

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 1986**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**THURSDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 1986**

---

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

**VOTING AS AND FOR A MEMBER ABSENT THROUGH ILL HEALTH**

**Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing**

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that I have received the following medical certificates—

“Dr. EMMANUEL J. COMINOS  
M.B., B.S. (QLD) F.R.A.C.G.P.  
Telephone  
Surfers Paradise 31 6710  
P.O. Box 339  
Surfers Paradise

Chevron Hotel Arcade,  
Gold Coast Highway,  
Surfers Paradise,  
Q. 4217

**TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN**

I, Doctor Emmanuel J. Cominos of Chevron Hotel Arcade, Surfers Paradise, a legally qualified medical practitioner hereby certify that RUSSELL JAMES HINZE by reason of recent operation on (L) knee on 5 February 1986 is in such a state of ill health through no fault on his part that he is unable and in my opinion will during a period of six weeks on and from 5 February 1986 be unable to attend any sittings of the House without gravely endangering his health.

Signed E. J. Cominos  
Dated at Surfers Paradise  
this Seventh day of February 1986.”

“Dr. PAUL ROBINSON  
M.B., B.S., F.R.C.S. (EDIN), F.R.A.C.S.  
Orthopaedic Surgeon

144 Ferny Avenue  
P.O. Box 750  
Surfers Paradise 4217  
Telephone: 38 6636

**TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN**

I, Doctor Paul Robinson of 144 Ferny Avenue, Surfers Paradise a legally qualified medical practitioner hereby certify that RUSSELL JAMES HINZE by reason of a knee condition is in such a state of ill health through no fault on his part that he is unable and in my opinion will during a period of six weeks on and from 5th February 1986 be unable to attend any sittings of the House without gravely endangering his health.

Signed Paul Robinson  
Dated at Surfers Paradise this  
Eleventh day of February 1986.”

I have further received a notification from the honourable member for South Coast that he has endeavoured to secure, and through no fault on his part has failed to secure, a pair during the period specified in the beforementioned certificates, and that he desires to vote as a member at every sitting of the House and of every Committee of the whole House by means of a proxy in the person of the Honourable Sir Johannes Bjelke-Petersen or, in his absence, by means of a proxy in the person of the Honourable Claude Alfred Wharton, both of whom are members of this Assembly.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Legislative Assembly Act Amendment Act of 1922, I declare that I am satisfied that the matters stated in such notification are true.

**Mr DAVIS (Brisbane Central) (11.4 a.m.):** I wish to make a point by way of explanation. As the Opposition Whip, I did arrange pairs for the first two days of the sitting for the honourable member for South Coast (Mr Hinze) with one or two honourable members on this side of the House. You have just said, Mr Speaker, that the Opposition did not try to pair off. Another half dozen members of the Opposition, who are known as the "six-pack", are running mates of the Government. I am sure they have not been asked. If they want to pair off with the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze), they can go ahead and do it.

**Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (11.5 a.m.):** By way of explanation, I would say that no approach has been made to the Liberal Party for any pairing in this particular matter.

### PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table, and ordered to be printed—

#### Reports—

Cairns Port Authority for year ended 30 June 1985

Gladstone Harbour Board for year ended 30 June 1985

A suggested Sexual (Summary) Offences Bill arising from an Inquiry into Sexual Offences Involving Children and Related Matters recommended by Mr D. G. Sturgess, Q.C., Director of Prosecutions

Suggested legislative amendments to The Criminal Code arising from an Inquiry into Sexual Offences Involving Children and Related Matters recommended by Mr D. G. Sturgess, Q.C., Director of Prosecutions

Seventh Report by the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal constituted pursuant to Section 20 of the Judges' Salaries and Pensions Act 1967-1984

Queensland Performing Arts Trust for the year ended 30 June 1985.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Proclamation under the Prisons Act 1958-1974

#### Orders in Council under—

Irrigation Act 1922-1983 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

River Improvement Trust Act 1940-1983 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Water Act 1926-1983 and Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Water Act 1926-1983

Water Resources Administration Act 1978-1984

Judges' Salaries and Pensions Act 1967-1984

Supreme Court Act of 1921

District Courts Act 1967-1982

Magistrates Courts Act 1921-1982

Money Lenders Act 1916-1979

Building Societies Act 1985

Auctioneers and Agents Act 1971-1985

Land Act 1962-1985

Fraser Island Public Access Act 1985

National Parks and Wildlife Act 1975-1984

Newstead House Trust Act of 1939

**Regulations under—**

Irrigation Act 1922-1983

Water Act 1926-1983

Land Sales Act 1984-1985

Fauna Conservation Act 1974-1985

**Reports—**

Privacy Committee for the period 22 August 1985 to 31 December 1985

Operations of the Registrar of Superannuation Trust Deeds for the period ended 30 June 1985

Balance Sheet ANZ Executors and Trustee Company Limited for the year ended 30 September 1985.

**FEEES PAID BY CROWN TO BARRISTERS AND SOLICITORS****Return to Order**

The following paper was laid on the table—

Return to an Order made by the House on 27 August 1985, on the motion of Mr Elliott, showing all payments made by the Government to barristers and solicitors during the 1984-85 financial year, stating the names of the recipients and the amounts received separately.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Japanese Bond Market**

**Hon. Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (11.8 a.m.), by leave: As honourable members would be aware, in October last year, the then Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer (Mr Gunn) informed Parliament that Queensland had, at the time, never applied for a credit-rating in the Japanese bond market. That was because conditions in the Japanese bond market were such that the State had been able to tap more favourable alternative market opportunities elsewhere.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the member for Warwick and other members to take their seats. There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Conditions in the Japanese bond market now make an approach to this market very attractive. Indeed, if market conditions continue to remain favourable, Queensland may well wish to proceed to approach the market at some stage before the end of this financial year.

To be able to launch a public bond issue in the domestic market in Japan, one of the first steps required is to obtain a long-term credit-rating from one of the recognised Japanese credit-rating agencies. Queensland has now sought and been granted such a rating from the Japan Credit Rating Agency.

Queensland has received a Triple A (AAA) long-term credit rating, which is the highest possible rating. The Triple A rating is available only to the most financially sound and secure institutions.

The fact that the Japan Credit Rating Agency has seen fit to grant its highest rating to Queensland is confirmation of the State's underlying financial and economic strength and its standing in the international financial community.

The long-term credit rating of Triple A granted to Queensland in the Japanese market complements the A1+/P1 rating for the State's commercial paper program in the United States, which is the highest rating available from the US rating agencies for these issues.

The granting of the Japanese bond rating will allow the public to see the Leader of the Opposition with his foot once again firmly implanted in his mouth and egg all over his face. No wonder he is being challenged for preselection for his seat by a member of his own party, and no wonder his leadership is under threat.

As usual, the Leader of the Opposition jumped in without thinking when he claimed last year that Queensland had missed out on the Japanese top rating. He ignored the fact that Queensland had never applied for a rating in the first place and he climbed on the bandwagon with some commentators to claim that this was proof that there was something wrong with the Queensland economy. He took every opportunity to downgrade Queensland's economic performance.

I take the Leader of the Opposition to task for his own logic. If, by his logic, Queensland's economic performance was not up to scratch because it did not have a rating, by the same logic he must now admit that Queensland's economy is recognised as strong and positive. And it is strong and positive because of the policies of the Queensland Government. The rating is just further proof of that fact and further proof of the undoubted ability of the temporary Leader of the Opposition to make a complete fool of himself.

Honourable members opposite, unfortunately supported by some sections of the media, are refusing to give a true and balanced picture of the Queensland economy. In an attempt to achieve its aim, the ALP is continually out to knock Queensland and will seize on any information—even reports prepared by an out-of-work town-planner—honourable members know to whom I refer—with no qualifications in economics or commerce.

The negative statements by the ALP on the economy are simply not supported by the official figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics; nor, as I pointed out today, are they shared by the world's leading credit-rating agencies.

The official figures show that Queensland continues to have the highest annual population growth rate in the nation, which is a sure sign of confidence. In addition, Queensland is the leading export State in Australia. Our export earnings are propping up the Australian economy and an inefficient, southern-based manufacturing industry. In the 12 months to November 1985, Queensland accounted for 22 per cent of the nation's export trade. That makes a mockery of Hawke's statement to the media yesterday that Queensland is in a terrible financial position. If it were not for Queensland, the Hawke Government and Australia would be well and truly on their knees.

Queensland has the lowest annual inflation rate of all State capitals—8.1 per cent for the year to December 1985. It has the second highest annual retail sales growth in the entire nation—11.1 per cent. But, more importantly—despite the high interest rates and the high taxes stemming from Canberra that deter business initiative—Queensland last year created more jobs than any other State. Our total was 70 300 jobs or 28 per cent of all jobs created in Australia.

In addition, Queensland had the highest employment growth of all Australian States for the year ended December 1985—7 per cent or almost double the national average of 3.8 per cent. Further, for the year ended December 1985, Queensland had the fastest annual labour force growth of all States—5.7 per cent compared with the national growth of only 3 per cent. In addition, for the year ended March 1985, Queensland had an annual increase in job vacancies of 63 per cent—again double the national average.

Those are all sound and positive indicators on Queensland's economic performance—indicators that the Opposition and sections of the media cannot hide and cannot ignore, much as they may try. Today, the Opposition has been exposed once again as a fraud on economic issues and the Leader of the Opposition has been caught with his pants down.

#### **Allegations by Federal Minister for Primary Industry and by Member for Murrumba**

**Hon. N. J. TURNER** (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) (11.16 a.m.), by leave: In the past two days, the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin) and the Queensland Opposition spokesman on Primary Industries (Mr Kruger) have alleged

that the Government of Queensland has misappropriated Federal funds allocated for rural assistance, and they have both made statements that the State Government has millions of dollars stashed in a hollow log. I reject those allegations completely.

Money held by this Government for assistance to needy primary producers has come into its hands by way of grants from the Commonwealth, and from repayments of loans taken out by primary producers. I point out that the State borrows money from the Commonwealth on terms laid down by the Commonwealth and is responsible for seeing that such borrowings are repaid. The State bears the cost of administration, and must also be responsible for any bad debts. The State has, in fact, met all its interest and redemption obligations to the Commonwealth under the scheme.

I am aware that other Federal and State members have made similar allegations in the past, and those allegations have been answered in full by my colleague the Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police (Mr Gunn). One would think that honourable members who profess to show deep concern for the plight of the rural sector would be concentrating their efforts on urging the Federal Government to do something positive in that regard, such as pressing for a realistic reduction in interest rates and in the price of fuel, and opposing what appears to be an imminent introduction of capital gains tax and de facto death duties.

The talk about money up a hollow log is as true, genuine and sincere as the promises that Bob Hawke made, prior to his election, to reduce petrol prices, not to introduce a capital gains tax, to create 600 000 new jobs, not to interfere with superannuation pay-outs and so on.

**Mr De Lacy interjected.**

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! It seems that we are again to go through the same charade during ministerial statements. I give honourable members a general warning, and it is my last general warning.

**Mr TURNER:** The way the Hawke Government has treated the sugar industry is the clearest illustration of its lack of care or concern for rural Australia. Compared with this Government's input of well over \$30m into assistance measures for the industry, the Federal Government has made just \$15m available in three years—and that was after promising to give the industry "top priority" if elected in 1983.

The Federal Government's promise of a price-support scheme for the next three years sounds generous. But, as I have pointed out, it will not give one cent to the industry until the No. 1 pool price for this season's crop is determined in about June or July this year. So, clearly, it is nonsense for anyone to claim that the Queensland Government's attitude is stopping Federal money from flowing into the industry.

