the effects of Ridomil have worn off because a different strain of blue mould has crept in. Ridomil has provided effective control in this State. It is to be hoped that the stage will not be reached at which another type of spray will be needed to overcome a disease that could be controlled by the imposition of reasonable regulations and fines on growers. A limited number of tobacco-growers might become complacent. If such a deterrent was implemented, it could save the industry many problems on the production side. If necessary, at the Committee stage I will go into more detail about the amount of any prospective fine.

The Opposition does not oppose the Bill. It is merely an updating of the legislation.

**Mr De LACY (Cairns) (3.11 p.m.):** I support the comments made by the Opposition spokesman on primary industries, the honourable member for Murrumbidgee (Mr Kruger). The Opposition does not foresee any difficulties with the Bill and it supports the intent of it.

I feel obliged to speak on the tobacco industry because that industry occupied a major part of my life. I grew up on a tobacco farm, and for a number of years I was a tobacco-farmer. The tobacco industry is of importance to Queensland, particularly to north Queensland.

As the honourable member for Murrumbidgee said, debate continues in the community about whether or not people should smoke and whether or not Queensland should have an industry that produces a product that I think most people would agree is detrimental to the health of those who use it. My point of view has always been, and continues to be, that whether to smoke or not to smoke is a personal choice. If people want to damage their health, that is their business. I suppose a case can be made for smoking being restricted to certain areas, where it may have a detrimental effect on other people. I have heard on the grape-vine that one or two honourable members may rise during this debate and make that very point.

**Mr Innes** interjected.

**Mr De LACY:** That is right—the smoking and non-smoking factions in the Labor Party.

The attitude of people in the Mareeba/Dimbulah area is that smoking should not be made compulsory. Nobody would suggest that people should have to smoke. However, it must be acknowledged that the tobacco industry is a viable industry in north Queensland, and that if people do choose to smoke, they should at least be smoking Australian tobacco.

I point out for the benefit of honourable members that the product that is smoked in Australia at this stage contains only 57 per cent of Australian tobacco; 43 per cent of the tobacco that goes into the make-up of manufactured cigarettes and tobacco is imported from overseas.

**Mr Comben:** Is that because the State Government is not giving enough support to the tobacco industry?

**Mr De LACY:** I will take that interjection. Supporting the tobacco industry is a very complex matter. I believe that in some areas the State Government could provide more support for the industry.

Over a number of years, successive Federal Governments have failed to bite the bullet and suggest that the content of Australian tobacco should be increased over and above the 57 per cent. In fact, under Federal legislation, only a statutory 50 per cent of Australian tobacco needs to be included. I understand that the 7 per cent is there by virtue of a voluntary agreement between the manufacturers, the Federal Government and the tobacco-growers.

**Mr Innes:** Is it true that, when he finished his ride down the Great Dividing Range, Mr Comben's horse was a chain smoker?

**Mr De LACY:** I understand that, although the horse was smoking, my colleague the member for Windsor has never been attracted to that dirty habit.

**Mr Scott:** Some of those old war-horses of the Country Party, such as Sinclair and Anthony, are not too well regarded by tobacco-farmers, are they?

**Mr De LACY:** Not at all. I once attended a meeting in Mareeba at which Mr Sinclair addressed a large number of tobacco-growers. He said to them, "What are you

people complaining about? You are all driving cars, aren't you?" That was quoted a million times in the Mareeba/Dimbulah area. As a result, Mr Anthony and Mr Sinclair are persona non grata in that part of the world.

**Mr Hamill:** It's typical of the Country Party. They only think of the big fellows.

**Mr De LACY:** That is right. The Country Party, or the National Party as it now is, tends to have changed allegiance over recent years. It is more interested in the big farmer, the big person and the big city interests than in the small farmer.

One thing in favour of the tobacco industry is that it is so structured that it suits family farms. Being comprised of an aggregation of small family farms, it is the type of industry that everything possible should be done to support.

A comment made in that part of the world is, "If we are going to die from smoking, let's die from smoking Australian tobacco."

I now address myself more specifically to the legislation. We support the Bill, which principally contains machinery amendments. The tobacco plant is probably the most susceptible of any crop grown to insects and disease. That is partly because of the way in which the plant grows and the leaf is harvested. Anything that attacks the leaf attacks the harvest. In our farming days, we were continually fighting the elements, insects and diseases. When I look back, I do so with some trepidation. In those days, we guarded against insects and diseases by using fungicides and insecticides twice a week. The tobacco leaf would be white. I understand that these days more sophisticated measures of insect and disease control have been developed. A pest-forecasting service is now available. Farmers are advised of a build-up of insects, at which stage they apply insecticides.

The Opposition spokesman on primary industries (Mr Kruger) mentioned blue mould, which is the worst disease to have confronted the Australian tobacco industry. It has been with the industry for as long as I can remember. There have been notable successes in its control. Fungicides were never fully satisfactory. When the weather conditions encouraged the incidence of blue mould, it did not matter which fungicides were used or how liberally they were applied; blue mould tended to win the day. Shortly after I left the industry, but not because I left the industry, a resistant strain of tobacco was developed. It seemed at that time that the problem was solved. However, those micro-organisms are very resilient and have a way of coming back. A new strain of blue mould appeared, and it overcame the previously resistant tobacco variety. In recent years, a new systemic fungicide, Ridomil, has been developed. It seems to have been extremely successful in controlling blue mould.

**Mr R. J. Gibbs:** Is blue mould used to eradicate the cane toad?

**Mr De LACY:** That is an interesting concept. Perhaps it is something that could be considered.

**Mr Casey:** There is no need for it. The cane toads have migrated to the Northern Territory.

**Mr De LACY:** I do not think I will continue with that train of thought.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** Order! That it has been a relaxed afternoon so far does not mean that levity will pervade the Chamber for the remainder of the day. I ask the honourable member for Cairns to bring his attention back to the Bill.

**Mr Scott:** The Minister is asleep. He is very relaxed.

**Mr TURNER:** I rise to a point of order. To prove that I am not asleep, I ask the honourable member to withdraw that remark.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister points out that he was not asleep.

**Mr Scott:** I withdraw the remark.

**Mr De LACY:** I do not know why the Minister or anybody else should be sleeping this afternoon, while such an entertaining debate is in progress.

**Mr TURNER:** I rise to a point of order. I have not been sleeping, and I ask the honourable member to withdraw that remark because I find it offensive.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! As I said a moment ago, levity in the Chamber must cease. The House must come to order, and I ask the honourable member for Cairns to withdraw the remark that has offended the Minister. I ask all honourable members to bring their attention back to the Bill. Does the honourable member for Cairns withdraw the remark?

**Mr De LACY:** I withdraw the remark, and I apologise. I did not intend to imply that the Minister was sleeping.

The point I was making was that fungicides that now control blue mould are presently effective, but there is no guarantee that they will remain effective in the future. It is therefore important that normal crop-protection measures should continue to be undertaken. One of the most successful measures that have been used and are in continuing use in the tobacco industry is the implementation of a crop-free period during the year. That technique is what this piece of legislation addresses itself to.

In the use of such a method, crop residues need to be ploughed in. Farmers need encouragement to do this voluntarily; but if they are not prepared to do it in the interests of the common good—and in any industry or group in any society, there will always be people who make things difficult for everybody else—legislation must be enacted to enforce proper farm management.

This legislation is sensible because it increases from \$200 to \$1,000 the penalty imposed on farmers who are not prepared to comply with the Act. I understand that the period that has been set as that in which tobacco is not to be grown is the first quarter of the year, that is, January, February and March. Because the organisms have no host throughout that period, it is hoped that the result will be that organisms cease to exist.

This Bill opens up the whole debate about the extent to which Governments can control industries and regulate them. In recent months, the subject of governmental regulation has raised its ugly head in Queensland and in other parts of Australia because it is a matter of concern to industries, such as the tobacco industry. To substantiate that point, I wish to quote what the chairman of the Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board said in the board's last annual report. He said—

“The Board views with concern recent statements concerning orderly marketing, stabilisation schemes and deregulation in general as they apply to primary industry in Australia.”

The chairman then went on to say that the tobacco industry is stable, and that the people who continue in the industry make a reasonable living. The chairman further stated that the only reason people make a reasonable living is that stability has been brought to the industry by the stabilisation scheme.

In the old days, farmers had to battle not only the elements—such as wind and rain—but also insects and so forth. Farmers also had to battle the vagaries of the market-place, which all primary producers have to do. However, I suggest that tobacco-farmers were a little worse off than most other farmers, because nobody has been able to define what constitutes a good and acceptable product. I can remember that before the days of the full stabilisation scheme I lived on a farm and that the manufacturers always had the whip hand. From year to year, manufacturers would change the definition of the requirements. It did not matter what type of leaf was grown, the manufacturers always seemed to want something else. At different times they were able to wipe out whole farming areas, not so much in north Queensland but in other parts of Australia.



**Mr FitzGerald:** Was it a quality problem with chlorine or those things, or just a put-up?

**Mr De LACY:** In hindsight, I would say that it was a put-up situation.

**Mr FitzGerald:** You don't believe it was the chlorine problem?

**Mr De LACY:** I can remember that, in the early 1960s, the manufacturers used to talk about flat tobacco that was perhaps affected by the salt or the chlorine content mentioned by the honourable member for Lockyer. It was said that it did not have a quality look about it. Whenever that happened manufacturers paid a lower price for the tobacco. But I never saw any good evidence that the final manufactured product was any worse than normal because the allegedly affected tobacco was used in blends.

**Mr FitzGerald:** The operation of a cartel against those areas.

**Mr De LACY:** Not against particular areas. I think the action was taken mostly to keep the farmers in their place and to enable the manufacturers to retain the whip hand. There certainly always were cartels. Throughout the history of the industry, only one, two or three manufacturers have ever bought the entire Australian crop. At one stage there was only one manufacturer and we growers thought that, when Rothmans came back into the industry in the 1950s or 1960s, we would be saved because finally some competition would be reintroduced. Unfortunately, that did not prove to be the case. In fact, I can remember saying for years how sorry we were that Rothmans came back because that company seemed to be leading the push to keep farmers down. So I grew up with an attitude of being opposed to big-city manufacturers. We were in a them-or-us situation.

I suppose that that is the big difference between the tobacco industry and the sugar industry. The sugar industry always talks about a whole industry approach, with the millers and farmers getting together and putting forward a joint submission on behalf of the entire industry. I suggest that that has not been and is not in the best interests of the sugar industry. In contrast, tobacco farmers looked after themselves and ended up with a stabilisation scheme that I believe has been of great benefit to the industry. I do not want to go too far along that track but let me say that, in recent conversations with tobacco-growers and members of the Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board, I have discovered that the industry is very concerned about its future.

**Mr Innes:** Does this speech indicate that you might represent them after the next redistribution?

**Mr De LACY:** There is no chance of that. I understand that my electorate will be made smaller, not bigger, and tobacco will not be grown in Cairns.

The tobacco industry faces the same problems as other primary industries. At present there is a glut of tobacco on the world market. In other countries, Governments are looking at different ways of protecting their own growers. At the same time, in Australia, there is this mad push for deregulation. It is said that overregulation introduces inefficiencies and diseconomies so, although the rest of the world is looking towards more regulation, Australia is looking towards less regulation. Australia will be placing a number of its primary industries at the mercy of international companies and other Governments, or other people who are competing with the support of their Governments.

So I will say here today, and will continue to say it no matter which industry is being discussed, that the most civilised way that Australia can go is to look at means of adopting a regulated structure. Certainly there is a need to look at the ways in which an industry is regulated and to make sure that regulations in some industries are not counter-productive. Over the years the tobacco industry can point to the fact that it has been successful, through its stabilisation scheme, in increasing efficiency. It has reduced

production from 15 500 000 kg a number of years ago to 13 000 000 kg today. The number of farmers involved in the industry has been reduced from 1 300 to 850.

More to the point is that during the last 10 years, the average price of tobacco has increased by 4.2 per cent each year, which has been approximately half the rate of inflation. The tobacco industry has been able, to a large extent, to absorb the cost increases. One of the points of the present stabilisation plan is that the Australian tobacco industry must move the price of its product closer to comparability with international prices. The industry is certainly doing that; it has the runs on the board.

The recent devaluation in the Australian dollar has assisted the industry in that regard, particularly in relation to the price of American tobacco. The price of Australian tobacco is almost the same as, or very close to, the price of American tobacco. The devaluation in the Australian dollar did not carry across to all other currencies. Some other countries still have much cheaper tobacco than Australia. But the Australian industry is moving in the right direction, and it is concerned that due recognition is not being given to that fact. There is always talk in the media about less regulation and throwing the industry open to the market forces. At this stage, the industry is not really in a position to compete with the tobacco industry in most other countries.