I repeat also that it is totally wrong of Canberra to insist on a one-third contribution by Queensland to such a price-support scheme. The sugar industry is a national asset from which the Federal Government derives huge amounts of taxes and excise. Assistance by way of price support should surely be a national responsibility.

For its part, the Queensland Government has indicated its willingness to make \$100m available to the milling sector and \$63m to growers by way of grants, loans and subsidies over the next three years, but apparently that is not acceptable to Canberra.

The Queensland Government is supporting research into production of kenaf and ethanol, and recently put in \$3m to meet the added cost of interest on borrowings to enable the first-advance delivery price for sugar to be increased from \$150 a tonne to \$170 a tonne. That gave the growers liquidity to carry on.

This Government has played, and will continue to play, its part in helping the sugar industry. It would be well if honourable members opposite urged their Canberra counterparts to do the same.

I quote from an article that appeared in this morning's *Financial Review* under the heading, "Sugar package fails to impress Kerin". In part, the article states—

"The Queensland Government has formally adopted the deregulatory stance of the Queensland Cane Growers' Council as a basis for its continuing negotiations with the Commonwealth for a joint support package to the sugar industry. But the Commonwealth appears to be not impressed. The Federal Minister for Primary Industry, Mr Kerin, told Federal Caucus this week that the package did not go far enough towards deregulation of the industry.

. . .

In formally adopting the QCGC's position on deregulation, the Queensland Cabinet has fulfilled an undertaking given the growers in November last year that it would not attempt to force on them the level of deregulation being sought by the Commonwealth."

The Queensland Government makes no apology for having made that undertaking. The article goes on to state—

"It has also placed inevitable further delays in implementing any Federal aid for the Queensland sugar industry."

I call on the Federal Government to accept its responsibilities and honour previous promises of assistance to the sugar industry that have been made.

To save time, I table the article to which I have referred.

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

#### Interstate Migration; Effects on Employment

**Hon. V. P. LESTER** (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs) (11.20 a.m.), by leave: I wish to clarify some obvious misconceptions concerning employment in Queensland and interstate migration. Both the Australian Labor Party and the Liberal Party have shown recently their limitations by not being able to read simple statistics.

Earlier this week, the Queensland president of the Young Liberals, Santo Santoro, displayed his ignorance when he made a personal attack on me on ABC radio. If Mr Santoro has any intention of going further in politics, someone from the Liberal Party six-pack should at least make sure he has his facts straight, and that he tells the truth.

I must admit that, before entering politics, I had some respect for the Young Liberals movement. And why should I not have had respect when the movement was led by people such as Sir James Killen? Unfortunately, the Young Liberals have followed the general decline of their senior party and are now languishing under the leadership of Mr Santoro.

Statements made by Mr Santoro on ABC radio this week show that the gentleman is not even able to correctly read numbers from a publication. He said that during 1984-85 only a net 3 100 interstate migrants came to Queensland.

For the benefit of Mr Santoro, I will give the correct figures. During 1984-85, the figure was 10 287. I simply suggest that instead of mouthing-off on radio and telling a pack of lies, Mr Santoro should get his facts straight and begin promoting Queensland, if he wants to get ahead in politics.

Our good friend the honourable member for Ipswich West graced this House yesterday and gave us the benefit of some of his wisdom.

**Mr HAMILL:** I rise to a point of order. The Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs cannot read statistics, and he cannot even get the name of my seat right. My seat is Ipswich, not Ipswich West. For the information of the House, I table a copy of the report that deals with the statistics that the Minister is endeavouring to use in an attempt to mislead the House this morning.

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

**Mr LESTER:** It is obvious that the honourable member for Ipswich has a very guilty conscience, because he has come forward to try to——

**Opposition Members interjected.**

**Mr LESTER:** The honourable member has tabled a document, so we might now discuss that document. Had the honourable member bothered to read the fine print, he would have noticed that the Australian Bureau of Statistics stated that the figures from the survey were “inadequate as measures of the volume of net gain or loss of population through migration”.

For the benefit of the honourable member, I point out that two weeks after the ABS released those survey results, with its warning regarding their reliability, it released revised estimates of internal migration and has obviously totally rejected the result of its previous survey.

To give the honourable member an indication of how wrong the survey results were, I indicate that in the case of New South Wales, it showed a net migration loss of 20 800. The revised ABS figures released two weeks later showed a net loss of only 8 180. That represents a revision of more than 150 per cent.

I am afraid that I could give the honourable member—who, incidentally, is a Rhodes Scholar—only zero out of ten for his effort yesterday.

For the record, and for the benefit of the member for Ipswich and Mr Santoro in particular, I state that Queensland has absorbed 144 000 interstate migrants since 1979 and more than 10 000 last financial year. As far as job creation is concerned, Queensland has created 40 per cent of all new jobs in Australia since Mr Hawke’s re-election in December 1984.

Employment growth in Queensland is approximately 7 per cent, compared with the national average of 3.8 per cent. Incidentally, Queensland is also the fastest-growing State, if that is of any interest to members opposite. That proves conclusively that young people in Queensland obviously have better prospects of finding long-term employment than their counterparts in other States.

It is about time that members of the Labor Party and the Liberal Party started to promote Queensland, to stand up for this State and to get their heads right out of the gutter.

#### **Queensland Film Corporation; Allegations of Fraud by Mr A. L. Callaghan**

**Hon. P. R. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon—Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts) (11.25 a.m.), by leave: I wish to set the record straight on the matter of today’s page 1 lead in *The Courier-Mail* headed, “Callaghan alleges fraud in Film Corp”.

On 10 February this year, Allen Callaghan delivered to my acting under secretary a letter addressed to me containing these allegations. That letter was duly stamped and, after I perused it, was immediately hand delivered to the Auditor-General.

The Auditor-General’s acknowledgement to my acting under secretary stated—and I want to quote it for a particular reason—

“Thank you for forwarding material (or copies thereof) handed to you by the former under secretary, Mr A. L. Callaghan, this morning.

Mr Callaghan’s advices will be taken to account in the continuing audit of your department and the Queensland Film Corporation, which will include a close review of the transactions of the corporation’s trust accounts.

As my officers have become aware of the existence of these accounts only within the last fortnight or so, it was noted as one of the several areas to be given priority attention immediately following completion of the report that was presented to the Honourable the Premier and your Minister on Friday last.

Prior to the receipt by you of Mr Callaghan's communication, Mr Goodhew (the authorised auditor) was—"

this should be noted—

"in fact, endeavouring to obtain from corporation staff, all books and records relevant to the trust accounts in order to proceed with an audit thereof."

The next mention of this matter was in a question without notice from the Leader of the Opposition on 18 February, to which I responded—

"We all have a responsibility to see that justice is brought to bear in this matter."

The Leader of the Opposition chose to ignore my suggestion. Yesterday, in the debate on matters of public interest, he again raised the subject, and many of his words were exactly the same as those in the Callaghan letter. I find that most interesting.

I definitely know that the contents of it were not leaked by my acting under secretary or the Auditor-General to any source—be it the Opposition or *The Courier-Mail's* political writer, Peter Morley.

Mr Warburton interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition under Standing Order No. 123A.

Mr McKECHNIE: Mr Morley claimed in today's *Courier-Mail* that he had received a copy of the letter. Mr Morley, on 5 February this year, also detailed the contents of Mr Callaghan's resignation—another Government document. These facts lead to a very interesting circle: Callaghan, Morley and the Opposition Labor Party. I leave it to the House to draw its own conclusions.

Again I re-emphasise that all members have a responsibility to see that justice is brought to bear in this matter.

One further matter raised by the Opposition yesterday concerned the affairs of the Queensland Film Corporation board member, Mr Mike Williams, of Martin Williams Films. I again urged extreme caution because of the delicate nature of the Auditor-General's inquiries.

I have looked into the matter, as I promised I would, and have found nothing to suggest any conflict of interest concerning Mr Williams.

The facts are: Martin Williams Films has received \$32,500 in QFC investments in three separate film projects. Every cent of this investment was paid to the script-writers involved, and neither Mr Williams nor his company received any pecuniary gain whatsoever.

The QFC also invested \$192,000 towards the production costs of the first all-Queensland feature film *Final Cut*, which was produced by Wilgar Productions, a company in which Mr Williams was a partner. His producer's fee out of the entire budget was \$15,000, of which \$10,000 was reinvested by Mr Williams to help enable the film to be made. Mr Williams always—note the word "always"—declared any interest he had at meetings when applications concerning him were discussed and never voted on any of these matters.

Mr Williams said it is a matter of public record that, at the inaugural meeting of the QFC in 1977, he declared his potential conflict of interest, stating that he fully expected to be the first and most frequent applicant for financial assistance and that, if any member felt that there was a conflict of interest, he would resign immediately. This statement has been echoed several times in subsequent years.

Every film corporation in Australia suffers from the problem of needing a member with practical experience in film production to represent the industry's interests. Fred Schepisi, Tony Buckley, Jill Robb, Matt Carroll, Henry Crawford and many others have

faced the same potential conflict on southern film bodies, but there is no conflict of interest in the conduct of Mr Williams in Queensland.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

**Mr WARBURTON** (Sandgate—Leader of the Opposition) (11.31 a.m.), by leave: I reject the implications of the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts yesterday and again today. He has been refusing persistently to answer questions in full about alleged fraud and corruption in matters under his jurisdiction and has accused me of creating a trial by media—of in fact conducting a kangaroo court. Whilst I completely reject his claims, I do agree, however, that a trial is in progress. It is the National Party Government that is on trial—it is the Premier who is on trial and, so far as the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts is concerned, the verdict is very clear and all that remains is for the sentence to be imposed.

**Hon. Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (11.32 a.m.), by leave: The Leader of the Opposition cannot get out of it. He stands condemned completely and utterly because of his refusal to give a fair trial to certain people, to be fair and above board in every way on this whole question. It has been suggested by the Auditor-General and by the Police Department that no-one should say or do anything at this point in time. If the Leader of the Opposition will contain himself until the inquiries have been made and the matter is open, naturally he will be able to debate the matter as much as he likes. However, during the period when it is sub judice or should really be sub judice—one case is and the other one is at a very delicate point—

**Mr Warburton** interjected.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The Leader of the Opposition cannot get me to sit down on that basis.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier is making a personal explanation?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Yes, Mr Speaker, I am making a personal explanation. A few moments ago, the honourable member pointed at me and said, "You, Mr Speaker—"

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

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier is making a personal explanation.

**Mr WARBURTON:** I rise to a point of order. The Premier is not making a personal explanation to the House. I ask you, Mr Speaker, in all deference to your position, to rule accordingly.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Premier whether he believes this to be a personal explanation and, if it is not a personal explanation, whether he requires to make a ministerial statement.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The Leader of the Opposition is now looking up at members of the press gallery, giving them a few winks and nods about what to write and what not to write, just as he usually does.

A few moments ago, the Leader of the Opposition accused me of being culpable in this whole affair. I have to repeat that that is an untruth, that it is a deliberate untruth, and I will leave it as lightly as that. The Leader of the Opposition stands condemned by his statement relative to me and his whole attitude in this issue. I will let the public judge. If the Leader of the Opposition could hear what the public are saying about him when this matter is under investigation, I think he would go home and hide himself in the bushes.