It might be said that if the industry were to do away with the stabilisation plan—the present plan runs out in 1988—the Australian consumer could get a product at a cheaper price. If that were to happen, it would be at the expense of the whole industry. The people in the industry would do Heaven knows what. The social and economic dislocation that would flow from such a step would not be worth the move to make the product so much cheaper to the Australian consumer.

**Mr Scott:** It would be the old story. After having wiped out the Australian industry, the suppliers in the other countries would manipulate the price. A cheaper price would not be guaranteed.

**Mr De LACY:** Exactly. One person who would not benefit from such a move would be the Australian consumer.

The point is often made that the price——

**Mr FitzGerald:** How does the Queensland tobacco tax affect it?

**Mr De LACY:** There is no tobacco tax in Queensland. I do not think that State tobacco taxes have any bearing on the consumption of tobacco. I would not suggest that we should leave taxes off tobacco to increase consumption. That is not the objective.

**Mr FitzGerald** interjected.

**Mr De LACY:** I did not say that. The point needs to be made that the only Labor Government in Australia that introduced a State tobacco tax was the one in South Australia.

**Mr FitzGerald:** The rest have maintained it.

**Mr De LACY:** The rest have not removed it. State tobacco taxes were introduced in New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia by Liberal/Country Party Governments. I do not think that the honourable member can score any points in that regard.

The point that I was going to make about the stabilisation plan is that the industry is concerned about its future. It has no clear guide-lines on where it is going. The rationalisation process that has been going on in recent years has virtually come to a full stop half way through the stabilisation plan period. If the growers could be given some indication of what is in store for them in the future, they would be in a position to introduce new technology, and to fix up their buildings, barns, tractors and so forth, and so introduce new economies into their production methods. As it is, people in the industry are not prepared to spend money on those matters, and one can understand that.

I reiterate that the Opposition supports this amending Bill and the thrust of the legislation. It is a firm supporter, and always has been, of the tobacco industry in north Queensland. In Government, the Labor Party would continue to hold that attitude.

**Mr SCOTT (Cook) (3.34 p.m.):** I support the remarks that have been made by speakers from this side of the Chamber and also express my support for the Bill.

I know that the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) does take an interest in primary industries in this State. It is a big job to look after primary industries. I feel that the Minister is not really on top of all the parts of his portfolio, and I say that fairly kindly. The problem on the Government side is that there is a limited pool of people with experience from which to choose a Minister. It becomes very difficult for the member who is thrown in at the deep end of such a difficult portfolio. The Minister for Primary Industries still has to measure up, but I pay him a compliment in saying that his heart is certainly in the job.

**Mr Turner** interjected.

**Mr SCOTT:** Many of the Ministers will probably be on the back-bench before very long.

**Mr Turner:** You will be an old fellow by then.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** Order! The honourable member for Cook should get back to the Bill, otherwise, before very long, he will be out of the Chamber.

**Mr SCOTT:** The Minister is being very challenging. I wonder whether he has been up to the Mareeba/Dimbulah area, and, if so, how many times he has been there. I extend the challenge to other members. Have they been up there?

**Mr Turner:** Three or four times.

**Mr SCOTT:** Well, if the Minister has been there, he has not made much of an impact. The people in that area do not speak very kindly about National Party members, whether they be Ministers or back-benchers. Recently, I attended a function in Mareeba for the Governor, and the member who represents the area, who is also a Minister of the Crown, did not see fit to attend. That is a shame. The people of Mareeba feel deserted by the National Party; but as I have said in this House on numerous occasions before, that is par for the course. When the Country Party changed its name to the National Party, it forgot all about the people in the rural areas. It is no good Government members saying that they have been up to Mareeba half a dozen times if they are not doing something for the industry.

**Mr Turner:** You asked the question whether I had been up there.

**Mr SCOTT:** I accept the Minister's answer, but the tobacco-growers do not get the feeling that he is really concerned about them. I represent the tobacco-growers in the Dimbulah area, and they are concerned, as the member for Cairns said, about where the industry is going. They are not receiving any words of encouragement from the Queensland Government.

The tobacco industry in Queensland is worth \$35m, and it would not be easily replaced should it fail. It is now largely based on Mareeba, and 60 per cent of Australia's quota is grown in Queensland, the balance being grown in Victoria. The trend is changing and, before long, the Mareeba/Dimbulah area will grow 80 to 90 per cent of the Australian quota; and deservedly so, because it is an ideal farming region.

**Mr FitzGerald** interjected.

**Mr SCOTT:** When the honourable member's seat becomes risky because of the swing against the National Party, he might seek to diversify his farming interests, buy a quota and put his money where his mouth is.

Tobacco leaf is processed by three large companies—known as “The Big Three”—and as the member for Cairns said, because those companies call the tune, they cause great concern for the growers. It is not good for the industry that such a cartel-type operation should control the industry.

Unfortunately, Australia has a trade agreement under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade that over 40 per cent of the leaf used in Australian cigarettes is imported. That imported leaf comes from a range of countries, but mostly from the United States of America. Why should Australia import American leaf? Those exporting countries would love to see Australian farmers, or, more particularly, Queensland farmers leaving the industry. The Tinaroo irrigation system that was developed by a Labor Government for the benefit of Queensland farmers would fall into disuse if tobacco-growing ceased in the Mareeba/Dimbulah region. Other irrigated crops have not been very successful in the region.

In Canada, tobacco products contain 90 per cent home-grown leaf. I have been told that one would not find a Canadian smoking an American cigarette. That type of chauvinism can only be admired, and I am sure that Canadian tobacco-farmers think highly of their fellow-citizens who support their product to that extent. I would be interested to know more about that, but one thing is certain; tobacco does not cross the border into Canada.

The Opposition supports the Bill because it is important for the control of pests in the industry, particularly blue mould. Like my colleague the member for Cairns, I was a tobacco-grower. I humped my knapsack spray and probably became a little round-shouldered as a result.

It is unfortunate that apparently the GATT agreements on tobacco cannot be broken. I know that the Federal Government is in favour of changing them. Certainly Mr Kerin would like to see them changed so that more tobacco could be grown in Australia. However, it is not possible to do that. It has been clearly established that the Federal Government shows total goodwill towards Australian tobacco-growers.

**Mr Simpson:** Rubbish!

**Mr SCOTT:** That comment is typical of the honourable member, who would not have a clue. He should ask the growers in the north about Mr Kerin and mention the names of leading National Party people, and see what sort of reaction he gets.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! If the honourable member for Cook intends to get on to personalities again, I will pull him up. They are irrelevant. All of the honourable member's speeches seem to dwell on personalities. Personalities have nothing to do with the Bill. I tell the honourable member to get back to the Bill.

**Mr SCOTT:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I have been speaking to the Bill and I intend to continue speaking to the Bill. The things that I am saying are relevant to the legislation before us. I will continue to put the case on behalf of the tobacco-growers from the Mareeba/Dimbulah area, in spite of the terribly negative comments made from the Government benches. Government members have every reason to feel guilty.

Mr Kerin has the confidence of Queensland tobacco-growers. The matter to which I am speaking is quite relevant to the Bill. The Opposition supports the Bill, just as it supports a satisfactory marketing program for the products of the industry.

I turn now to the industry's marketing arrangements, which the growers like to term the orderly marketing of their product. Those marketing arrangements come to an end in 1988. It is essential that those arrangements be replaced by a satisfactory program. Given the goodwill of the industry, and even perhaps some support from the Queensland Government, I am sure that will happen.

Within the present guide-lines now set for the industry, successful efforts are being made by growers to contain costs and to limit price rises for the product. Because that

shows that farmers in the Mareeba/Dimbulah area are extremely realistic, I am very pleased about that. They did not have to be pushed too hard in that direction. They had the sense to see what the industry needed. I do not think it has ever been an industry in which feather-bedding or padding applied. It is certainly not an industry that relies on subsidisation.

The industry faces great difficulties. What is happening is raising serious doubts about the future of growers. The industry now suffers from the "get big or get out" syndrome. Because tobacco-growers do not know when to take a punt and get big or when to get out, they face very difficult times. The sad thing is that the soils in that area are admirably suited to tobacco-growing. If the right things were to happen, the industry would be made even more successful. Sadly, the number of tobacco-farmers in the Mareeba/Dimbulah area has declined from 600 to 400. I hope that the rate of decline is not increasing. It is a sad state of affairs. The quotas of those 200 relinquishing growers have been absorbed by those left in the industry. In addition, leaf quota has been transferred from New South Wales to Queensland. New South Wales now grows only 5 to 7 per cent of Australian leaf.

The industry is vital to Queensland. Earlier in my speech I quoted its value. In any list of valuable Queensland industries, it ranks very highly. Mango-growing, which is often quoted as a viable alternative, has a value in the Mareeba area of \$1.5m. That and other irrigated crops have a long way to go before they can take up the leeway of a \$35m industry.

Everything possible has to be done to support the tobacco industry. This legislation contributes to that support. The Queensland Government has been supportive of the tobacco industry in Queensland, but I endorse the remarks made on this side of the House that it has not been supportive enough. Much more could be done. However, I know that, at the time of the inquiry by the Industries Assistance Commission, the Minister's department prepared a comprehensive survey and statements in support of the industry's needs and presented them to the IAC inquiry.

Although this is a very small Bill and is printed on only one sheet of paper, it is most important legislation. Those on this side of the House support it totally.

**Mr CASEY (Mackay) (3.44 p.m.):** Along with the honourable member for Murrumba and other Opposition members, I lend weight to the Opposition support for this very important legislation, which deals with what is to the Opposition a very important Queensland industry. I would be remiss if I did not remind the House that the whole thrust of this Bill is aimed at protection for the Australian industry, protection from some of those scourges that have hit the industry in other States and in other parts of the world. In some areas the industry has almost been wiped out. Certainly the increase in costs occasioned by these problems has made it difficult to continue to maintain and organise a viable industry.

I draw the attention of honourable members to the principle enunciated clearly in the Bill that the tobacco industry is one of those Queensland primary industries that were found a long time ago to be in need of protective regulations to ensure an income for everybody involved in the industry. That is an important factor that must be considered when examining this legislation. Those regulatory provisions were introduced by Labor Governments in this State for the protection of primary producers.

A perusal of *Hansard* at the time when this legislation was introduced will show clearly that the forerunner of the National Party, the Country Party, was fully supportive of those provisions because they ensured that the primary producer received at least an adequate income from the industry. As well, the intention of the legislation was to ensure that everybody else in the industry received an adequate income from it. That occurred before people started talking about a free enterprise Government, free society and deregulatory provisions, and the other nonsense about which we hear so much today.

Despite the fall in the number of persons in our nation smoking tobacco and cigarettes, and despite hassles over price and quota, the industry in Queensland has experienced in recent years a large increase in production and in the growing side. As has been pointed out by my colleagues the honourable member for Cook (Mr Scott) and the honourable member for Cairns (Mr De Lacy), production has increased because of the strength of the industry in the Mareeba/Dimbulah area of north Queensland. That has been achieved because the Queensland tobacco industry has been able to buy up quota from the more inefficient producers in other States, particularly New South Wales, and in southern Queensland. The productivity of the tobacco industry in north Queensland has been strengthened because of the Mareeba/Dimbulah irrigation scheme, which is supplied with water from the Tinaroo Dam. I shall refer to that in more detail later.

In the very near future, it may be possible for the Queensland tobacco industry to purchase quota from Victoria. The Victorian Government has introduced regulatory provisions whereby quota can be sold interstate, provided that 25 per cent of that quota is retained for redistribution amongst some of the Victorian growers to put them into a more viable position. Nonetheless, the industry in Queensland, especially north Queensland, will continue to increase its share of national tobacco production. Queensland's share is presently 60 per cent of Australian production. Queensland has very few primary industries that produce the bulk of Australian production. Of course, the sugar industry is certainly one such industry. Approximately 95 per cent of Australian sugar production comes from Queensland.

**Mr FitzGerald:** Beef.

**Mr CASEY:** Queensland produces approximately 50 per cent of Australia's beef requirements.

Of course, the tobacco industry is one of those major industries. As has already been mentioned, 43 per cent of Australia's manufactured tobacco products are made from imported leaf. Most of that tobacco is imported through the United States of America. Unfortunately, a considerable amount of it is already coming from countries such as South Africa and Zimbabwe. It is coming through a Third World system because the United States of America controls tobacco exports and imports on the world scene. That competition is still foisted on Australia, even though Australian growers are constantly reminded that they must equate themselves and their production costs with world production costs, which are much lower. When the actual American cost of tobacco production is taken into consideration, Australia's costs are seen to be on a par with world tobacco production costs. However, it must be admitted that, as was recently pointed out by former Australian parliamentarians, including Malcolm Fraser—who was a former Liberal Prime Minister—in some other countries, such as South Africa, tobacco is grown by what can only be described as slave labour. That is the type of competition that the Queensland tobacco industry faces.

Only seven or eight years ago—or perhaps even less—the then Federal Minister for Trade—none other than the then leader of the National Party, Doug Anthony—was actually prepared to trade off the Australian tobacco industry to the Americans to increase beef and wool exports from Australia to the United States.

The National Party does not have a very good record as far as the tobacco industry in this State and this nation is concerned, and members of the National Party should be very careful about what they say about the industry.

**Mr Scott:** With the Liberal Party's policy of deregulation, I cannot imagine any tobacco-farmers voting either National or Liberal.

**Mr CASEY:** Unfortunately the Liberal party has absolutely no understanding of the need for protection and regulatory controls in this State's primary industries to ensure that all Queensland's requirements are not either imported or grown within a 15 km radius of Brisbane.

Recently the Liberal Party tried to have a great splurge in north Queensland with the assistance of a fellow from the Northern Territory by the name of Everingham, I believe. He was going to be the be-all and end-all of the Liberal Party in north Queensland and assist it with its policies. You would recall that he visited your electorate, Mr Deputy Speaker. He visited many areas in north Queensland. What happened to Mr Everingham? He has gone down the tube with poor old Andrew Peacock. John Howard has now appointed a man from the Brisbane Stock Exchange as the shadow Minister for Northern Development. I believe that a lead would have to be tied round Mr Everingham's neck to guide him up to north Queensland. He would not be able to find the place otherwise. That is the attitude of the Liberal Party towards primary industries in Australia.

**Mr Scott** interjected.

**Mr CASEY:** I do not know very much about casinos. However, I enjoy attending them.

**Mr Innes:** Mr Everingham will be back in your electorate very quickly, too.

**Mr CASEY:** I would welcome Mr Everingham back. He is a nonentity. Nobody knows much about him. I throw out the challenge to the Liberal Party. I would be quite happy to have a Liberal Party candidate run against me at the next State election because, as I recall it, the last Liberal Party candidate lost her deposit. On the only other occasion on which the Liberal Party has been campaigning in my area, two planeloads of people had to be flown from Brisbane to staff the polling-booths and give out how-to-vote cards for the Liberal Senate candidate. I wish Mr Everingham well. If he is feeling lonely when he gets into town, he should come and see me and I will give him a few hints on how to look after himself back in the Northern Territory.

I will return to the Bill, from which I was distracted by a few rude interjections. I have already said that the tobacco industry is a great industry for Queensland and particularly north Queensland, because that area grows a large percentage of the Australian crop. It is an absolute disgrace that our tobacco products are not completely processed in Queensland. One company at Bundamba, which processes roughly about one-third of Australia's leaf, only processes up to the cut-tobacco stage. The tobacco is still sent to either Sydney or Melbourne where the various manufacturing processes are carried out. That is a crying shame and an indictment of this Government.

As a young fellow in north Queensland 30 years ago you would recall, Mr Deputy Speaker, that North Queensland tobacco and cigarettes could be bought freely in any shop in north Queensland. The North Queensland Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board brought in a machine and started to process its own tobacco. The tobacco industry has gone backwards under this Government, for the simple reason that it has a farm-gate philosophy. The National Party believes that, once a product is off the farm, that is it. It believes that, as long as the primary producer is getting his return, that is it.

Australian industry has to start looking very hard at further marketing of its products. Queensland industry must look very hard at the further processing of those products that it excels in producing. Tobacco is certainly one of those products.

Queensland produces 60 per cent of Australia's leaf, but it does not manufacture one cigarette. That is an indictment on the Government and speaks volumes for the lack of progress over the last 30 years. In Mareeba, 100 000 sq ft of warehouse space is available for some other use, even if only for drying. It is used by the Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board for only 28 days of the year as a warehouse to facilitate tobacco sales. Buyers come from the southern States, purchase their leaf and have it dispatched to processing plants in the south. The industry then slows down and, apart from the farmers themselves, there is no employment until the beginning of the next picking season.

Ministers travel overseas on their Enterprise Queensland program, with its accompanying public relations nonsense. The Government says that that encourages

investment for this and that. But when the Government has the opportunities to manufacture, when north Queensland has double the national average unemployment and when the greatest resource—people—is available, what does it do? It ignores that and follows its farm-gate philosophy. It is satisfied to sell the State's primary produce without attempting to create additional jobs through processing. In Queensland, land is sold to Japanese, Arabs and Koreans and overseas companies are encouraged to take part in computer-manufacturing at a time when our own people are put out of work. The Government is not interested in helping the tobacco industry to lift itself up to the processing stage. It should be doing all it can to upgrade that industry. That was the original intent of the Labor Government that initiated the Tinaroo irrigation scheme, which was the first time in Australia's history that water was turned inland. The growth of the tobacco industry in the Mareeba/Dimbulah area of the Atherton Tableland was encouraged by that scheme, as a prelude to manufacturing a Queensland product, which happened when the old North Queensland Tobacco Marketing Board manufactured and sold NQ cigarettes.

All of that went by the board when National Party Governments came to power federally and in this State. The big industrial cartels mentioned by the honourable member for Cook (Mr Scott) and the honourable member for Cairns (Mr De Lacy) took complete control of the industry, put the screws on the growers and pushed them out of manufacturing. Even if only drying was carried out, additional jobs would result. I repeat that all of the processing is now being done in Sydney and Melbourne.

One of the major Australian tobacco-manufacturers—it produces one-third of Australia's cut tobacco and cigarette requirements—is in the process of moving its major drying facilities from Melbourne to Sydney. Why is the Queensland Government not getting off its tail and giving that company a good economic reason why that process should be done in north Queensland? Why is not the Government putting together a feasibility study to show that it would be to the company's advantage to have the drying carried out in Queensland? In that way, employment would be retained for Queensland instead of being exported to southern States. Until downstream manufacturing for the State's primary industries is encouraged, Queensland producers will continue to be at the mercy of export markets, international agreements and other Governments that engage in deliberate manipulation to ensure that their marketing techniques are forced on Australia. When the cost advantage is with us, we should be grasping the opportunity.

The attitude towards the tobacco industry ought to be refined. Apart from anything else, a drying plant in north Queensland would result in considerable savings to Queensland growers. It has been estimated that the additional savings for growers in baling, handling and transportation would be \$1m. That amount represents almost 3 per cent in added productivity straight away for the growers. That would be of enormous benefit to them, especially when it is remembered that the industry is worth something like \$35m to north Queensland. But, no; unfortunately, the Queensland Government is typically following its National Party farm-gate philosophy instead of really examining where to start. If a primary industry product is to be marketed, the marketing organisation does not start at the farm end. Marketing organisation starts with the consumer, irrespective of where he lives.

The Government should examine every link in the chain of the process to find out what can be done at every stage to produce value-added products. The region in which the product is grown should be the region into which the benefits flow from the sale of the product, and the benefits should not be dissipated by subjecting them to the influences and pressures that come into broad marketing operations on the international scene. The benefits should flow back into the community that produced the product. That is why the Queensland Government must become more involved in commodity-marketing.

I realise that the Director of the Division of Marketing, either by direct participation or through his representatives, is an active member of most of the commodity marketing boards that operate in Queensland. That is fair enough, but the point I wish to make is that that input is directed towards the growing of primary products rather than the



marketing of them. The Queensland Government ought to have an officer from the Department of Industry Development involved in the activities of the commodity marketing boards so that the selling of the product can be improved. The Government ought to examine ways and means of becoming involved in value-added manufacturing in Queensland. Until it does, the economy in Queensland will not be expanded or improved.

I point out that, throughout the present period of economic recovery in Australia, the major areas of recovery have been in the manufacturing industry States of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. Economic recovery has not occurred in Queensland because it remains totally and completely reliant upon primary commodities. I do not wish to divert my attention towards the plight of the sugar industry. However, when that industry is taken as an example, it is realised that the industry basis of the Queensland economy must be expanded. At the present time, the Queensland economy is completely controlled by outside forces, such as international market fluctuations.

It must be acknowledged that there is considerable opposition to smoking. I point out that excesses of anything will kill anybody. To use a general, broad term, grog is one of the biggest killers of all time. However, not everybody goes about the community saying that alcohol should not be available. Not many people support prohibition or advocate that the Government should bring in legislation that will stop people from drinking alcohol.

Another example is that more people are killed by motor vehicles than by any other means. Of course, the solution to that problem is very simple. If the Government wanted to stop people being killed by motor vehicles, it should simply ban cars. The same mentality could be applied to those who want to ban smoking.

My only complaint about the tobacco industry in Queensland is that it does not produce a good cigar tobacco. As most honourable members know, I am well known for enjoying an occasional cigar. Unfortunately, Queensland does not produce a tobacco suitable for the manufacture of cigars, nor does any other State in Australia for that matter. The Queensland Government must face facts. The tobacco industry is a great Queensland industry and it could be developed to become bigger and better.

Another matter is sponsorship by tobacco companies of sporting organisations. With the financial assistance, sponsorship and support that is provided by tobacco companies, sporting organisations have lifted performance levels above the norm, and that is particularly important in Queensland because this State does not have the support of licensed clubs. It should be obvious that Government assistance is required.

Existing regulatory control must be retained, and this Bill ensures that that will continue. That is the reason that this legislation is supported by all honourable members. However, I emphasise that the Government must take a further step by becoming involved not only in marketing operations but also in the encouragement of further industrial development that will complement primary industry in Queensland.

**Mr SIMPSON (Coorooora) (4.5 p.m.):** I support the Bill. The Queensland Government is very much in tune with the needs of the tobacco industry, just as it is with the needs of all primary industries. Because of its perception, the Government has seen fit to strengthen the disease-control requirements in the industry. Having listened to several Opposition members in this debate, I believe it is important to say that it is because of this Government's rapport with the industry and because it listens to what the industry wants that it has introduced this legislation.

If any industry is to operate properly, controls must be introduced in certain areas, particularly in the areas of research and disease prevention. It is necessary to control the movement of plant material from one district to another. It is also necessary to foster good husbandry practices and to prevent the cycle of infestation by using the fallow process between crops as the most effective means of controlling disease. Similar

means of prevention and control are applied in the banana, sugar-cane, tobacco and other industries.

Many members of the community do not realize that they can be responsible for transmitting plant diseases, and there is a need to educate the public about the dangers involved in such transmissions. Major industries can be affected by the spread of disease and the livelihood of many people can be threatened. Large numbers of tourists who move through country areas do not realise that they can be instrumental in transmitting plant disease from one area to another. So a number of controls are necessary.

The tobacco industry is still based on private enterprise and the private ownership of farms, with people being free agents who are able to buy or sell their own properties.

This afternoon it has been said that this Government is not adequately supporting the tobacco industry. The Australian Labor Party adopts a different attitude to primary industries from that of this Government, and that is nowhere more apparent than in the tobacco industry. The ALP does have a different attitude, and it is a very restrictive one. It is based on high taxes. Right from the day a farmer begins to clear his property to grow a crop, the Australian Labor Party impose controls. The Federal Labor Government has dropped the tax incentives that were once enjoyed by farmers. The payment of fertiliser bounties used to provide an incentive to farmers to improve productivity, but the Federal Government wiped out that bounty. The Labor States have imposed a tax on cigarettes and the Federal Government has begun to mount anti-tobacco campaigns.

**Mr Casey:** That is a load of rubbish.

**Mr SIMPSON:** It is not rubbish; people are coming to Queensland because it is not a high-tax State. This Government encourages the entry of people into viable industries. In contrast to this Government's rapport with primary industries, the Labor Party's attitude is one that more and more is controlled by interests who are opposed to the primary producers of this nation. One can see that with the proposed introduction of capital gains tax.

**Mr Comben** interjected.

**Mr SIMPSON:** What has that got to do with it?

**Mr COMBEN:** I rise to a point of order. The member is drawing the longbow again. He is talking about capital gains taxes and economic matters, when the Bill is concerned with blue mould in tobacco. I ask that he be prevented from speaking on that subject.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** Order! I do not believe that any personal reflection is involved. There is no valid point of order.

**Mr SIMPSON:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The colour of the honourable member's suit indicates that it has some blue mould on it, and that is affecting his thinking.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is now casting personal reflections.