**Mr WARBURTON** (Sandgate—Leader of the Opposition) (11.35 a.m.), by leave: Once again, in this Parliament, the Premier and Treasurer is attempting to denigrate

me. I want to make one or two points very clear. Never has the Police Department, particularly Commissioner Lewis, approached me——

**Government Members interjected.**

**Mr WARBURTON:** Wait a minute. Nobody officially representing the Police Department or the Auditor-General's Department—and that includes the Auditor-General—has ever approached me about my attitude or what I am doing in respect of this matter.

The position is clearly this: I will continue to do what I believe is in the public interest, mainly because no-one on this side of the Chamber—and that includes me—trusts the Government.

**Mr GUNN:** I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition did approach Sir Terence Lewis, and he told the Leader of the Opposition where the Leader of the Opposition stood in this matter.

**Mr WARBURTON:** I have to rise to a point of order; I deserve that. What Mr Gunn is saying is absolutely incorrect. He is telling blatant lies in this Chamber today. Unless he can produce evidence——

**Mr GUNN:** I rise to a point of order. I ask for a withdrawal of that remark. The report was made to me by the commissioner.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition is on a point of order, and I will hear the point of order of the Deputy Premier next.

**Mr WARBURTON:** I am saying very clearly to every honourable member in this House today that Mr Gunn is telling blatant lies.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr GUNN:** Mr Speaker, I would have more faith in the Commissioner of Police than in the Leader of the Opposition. The commissioner reported this matter to me.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I will allow no more points of order on this. This is turning into a debate.

**Sir WILLIAM KNOX:** Mr Speaker——

**Mr SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Nundah.

**Mr GUNN:** Mr Speaker——

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I have called the member for Nundah.

**Sir WILLIAM KNOX:** Mr Speaker, in view of the——

**Mr GUNN:** Mr Speaker, with due respect, I rise to a point of order.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! A point of order.

**Honourable Members interjected.**

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Did the member for Nundah rise on a point of order?

**Sir WILLIAM KNOX:** No.

**Mr SPEAKER:** What is the Deputy Premier's point of order?

**Mr GUNN:** Mr Speaker, I ask for a total withdrawal of the Leader of the Opposition's remarks. He intimated to this Chamber that I was lying, which is incorrect.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The deputy leader of the Government has asked for a withdrawal of the statements that the Leader of the Opposition has made. I ask him to withdraw them.

**Mr WARBURTON:** I withdraw the word "lies" and replace it with the words "he is not telling the truth".

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

### SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

#### General Business—Notice of Motion No. 2

**Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah)** (11.38 a.m.): Mr Speaker, in view of the predicaments facing the Government at the moment with regard to finances, the transfer of funds and also the alleged diversion of public moneys from the Federal Government, I move—

"That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as to enable Notice of Motion No. 2 listed under 'General Business—Notices of Motion (called "Not formal")' in my name and dealing with the appointment of a parliamentary public accounts committee be debated forthwith."

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Is leave granted?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, I want to point out that it is completely improper to suggest a debate of this nature when the whole matter is under investigation by the police, as we have outlined so often in this House; and, of course, we cannot permit it. I am surprised that the leader of the Liberal Party is so simple that he would fall into that trap.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

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

AYES, 35		NOES, 43	
Braddy	Shaw	Ahern	Lester
Campbell	Smith	Alison	Lingard
Comben	Underwood	Austin	Littleproud
D'Arcy	Vaughan	Bailey	McKechnie
De Lacy	Veivers	Bjelke-Petersen	McPhie
Eaton	Warburton	Booth	Menzel
Fouras	Warner, A. M.	Borbidge	Miller
Gibbs, R. J.	White	Cahill	Muntz
Goss	Wilson	Chapman	Newton
Gygar	Yewdale	Clauson	Powell
Hamill		Cooper	Randell
Innes		Elliott	Row
Knox		FitzGerald	Simpson
Kruger		Gibbs, I. J.	Stephan
Lee		Glasson	Stoneman
Lickiss		Gunn	Tenni
Mackenroth		Harper	Turner
McElligott		Hartwig	Wharton
McLean		Harvey	
Milliner		Henderson	
Palaszczuk	<i>Tellers:</i>	Jennings	<i>Tellers:</i>
Price	Davis	Katter	Kaus
Scott	Prest	Lane	Neal

Resolved in the negative.

### QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

Questions submitted on notice were answered as follows—

#### 1. Seafarers Club, Gladstone

Mr PREST asked the acting Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing—

With reference to my request in my question on 20 November 1985 to the Minister for Local Government to investigate the events leading up to the Gladstone City Council's

change-over of banks, to give reasons for doing so and to show costs involved that affected rate-payers and to a letter I wrote on 26 November 1985 on three matters for investigation and answers, but to no avail, and to the fact that the Minister had previously acknowledged the council had changed banks as the Commonwealth had refused to fund a Local Government Association dinner to cost \$30,000, but Westpac was co-operative and now has council business and that no reply was given to my other two matters of concern—

(1) Will he consider a complete investigation and have an audit conducted by the Auditor-General's Department into the affairs and finances of that council?

(2) Is he aware that a further financial disaster which affects both the mayor and deputy mayor of Gladstone as guarantors to Westpac Bank on behalf of the Seafarers Club may have just been an added reason to change council banking business as the guarantors owe \$24,000 each to Westpac Bank?

(3) Is he aware that Westpac has put into the Seafarers Club, Peat, Marwick & Mitchell as receivers because approximately \$621,000 was owing to the bank at the last available figure, that bank having to pay \$25,000 for the licence fee for the year, and that the club, under the management of the deputy mayor, Alderman Burns, lost some \$100,000 trading for the year and, at this point in time, no investigations as to the reason for that loss have been instigated?

(4) Has any audit been made of that club's books of account for the years that Burns was in charge?

(5) Is he aware that this club could not get supplies or stock unless it paid cash?

(6) Is he aware that this club is on harbour board lease land and the bank had to pay the lease fees to the Gladstone Harbour Board on at least two occasions?

(7) Is he aware that mayor Brown and deputy mayor Burns and former Alderman Mawer, also a guarantor, are Gladstone representatives on the harbour board and speak and vote on matters affecting the leases of the Seafarers Club, all having pecuniary interests?

(8) Is he aware that the Gladstone City Council has leased a caravan-park for \$1 per year, for five years, such van-park not to be used whilst present caravan-parks, which are only 20 per cent occupied, have vacant lots, that at present rate-payers of Gladstone are subsidising caravan-park proprietors as park-owners do not pay for services to vacant lots, but pay only for lots occupied and that the agreement with QAL and Gladstone City Council denies revenue to the council of rates, sewerage and water charges and places a cost on rate-payers for lighting, security and maintenance of this park, previously the responsibility of QAL?

(9) Is he aware that Gladstone city is the third-highest rated city or town in Queensland and has the highest administration cost per capita in Queensland and, whilst at the same time Gladstone has received about \$2.4m in CEP grants and \$777,000 Grants Commission funding in 1985-86, it is time a complete investigation was made into its internal workings?

(10) Is it just coincidental that, when questions about such serious matters of public importance are being asked, answers cannot be obtained and when an investigation into such allegations is called for, a member of that council, namely the mayor, offers himself as the National Party candidate at the forthcoming State election, thus being given protection for his council's actions until after such election, hoping that, in the event of his being successful, no investigation would be held?

(11) Is not this affair very similar to the position of this council in 1977 when the mayor stood as the National Party candidate, and was defeated and the investigation in 1978 found massive theft, fraud and misappropriation of funds in this council?

*Answer—*

(1 to 11) The honourable member has asked me so many questions that they cover a whole foolscap sheet.

I have examined the various matters raised by the honourable member and it is quite evident that he displays an appalling lack of knowledge relating to local government matters and, in fact, to the tremendous development that has occurred in the city of Gladstone over recent years. I thought he would have been able to see that.

I can only assume from the tone of the issues raised by the honourable member that he has set out deliberately to discredit the present mayor of the city, Alderman Brown, while having absolutely no basis for such action.

Alderman Brown has served with distinction as mayor of the Gladstone City Council over a considerable period and has played a valuable role in assisting in the development of the city, and I have no doubt that he will continue to do so in the future.

One of the matters in respect of which the honourable member complains, namely, the arrangement between the Gladstone City Council and Queensland Alumina Ltd concerning a caravan-park is, in fact, an attempt by the mayor and his council to retain for the city a caravan-park that would otherwise have been demolished. The council's motive in taking this action was to retain the caravan-park, against possible accommodation shortages during expected future expansion in the city, and I see this as a very worthwhile exercise.

I am informed that the council is investigating the interim use of the facility as a youth hostel and, once again, I consider that there is merit in the council's action.

I understand that the council has not acted outside its powers in the arrangements made with Queensland Alumina Ltd in respect of the payment of rates and charges on the premises.

The statement made by the honourable member as to the rating level of the Gladstone City Council and the per capita administration costs of the council are, as I am advised, simply not correct.

On both issues, the council, under the chairmanship of Alderman Brown, has achieved a more than satisfactory performance, and he should be commended for that.

The honourable member should be aware that the matters raised concerning private organisations, such as the Seafarers Club, are ones beyond the official knowledge of the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing and that he would have no jurisdiction in those matters.

As to the honourable member's request for an investigation and audit into the affairs of the Gladstone City Council—he should be aware, because of his previous involvement in local government, that the books and accounts of all local authorities are required to be audited from time to time by an auditor appointed by the Auditor-General, and that an auditor so appointed is required to make an investigation into the books and accounts of the local authority and the financial results of the year in relation to that budget.

Finally, I repeat that the Government is appreciative of the efforts of the present mayor of the city of Gladstone, Alderman Brown, in the part that he has played in the outstanding development that has occurred in the city in recent times. The Government is confident that Alderman Brown will continue to play a leading role in that area in the future. If the honourable member does not have that published in the press, I will make sure that it is.

## 2. Confectionery

Sir WILLIAM KNOX asked the Minister for Health and Environment—

(1) Has any confectionery on sale in this State been declared unfit for human consumption in recent months?

(2) If so, what are the kinds and brand names of that confectionery?

(3) Is confectionery on sale in Queensland, through the usual retail establishments, fit for human consumption?

*Answer—*

(1) No.

(2) No.

(3) My department has undertaken tests to determine whether there were any toxic metals present in the coatings and ink used on confectionery and iced-confection wrappers. This followed an incident in which a child who had been given a wrapped chocolate sucked the coloured coatings from the wrapper after consuming the chocolate.

The initial research project undertaken by my department indicated the presence of some toxic metals, including lead, in the colourings of the wrappers tested. This information was placed before the Food Standards Committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council for consideration as to whether a national standard to control the use of colours, inks or coatings containing toxic metals, especially lead, should be developed for certain food wrappers.

In the intervening period, further tests have been carried out on the presence of metals in food wrappers. In all, 272 items produced by 23 different manufacturers have been tested. All but 18 items had levels of lead below 1 microgram per square centimetre of wrapper. It is stressed that these tests have been done on the product wrappers, and any migration of the detected metals into the food would not usually be expected. In any event, the levels detected do not represent a hazard to a person eating the food or consuming any part of the wrapper. However, the results of all tests have been notified to the relevant manufacturers and we are aware that the industry is taking immediate action to reduce the levels of metal in the wrappers. It is my department's intention to resurvey the confectionery wrappers to ensure that this has occurred.

Once again, Queensland has taken the initiative on an important public health issue in relation to food standards. I believe that this exercise has been a most successful and effective response to concerns expressed by an individual in the community in the interests of consumer safety and protection.

I have asked the Director-General of Health and Medical Services to pursue the matter further with the National Health and Medical Research Council so that its investigations can be finalised and a national standard developed on this matter.