**Mr SIMPSON:** No, Mr Deputy Speaker; it is quite an attractive suit. I was casting no aspersions at all. Blue mould is no good for tobacco, but it might help on the honourable member's suit.

The question has been asked whether we on this side of the House support the Bill. We introduced the legislation. We understand the importance of primary production to this State and nation. Although a tremendous amount of capital is invested in the tobacco industry and in other primary industries, Opposition members go to extreme lengths to disadvantage primary producers in this State and nation by taxing their

product. Of course, that tax becomes a major ingredient in the production cost of tobacco, sugar-cane and many other primary products.

I am worried about the attitude that the ALP adopts to primary producers. I am pleased to note that Opposition members are at least supporting the Bill. The Bill provides for controls and for increased penalties for the few people in the industry who take short-cuts and do not carry out proper husbandry, which puts other producers in the industry at risk.

The best way to control the industry is to talk to the growers and get their co-operation, and that is what the officers of the Department of Primary Industries do. That is the better way to do it. The punitive side of the legislation should be kept in reserve for those people who flout the spirit of the legislation. The best for the industry can be achieved through co-operation.

Although Opposition members support this legislation, they are influenced by other forces that do not have the interests of primary producers at heart, and that is what really concerns me. That influence could erode the fabric of many of our major industries. It is not just a matter of putting our act together in one area. We have to put our act together in all areas. The right thing has to be done in all areas, otherwise people do not make a profit. Of course the aim is to allow people to make a profit at the end of the line without being unduly taxed out of existence, which is the aim of some members of the Labor Party.

**Mr Vaughan:** That is not right.

**Mr SIMPSON:** It is right. Opposition members want to discriminate against people who make a profit. They do not believe that people should make a profit.

**Mr De Lacy:** Are you just saying that to get it into *Hansard*, or do you believe it?

**Mr SIMPSON:** Of course I believe it. That interjection further indicates that the Opposition does not believe in profit. Profit should be the bottom line in all enterprises. Major industries, such as the tobacco industry, should be encouraged to succeed. The costs in those industries should not be increased. The industries should be given regulatory powers to protect themselves against those aspects, such as disease, that can knock them out of the ring. We are keeping government small by providing regulatory powers and not imposing a whole range of charges.

We support this legislation. The tobacco industry is important to this State. It has been established in Queensland for ages. As the tobacco industry is harassed in other States in Australia, I can see more people in the tobacco industry coming to Queensland.

**Mr SHAW (Wynnum) (4.15 p.m.):** I will introduce a new note into the debate, and it is one that was obviously anticipated by some speakers. I express my gratitude to the Opposition spokesman (Mr Kruger), who knows that some of the views that I express are my own and do not align completely with some of his and with some of those of my other colleagues in the Labor Party. Nevertheless, he has given me the opportunity to express them.

The Bill under discussion has the aim of protecting and ensuring the survival of the tobacco industry. Most members are aware that, in the past, I have often made comment about the need to reduce smoking in the community and the need for this Assembly to take action to end the expensive promotions aimed at encouraging young people to take up the habit. The advertising campaigns imply that sophisticated, worldly, fun-loving people smoke. The real effect is to leave young people with an addiction that causes damage to their health for the rest of their lives.

I have also stressed the need to end what I might term compulsory smoking. That happens when people who choose not to smoke are forced to inhale the drug because they have to work in a smoky atmosphere or when they participate in social activities.

Whilst discussing this Bill, it is timely that I make it abundantly clear that I am not advocating a ban on people being allowed to smoke or the immediate closing down of the tobacco industry. That is not a possibility, and there is some doubt on its desirability.

It must be recognised that people's habits do not change overnight. Addiction to tobacco is as strong as addiction to many other drugs and, for that reason alone, prohibition is not an option. There can be little doubt that it would lead to problems similar to those that confronted the Government of the United States of America when it attempted to prohibit the sale of alcohol.

If the industry did come to an abrupt halt, there would be extensive unemployment and probable loss of revenue. The extent of that loss is very difficult to calculate when one considers the loss already taking place by way of damage to people's health, loss of productive lives through early death and damage to property. Almost certainly, any attempt to abruptly end the industry would create a black market and would result in the involvement of criminal elements. A situation similar to that which presently exists with marijuana would develop. On the other hand, when one observes the way in which tobacco, as a legal drug, is pushed on to young people, the dangers of legitimising the sale of marijuana are clearly apparent.

If it were not for the vast sums invested in tobacco production, Governments would have moved long ago to reduce its use. The medical evidence of the harm caused by tobacco is irrefutable. It is ridiculous to suggest that a giant, world-wide conspiracy exists that involves scientists and medical people who falsely claim that smoking damages health. However, the industry does suggest that.

The tobacco industry was developed in Australia during the 1930s with encouragement from Governments of the day and subsequent Governments. Without doubt, if the resulting damage to health was known then, such support would not have been given so enthusiastically. Over the last 50 years, the tobacco industry in Australia has grown considerably. In 1979-80, there were 3 500 ha producing 7.7 million kg of dry leaf. As 78 per cent of that production was from the Mareeba district, the issue is particularly important to Queensland. The sale of leaf by the Tobacco Marketing Board realises millions of dollars and it has been claimed that the tobacco industry generates an income to Governments throughout Australia of nearly one billion dollars.

I must add here that it has been estimated that the cost throughout Australia of treating health problems that result from use of the drug is also approximately equal to the tax revenue collected.

Over 5 000 people are employed in the industry in Queensland, and it has been estimated that an additional 7 500 people receive employment because the industry exists. The security of employment for those people is a factor that needs to be taken into consideration, but it cannot be argued that the tobacco industry should be supported indefinitely and encouraged to expand because of these jobs.

Ambulance officers are employed in treating accident victims and policemen are employed in combating crime; but no one seriously suggests that traffic accidents or crime should be encouraged. Rather, Governments and the community should be planning to open up alternative avenues of employment for those people and alternative crops and means of earning income for the tobacco-growers. If we fail to do this, we will not be offering the protection to those in the tobacco industry that this Bill purports to offer, because, without doubt, the tobacco industry is doomed.

Tobacco consumption amongst educated people is already falling off rapidly as the awareness grows that the habit is expensive and damaging to health. The tobacco industry, which is controlled by a small number of multinational corporations, annually spends between \$3 billion and \$4 billion advertising its highly profitable product in an effort to combat that trend, but it has failed in its endeavours. The time will come when

ashtrays are as obsolete as spittoons and people will wonder how our society could support such a repulsive habit.

Multinational corporations have a responsibility to make provision for the opening up of other markets. The huge amount of money that they have been able to accumulate puts them in an ideal position to assist Governments rather than continue to jealously guard their right to grow, market and sell tobacco, as they have done so vigorously in recent times.

I believe that it is time Government action is taken to ensure that all tobacco used in Australia is Australian-grown, which virtually means Queensland-grown. I support the argument of the member for Cairns and other members who spoke along those lines.

The evidence is irrefutable that Australians will die in huge numbers as the result of using tobacco. I suppose at least something is retrieved if they die from smoking Australian tobacco. But let us not mince words. As the trade in their own countries declines, other nations will attempt to dump their tobacco and make their profits from addicts in other countries, as is presently done ruthlessly with the illegal export of hard drugs.

In the present debate about people's right to smoke, a great deal has been said about freedom of choice. It must be accepted that the use of tobacco is legal and that if people want to damage their own health, that is their right. In contrast, this Government does force people to wear seat belts to protect their lives and imposes fines on them if they fail to do so. Big Brother operates sometimes.

If people smoke in an area in which they are not forcing others to inhale their smoke, I argue that that is their business. The problem comes when they force others, against their will, to risk their health.

The problem of inhaling smoke in the work-place is appearing all round the nation. Unions are taking up the cause on behalf of their members, although, recognising the one-eyed approach of many addicted smokers, they require the wisdom of Solomon to produce solutions acceptable to everyone. However, in the precincts of Parliament, workers do not have a union to advance their cause for them. It came to my attention that there exists a number of serious problems and that some members of the staff have been placed under some pressure—extreme pressure—because of their desire to work without suffering the unpleasant side-effects that many people, allergic in varying degrees, suffer. Bear in mind that these people are required to be present in order to earn their livelihood. Apparently, it has been suggested that no action can be taken because the members of this House felt strongly that no restrictions should be introduced. I believe that this is ultimately a question for Mr Speaker, but I recognise that he would have a desire to act in accordance with the views of the majority of members.

It is for this reason that I recently circulated a letter, which all members received, asking their views on this subject. It is not my intention to publicly quote the views expressed to me by members, but it does seem that the views of the community at large are reflected in the views of members of this House. I have not yet received an answer from all members, but, to date, it seems that a large majority support the view that people should not be forced to inhale tobacco smoke.

**Mr R. J. Gibbs:** I support that view.

**Mr SHAW:** I appreciate that comment.

A lack of understanding of the suffering inflicted on some who are allergic to tobacco, by being forced to work in a smoky atmosphere, is reflected in the views of one member who referred to those people as fanatics. In this case, it is the addict who is fanatical, not the person who is suffering from the effects of smoke. People certainly have the right to smoke; but they do not have the right to inflict that smoke, with the effect that it has, on others. One often wonders whether in the future this State will

have to meet huge compensation payments as people lodge claims for damage to their health caused by being forced to inhale tobacco smoke in the course of their employment.

Many people do not understand that some people suffer immediate acute pain, not only the long-term effects that have been well documented.

In time, the community will demand smoke-free areas and smoke-free restaurants. The honourable member for Mackay (Mr Casey) said that he was a cigar-smoker. I hasten to add that my remarks are not directed at him. Yesterday, in the Strangers' Dining Room, I heard a number of persons express their disgust when an honourable member of this Assembly lit a cigar whilst other persons were eating.

**Mr Simpson:** That was Casey.

**Mr SHAW:** It was not the honourable member for Mackay. Unlike the honourable member for Cooroora, I am too polite to mention the honourable member's name.

It must be remembered that some people are adversely affected by cigarette-smoking. More seriously, some people who are affected by it in the work-place go home each evening with severe headache or sinus problems, as other honourable members have suggested. It is a fact that many people are unable to attend social functions, dinner dances or floor shows because of the polluted atmosphere that they are forced to endure. Their health is affected.

**Mr Simpson:** What has this got to do with the Bill?

**Mr SHAW:** I will tell the honourable member in a moment.

Every day, increasing numbers of people are opting out of the smoking habit. Today, the majority of persons in the community do not smoke.

**Mr FitzGerald:** Young people do—young girls, particularly.

**Mr SHAW:** Young people smoke, and that is largely the fault of the Queensland Government.

**Mr Vaughan:** Advertising.

**Mr SHAW:** Advertising has a great deal to do with it.

If those persons who are affected are to be protected, the long-term future of the industry must be considered. It is inevitable that consumption will drop and that tobacco-growers will suffer. Although that is my point of view, I am sure that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, would believe that that matter is relevant to the Bill.

**Mr Simpson:** In what way?

**Mr SHAW:** Its effect on young people, particularly children.

The main impetus in cigarette-advertising is aimed at young people. It is obviously effective because more children smoke than adults. Today, more girls than boys smoke. That is something that any responsible Government should investigate.

The Government allows the promotion of cigarette-advertising on its own billboards. Advertising can be seen on railway property and in other areas. Although the Government has been talking for a long time about educating children about the effects of smoking, very little has been done. Recently I heard that the strategy adopted by the Government to protect young children will have effect in about 20 years' time. Two generations of children will be allowed to acquire a habit that will, at best, shorten their lives and, at worst, kill them. In the meantime, a great deal of ill health will be caused. That practice is being allowed to continue.

**Mr Simpson:** Would you ban tobacco?

**Mr SHAW:** The honourable member has obviously not listened to one word that I have said. Repeatedly I have heard the honourable member say that the Labor Party wants to legalise marijuana and impose a tax on tobacco. Nobody on this side of the House has said that. However, the honourable member repeats it continually. Although he knows that it is a lie, he repeats it. I can only assume that he does it because he wants to mislead the people. For the honourable member's benefit, I point out to him that I am trying to protect people who use tobacco. A person who induces a minor to take up this drug habit or sells tobacco to a minor could be fined £10, and a juvenile who is caught smoking in a public place could be fined 5s. However, I understand that in the last 50 years, no penalties have been imposed under the Juvenile Smoking Suppression Act. And Government members talk about International Youth Year and the Year of the Family! The Government is doing absolutely nothing to protect young people and families.

The seriousness of the situation must not be overlooked. Each year in Australia, the equivalent of the population of a small town dies as a result of the use of tobacco.

**Mr Simpson:** Do you want to ban tobacco?

**Mr SHAW:** If the honourable member for Cooroora wishes, I will repeat everything that I have said.

**Mr Simpson:** Just answer "Yes" or "No" Do you want to ban tobacco?

**Mr SHAW:** I began my speech by saying that I do not advocate a ban on the use of tobacco. I said that it is not sensible, and I outlined the reasons why I said that. If the honourable member for Cooroora had any sense, he would understand what I am saying.

The community has expressed concern at the road toll, the loss of life from the use of heroin and so-called hard drugs and, to a lesser extent, the consumption of alcohol. Many people wring their hands and say that something should be done about it. However, far more people die each year from tobacco than from all of these other causes put together. In 1983 an estimated 2 540 Queenslanders died from tobacco, 490 from alcohol, 30 from opiates, 20 from barbiturates and 60 as a result of other drugs.

The Government should bring this Act before the House again, as quickly as possible, with the aim of amending it to provide assistance to farmers disadvantaged by the inevitable end of the tobacco industry—it might take 20 years, but it is inevitable—and it should also introduce legislation designed to end the program to entice young people into the habit, by providing for a ban on advertising that is aimed not at promoting particular brands, as is sometimes claimed, but at encouraging young people to believe that smoking is a habit of joy and sophistication instead of the reality of poverty and death.

**Mr INNES (Sherwood) (4.33 p.m.):** I will be brief. The Liberal Party supports the proposed amendments. I will deal with a couple of comments that have been made.

The phobia which has been created about the use of advertising by tobacco companies is bordering on the irrational and, in fact, is damaging to many worthwhile organisations and the fostering of sport.

**Mr Comben:** Do you smoke?

**Mr INNES:** I do not smoke, but my wife does. As to the comments made by the honourable member for Wynnum (Mr Shaw), one would hope that good sense and courtesy will prevail. There is room in this world for people who smoke and for people who do not smoke.

It borders on the irrational to suggest that claims will be made against employers because of the ultimate effects of smoking—claims, I suppose, of sinus or cancer. Claims as a result of cancer would not be in accordance with modern, confirmed or proven

medical knowledge and would be the sort of fantasising and cost-crazy stupidity which one finds amongst the more militant proponents of modern unionism.

**Mr Shaw:** The figures I quoted came from the Queensland Health Department.

**Mr INNES:** I am just saying that the debate gets absolutely off the rails.

There is a place in this world for those people who choose to smoke. One would hope that they will not choose to smoke at the distress or inconvenience of other people. That is a matter of human adjustment; it is not a matter for law-making and intervention of the type that is hinted at in the speech made by the honourable member for Wynnum (Mr Shaw).

One does not say that one does not have sympathy for people who do not smoke and find smoking offensive. Indeed, that relates to matters of adjustment. There is no smoking in my house over breakfast; but it cannot be a matter for law-making.

If people in this building are distressed, one would hope that their distress is made known to the people who cause that distress. That and not law-making is the first resort. If people ignore that fact, the matter could be reported to those in control, and they might give informal advice or instruction; otherwise our conduct goes completely off the rails and ends up with the bizarre, militant, minority-based attacks that have occurred, particularly towards cigarette-advertising. We cannot have it both ways. If it is claimed that our tobacco industry is viable, we cannot do everything in the world to stop it.

Cigarette-smoking is one of the vices or quirks with which we live. Many activities—whether eating, drinking, not exercising or over-exercising—harm people if they are engaged in to excess. Tens of thousands of activities engaged in by human beings have the potential to cause damage. It is all a matter of degree. In the end result, it is a matter of live and let live, freedom of individual action and adjustment between reasonable human beings.

The Liberal Party supports the legislation.

**Hon. N. J. TURNER** (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) (4.37 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate. No honourable member opposed the Bill, and the legislation has the support of industry.

The increased penalties contained in the Bill are in line with inflation. They have not been increased for 20 years. They ought to act as a deterrent. Legislation must ensure that the industry complies with the requirements of the Act. The tobacco industry is a stable industry for Queensland and, more particularly, for north Queensland.

The Labor Party's spokesman, the honourable member for Murrumba (Mr Kruger), supported the Bill. We must adopt measures that ensure that our farming practices remain ahead of our pest problems. It is very easy to fall into the trap, when a new chemical is formulated, of believing that it is the complete answer. The honourable member for Murrumba made that point. We must be conscious that blue mould fungus that would be resistant to Ridomil could develop. That has happened in Nicaragua.

The honourable member for Cairns (Mr De Lacy) supported the Bill. I can well understand why. His father was one of the pioneers of the tobacco industry in north Queensland and he made a significant contribution to it. I do not always agree with the honourable member's politics, but I would have to concede that he has some knowledge of the tobacco industry. However, he was wrong when he spoke about the Queensland Government's neglect of the tobacco industry and primary industries generally. That is not so, as he ought to be well aware. Over a long period, voters in rural areas have demonstrated who looks after them and who does not.

I place on record the amount of revenue collected through licence fees in other States, though none is applied in Queensland. The figures for 1983-84 are—



	\$
New South Wales . . . . .	69.63m
Victoria . . . . .	83.8m
South Australia . . . . .	29.27m
Western Australia . . . . .	46.72m
Tasmania . . . . .	9.56m
Northern Territory . . . . .	2.4m

The total for Australia is almost \$241.4m. I repeat that none applied in Queensland. I point out that the recent Federal Budget imposed a tobacco franchise tax in Canberra.

The honourable member for Cook (Mr Scott) contributed very little of consequence. He said that the Kerin people in Canberra are looking after the tobacco industry. That would have to be the joke of all time. One only has to consider what I have just said about the taxes imposed by Labor States on the industry. It is being almost taxed out of existence.

The honourable member for Mackay (Mr Casey) made his usual, irrelevant theatrical contribution to the debate. He also tried to indicate that the Queensland Government is not looking after the interests of the tobacco-farmer. As I have said previously, that is not correct. The Queensland Government performs well in the interests of the industry, and far better than any other Government in Australia.

The honourable member for Coorooora (Mr Simpson) displayed his usual knowledge of primary industry in general and of the tobacco industry in particular. He correctly interpreted the Queensland Government's reaction to industry requests for legislation by its presentation of the Bill. Legislation is required by the industry, and the Queensland Government is complying with requests based on that requirement. The honourable member also supported the need for good farming practices and, of course, that is an essential part of agricultural husbandry. He referred also to the need for educating members of the public, and that is an ongoing process to which officers of my department have turned their attention. It is hoped that this legislation, combined with a program of education, will be of benefit to the industry.

The honourable member for Wynnum (Mr Shaw) referred to the need for Government action to reduce the incidence of smoking and the use of tobacco in the community. Of course, the honourable member is entitled to his views, but I believe that the points he made were not related directly to the contents of the Bill. They would relate more to matters of public interest and probably should be introduced into the Parliament in that way.

I thank the honourable member for Sherwood (Mr Innes) for his contribution and his support for the Bill.

Motion (Mr Turner) agreed to.

#### Committee

Clauses 1 to 6, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

#### Third Reading

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

#### GAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Mines and Energy), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Gas Act 1965-1981 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

### First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr I. J. Gibbs, read a first time.

### Second Reading

**Hon. I. J. GIBBS** (Albert—Minister for Mines and Energy) (4.44 p.m.): I move—  
“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

The Bill has been introduced to correct certain anomalies that exist in the Gas Act 1965-1981. The Government has taken this action following advice received from the Justice Department that the Gas Act ought to be amended to tidy up a drafting inconsistency that emerged when the Act was amended in 1976.

Over the years, the character of the gas industry has changed from one which was originally based entirely on the carbonisation of coal, which produced gas, coke and tar. The gas produced in that way was piped to the consumer. Gas is now petroleum-based. Consumers now use either natural gas or re-formed gas that is produced locally or, in the majority of cases, liquefied petroleum gas, which is available throughout the State.

With the development of the LPG gas franchising system in the 1960s and early 1970s over many areas of the State, the Gas Act was amended in 1965, 1971 and 1976 to ensure that bulk LPG supply remained subject to the provisions of the Gas Act. That was seen to be in the best long-term interests of the stability of the industry, and clearly recognised the need to protect substantial capital investment as well as the customer.

At the present time there are 38 franchise areas in Queensland supplied exclusively by bulk LPG under Gas Act franchises. In fact, mains supply is available now only in Brisbane, Ipswich, Toowoomba, Oakey, Dalby, Roma, Bundaberg and Cairns.

In March 1985 the Solicitor-General advised the Department of Mines that, in his opinion, the 1976 amendments failed to make all the changes in the Act needed to allow the granting of a franchise for LPG supply without mains. This failure arose from an oversight in 1976 of not amending the definitions in the Act for a “gas undertaking”. The term as it still stands refers to supplying gas “through mains” to customers. Successive Ministers have recommended to the Governor in Council the granting of franchises for areas without mains. These have been granted, and bulk LPG services are now operating successfully in those areas.

It is necessary therefore to make a number of minor amendments to the Gas Act which will validate those franchises already granted, and remove any possible doubt that the franchise system can be applied to areas which, in the foreseeable future, will only obtain a gas supply by the use of bulk LPG supplied under franchise but not through underground gas mains.

That is the intention of the present amendments and was the intention of the changes made to the Act in 1976.

I therefore commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Vaughan, adjourned.

## MINING (FOSSICKING) BILL

### Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 21 August (see p. 58) on Mr I. J. Gibbs’s motion—

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

**Mr VAUGHAN** (Nudgee) (4.48 p.m.): It is not before time that the Government has eventually acted to do something to sort out the situation which exists on the forgotten and neglected mining areas of this State—the gem-fields.

This Bill should go a long way towards resolving the problems which have confronted those people—tourists in the main—who go to the gem-fields during their holidays for the thrill of fossicking for gems. As the Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr I. J. Gibbs) pointed out, a considerable number of people regularly visit the gem-fields for relatively short periods to try their luck.

Although the Minister stated that, in an endeavour to prevent further applications for mining leases in sensitive areas of the gem-fields, areas were proclaimed round Sapphire, Rubyvale, Glen Alva and The Willows, in which mining tenements were restricted, as I understand it, the casual prospector or fossicker has continued to run into problems.

On a visit to the gem-fields in October 1979, I became aware of these problems and, in an endeavour to resolve the situation that existed, on 30 October 1979, in a question to the then Minister for Mines, Energy and Police (Mr Camm), asked him whether he had been approached to set aside designated areas where tourists and visitors to the gem-fields could hand mine and fossick without trespassing on the mining claims or leases of permanent residents in the area and, if so, why he was not prepared to set aside such designated areas.

In his reply, Mr Camm admitted that he had been approached, but stated that the decision not to set aside such areas was influenced to some degree by strong opposition by various associations on the central Queensland gem-fields and lapidary clubs throughout Australia to such a proposal. Yet, in answer to a question asked by the member for Peak Downs (Mr Lester) on 17 October 1979, Mr Camm said that the Government had reserved many thousands of acres of gem-bearing land in the Sapphire, The Willows and Rubyvale areas so that tourists and small miners could fossick.

On 2 December 1981, I asked the Minister the following question—

“With reference to the Anakie, Rubyvale and Sapphire gemfields—

- (1) Are there any areas of unoccupied Crown land set aside specifically for tourists who hold a miner's right to camp and dig for gems?
- (2) If so, where are these areas, are they marked and what facilities exist to inform tourists of such areas?
- (3) If no such areas are set aside for such purposes, will he initiate action to provide such areas?
- (4) If not, what is the reason?”

The Minister's reply, which only answered part of my question, was—

“The holder of a miner's right has no authority to camp on unoccupied Crown land by virtue of that document and there is no intention that he be allowed to do so.

However, following an approach from the honourable member for Peak Downs, I have initiated discussions with a number of my ministerial colleagues over the problems of accommodation, hygiene, and environmental pollution arising from the influx of large numbers of tourists who visit the Central Queensland gemfields annually to engage in itinerant mining activities as holders of miner's rights.”

Obviously the previous Minister saw that I was trying to do something to correct a bad situation which existed on the gem-fields and, in an endeavour to protect the member for Peak Downs who should have been the one pursuing the matter, replied as he did.

Finally, almost four years later, we have a Bill before us that will do what I asked for in 1979 and 1981. The Bill provides for the declaration of areas in the State in which fossicking for gemstones and gold is to be permitted. Any area within a mining district, except the areas excluded in the Bill, may be declared a designated area where, under regulated and controlled conditions, fossicking can be carried out.

Any land within a designated area may be declared a fossicking area in which fossicking is restricted to a person who is the holder of a fossicker's licence or a miner's right. However, no person is entitled to mark out or apply for registration of a mining claim over land within a fossicking area.