**Mr R. J. GIBBS:** I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, I look to you for some assistance and guidance. I am very embarrassed. A question has been left on my desk. It is obviously a Dorothy Dixier. It is typed out and is to be directed to the "Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer". I suspect that it is to be asked by a member of the Government back bench. I am at a loss to know what I should do with it. Would you like me to return it to the member who is supposed to ask the question?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

### **3. Contributions to Queensland Commercial Fishermen's Organisation by Retired Professional Fishermen**

Mr SHAW asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

(1) How many retired professional fishermen are licensed by the Queensland Fish Management Authority to permit them to continue a part-time interest in the industry?

(2) Is it a requirement of the authority that such fishermen be contributors to the Queensland Commercial Fishermen's Organisation in order to retain a licence?

(3) Do these pensioner fishermen have to pay the same amount to the Queensland Commercial Fishermen's Organisation to retain a licence for estuarine fishing as professional fishermen with significant interests in the industry?

(4) Will he give consideration to instructing the authority to waive or considerably reduce the required contribution to the Queensland Commercial Fishermen's Organisation for pensioner fishermen?

(5) Alternatively, will he remove the compulsory unionism imposed by his Government of no ticket, no permit to work?

*Answer—*

(1) In 1985, there were 94 licensed retired master fishermen. However, this category of master fisherman's licence was deleted in June 1985 and such persons are now allocated an open licence.

(2) Under the Fishing Industry Organization and Marketing Regulations 1983, all persons who hold a master fisherman's licence are required to pay the QCFO levy. The QCFO had previously waived the requirement for retired master fishermen to pay this levy. However, at its State council meeting in June 1985, it decided to reimpose the requirement of payment of the levy, as such fishermen benefited from management of the fishery and were required to contribute to the cost of that management.

(3) Yes, they are required to pay the same amount as other licensed master fishermen.

(4) The matter of the payment of this levy by retired master fishermen to the QCFO is not a matter for the Queensland Fish Management Authority to determine. The authority issues a normal master fisherman's licence to these people, which enables them to fish at any level they choose, and they are able—with or without help from assistant fishermen—to use all legal apparatus. The distinction of "retired" master fisherman only applied to the QCFO's previous decision to exempt them from payment of the levy.

(5) The matter of the QCFO levy has been raised many times. I can only repeat that the levy is provided for under the Fishing Industry Organization and Marketing Regulations as a reasonable means of funding a representative fishermen's organisation, which provides an essential forum for fishermen to present their views on fisheries management to the authority and to the Government generally.

#### 4. Toll Charges, Gateway Bridge

Mr SHAW asked the acting Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing—

With reference to a report in *The Courier-Mail* dated 18 February that Cabinet is considering a reduction of \$1 in the toll charged for large trucks using the Gateway Bridge—

As many private motorists, particularly students attending colleges on the north side, are finding the present toll a burden, will he consider a similar decrease in the toll for private vehicles so as to make the cost of using the bridge at least comparable to alternative routes?

*Answer—*

The matter of tolls is one that is receiving considerable comment, particularly from the ALP's Hughie Williams of the Transport Workers Union. The Opposition spokesmen are giving the impression that everyone is complaining about the toll, but that is not correct. Approximately 14 500 drivers are happy to use the bridge daily at this early stage in its life without the gateway arterial road being completed.

#### 5. Crocodile Management Program

Mr R. J. GIBBS asked the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts—

With reference to the current controversy surrounding crocodiles in the far north and the proposal to remove them from coastal streams—

(1) Why was his department's management program, which involves the removal of large and potentially dangerous crocodiles from coastal streams, not applied to the Daintree River prior to the death of Mrs Beryl Wruck?

(2) Is it true that, on 29 June 1985, the then Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services, Mr Tenni, visited the Daintree River in company with other National Party politicians?

(3) Did the Daintree Tourist Association members name the biggest crocodile in the Daintree River "Big Martin" after Mr Tenni?

(4) Is it true that, in acknowledgment of this honour, Mr Tenni promised to support this association in their efforts not to have the National Parks and Wildlife Service management plan applied to the Daintree River?

(5) Is it true that Mr Harry Freeman purchased the land on which he established the Crocodile Park in Wild World at Clifton Beach north of Cairns from M. J. & M. D. Tenni on 9 April 1981?

(6) Is this the same Mr Freeman who carried out the so-called population survey of crocodile numbers which the Minister, Mr Tenni, uses to justify his call for the removal of all crocodiles from Queensland streams?

(7) Is it the same Mr Freeman who is prepared to establish a commercial crocodile-ranching enterprise utilising the culled crocodiles?

(8) Did the then Minister for Environment, Mr Tenni, launch an information brochure titled *Crocodiles in Queensland* on behalf of the Minister for Tourism in north Queensland in 1985 at which the Minister sang the praises of the publication?

(9) Did this publication state, "removal of all crocodiles from natural habitat as an unrealistic approach to crocodile management"?

(10) Is Mr Tenni's most recent call for the complete removal of all crocodiles completely at odds with information contained in the brochure which he launched?

*Answer—*

(1) The present Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service management plan allows the wishes of the people of an area to be taken into consideration. At the time of the incident to which the honourable member refers the community concerned could not express a clear desire to have the larger and more potentially dangerous crocodiles removed, and the matter was awaiting resolution at the time of Mrs Wruck's disappearance.

(2) The honourable member's queries on this matter would more appropriately be addressed to the Minister concerned. However, I know that the honourable member for Barron River (Mr Tenni) constantly keeps in touch with his electorate of about 13 850 sq km, and I have no idea what he was doing on 29 June 1985.

(3 & 4) A search of the "Thick Skinned Lizard" names register reveals exclusively Labor politicians.

(5 to 7) This matter would be resolved by Titles Office search and I do not know whether the Mr Freemans referred to are one and the same person. However, I understand that Mr Harry Freeman of Wild World, Clifton Beach, has expressed an interest in commercial crocodile-farming.

(8 to 10) The then Minister (Mr Tenni) did launch the wildlife information brochure entitled *Crocodiles in Queensland*. But I am not aware of any statement on his part calling for a complete removal of all crocodiles.

I point out also that, approximately 12 or 18 months ago, I did make an amendment to the legislation. That amendment made it quite clear that, if anybody feels that a crocodile may be a danger to his life, that animal can be shot. That person does not have to wait until the National Parks and Wildlife Service can be contacted. The service understands that, occasionally, people have to take emergency action. In that regard, the legislation is implemented very sympathetically.

In regard to the proposed changes recently discussed by Cabinet—I can assure honourable members that the Government will not do anything precipitate. What it will do is remove excess numbers of crocodiles from populated areas.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Excuse me, Mr Speaker. In regard to the question that I was asked before by the honourable member for Wynnum—

**Mr R. J. GIBBS:** I have the call, not you. Sit down.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I will decide who does and who does not have the call. The honourable member for Wolston will resume his seat. The answer to Question No. 4 has not been completed. I ask the Premier to complete the answer.

**Mr R. J. GIBBS:** Wouldn't common courtesy require—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Common courtesy would require that the honourable member for Wolston resume his seat.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The honourable member is trying to be funny. There is another sheet to be added to the answer to a previous question, and I want to complete the answer.

#### 4. Toll Charges, Gateway Bridge

*Answer (continued)—*

The bridge is run by a public company, not the Government, and the company must earn sufficient income to meet the \$140m debt incurred in construction of the bridge. The company cannot be considering cuts in all levels of tolls; nor would the cuts suggested result in traffic volumes which compensate for those cuts. For this reason, the company cannot consider a change in toll levels for private vehicles. The toll collection system is unable to provide concessions for different types of drivers of private vehicles.

I would point out that tolls on the bridge are practically identical to those which were charged on the Sir James Holt ferry. Considering the great advantages in time of travel compared with the ferry, the bridge charges are very reasonable.

I emphasise that use of the bridge depends on a commercial decision by the private motorist, the truck owner-driver or the company concerned, and many factors come into that decision. They are the ones who make the decision whether to use the bridge or not. There are alternative routes which suit some trips better than others. There is no need to talk of black bans like those proposed by the Transport Workers Union of Australia.

In spite of attempts by the Opposition to undermine the Gateway Bridge company's financial position and to discredit the Government's initiative, traffic volumes using the bridge are far above expectations.

#### 6. Mrs B. Wruck

**Mr R. J. GIBBS** asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

With reference to the death of Mrs Beryl Wruck allegedly caused by a crocodile attack at the Daintree River on 1 December—

(1) Was Mrs Wruck to appear as a Crown witness in either a (a) north Queensland murder case or (b) major drug trial?

(2) In relation to the capture and subsequent removal of human remains from a crocodile a number of days later were forensic tests carried out on the human remains and, if so, what were the findings of such tests?

(3) What was the outcome of the coroner's inquest into this matter?

(4) Will he make available a copy of the coroner's report for my perusal?

*Answer—*

(1) So far as I am aware, a subpoena requiring Mrs Wruck to appear as a witness in a trial had not been issued. I am not aware whether police were considering calling

her as a Crown witness in any such trial, but I understand that her son is to be a Crown witness in a murder trial, *The Queen v. Van Breeman, Hunter and Sandford*.

(2) The results of forensic tests have not yet been received by the coroner.

(3) An inquest has not yet been held by the coroner.

(4) Consideration will be given to the honourable member's request when such a report becomes available.

#### 7. Drug-trafficking Convictions

Mr MACKENROTH asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) In each of the years 1983, 1984 and 1985, how many people were convicted in Queensland of possession of trafficking in heroin or cocaine where the amount of the drug involved exceeded 2 grams?

(2) In each case, what was the sentence imposed by the court?

(3) Did he appeal against the sentence imposed in any of these cases?

*Answer—*

(1 to 3) The statistics are not readily available. The Australian Bureau of Statistics—Uniform Offences Classification does not categorise an offence of the nature to which reference is made.

I can assure the honourable member that, in appropriate circumstances, I have not hesitated, nor will I hesitate, to refer sentences to the Court of Criminal Appeal if I consider them to be inadequate. That applies to all offences, not only drug-related offences.

#### 8. Two-monthly Electricity Accounts

Mr INNES asked the Minister for Mines and Energy—

(1) Will he tell the House whether, in compliance with the requirement of the Electricity Commissioner in a letter dated 14 January (expressed by the commissioner to be in compliance with the wishes of himself) for representatives of the electricity distribution boards to attend a meeting on 12 February with a positive attitude to a two-monthly billing of people in urban areas with information as to costs and methods of implementation, estimates were made by SEQEB?

(2) What were the total estimates of any additional capital costs involved?

(3) What were the total estimates of any increased operating costs?

(4) What were the estimates of any benefit by way of increased cash flow or, in other words, accelerated payments to SEQEB?

(5) How many extra meter-readers would be needed if the billing is on the basis of meters actually read and what is the additional cost in recruitment and salaries?

(6) How many additional vehicles would the extra meter-readers need and at what cost?

(7) What were the estimates of any additional head office expenses?

(8) What were the estimates of any additional stationery and printing?

(9) What were the estimates of any additional postage?

(10) What is the cost of extra computer capacity required for two-monthly billing as opposed to the present three-monthly bills?

(11) Has SEQEB in fact considered or determined to order a computer capable of billing and required to be capable of billing, on a once-a-month basis?

*Answer—*

(1 to 11) I have asked the secretaries of the State's seven regional electricity supply boards to prepare information on the question of two-monthly billing of accounts. When

that information has been gathered, I will have it examined to see the advantages and disadvantages, if any, such as extra costs that might apply.

The honourable member for Sherwood (Mr Innes) has been critical of the proposed two-monthly account system, claiming it is another method of the Government in trying to hide the effect of electricity costs.