A fossicker's licence, which is obtainable from the mining warden or authorised issuing officer in the area, may be issued to an individual person or may also include the family of that person for a period of two months.

As I understand the contents of the Bill, a designated area may include mining claims, mining leases and areas covered by an authority to prospect, and the method of mining in a designated area will in future be controlled by the Government through the mining warden.

Once a designated area is declared, new applications for mining leases within that area may be granted only under the conditions spelt out in the Bill. However, the position of existing mining leases remains unaltered.

As no reference is made to mining claims in designated areas, in view of the incidence of their existence on the gem-fields and to clarify the contents of the Bill to the fullest extent possible, I ask the Minister, in his reply, to explain their position.

It is pleasing to note that on and from the declaration of a designated area taking effect, any authority to prospect, whether granted before or after the passing of this Bill to the extent that it relates to land within the designated area, will have no force or effect.

In March 1982, when amendments to the Mining Act were before this House, I tried to move an amendment to provide that an authority to prospect should not authorise the prospecting for, or the carrying out of investigations with a view to winning, gold. I pointed out during that debate that most of the gold-bearing areas of the State were locked up under authorities to prospect and, as a result, small prospectors who only wanted to prospect for gold were prevented from doing so. Apparently someone took notice of what I said and decided to give the small prospector a go.

The Bill outlines the entitlements and duties of the holder of a fossicker's licence and provides that, in a designated area and a fossicking area, the holder of a miner's right shall have the same entitlements and duties. As a result, the holder of the miner's right can camp in a designated area, whereas under normal circumstances he cannot.

However, although the Bill has a provision that allows the Government to determine the methods by which prospecting or operations for mining purposes may or may not be carried on in a designated area that will allow full control of machine mining, it does not spell out that the holder of a fossicker's licence shall use only hand mining methods for the purpose of searching for and collecting gemstones and gold.

Hand mining is defined in the Bill and, as far as I can see, it is not referred to anywhere else. It should be spelt out that a fossicker's licence entitles the holder to use hand mining methods only. Apparently the Mines Department considers the provisions in the Bill to be adequate, so I will not pursue my views by moving an amendment. The Minister may care to comment on this in his reply. As very little hand mining as defined is actually carried out anywhere on the gem-fields, the penalties provided for any breach of the prohibition on the use of machinery, etc., in a designated area without the prior written consent of the warden will cause an impact.

It remains to be seen whether the provisions of this Bill are policed when they become law. Policing the provisions of this Bill could well be more than a full-time job for many wardens round the State, particularly on the gem-fields. As there is provision in the Bill for the warden to authorise persons to perform any act on behalf of the warden, it might well be desirable in some areas to have people engaged in this capacity full time.

The Bill provides that persons in whose name a licence is issued shall pay to the Crown in respect of all gemstones and gold won by all persons under the authority of that licence the royalty prescribed by the Mining Act 1968-1983. However, a royalty return is not required to be lodged if no amount of royalty is payable. It will certainly be interesting to see how much royalty is paid, particularly for gems.

For the record—in 1983-84, the value of gems produced in this State was estimated by the Mines Department to be \$10m. The amount of royalty that was paid to the Government amounted to \$38,817, which was less than half a cent in the dollar return to the State and certainly nowhere near enough to cover the Mines Department's costs of servicing the area. I understand that the amount of royalty from gem-mining last financial year amounted to only \$50,425. When the 1984-85 Mines Department annual report is published in the not-too-distant future, I will be interested to see what the estimated value of gems produced was in that financial year.

I will reserve any further comments for the Committee stage.

**Mr FITZGERALD (Lockyer) (4.58 p.m.):** This Bill has come before the House as a result of a tremendous amount of pressure from various areas. The Opposition spokesman (Mr Vaughan) commented that he had recognised the need for the legislation for quite some time. It has come about because of the desire of many people who want to enjoy week-end and holiday mining on the gem-fields and who like to get away with the family in their two-wheel-drive or four-wheel-drive vehicles for a long week-end.

People become excited when they find gems of value, and the Government was aware of that when it decided to bring this legislation forward. However, the Government also paid heed to the friction that is generated between the various groups who fossick for gems and to the disputes that arise between people who hold a miner's licence and those who do not. This legislation will enable people to enjoy the thrill of fossicking on the gem-fields and of trying their luck with a minimum amount of equipment, which will be permitted under the Bill.

It will also be of considerable benefit to Queensland's marvellous tourist industry. I have no doubt that, in the future, tour-operators who carry out to the gem-fields fossickers who want to stay for a couple of days will arrange to meet the warden. I imagine that the operators of camping tours will arrange to meet the warden on the gem-fields so that everybody on the bus can take out a fossicker's licence, which will remain in force for two months. The tourists can probably frame the licences when they get home. Instead of buying a sticker reading "I have been to Bourke", or a similar sticker, tourists will have a genuine Queensland fossicker's licence. I understand that the cost of the licence can be varied from time to time, but it will be minimal.

The licence means that the holder is legally entitled to try his luck. That is better than gambling. The people will be able to scratch round on the surface of the ground.

**Mr Davis:** When are you going to try it yourself?

**Mr FITZGERALD:** I am a farmer, so I am certainly gambling when it comes to scratching round in the soil.

I am aware that, for a long time, a great deal of friction has existed on the gem-fields. That has been caused by the intense rivalry that exists when one person believes that somebody else may have a better patch of ground to work. That is epitomised in the film *Buddies*. I realise that film is fictional, but it contains a fair amount of truth. Anyone who has been in those areas knows of the intense rivalry and knows that claim-jumping is not new. Many reports exist about people who have jumped claims at night or taken away large quantities of gem-bearing material so that it can be processed at their leisure. Of course, such operations are illegal.

This fairly comprehensive Bill contains 47 clauses and gives quite substantial powers to the local mining warden. The House should be made aware that the mining warden will have these powers and that, in fact, he will be in charge of the gem-field or, as the

case may be, the gold-field. The powers given to the mining warden are necessary. I simply hope that the selection of mining wardens is made with a great deal of care and sensitivity to the type of person needed. It is no good having a person who has to enforce the law, and therefore pass judgment on a person's right to fossick, having to write away to some officer in a major city. A decision on whether a person's actions are legal or illegal must be made on the spot.

The Bill provides for fines for using machinery in designated areas in which machinery is banned under a proclamation by the Governor in Council. Clause 9 provides for a penalty of \$10,000 for a first offence, \$20,000 for a second offence and \$50,000 for a third or subsequent offence. They are substantial fines. However, people must realise that, with the use of heavy machinery, large quantities of earth can be gouged out in a matter of hours. In fact, if that happens when nobody else is around, mining could go on for days, which would spoil the area. Had it not been mined by machines, it would have lasted for many years as an area to be used by fossickers. In a couple of days, machines can rip out the areas with the best potential.

The Bill also contains provisions for the machinery to be confiscated or to be held for a certain time before it is returned. Because of those provisions, those who contemplate the use of machines in declared areas will have to consider seriously the consequences of their actions. Bulldozers, loaders and machinery of that type often are valued at up to \$50,000. If people know there is a risk that that equipment will be taken away from them and that, in addition, they face the possibility of a fine of \$10,000 for a first offence, it should become obvious to them that this House views those actions in a very serious light. They are just not on.

The warden has the responsibility to dispense what he believes to be justice on the gem-fields. It is an excellent idea that anybody over the age of 18 can obtain a fossicker's licence and that any person under the age of 18 can participate in a family fossickers' licence. The warden has the power to refuse the issue of a licence to any person if he believes that the person who is making the application has committed an offence against the Act. He has very wide powers. If he believes that a person has contravened the Act, he does not have to prove that an offence has been committed, and there is no appeal from the warden's decision.

The warden must act responsibly at all times. I ask the Minister to review the situation from time to time. If complaints are made about the actions of wardens, or if they are not doing their job properly, the Minister should investigate those matters to see whether the warden should retain his position. Undoubtedly, the Minister's officers will select wardens very carefully. However, because of the heat of the sun in mid-summer, tempers tend to fray and people will, at times, act irresponsibly. Those are matters that the warden must take into consideration.

The provision that allows camping in designated areas is excellent. A fossicker is required to make safe the land in which he has been gouging and working. Fossickers should be made aware that they are responsible for that. It will be difficult to ensure that before people leave an area in which they have spent a whole week-end gouging, using a windlass or making holes in the landscape, it is made safe. That provision will be difficult to enforce, because people forget that they should make the area safe before they leave. If substantial diggings are made, fossickers should be advised as early as possible that they should make the land safe before they leave.

The Bill is excellent. It will help put Queensland on the map. Queensland has many gem-fields. Undoubtedly, in the future, alluvial gold could be found in some areas. When the late Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services (Mr Goleby) visited the Burdekin Falls Dam last September when construction on the dam was commenced, it could be seen that, when the rock in the Burdekin River was being removed to a depth of up to two metres for the foundations, the little cracks and fissures in the rock were gold-bearing. There was insufficient gold for anybody to make a living from it. However, I understand that a few workers found sand once the rock had been removed and panned

it for gold. Some worthwhile finds were made. The workers enjoyed what they were doing. The country above the dam site in the Ravenswood area is gold-bearing. If some alluvial gold was found, the area could have tourist potential.

Nowadays, a large number of elderly people who have taken their long-service leave do not want to sit on the coast all the time. Some of them have other interests. As they move into the gem-fields, the thought of finding some stone that could be polished and made into jewellery is an incentive for them and adds a great deal of pleasure to their holiday.

The legislation is timely. I support it whole-heartedly, and I will be very interested to watch its progress in the future.

**Mr HAMILL (Ipswich) (5.10 p.m.):** Fossicking is probably one of the less publicised facets of the mining industry. Of course, all honourable members realise how important the mining industry is to Queensland as a whole. Mining has traditionally made a major contribution to Queensland's economy; it has made a major contribution to the State's revenue.

As can be found in the Budget that was presented recently by the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen), mining as a category of revenue-raising is consistently increasing its share of the total receipts of this Government. Much of the revenue raised from the railways is derived from freights which have been levied on the mining industry. Almost 25 per cent of the State's revenue can be placed at the feet of the mining industry and its associated activities.

I was interested to hear the comments made by my colleague the honourable member for Nudgee (Mr Vaughan). He mentioned that fossicking for gemstones has not been a particularly great revenue-raiser for the State Government. It is important to remind honourable members of the figures. It was estimated by the Mines Department that, in 1983-84, approximately \$10m was the value of gemstones that had been produced from that facet of the mining industry and that the royalties received by the Government amounted to \$38,817. As the honourable member for Nudgee pointed out, less than half a cent in the dollar was returned to the Government.

Of course, Governments have traditionally had great difficulties in properly regulating the activities of fossickers. Obviously, this legislation was designed to go some way towards remedying that situation. It will be very interesting to see what revenue will be generated for the Government from the issue of these licences and the encouragement to people to have, if you like, fossicking holidays. I believe that that was the thinking behind the introduction of the Bill.

I have said that the mining industry has made a major contribution to the State's economy, and that it is a multi-faceted industry. The Opposition has frequently expressed the concern that the importance attached to mining as part of Queensland's economy has been disproportionate. The mining industry and indeed primary industries in general have been exploited by the State Government as the basis for the Queensland economy. It has been a lopsided development. Mining and primary industries generally have been the props——

**Mr Littleproud** interjected.

**Mr HAMILL:** "Exploited" is a very good word. The resources of this State are being exploited, presumably in the interests of the State, but exploited they are.

There has been a lopsided development of the industrial base of this State. Mining and primary industry in general have been disproportionately important to the Queensland economy. The results of that can be seen in the present economic climate in Queensland. Queensland is dragging behind the rest of Australia on a whole range of economic indicators. The reason for that is that these pillars of the Queensland economy—the mining industry and agricultural industry—are experiencing bad times. As a result, a flow-on is being experienced right across the board in Queensland.

It is interesting that the neglect which has been the hallmark of this Government in terms of its industrial policy has also been the hallmark of the Government in terms of a decentralisation policy. The Government claims that it is particularly concerned about non-metropolitan areas of the State. However, no effective decentralisation policy is being pursued by the Queensland Government.

**Mr Elliott** interjected.

**Mr HAMILL:** It can be seen in the decline of small country towns such as those that the honourable member for Cunningham (Mr Elliott) represents. He knows full well that a number of the small country towns in his electorate are dying because his Government does not support small country towns.

**Mr ELLIOTT:** I rise to a point of order. What the honourable member for Ipswich is saying is untrue. In fact, Pittsworth and Oakey are both growing centres in my area.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** Order! I do not see that any personal reflection has been cast. I do not think there is a point of order.