Obviously the honourable member is unaware of the fact that already there are three of the seven regional electricity boards that operate bimonthly accounts for consumers and in fact one of those boards, Capricornia Electricity Board, operates a monthly account for its Rockhampton consumers, without any apparent problems. Of course, the honourable member is in the fortunate position of never having to count up his dollars when an electricity account arrives, to find if he can meet the payment, but I can assure him that there are many people in the community who are unable to budget and find it very difficult to raise the money when a large account arrives.

In my own electorate of Albert, for example, there are about 400 Housing Commission homes, and on many occasions I have had people complain to me about their inability to find the finance for an electricity account. My intention in having a bimonthly electricity account examined was to see whether the Government could give some monetary relief on consumers bills. Obviously, the account will remain basically the same at the end of 12 months and any system that would prove more costly to the consumers would not be introduced.

The honourable member for Sherwood is obviously insulting the intelligence of people by claiming that he has uncovered a Government scheme to try to fool the consumers. In an article in *The Courier-Mail* on Saturday last, the political correspondent, Mr Peter Morley, clearly outlined what my intentions were in seeking an investigation into bimonthly accounts, and gave it his support. I recommend that the honourable member for Sherwood read and digest it, and so save him making a fool of himself again.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### New Zealand Visit of Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts

**Mr WARBURTON:** My first question is to Mr McKechnie——

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! “The Minister for Tourism”.

**Mr WARBURTON:** I was trying to get him used to the inevitable.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will be addressed by his correct title.

**Mr WARBURTON:** I direct a question to the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts and refer to his visit to New Zealand in 1985, a matter that I canvassed with him over the last few days. I do not believe that he responded in full to my questions, so I will ask three very simple questions: Was Mr Allen Callaghan a member of the group that travelled from Rotorua to Auckland, a trip that I understand took approximately three or four days? Secondly, was Judith Callaghan also on the trip? I am not sure of that one, so perhaps the Minister will be able to advise me. Thirdly, and most importantly—“Yes” or “No” will do for this one—were the Minister’s expenses for travel, accommodation, etc., paid for by the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation?

**Mr McKECHNIE:** The answers to the first two questions are “No”, “No”.

As to the other matter, the Leader of the Opposition really has a hide to be so petty as to delve into something that is so unimportant in the overall scheme of things. He should look at the double standards and hypocrisy of the Labor Party. What about when Mr Hawke used a VIP aircraft to fly half-way across Australia for a holiday at Lizard Island? Did the Leader of the Opposition complain about the use of tax-payers’ money then? He should also remember that Mr Hawke used a VIP aircraft to fly to

Cairns for a fishing trip. I have said before that my expenses are tabled in Parliament for the Leader of the Opposition to see any time he likes.

**Mr WARBURTON:** I think the case rests, does it not?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition will ask his second question.

**Executive Director of Queensland Film Corporation, Mr Brian Williams**

**Mr WARBURTON:** My second question, which is a little longer, is also directed to the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts. I refer to the Executive Director of the Queensland Film Corporation, Mr Brian Williams.

I ask: Was Mr Williams sent on leave in 1983 while an audit was carried out on certain trust funds of the corporation, including one for Ron McLean Productions? I point out that he definitely has no connection with the honourable member for Bulimba. Was this trust fund set up by Brian Williams without the knowledge or authority of the corporation? Was an audit of this fund carried out by Mr Ronald S. Parkes, a senior partner of the firm Deloitte, Haskins and Sells? Is Mr Parkes also a member of the corporation board? Did the Queensland Film Corporation subsequently suspend Brian Williams's contract, and is he now on virtually 24-hours' notice? Why has Mr Parkes now provided the corporation—only last week—with a fresh audit certificate in relation to Ron McLean Productions after a period of two years? Is the Auditor-General now carrying out his own audit of this trust fund?

**Mr McKECHNIE:** Mr Speaker——

**Mr Warburton:** Do you want me to put it on notice?

**Mr McKECHNIE:** No, I do not want the Leader of the Opposition to place the question on notice. I want to say again to the Leader of the Opposition that the Auditor-General is making certain inquiries relative to certain matters——

**Mr Warburton:** Not necessarily these.

**Mr McKECHNIE:** I say again that I spoke to the Leader of the Opposition yesterday morning and suggested——

**Mr Warburton** interjected.

**Mr McKECHNIE:** It might have been the morning before; it was this week, anyway. I suggested that he should be very cautious about asking questions relative to financial matters involving the Queensland Film Corporation, because, in my opinion, they could cause problems relative to certain investigations.

**Mr Warburton:** I don't take notice of what you say.

**Mr McKECHNIE:** The honourable member says that he does not take notice of what I say. I just say to him that if investigations are mucked up, be it on his head.

**Fuel-pricing**

**Mr NEAL:** I ask the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs: In the light of the huge drop in overseas crude oil prices, can he inform the House how much the price of crude oil has dropped world-wide in recent times? Have similar reductions occurred in Australia? In view of the huge cost savings that would accrue to primary industries and industry and the motoring public in general from such drops, what does the State Government intend doing in its endeavours to force the Federal Government to pass on those savings?

**Mr LESTER:** The State Government is very unhappy with the attitude of the Federal Government relative to its passing on to the general public of cost savings. Only today, it was reported in *The Australian* that crude oil prices have dropped about 50 per cent in the past three to four months. Prior to Mr Hawke's being elected to power,

he made it very clear that the cost of fuel would decrease by about 3c a litre; but when he came to power, he cold bloodedly proceeded to introduce new taxes that were very effective in limiting profits for Australian business people, farmers and everyone else, and that had a big bearing on the employment of people. Wage indexation at intervals of six months was introduced, and the freight subsidy for country people was cut. Later, an additional 20 per cent in sales tax was placed on lubricants.

It is clear that the public has been totally double-crossed. Mr Keating, the Federal Treasurer, said publicly on television and radio that with world parity pricing, which was designed to encourage oil exploration in Australia, the cost to the consumer would go up and down with fluctuations in world oil prices. Yet the moment the cost of crude oil went down throughout the world, and certain benefits were due to be passed on to the public, the Federal Government started to dither and suggest that it would not pass on the benefits to the public.

The State Government is not prepared to accept that. It expects the promises made to be kept. It will not accept the attitude displayed by people such as Mr Keating, who win a few marbles from the unsuspecting public, have a couple of marbles taken away from them and then want to change the rules of the game, put the winnings in their pockets and leave without completing the game. The Queensland Government will not be in that. If the price of fuel is not reduced on 1 March, when the world parity price is due to be adjusted, the Government will proceed with legal action. In the interests of the public, it will not give up until it wins.

#### Queensland Film Corporation

**Mr YEWDAL:** In directing a question to the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts, I refer to all applications for grants from the Queensland Film Corporation for the development of film scripts and ask him whether all applicants actually exist or whether any applicants are bogus. I ask the Minister whether he can explain why, as reported in *The Courier-Mail*, an application from a Mr J. Petherick, was not proceeded with in accordance with departmental procedures. Can he also advise whether the proposed film script entitled *Beach Story* has not materialised?

**Mr McKECHNIE:** I again remind Opposition members that Queensland Film Corporation matters are in the hands of the police. I put to Opposition members, perhaps in words that they can understand, that if the police are to investigate certain matters they need the voluntary co-operation of the public in order to have the best chance of launching a prosecution. Naturally, if people think that they are to be named in the House, the more the Opposition raises matters of this nature in the House, the less likely those people will be to co-operate voluntarily. That is why I will not answer the honourable member's questions on these matters. I ask him to be more responsible.

**Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen:** What about paying back the money that you took—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

#### Interviews by Auditor-General with Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts

**Mr YEWDAL:** I ask the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts: On how many occasions did the Auditor-General or his officials interview the Minister about matters within his own department that were totally unrelated to the Queensland Day Committee? I also ask whether, at any stage, the Minister had in his office the late Mr Hank Coblens of the Auditor-General's Department and, if so, for what purpose?

**Mr McKECHNIE:** The Opposition is getting a little low in suggesting that I had any association with Mr Coblens. To the best of my knowledge, I never met the unfortunate gentleman. I am sorry for his family that his name is dragged up so much. No, he has not been in my office—to the best of my knowledge, he has not been in my office. I am telling the honourable member that.

In regard to other matters—I think it is about time, as the Premier and Treasurer said a while ago, that the honourable member paid his own debts. I do not owe any money to the Crown.

**Mr Yewdale:** Neither do I.

**Mr McKECHNIE:** I happen to think that the honourable member does.

#### **Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation Video Production Unit**

**Mr VAUGHAN:** In directing a question to the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts, I refer to the in-house video production unit within the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. I ask: Can the Minister advise whether the people involved in that video production unit also produce videos for the private market? Do those same people use the production equipment within the QTTC for that private work? Can the Minister advise whether those same people have used this QTTC equipment to produce a commercial for Daydream Island, which is owned and operated by the deputy chairman of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, Mr J. J. Kennedy, CBE?

**Mr McKECHNIE:** The video production unit in the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation assists various promotions throughout the State. I do not think that the honourable member would expect me to know the details of the day-to-day operations of that equipment—who got what assistance and when. I ask the honourable member to put the question on notice.

**Mr VAUGHAN:** I do so accordingly.

#### **Senator Macklin's Comments on Queensland Health Services**

**Mr KAUS:** I ask the Minister for Health and Environment: Has his attention been drawn to the comments of Senator Michael Macklin on last night's Australian Broadcasting Corporation's television program *The 7.30 Report*, in which he claimed that the country areas of Queensland were poorly served with health and other essential services? Will the Minister outline to the House the State Government's record on the provision of health services in country areas?

**Mr AUSTIN:** I just happen to have some information with me. Last night, when watching *The 7.30 Report*, I was surprised that Senator Macklin had the hide to suggest that the essential services provided to people in the country areas of Queensland were the worst in Australia. His comments were really and truly an insult to the many dedicated people who work in the health and hospital system throughout the State.

Queensland has the most decentralised health network of any State in Australia and has an excellent record of delivering a high standard of health and hospital services to the remote areas of the State. It is interesting to note that Senator Macklin made no comment on other States in Australia, particularly New South Wales. The Government in that State has been closing public hospital beds in country areas at quite a rapid rate. Queensland has been developing and redeveloping public hospital beds in country areas to service the people of the country. This morning, everyone heard the Premier and Treasurer talk about the way in which people in the country areas serve this State.

**Mr Wilson:** They are building hospitals and not staffing them.

**Mr AUSTIN:** The Government is building hospitals and staffing them.

To give honourable members of this House an idea of what has happened in country areas—in recent years, these projects have been completed: Cunnamulla, Charleville, Goondiwindi, Longreach, Mungindi, Miles, Mitchell and Tambo. By the end of this year, other projects to be completed are at Cooktown, Dirranbandi, Kingaroy, Moranbah, Mount Isa, Nambour, Quilpie, Rockhampton, Toowoomba, Warwick, Woorabinda and Wondai.

Where the hell has Senator Macklin been? Everyone in this House and in Queensland has the right to question what he is doing as a senator of this State. He must spend all his time in Brisbane and not travel round this State.

For Senator Macklin's information, I point out that the Government also offers other services. Services have been expanded in areas such as mental health, intellectual handicap services, and alcohol and drug dependence services. Queensland has the best Aboriginal health program—recognised not only by the Queensland Labor Party but also by its colleagues in Canberra. Child health facilities are developed right throughout this State. Every honourable member in this Parliament who represents a country area knows that the Queensland Government offers dental services right throughout this State.

I ask again: Where the hell has Macklin been? No-one knows where he has been. He is supposed to be representing the people of Queensland. If he had taken the time and trouble to travel round this State, he would not have made such an inane statement on State-wide television. He is a fraud and a hypocrite who is determined to deny the people of this State fair electoral representation. He is a fraud because he continues to misrepresent the true position on essential services in Queensland. He is a hypocrite because his own political power is derived from an electoral system that does not embody the principle of one vote, one value, yet he claims that this principle must be applied in Queensland. What a hypocrite! He belongs to the Australian Democrats, yet he is engaged in one of the most undemocratic exercises that this nation has seen. His small party, with only a fraction of the vote nationally, is now holding to ransom a Federal Government elected by the people.

#### **Purchase of Jewellery in London by Mr A. L. Callaghan**

**Mr FOURAS:** I ask the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts: On how many occasions has Mr Callaghan visited London since he was first appointed to the Minister's department after finishing work as the Premier's press secretary? On one occasion, did a London jeweller send to the Minister's department an account for the purchase of jewellery? Did departmental officers, in good faith, pass on this account to Callaghan for his own personal payment? Was this account from a London jeweller subsequently charged to the department under the guise of entertainment or some other unauthorised means? Did this happen with the Minister's concurrence or the concurrence of his ministerial predecessors and what attempts were made by departmental officers to advise him or his predecessors of this unscrupulous, unauthorised and illegal activity?

**Mr McKECHNIE:** I would not be aware of the exact number of times that Mr Callaghan visited London, because other Ministers were involved with Mr Callaghan before I became Minister. One should give credit where it is due. Mr Callaghan was largely responsible for setting up a conference to be held here next year by the Association of British Travel Agents. That is where credit is due.

However, as to whether Mr Callaghan has been involved in any illegal activities—I certainly had no prior knowledge if he was involved in those activities. The matter is presently under investigation by the police.

**Mr Fouras:** Would you like it on notice?

**Mr McKECHNIE:** No. I have answered the question.

#### **Premier and Treasurer's Association with Mr A. L. Callaghan**

**Mr FOURAS:** In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to his association with Mr Allen Callaghan, his protege, who rose to the position he held until only recently as one of Queensland's most influential public servants under the Premier's patronage. As Mr Callaghan is now under investigation by the police fraud squad over allegations that he misappropriated huge amounts of public funds, will the Premier advise the House of the contact that he has had with Mr Callaghan, one of his closest political advisers, over the last 12 months? Has Mr Callaghan had any contact with the

Premier, members of his family or any of his advisers since he resigned as Under Secretary, Department of The Arts, National Parks and Sport?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** For the honourable member to ask such a question is absolutely absurd. He does not have the brain capacity to know not to ask such a question. He should know that the answer would be, "No".

#### **Dissent Among Federal Cabinet Ministers**

**Mr ELLIOTT:** I ask the Premier and Treasurer: Has it been drawn to his attention that seven Federal Ministers have basically threatened the Prime Minister over the financial allocations to their portfolios? If it has been, would he indicate to the House how he would see such——

**Mr Vaughan:** You should have written this out.

**Mr ELLIOTT:** Why does not the honourable member just keep quiet and let me get on with my job?

How does the Premier see those actions as affecting the drawing up of the Federal Budget? Would increased allocations run counter to the advice that all reasonable people in economic circles are giving to the Federal Government about cutting Government spending? That advice has come from the National Farmers Federation, which has been particularly vocal on that subject.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Now the House is getting to something affecting everyday living. I appreciate the question asked by the honourable member, as it reminds me to tell the House that this nation is in a frightful mess and that it is being run by a whole number of different ideologies and attitudes, whatever one likes to call them—the left wing, the right wing, the socialists and the communists and the whole lot of them. All Ministers of the Federal Government are under the control of different sections of the party, and some are under the control of the coms. They are not under the control of the Prime Minister, who has very little say in what they do and what they do not do. He can swear a bit, as he did on the radio this morning, and blow and puff as much as he likes, but these seven Ministers have openly defied him. They have openly told him that they do not serve him, that they serve their own particular groups, whether they be the centre group, the left group or the right group. They have told him that they will spend money right, left and centre, regardless of whether or not the nation has a huge deficit. That is completely irresponsible. As a result, the nation is now in a mess.

I can see the honourable member for Archerfield (Mr Palaszczuk) is nodding his head in complete agreement with what I am saying. At least he seems to know what a mess the nation is in. Even the member for Kurilpa (Ms Warner) is agreeing with me. I can see a few Opposition members agreeing with me. I can see, of course, that the member for Nundah (Sir William Knox) is agreeing with me.

The main point of my reply is to demonstrate what a serious and terrible position this nation is in. It is being run by Ministers who are all running in different directions. That is probably because the Prime Minister has been away a good deal of the time learning to play golf or watching cricket. Obviously, the other Ministers have taken over while he has been away.

#### **Deregulation of Commodities Carried by Rail**

**Mr ELLIOTT:** In asking a question of the Minister for Transport, I refer to the fact that PA Australia, which reviewed the management practices of the Queensland Railway Department, made a number of recommendations on the deregulation of certain commodities, the carriage by road of which is presently restricted. In the area that I represent, one of the greatest concerns is the cartage of fuel. I now ask the Minister: What is the position in respect of that, particularly as certain economies can be brought about to farming areas if fuel can be carted by road tanker?

**Mr LANE:** Yes, it is true that, in the report provided to me and to the Government by PA Australia into the economics of the cartage of certain products by rail, a recommendation was made to deregulate the cartage of bulk petroleum products at some time in the future. The Government adopted that recommendation and is now in the process of implementing a two-year plan to gradually, on a staged basis, deregulate the carriage of bulk petroleum products by amending legislation to remove the requirement for road permits and allow bulk petroleum products to be carted competitively by road throughout the State.

The mechanics involve the division of the State into several zones and for each of those zones to be phased in progressively over a period of two years. Last week, the Government discussed this matter and reaffirmed its commitment to this deregulation and to this program over the period of two years.

Honourable members should understand that deregulation has the potential of taking away some revenue from the railways, and that could have some budgetary implications. To meet that possibility, the Railway Department has, to be competitive, come up with a new set of rail freights. I feel confident that the railways will hold substantially the cartage of bulk fuel by tankers throughout the State. The scheme will allow for greater flexibility so that bulk fuel can be carted by road where it is more economical to do so and thereby service the farming communities referred to by the honourable member.

#### **Mr A. L. Callaghan**

**Mr D'ARCY:** I ask the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts: Did any officer of the Department of The Arts, National Parks and Sport refuse to process vouchers for payment on the grounds that they related to Mr Callaghan's personal affairs? Did Mr Callaghan then seek the Minister's signature on the voucher to be processed? If so, on how many occasions did that occur? How much was involved and what was the item purchased in each case?

**Mr McKECHNIE:** Is the honourable member talking about personal items of Mr Callaghan?

**Mr D'ARCY:** Yes. I asked whether any officer of the department refused to process vouchers on the ground that they were personal items, and whether the Minister was then asked to sign those documents.

**Mr McKECHNIE:** Very simply, the answer is that, to the best of my knowledge, I have never been asked to sign Mr Callaghan's vouchers for personal expenses that another officer has refused to sign. I think that that is a ridiculous situation. Obviously, I did not do that.

#### **Expenditure on Welfare**

**Mr SIMPSON:** I ask the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs: Has her attention been drawn to a series of articles by a Melbourne academic and former employee of the Queensland Department of Welfare Services, Mr Prasser, published in Brisbane and southern press, in which it was alleged that Queensland's expenditure on welfare was less than in other States? Are Mr Prasser's assertions well founded? In the opinion of the Minister, on what information has Mr Prasser based those allegations?

**Mrs CHAPMAN:** I thank the honourable member for his question.

**Opposition Members interjected.**

**Mrs CHAPMAN:** I must admit that I am very disappointed——

**Opposition Members interjected.**

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I ask for some decorum in the Chamber.

**Mrs CHAPMAN:** I am very disappointed that the honourable member for South Brisbane, instead of getting in and doing his business, has busied himself with some

other funny little matters. He is supposed to be the Opposition spokesman on welfare matters.

I was aware of these articles before entering Cabinet, and I have since taken the trouble to find out the true position. I feel that I should put the record straight regarding Mr Prasser before I deal with the honourable member's allegations.

**An Opposition Member interjected.**

**Mrs CHAPMAN:** If there are any grubs in this place, they are members of the Opposition.

I am advised that, in 1981, Mr Prasser was brought into the Department of Welfare Services, on a fairly senior classification, by the then Minister, the honourable member for Redcliffe (Mr White). Mr Prasser enjoyed a position of privilege and trust in the department as an adviser and researcher for the Minister.

In 1982, Mr Prasser was given favoured treatment when an arrangement was made for him to be seconded to serve with the Commonwealth Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, while his own job in the State Public Service was being held open for him until he wished to return.

After the fall of the Fraser Government, Mr Prasser returned to the department in 1983, and was a close adviser to the then Minister for some time.

I am advised also that Mr Prasser's political allegiance during that period changed as rapidly as did the fortunes of the honourable member for Redcliffe. In spite of a promotion, Mr Prasser became disenchanted after he was moved from the office of my colleague the Honourable Geoff Muntz.

Subsequently, Mr Prasser left the department for an academic career in Melbourne, using his former position of privilege and trust to take out departmental confidential information which, apparently, he later gave to the media and used as the basis of the series of articles to which the honourable member has referred. In those articles he attempted to discredit the department and those who had been so good to him.

Turning to the allegations concerning the level of welfare spending in this State, I point out that Mr Prasser fell into the same trap as members of the Opposition have done over many years. The document produced by Mr Prasser, on which he based his statements, contained many inaccuracies, even in the basic——

**Mr Fouras interjected.**

**Mrs CHAPMAN:** The honourable member for South Brisbane should be quiet. I will not listen to him.

The document produced by Mr Prasser, on which he based his statements, contained many inaccuracies, even in the basic data obtained from his own former department.

**Mr Hamill:** Do you agree with the Grants Commission report?

**Mrs CHAPMAN:** If the honourable member for Ipswich would shave off his moustache, I would be better able to understand him.

Several categories of expenditure by the department, such as pensioners' rail passes, and welfare spending by other departments such as Health, Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs and Education, were excluded.

The Opposition has made this claim of inadequate welfare spending for years, but not once has it been able to come up with an authoritative assessment in which a fair and proper comparison has been made on a State-for-State basis.

**Mr FOURAS:** I rise to a point of order. The Minister is misrepresenting the point of view of the Opposition on this matter. For years the Grants Commission has been issuing State-by-State comparisons that show that Queensland is the lowest-spending State in Australia.

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

**Mrs CHAPMAN:** The Opposition has been unable to do this, because a proper all-embracing comparison has not been carried out, in view of difficulties caused by variations in the components of the welfare system in each State. Even the comparisons produced by the Grants Commission were limited to certain categories and did not recognise aspects of welfare spending in Queensland and some of the other States.

It is significant that all of the figures trotted up by honourable members opposite from time to time have never included the expenditure over the years on Queensland's free—and I emphasise “free”—hospital system. If that had been taken into consideration, as it should have been in any true and logical comparison, Queensland would have far outstripped all other States on a per capita basis in welfare spending. Even without its inclusion, recent statistics provided by the Australian Bureau of Statistics show that Queensland is ahead of most of the other States.

Also, an earlier study by the same Mr Prasser showed that Queensland spends more from its own resources per capita on welfare than all the other States.