**Mr HAMILL:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. That point of order was as spurious as some of the statements that the honourable member for Cunningham made when he was a Minister.

The statistics are quite clear. Many small country towns in Queensland, including those in the areas of the Darling Downs which the honourable member for Cunningham represents—I do not say Oakey or Pittsworth, but towns with a population of less than 10 000—are dying. The Government is doing nothing about it. Urban studies have shown quite clearly that the small country towns of this State, towns which have a population of less than 10 000 and which are away from major provincial centres, are dying because no industry is going to those areas.

**Mr Eaton:** Government members don't realise that there are towns outside Pittsworth and Oakey.

**Mr HAMILL:** That is so. They are concerned only about the larger centres. I am concerned about rural Queensland. I am concerned that the bleating bunch on my left—though certainly not politically on my left—are not concerned about the people whom they claim to be supporting. Clearly, the rural areas of the west and the north of the State are facing deep-seated problems because the Government does not have a decentralisation policy to generate industry and jobs for them.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** I rise to a point of order. I have been listening to the honourable member, but I have not perceived much reference to the Bill before us. I draw that to your attention, Mr Deputy Speaker.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I point out, for the benefit of honourable members, that I will determine the relevance of debate.

**Mr HAMILL:** I thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I ask the honourable member for Ipswich to discuss the Bill.

**Mr HAMILL:** I point out to the member for Surfers Paradise, who must have been interjecting so much that he was not able to listen to what I was saying, that I have been making the point that the thrust of the legislation is the generation of tourist activity in the fossicking areas of the State. It might not be possible for the member for Surfers Paradise to realise that there are areas of the State other than the Gold Coast. It might not be possible for him to realise that parts of the State other than the Gold Coast are very important. The member for Surfers Paradise ought to realise that the fossicking areas, which presumably will be delineated by the Minister, will be in the western and northern areas of the State, from which population has been drifting.



The point of my discussion is that the Bill is a step in the right direction. If the bleating mob opposite were prepared to listen to what I am saying, they would realise that my speech is closely connected to the thinking behind the legislation. I am not attempting to give them a serve that they do not deserve. They continually walk into traps. They are endeavouring to deny the fact that their Government has not assisted small country towns. The seriousness of the problem is that, when industries fail in small country centres, businesses go broke. This is a Government that is supposed to be concerned about small business. It is doing nothing on that score.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I assume that the honourable member is referring to the mining industry. The Bill deals with mining matters.

**Mr HAMILL:** I certainly am. Many small country towns in the north and west, such as Chillagoe and Ravenswood, were based upon mining.

**Mr Comben:** You were there recently.

**Mr HAMILL:** I certainly was. Shortly I will be saying a little about my visit there with the honourable member for Windsor.

Charters Towers originated through the mining industry. The common theme for a number of Queensland centres is that their population has contracted as mining activity has wound down. I would hope that, through legislation such as this, the Government is recognising the enormous potential for developing the north and west by encouraging population back to them.

Chillagoe once had a population of 40 000 souls. It now has a population of fewer than 200. Tourism provides enormous potential to create business activity. The Government would do a great deal of good by encouraging population back to those centres, assisting businesses to be viable and thereby creating jobs. I hope that legislation such as this will help do that.

It is high time that the State Government put something back into the areas of the State that, for many years, have supported its revenue. The mining industry has disproportionately played its role in supporting the Government's revenue.

I shall address further comments to centres such as that.

**Mr Neal:** That would be very good if they had anything to do with the Bill.

**Mr HAMILL:** The honourable member for Balonne—the aspiring Minister—says that it would be nice to hear something about the Bill. I suggest that, if he turns up his hearing aid, he may discover that I have been talking about fossicking and mining, and that I am also talking about country towns. I thought that he was supposed to be concerned about country towns.

The point I make is that enormous potential for tourism development exists. I hope that co-operation can be fostered among State Government departments and between the State Government and the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation in the provision of infrastructural facilities to cope with the anticipated influx of fossickers and tourists.

When my colleague the honourable member for Windsor (Mr Comben) and I visited Chillagoe—

**Mr Alison:** What? On a horse?

**Mr HAMILL:** The honourable member for Maryborough might tour his electorate on a horse, but the honourable member for Windsor and I have caught up with the twentieth century.

**Mr Scott:** You certainly learned a lot by walking round parts of my electorate.

**Mr HAMILL:** We learned a great deal while we were there, and we also realised the good parliamentary representation that the honourable member has given the people in the electorate of Cook. It is a shame that, through the current redistribution, the Queensland Government is being seen to try to rort the electoral boundaries to take that electorate out of the western and far northern zone. However, I digress slightly.

The point I wish to make about a centre such as Chillagoe is that that town illustrates clearly what the thrust of the Government's policies should be in its development of tourism through measures such as the legislation that is presently before the House. For instance, in Chillagoe lie the remains of a mining operation that closed down many years ago but, more importantly, Chillagoe has problems such as a lack of facilities and accommodation. If the Government is serious about making centres such as Chillagoe into tourist attractions by the provision of fossicking areas for visitors, thereby making available something that is quite unique in terms of a holiday, which the Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr I. J. Gibbs) referred to, the provision of facilities and accommodation is the major consideration in the initiatives mentioned in the Bill, and the Queensland Government will have to come good with infrastructural support. Great difficulty is experienced in obtaining accommodation in the areas mentioned in the legislation. If proper facilities are provided, enormous benefits will flow—and not only to the centres themselves but also to the surrounding rural communities in the area. The dollars that will be spent in the towns will benefit the community as a whole. The honourable member for Lockyer (Mr FitzGerald) realises the truth of what I have said because I noticed he at least nodded in agreement. That is more than I can say for a couple of his less-informed colleagues.

I am sure, Mr Deputy Speaker, that you would be interested to learn that the Federal Government has committed funds to assist in the development of the tourism potential of the area that surrounds Chillagoe. The Federal Government has provided funds to clean up the site of the old smelter and money for a feasibility study directed towards restoration of that site. In contrast, the input of the State Government into the development of tourism round Chillagoe has been the dismantling of the mining industry and the removal of the smelter to another place.

Although the legislation is important, it must become part of an overall package designed to develop these small centres which have suffered because of years of neglect by the Government as the mining industry declined. If people can be brought back into those areas, great benefit will be derived by the community.

The member for Lockyer (Mr FitzGerald) raised some issues about the powers conferred on mining wardens by the legislation. I share his concern about the enormous powers that mining wardens will be given. I had hoped that he would be prepared to take a couple of interjections when he referred to this matter, because he correctly pointed out that there is no provision for appeal from determinations made by the mining warden. Although Opposition members are not considering an amendment to that aspect of the legislation, it is absolutely essential that the mining wardens exercise their powers under the various clauses in such a way that the potential for tourism in these fossicking areas is achieved. It is very important that mining wardens exercise their powers in a very fair and impartial manner. It is also important that mining wardens be provided with adequate resources so that they may fulfil the enormous tasks that they have been set under the legislation. I hope that the Minister intends to monitor the work of the mining wardens as well as the overall activities that will be conducted under the terms of the Bill.

I agree with the honourable member for Lockyer (Mr FitzGerald) when he says that it is very important for mining wardens to carry out their duties correctly and properly so that the public will have confidence in them. If the preservation of public confidence means that, at some time in the future, an appeals provision should be included in the legislation, the Minister should recognise his responsibility and ensure that adequate safeguards are put in place.

In short, this is on the whole a good Bill. It offers encouragement to the small country centres in mining areas, about which the Labor Party, at least, is concerned. I am disappointed that some Government members whose electorates are close to the metropolitan area do not care too much about what goes on in the west and the north of the State.

**Hon. W. D. LICKISS** (Mount Coot-tha) (5.25 p.m.): The Liberal Party supports this legislation as being an innovation which rationalises and makes legal what has actually been happening over past years. The means by which this innovation will become reality are worthy of praise.

The mining industry has been the economic base of Australia's entire financial system. The basis of Australia's economy was the mining industry, and the custom of "finding it" is just as valid today as it was to our forbears who went out unaided, in the main as gougers, and discovered what are some of the most important mining fields in Australia today. Today, the Assembly is looking at regulating something that has in fact been occurring over the years.

**Mr Comben:** You're boring.

**Mr LICKISS:** If the horse-rider with the identikit face who sits in front of me would listen for a while, he might learn something.

Traditionally, the gougers or miners went out armed with a miner's right, and that was their legal right to be able to gouge, mine, prospect or whatever. They went out with the idea of making a gain, finding something which they could either dispose of or mine in their own right, and profit from it.

Over the years, with the mobility of the population and the facility of campmobiles, four-wheel-drives, caravans and so on, it has become possible to satisfy more easily the urge that has grown up in the Australian public over the years to go out to see whether they could find something for themselves. The multitudes are now able to try their luck. This Bill will more easily enable them to do just that.

I have heard it said that the Bill gives too much power to the mining wardens. Any members who know a good deal about some of the prospecting areas in the gem-fields will know that in many instances a person who is out there unprotected is not enjoying a Christmas party.

**Mr Comben:** I worked out there for a year.

**Mr LICKISS:** I will take the honourable member's interjection. I am surprised. I did not think that he would work in an iron lung, let alone in a mining-field.

Some regulation is necessary because, as I understand it, a person with a fossicker's licence will not be able to peg claims. He will not be able to protect his rights, and therefore, in the case of a dispute, he has to look to someone else for protection, who would be the mining warden. A person armed with a miner's right can peg a claim and secure his tenure. Under the law, he holds that claim against anyone else, unless a mining warden's court decides otherwise, perhaps on the grounds that he has over-pegged.

This legislation, however, deals with week-end prospectors who go out to scratch the ground in the hope that they will find something. They need protection. They need facilities that the experienced miner will not need, and therefore the authorities and powers given under this Bill to mining wardens are valid. I do not believe that they are too extreme. For example, I would not like to see people who camp in tents, caravans and so on carrying firearms and explosives, so it is essential that the measure of protection provided in the Bill be extended to such people.

As I said, a person with a fossicker's licence will not be able to stake a claim or peg an area. He will be able merely to mine an area without having any rights to it. If,

for argument's sake, he does happen to find something of some note, there will need to be a gentlemen's agreement for him even to be able to retain the right to prospect that same area the next day.

**Mr FitzGerald:** It will be just like fishing, when you land one.

**Mr LICKISS:** That is right.

This legislation is contemporary to our time. It meets a need that is not presently met in the Mining Acts of this country. It will facilitate the role that the mining industry can play in conjunction with the tourist industry. That is the simple purpose of the legislation.

A number of other matters could be mentioned, but to do so would be only to restate what is in the Bill. The Bill is well designed and will meet a need in the contemporary Queensland mining and tourist industries.

**Mr PRICE (Mount Isa) (5.31 p.m.):** I concur with the comments that have already been made by the spokesman for the Opposition and by other Opposition members. Also, some very good points were made by Government members, particularly the member for Lockyer (Mr FitzGerald), and I am prepared to give them an accolade for that. The honourable member for Lockyer raised a good idea. He said that when people pay for a fossicker's licence they be given a parchment licence that would be suitable for framing, or a set of maps of the field.

This Bill gives me a unique opportunity to reflect on the present-day position of the fossicker-cum-gouger or small ore-producer. The honourable member for Mount Coot-tha (Mr Lickiss) referred to the small ore-producer in years gone by. In looking through *Hansard* of the past half century in the hallowed halls of the Parliamentary Library, I found that there was always some mention of the small ore-producer. He was looked after in various ways. One particular dissertation described a small ore-producer as someone who produced 50 tons of ore or less.

When a smelter was built in Mount Isa, which is in my area, the ore-producer had an automatic right to put his ore into the smelter and have it treated.

However, there seems to have been an all-out war against the gouger and ore-producer. The charges in the mining industry have been increased. The Government seems to have a propensity to destroy the grass roots in the industry.

Mining has gone to a grand scale, and it is good to see that the Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr I. J. Gibbs) recognises the mineral wealth that emanates, particularly from the north of the State.

The member for Ipswich (Mr Hamill) mentioned the contribution that mining makes to the State's wealth. Last year, almost 25 per cent of the State's income came from mining. I would be willing to wager that more than 20 per cent of that revenue was raised in the area north of the Tropic of Capricorn.

The Chinese have a great way of maintaining the work of the gouger and fossicker in mineral fields. Signboards are erected in every village in the country depicting the different ores that are likely to be found in a region.

Virtually all the people in China are fossickers. More than one billion people are able to recognise what payable ore is. I am sure that that makes a great contribution to the wealth of that nation.