It is also worth noting that the honourable member's question comes at a time when Labor's Prime Minister is facing a revolt from his very own Ministers because of his admission that his Labor Government in Canberra has wasted its money on bandaid, ill-conceived, politically motivated welfare payments. Not only are the Hawke Government policies plunging Australia into a record deficit situation, begrudgingly admitted by the Prime Minister himself only this morning, but also they are turning Australia into one of the world's highest taxed nations.

The present Commonwealth Government also is placing intolerable strains on the Budgets of the States by introducing badly planned and badly researched programs, then reducing or withdrawing initial funding after an initial period, and expecting the State Governments to carry the odium of slashing funding or even closing facilities down or picking up the tab. This sneaky form of political blackmail by the Hawke Government has to stop, and I will be taking a strong stand, along with our Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen), to ensure that it is not continued, and I will be taking that stand against this and other measures that are designed to force Commonwealth policies on States such as Queensland. I will attempt to determine our priorities correctly.

#### **Review of Local Government Act**

**Mr HARTWIG:** In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer and acting Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing, I refer to the many rezoning applications that are nowadays causing unnecessary delays and frustrations in the promotion of business expenditure and creation of job opportunities in the field of local government. I cite the example of objections lodged against a \$7m project at Yeppoon. Recently, an appeal was upheld and costs were awarded against the Livingstone Shire Council because of a minor technical point, that is, that adjoining land-owners had not been notified in writing about the proposed shopping complex. I ask: What plans has the Government in hand to rewrite the Local Government Act so that councils can cut out the red tape that is presently frustrating applications for rezoning and creating delays together with a denial of much-needed investment and job opportunities?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I am aware of the case referred to by the honourable member for Callide. I am aware of the postponement that will result, and, because I am very strongly in favour of progress, development, and job opportunities, I regret it very much. It is true that the application was dismissed by the Land Court on technical grounds. I must remind the honourable member that some time ago, the Government introduced into this House certain amendments that were designed to speed up the procedure by reducing the notice provisions to two months and one month in the case of advertising. Apparently it was considered not to be in the best interests of all concerned to eliminate third-party objector appeals.

I inform the honourable member that the Department of Local Government has retained the services of its former director, Mr Harold Jacobs, who is a very skilled and able man and presently retired. The Government has retained his services for the next 18 months or two years for the purpose of drafting an entirely new concept associated with many aspects of town-planning and development. When the Government has received the suggestions and recommendations made by Mr Jacobs, naturally they will receive serious consideration.

Personally, I would prefer a much quicker procedure than the one that presently operates, but some cognisance must be taken of the rights of people from all walks of life to lodge appeals. That is the reason that, at the moment, the procedures are somewhat lengthy; moreover, technical difficulties sometimes arise and make the process longer and more complicated.

**Mr DAVIS:** I wished to ask a question of the new Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs; However, after answering one question, she has disappeared. Where has she gone?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will ask his question.

**Mr DAVIS:** I wanted to ask a question without notice.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will ask his question.

**Mr DAVIS:** She is not here. Where is she?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member should place his question on notice if the Minister is not here.

**Mr DAVIS:** I place on notice a question that should be without notice.

#### **School Bus Passes**

**Mr DAVIS:** I ask the Minister for Education: Will he reduce the unreasonable distance of 4.8 km that Queensland children must travel to high school before receiving a bus pass? I remind the Minister that this requirement is causing undue hardship to a large number of families. I point out that the distance in New South Wales, by comparison, is 1.6 km.

**Mr POWELL:** I thank the honourable member for the question, because it gives me the opportunity to put on record the very sensible regulations that pertain to school bus transport in Queensland. It is interesting that the honourable member who asked the question is not even interested in listening to the answer. There will be no reduction in the distance of 4.8 km that children over 10 years of age are required to travel before they receive a bus pass. For children under 10 years of age, the distance is 3.2 km. The system is designed primarily for children who live in country areas and have to travel long distances to school. Children who live in city areas usually have access to public transport or other means of travelling to school. A large number of children in this State do not receive free bus transport.

This year the Budget allocation for school bus transport amounted to almost \$40m. If the regulations were changed, as is being suggested by the honourable member, costs would probably treble, if not quadruple. Such action would take valuable money away from education, and, after all, the transport of children to school is primarily the responsibility of their parents. It is interesting to note that the New South Wales Minister (Honourable Rod Cavalier) is busily trying to bring the school transport budget under control. It has grown out of all proportion.

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

#### **PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

**Mr PREST** (Port Curtis) (12.48 p.m.), by leave: I deny the remarks made about me this morning by the Premier and Treasurer and yesterday by the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services when answering questions that I put to them. Those

questions related to the Gladstone City Council and the Westpac Bank, the Gladstone City Council and Queensland Alumina Limited relative to the caravan park, and the Westpac Bank and the Seafarers Centre. I do not believe in blackmail, theft or misappropriation of funds, especially by people in public office. I had asked those questions in an endeavour to obtain answers, and some action on behalf of my constituents—not necessarily supporters of mine or the Australian Labor Party—relative to the Gladstone City Council and the Westpac Bank, the Westpac Bank and the Seafarers Centre, and the deputy mayor's performance as manager of that club.

I am concerned about why the bank allowed that club's debt to grow to \$621,000 before it took action, and why no action is to be taken in an endeavour to find out why and how that debt was incurred. I am greatly concerned for the guarantors. I am also greatly concerned about the continuation of good working relationships in the Gladstone Harbour Board.

As to other matters raised—I am also greatly concerned for the rate-payers of the city of Gladstone. It is obvious that this Government, and particularly the Premier, support any sorts of public funds.

## FRASER ISLAND PUBLIC ACCESS ACT

### Motion for Disallowance of Regulations

**Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (12.50 p.m.):** I move—

“That the Fraser Island Public Access Regulations 1985 under the Fraser Island Public Access Act 1985 as made on 21 November 1985 and tabled in this House on 3 December 1985 be disallowed.”

Opposition members have certain reservations about the Fraser Island Public Access Act, which was passed by Parliament last year. At the time, the Opposition's case was very ably handled by its spokesman, the honourable member for Ipswich West. In many ways he expressed views similar to those that I will advance today. It would be a failing on my part not to say that had the Deputy Leader of the Opposition been here, he would have spoken very strongly about the regulations. I will be putting forward a case to express his point of view as a man who is very keen on fishing and the outdoors. I might say that I disagree with some of his personal opinions about the charges levied on people who visit Fraser Island.

Because there is so much noise in the Chamber, Mr Deputy Speaker, I cannot hear myself speaking.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Booth):** Order! The House will come to order. The honourable member is trying to make his point.

**Mr R. J. GIBBS:** I thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

In many ways, Opposition members support the concept of user pays. It is a fair proposition. Personally, I have no problem in coming to grips with the charges levied on visitors. People who pay a fee of \$25 a week to camp on Fraser Island are not being charged excessively and the \$10 charge for a four-wheel-drive vehicle visiting Fraser Island is not excessive.

My primary concern lies with a couple of the regulations and how the money is to be used. Because I believe it is virtually impossible to do so, I have not tried to make a rough estimate of the fees to be collected. I suppose that an estimate could be made based on the number of people who visited Fraser Island in the past 12 months, but no-one can determine accurately how many families or individual groups are involved.

It is incumbent on the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts to present to Parliament the overall management plan or concept that he must have in mind for Fraser Island, but it has not materialised. In the light of the charges being levied on people visiting this beautiful island, which deserves to be protected, all moneys

collected should be spent on the overall management plan. Opposition members want to sight the program that the Minister has in mind. I am told that, at present, only three rangers are responsible for the whole of Fraser Island. That number is totally inadequate to do the job properly.

I fully agree with a number of the proposals in the regulations covering Fraser Island. However, it is time that the Government considered taking similar action relative to Moreton Island. On my regular visits to Moreton Island it has become apparent to me that the behaviour of many Moreton Island visitors is absolutely disgraceful. The quicker the Government applies some of these regulations to Moreton Island, the better it will be. I have in mind particularly the blatant conduct of irresponsible parents of children aged three to four years who ride trail bikes on Moreton Island. I am concerned because they are incapable of controlling the bikes properly, and do not exhibit a responsible attitude.

Accidents have occurred on Moreton Island, and a court case is presently under way concerning a young child who ran into an adult. The child should not have been allowed to ride the trail bike. To stop blatant abuse, some of the Fraser Island Public Access Regulations should apply to Moreton Island.

I have visited both Fraser Island and Moreton Island. The piggish behaviour of some of the visitors relative to the disposal of garbage, bottles and broken glass is such that I have no problem in coming to grips with the charges being levied on Fraser Island visitors. However, some of the regulations concern me.

I refer firstly to page 8 of the Fraser Island Recreation Area By-laws, where reference is made to commercial activity. The by-laws refer to the giving of franchises in certain areas for the selling of goods, etc. Knowing the National Party's track record in some of the so-called private enterprise operations in this State at present, I am worried about the type of entrepreneur or person with National Party sticky fingers who will be allowed to utilise some of the permits under the heading "Commercial Activity".

By-law 17 refers to public meetings, and states—

"A person shall not in the Recreation Area organize, hold or cause to be held a public meeting, procession, public entertainment, fete or similar gathering of people unless he has first obtained authority from an Authorized Officer."

I have already had given to me a couple of reports on some of the authorised officers, that is, the park-rangers, who are presently operating on Fraser Island. One would need to have a fairly fertile imagination to believe that those people would have my political sympathies or leanings, or would even be impartial to a degree.

Here, I have to tie in the reference in the regulations to temporary commercial tour operators. The Minister would be aware of the controversy that has raged over the years concerning sand-mining on Fraser Island. Recently, the Minister's Federal colleagues announced that, if they are re-elected to Government, they will re-establish sand-mining on Fraser Island.

Many people, including members of my party, like to arrange tours of Fraser Island. The members of my party do it quite often. They hire a bus, go to the island and enjoy an excellent week-end. Often, at the end of the day, they stand round and have what could be termed, under these by-laws, a public meeting. Somebody stands in the middle of the group and talks about Fraser Island and some of the political ramifications of the actions of the State Government. People, including members of my party, might sit round a camp-fire in the evening, drink a few beers and eat dinner. Somebody might pick up a musical instrument and provide some entertainment. Under the by-laws, that is illegal, because they state that "A person shall not in the Recreation Area organize, hold or cause to be held a public meeting". The by-laws go on to provide that a person shall not hold a procession or organise public entertainment unless he has first obtained authority from an authorised officer.

I want to know who the authorised officer will be. Some members of my political party and I could go to Fraser Island. At 5 o'clock in the afternoon, I might stand in

the middle of my colleagues and say, "Here we are," and take a political stance. Because one of the park-rangers does not like my party or me personally, I could in fact face a penalty under these by-laws. That concerns me.

Here, I am talking about temporary commercial tour operators. Under these by-laws, before I can take a group of people to Fraser Island and show them round, I will have to apply to become a temporary commercial tour operator.

*Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.*

**Mr R. J. GIBBS:** Prior to the luncheon recess, I was speaking about the Fraser Island Public Access Regulations and the Fraser Island Recreation Area By-Laws. I have expressed to the Minister a number of concerns that I have there. Basically, I have put forward the worries and the doubts that I have about the Act.

I will wind up by saying to the Minister that, apart from the obvious problems that I have mentioned already in this legislation, I would appreciate an answer in relation to what the Minister proposes in terms of an overall management plan for the island, how the money is in fact to be disbursed, and, more importantly, how he proposes to police the collection of the money. I am aware that what is in the regulations certainly covers that to a degree—for example, the requirement for vehicles to have permits, etc.