I will bet that 50 per cent of the great mines in the world have been discovered by fossickers. Not too many great mines are left to be discovered, but I will bet that a few of them are in Australia. More mines, such as those at Roxby Downs and Mount Isa, will be discovered. Of course, the Mount Isa mine was discovered by a fossicker. I am sure that other mines are waiting to be discovered.

I support the Bill whole-heartedly because it links the tourist industry with the mining industry, which is an excellent idea. Additional effort could be made in presenting to the fossickers, along with their parchment licence, brochures that illustrate ways of recognising ores in particular regions.

The fossickers of old, as we knew them, are fast becoming an extinct breed. I hope that the Minister will review the position of the gouger and the old ore-producer, particularly at a time when no new mining ventures are starting and little mining capital is being expended in a State that has tremendous mineral potential.

Mention was made of the mighty Mount Isa Mines, and recent legislation consolidated the leases of that company. Since its inception, Mount Isa Mines has endeavoured to do that, recognising that the viability of the discovery depended upon it. By that I mean that, because of the large amounts of non-payable or low-percentage ore, the company had to consolidate the leases held in the early days by a myriad of miners in the field to make it a paying field.

The minerals at Mount Isa were discovered by a fossicker who was not restricted as the fossickers under this legislation will be. He was not a fossicker for any single mineral, but a fossicker in the true sense of the wanderers of this world. That type of discoverer is now facing extinction.

Years ago it was easy to peg out a claim, send in samples, blend the ore to suit the market and make a living from the millions of mineralised outcrops throughout the nation. A miner could work his claim, sell an option to a promoter and wait for the boom. Alternatively, a miner could work his claim, eventually have it drilled and live on the hope of the find, with the choice to work it, sell it or fail.

If a smelter was built on a mineral-field, it was a beacon of hope and renewed frenzied activity. Ore was ingested from a thousand sources. It was almost a compulsive act by a larger company to take the ore of the small producer, but that does not happen now. The collapse of world prices for Australia's mineral products has demanded higher efficiency in production. Blending techniques can be easily affected by strange ore, and the fraternal attitude has gone by the board.

In the early days of Mount Isa Mines, the fraternal attitude was strong. The Federal Government lent money to that company conditionally, one of the conditions being that all producers could sell their ore to the mine. Unfortunately, as the money was paid back, the fraternal attitude to the smaller miners was lost.

Initially, Mount Isa Mines paid the producer for every mineral that was in the ore that he produced. In other words, a miner would be paid for the copper content, the nickel content and the silica content. He was paid for whatever minerals the ore contained. Smarter operators came along, so Mount Isa Mines restricted the amount of ore coming in when it did not need it and it would refuse, for example, to take ore containing nickel. The company's attitude was that it should not pay for nickel if it did not have to. The same thing happened with ore containing silica.

Mount Isa Mines decided that it would pay producers for only one mineral, say, copper. Obviously, the company would benefit from the other minerals contained in the ore. The company squeezed out the small ore-producer and that led to his demise, almost in a rush, on the mineral-field. In a State that is so heavily mineralised, it is a shame that small miners are so severely restricted.

Figures released recently by the Queensland Chamber of Mines reveal that charges levied against mining companies have risen by 120 per cent over the past five years. It was also claimed that rent on mining claims had risen to that extent and that rent on mining leases had risen by 95 per cent since 1979.

These all add up and impose burdens on the entire mining industry but, in particular, on the small miners. These crushing things happen to the gouger, the fossicker and anybody else who has a mining right and wants an ATP on a block of land.

The Mines Department seems to have the pedantic attitude that a return should be put in no matter what; that even if there is no production on the lease, a nil return must be made so that the Government will know what is going on in the region. Many Queensland fossickers are flat out reading and writing. They have a great deal of trouble with their leases, let alone having to come into the post office to pick up mail. Because of the price paid for ore by the large smelters, the fossickers have sold nothing from their leases, so they fail to fill out a return and, consequently, run the risk of losing their leases, or certainly their authorities to prospect. If that happens, they have to go through the whole procedure again. It is another cost, and the small guy gets squeezed a little further afield.

Some of the gougers have come into my office and indicated to me that they have outcrops of ore and are at the stage of waiting for a promoter to come along. However, because of the pedantic attitude of the department, they have had to give up their ATPs and, consequently, run the risk of somebody else coming along and finding their outcrops. They cannot afford to go on developing the area. I have no doubt that some of those gougers actually have worthwhile finds but, simply for that reason, are not willing to tell. They have to look for backing and try to convince somebody to go out and help them meet the costs of a survey. These days, surveys are costing \$1,000 a line, and to survey a mineral lease, at least three or four sides are necessary. Costs of that type wipe out the small gouger, so those guys are really being squeezed to one side. The Minister should take that into consideration when he is deliberating on just what is happening to the mining industry.

The Bill is a good move. I welcome the tourist miners. My electorate covers the country's most promising mineral-field. Real prospectors—those with the glint in their eyes—come in many forms. An influx of fresh blood will spur the industry along. The Mount Isa region is peppered with gold and gemstone sites, and discoveries have been made in the area for more than 100 years. If work is carried out in conjunction with local authorities and tourist bodies, suitable areas should not be hard to find.

On the subject of local authorities, the Minister should address himself to the right to camp on designated areas, particularly when they are close to a caravan park that may be owned by a local authority. Many local authorities encourage tourists to stay at their own caravan parks. If camping is allowed in a designated area that happens to be near a local authority caravan park, it may be cheaper to go down to the designated area, pay for a fossicker's licence and stay there for two months and not work the fossicking area. That would do the town itself a disservice. For those reasons, I hope that local authorities are allowed to lodge objections to the siting of designated areas. I ask the Minister to respond to that.

Other honourable members have mentioned the wide powers to be given to the mining wardens. The system of licensing will work only if wardens or other departmental officers are continually available. Perhaps national park rangers or officers of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation could be appointed as authorised officers. Particularly in the Mount Isa region, licences of this type will be extremely difficult to police. Because at the moment there is little activity on the mineral field, it is OK. As that activity increases, the officers responsible may have difficulty in handling the tourists.

I am somewhat concerned about the quantum of the fee for the licence. Considering that a miner's right costs only \$10, I am concerned about how the Government intends to get enough out of the fee to pay for the service of running the designated areas.

**Mr Scott:** They will very smartly put it up this year.

**Mr PRICE:** The Government probably will do that. The Minister should be very careful not to do that, because that would destroy the idea. Unfortunately, that is the record of his Government. Perhaps he will override those contentious ideas.

On occasions, the Crown and even local authorities make proclamations and policies, such as nominating a designated area.

It is not only the local authority that is affected if areas are designated by the Government without any requirement of pre-advertising its intentions and considering objections. Sometimes, citizens are affected. I would like to hear the Minister's response on that matter.

I propose to speak further to the Bill at the Committee stage.

Debate, on motion of Mr Wharton, adjourned.

### **QUEENSLAND MUSEUM (ASSIMILATION OF COOMERA TECHNOLOGY CENTRE) BILL**

**Hon. P. R. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon—Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to provide for the assimilation of and the continuation of the establishment, development, management and administration of the Queensland Transport and Technology Centre as a branch of the Queensland Museum, the amendment of the Queensland Museum Act 1970-1979 and for related purposes.”

Motion agreed to.

#### **First Reading**

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

#### **Second Reading**

**Hon. P. R. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon—Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts) (5.47 p.m.): I move—

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

This Bill is to rationalise museum services in the State, bringing under the one authority of the board of the Queensland Museum responsibility for the continuing development of those services. The rationalisation involves the repeal of the Queensland Transport and Technology Centre Act 1984, which was recently placed within the ambit of my portfolio.

As honourable members know, the Queensland Museum has been under the control of this portfolio since its inception in 1977. The museum, established in 1863, has operated out of many buildings round the city and has the additional provision within its legislative base for the establishment of branches of the Queensland Museum throughout the State.

One branch is already operating at Gympie. This branch, Woodworks, has been established in association with the Forestry Department and deals with the specialised area of the timber industry. Approval has also been given for the establishment of a general branch in Townsville within the Great Barrier Reef Wonderland Complex, and a second specialised branch covering the era of the horse, including the Cobb and Co collection of W. R. F. Bolton, has been approved for Toowoomba.

The development of a specialised transport and technology centre at Coomera under a separate board has been seen as an area in which rationalisation can be introduced without in any way diminishing the intent of the Government in meeting its original objectives. In effect, repeal of the Queensland Transport and Technology Centre Act and transfer of responsibility for the continuing development of the technology centre reduces the number of authorities operating in the State and removes any chance of future overlap between the main Queensland Museum operations and those to be developed at Coomera.

As all honourable members are aware, the Queensland Museum will be rehoused in its new accommodation in the Queensland Cultural Centre at South Brisbane in the

near future, and the opportunity is taken at this time to expand the heads of power necessary for the museum to develop by-laws for implementation at the Queensland Cultural Centre and its developing branch infrastructure that will be compatible with those already invoked for the Queensland Cultural Centre Trust.

The opportunity is also taken to commence to standardise the size and composition of boards associated with the occupancy of the Queensland Cultural Centre.

The Bill is therefore divided into three parts: the first being preliminary information; the second being the repeal of the Queensland Transport and Technology Centre Act 1984; and the third being amendments to the Queensland Museum Act 1970-1979.

In repealing the Queensland Transport and Technology Centre Act 1984, the second part of this Bill designates the centre to be a branch of the Queensland Museum. It also ensures that all assets, including real property, are transferred to the board of the Queensland Museum while liabilities are similarly transferred. The Bill enables the Governor in Council to make provision for any emergent details that may develop as a result of this action.

Within the third part of the Bill, covering the amendment of the principal Act, an increase in the number of board members from eight to nine is sought for the composition of the Queensland Museum Board. It is my belief that the board strength should be standardised for those organisations under my control and that will be occupying the Queensland Cultural Centre. The ideal number of members for this purpose is considered to be nine. This gives sufficient flexibility for representation by a wide diversity of community expertise in both the technical and managerial areas to ensure the efficient and effective operation of the organisations concerned, in this case the Queensland Museum. To allow for continuity of membership, provision has been made to retain the existing system whereby half the board is appointed or reappointed every two years.

Provisions relating to disqualification and vacation of office that were included within the Queensland Transport and Technology Centre Act 1984 have been added to those previously contained in the Queensland Museum Act 1970-1979. In addition, the opportunity has been taken to have the under secretary of the department appointed in future as an ex-officio member.

The Bill seeks to have the functions of the board expanded to take account of the provisions that were contained within the repealed Act to enable the Queensland Museum Board to undertake all actions necessary in the development of the Coomera and other branches. These relate specifically to the provision of such functions as the operation of workshops, the provision of meals, refreshments and other services, the provision of parking and associated charges, the development of sales outlets and the acquisition of patents and licences.

It is also intended to provide the Queensland Museum with the capacity to establish committees to assist it in the operation and development of its branches. It is my intention to recommend, to the board, the appointment of all non-Government members of the present Coomera board for appointment as an advisory committee under this proposed section to assist it in the future development at Coomera.

The Bill seeks to allow the Queensland Museum Board to appoint officers in addition to those provided through the public service as employees of the board. Funds for such appointments are already provided through grants and other sources, and it is anticipated that a proportion of staff required for special duties at both the main museum and its branches would ultimately be so employed.

The museum already appoints honorary associates, honorary consultants and members of the Queensland Museum Association Incorporated to assist it in research, collection management and interfacing with the public. It is intended that this pool of people from the general community will be expanded once the museum enters its new accommodation, and the museum is anxious to ensure that they are given the same measure of protection in their dealings with the public as are permanent staff members.



As part of the rationalisation, it is proposed that the collections of the Queensland Museum, representing, as they do, items lodged for permanent protection by both the general public and Government departments, should be designated as official collections of the State. This considerably strengthens the responsibility of the board in relation to their protection and management.

Heads of power will be expanded to allow the board to develop by-laws consistent with those of the Queensland Cultural Centre for general use and in association with the Coomera and other branches. These allow for the regulation of and charging for parking, allow the museum and its branches to be public places as far as security is concerned, and increase penalty and reward provisions similar to those provided for the Queensland Cultural Centre and under the repealed Act.

It has been the Government's intention to include the possibility of the Coomera branch incorporating elements of aviation history. To enable this concept to be considered fully by the museum board, existing provisions in the repealed Act relating to the operation of and restrictions on the operation of an aerodrome have been included.

Additional provisions have been included relating to disposal of unclaimed and perishable property either abandoned at any of the centres for which the museum board will have responsibility or left with the museum for identification and not recovered after reasonable notification.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr R. J. Gibbs, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.