I have spoken to a number of the tourist operators up there, and they expressed some concern in relation to how the moneys should be collected. Are the day fishermen, who may go to Fraser Island from Hervey Bay, land on the island without any permit and fish on the beach, going to be liable to be fined for suddenly landing on the beach, pulling their boat up, getting their gear out and throwing a line in the water without having a permit? That would be my interpretation of the legislation.

Finally, I am not opposed to the scale of the fees. I am a believer in the concept of user pays where national parks are concerned. The sooner something along those lines is implemented on Moreton Island, the better off that island will be.

**Mr ALISON (Maryborough) (2.16 p.m.):** I listened with interest to the comments of the honourable member for Wolston (Mr R. J. Gibbs), and in particular to his reasonable approach and to his support of the user-pays principle. I think that is pretty reasonable and I concur fully with that concept. Honourable members will see more of it in relation to Queensland's national parks and other recreation areas.

**Mr Comben:** Are you telling us that that will happen in national parks?

**Mr ALISON:** I am not telling; I am simply expressing an opinion that honourable members will see more of that concept. As more and more people go into more national parks and other recreation areas, there will be a greater need to clean up the areas, provide facilities, roads and so on. If people did the right thing in terms of taking their own rubbish home, this legislation would not be necessary.

I am all for as few regulations as possible, but this legislation is needed to keep the island clean. If people could be educated to do the right thing and take their rubbish home, a lot more money could be spent on facilities on Fraser Island and less money could be sent on cleaning up in the context of the summary budget that I have before me.

The honourable member for Wolston made a comment about the \$10 access fee being reasonable. Again, I concur with that wholeheartedly. I also concur with the camping fee of \$5 a night a site with a maximum of \$25 a week. A family can go to the island in a four-wheel-drive vehicle with camping equipment for a week and it will cost them \$25 camping fee plus the \$10 access fee, which adds up to \$35 a week. That is pretty good value for being permitted to go onto the island and camp almost where they wish, subject to certain restricted areas, and use the facilities that are on the island.

This legislation is of great significance to my electorate. It includes the bottom half of the island, which is administered by the Forestry Department. When the legislation

was first mooted, very considerable discussion took place. In my electorate, I invited all those who were interested to give me their views on what they thought should be in the legislation. When the Bill was presented to the House, I sought further views to gain constructive criticism and suggestions on the regulations. In addition to that I sought constructive criticism on the thing that probably created the most interest—the fees.

I received a great deal of feedback from my electorate—99 per cent of it was constructive—and I passed it on to the Minister. Both Ministers who are involved in this—the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts and the Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying—have been very reasonable in their approach to this matter and have listened to submissions put to them. When they have been able to, they have acted on those submissions, particularly submissions on the fees and regulations. The departmental officers have been very helpful, also.

Although I did not win all of the arguments, I am very happy with the way the matter has been handled. Had it been handled in anything other than a careful, conciliatory and proper manner, this could have been a pretty vexed question in my electorate. I am very pleased with the way it has been handled. Late last year, quite a large number of people responded to an invitation to attend a meeting in Maryborough. The Minister and officers of the departments were there and the meeting proved to be very fruitful.

The stage has been reached at which, so far as I am concerned, the only potential problem—I do not say it is a real problem—is that in my electorate and in that of my colleague the honourable member for Isis there is still strong concern—the Minister and his officers know of this—that the only places from which people can obtain an access permit are the offices of the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Forestry Department. I concede that they are available on the island itself, which should make it fairly easy for people to obtain a permit if they do not have one before they get to the island. However, the concern remains that the obtaining of a permit is still not easy enough for those from my electorate or the Isis electorate, who, on an impulse, may go to the island. If the weather is right and the fish are biting on a Saturday morning, obviously the departmental offices would be closed and people would go to the island without a permit.

The Minister is well aware that it has been suggested to him that, in due course, consideration be given to authorising the barge-proprietors to collect the access fee and issue the necessary permit. Of course, they would have to be paid a small fee to do that.

**Mr R. J. Gibbs:** He has indicated that he does not want to do that, though, hasn't he?

**Mr ALISON:** Yes. It is not so much that he does not want to do it, as I understand it. I have had many discussions with the Minister and he has intimated that he will consider this suggestion. He wants the Act and regulations to be enforced as they stand so that, at the moment, the barge-operators are not authorised to collect the fee. The Minister wants to see how the present system works but, in due course, he will be prepared to look at it. That is fair enough.

**Mr McKechnie:** What I am prepared to do is monitor the Act and, if there is a need for that to come in, the department will look at it at a later date.

**Mr R. J. Gibbs:** There is a need.

**Mr McKechnie:** We will look at it at a later date.

**Mr R. J. Gibbs:** Isn't this a wonderful tripartite discussion?

**Mr ALISON:** There is no doubt about that, yes.

I accept the Minister's statement that he will monitor what happens. I believe that, by and large, that is accepted in my electorate.

Another direct adjunct of barge-operators not being allowed to issue access permits that is causing concern is the form to be filled out. The point has been made to the

Minister that, if access to the island were by bridge and not by ferries and barges, motorists would stop at an office, pay their \$10, be given a ticket and away they would go. They would not have to fill out a form. Once again, the Minister has agreed to monitor what happens to see how things go. I accept that.

Whilst I am speaking about the part of the island that comes within my electorate, I wish to refer to the activities of the Forestry Department, which, for the last 40 years, has been monitoring and managing forest activities.

**Sir William Knox:** They have done a pretty good job, too.

**Mr ALISON:** The officers certainly have. They are professional conservationists. The officers do a tremendous job and are to be congratulated.

People in the Maryborough area have been taking timber from the island for more than 100 years.

**Mr Comben:** It is about time they stopped.

**Mr ALISON:** I thank the member for Windsor for that comment.

**Mr Simpson:** That is the attitude of the Labor Party.

**Mr ALISON:** That is correct.

The timber industry is very important to my electorate, because half the hardwood timber that goes to the two large sawmills at Maryborough comes from Fraser Island.

When the late Dr Denis Murphy visited Maryborough, he made the Labor Party's policy quite clear. Mr Keith Wright, the then Leader of the Opposition, also made the Labor Party's policy very clear. Only a couple of minutes ago, the honourable member for Windsor made it very clear that it is the Labor Party's policy to——

**Mr Simpson:** Close all the mills.

**Mr ALISON:** The honourable member is correct. It is the Labor Party's policy to stop the timber industry on Fraser Island. That has been its policy for the last 18 years. The closure of the mills would have a traumatic effect on Maryborough's economy.

**Mr Innes:** You would have to agree that Mr Comben is an authority on logs.

**Mr ALISON:** The honourable member has made a very good point, and I would have to agree with him.

The Labor Party's policy is a load of rubbish. I will be reminding the people of Maryborough that it is Labor Party policy to wind down the timber industry on Fraser Island. That would probably make non-viable the two hardwood mills in Maryborough, where between 500 and 700 people are directly or indirectly involved in the hardwood timber industry. Leading up to the election, I will be reminding them frequently about the Labor Party's policy. I hope that, from time to time, the honourable member for Windsor (Mr Comben) also visits my electorate to remind the people of the Labor Party's policy. If he does not remind them, I certainly will. I would welcome a visit by the honourable member to the district.

A quick perusal of the summary of the 1985-86 budget of the Fraser Island Recreation Board indicates that it is expected that \$364,000 will be spent on the beach clean-up; \$266,000 on visitor facilities; \$387,000 on visitor safety; \$190,000 on visitor information and control; \$238,500 on management facilities; \$68,500 on public information; \$358,000 on operating costs; and \$62,000 on salaries. That makes a total budget of \$1,934,000.

The people paying access fees can see that a very small portion of their fee is used for administration costs and salaries. By far the greater proportion will be used for the clean-up, providing improved facilities and so forth on the island. It will be interesting to see how much is collected in access fees. I know that the departmental officers do not have any accurate estimates of the amount that will be collected. I am not being critical of them, as nobody else can provide an accurate estimate.

*Time expired.*

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (2.27 p.m.): During the debate on the Fraser Island Public Access Bill, on behalf of the Liberal Party I pointed out that we agreed with the principle of paying for access to Fraser Island. I said that the principle could be extended to other islands in circumstances in which it was economic to collect the money. The Opposition spokesman began his speech on this motion by a reference to Moreton Island, which has an acute vehicular access problem during all major holidays. Any enjoyment of the island is being greatly diminished by the extent of access to the island.

During the debate on the Bill, the members of the Liberal Party agreed with the basic principle of paying for access to the island. However, a warning was issued for obvious and commonsense reasons and with the representations from and the attitudes expressed by organisations such as the 4-Wheel Drive Clubs of Queensland Association in mind. The Minister will recall that I took members of the executive of that association to see him during the formulation stages of the Bill. During the debate on the Bill, I said that, although \$10 for one trip seems to be fair and reasonable, a four-wheel-drive enthusiast will be paying for multiple trips to the same island or to a number of islands or a number of national parks. The imposition of a \$10 fee for each visit becomes a burden, particularly on four-wheel-drive enthusiasts or, in the case of the people residing in the electorate of the honourable member for Maryborough, people who, because of their closeness to the island, make frequent visits at short notice. The fee for multiple visits is \$80.

During the debate on the Fraser Island Public Access Bill, I pointed out that people such as members of the 4-Wheel Drive Clubs of Queensland Association cannot be placed in the same category as the four-wheel-drive set in the cities. They are usually ordinary people who have ordinary jobs and find fresh air recreation and cheaper recreation by going camping and fishing, and enjoying other types of recreation that are possible with a four-wheel-drive vehicle.

The 4-Wheel Drive Clubs of Queensland Association has 4 000 members. They are not in the Range Rover/Brisbane western suburbs income bracket.

Mr Comben: So they are not your sort of people?

Mr INNES: I have a 1978 long-base Toyota—very much the average man's four-wheel-drive vehicle.

The payment of \$80 for a multiple visit permit is an excessive burden. It is too much. The commercial vehicle operator only has to pay an annual permit fee of \$100, and he might visit the island twice a week—104 trips a year—and can take that into account in his charge factor, so \$80 per vehicle for a multiple visit permit is far too much; \$25 per vehicle would be reasonable.

I suggest that the whole question of fees needs to be reviewed. It is popping up everywhere. Local authorities are considering setting fees for the use of areas such as Double Island Point. The Noosa Shire Council might charge people to go across the Noosa River, and they might have to pay to enter the Double Island Point/Rainbow Beach area. People could be charged to visit other parks or Moreton Island.

The honourable member for Wolston and the honourable member for Maryborough have mentioned that people might decide to visit Fraser Island because the weather is fine or do so simply on the spur of the moment, bearing in mind the times at which the barge operates and the tides. The decision is made according to the tides and the operation of the barge. People can leave at the crack of dawn and return late at night.

There must be a convenience factor. The Liberal Party suggests that the holders of multiple visit permits should be able to pay the six-monthly or annual fee that covers any of these Government-controlled places that have four-wheel-drive vehicle access.

The fee is an intolerable burden. People from rural areas know only too well the cost of fuel. Running a four-wheel-drive vehicle is a darned expensive business. A four-wheel-drive vehicle chews up the gas, particularly when it is being driven on a sand island.

The users of the island already pay their taxes. The great majority of people for whom I am speaking are average people who own four-wheel-drive vehicles—the short-wheel-base Land Cruiser person or the old Land Rover person—but are already just hanging in there running a four-wheel-drive vehicle because of all the associated expenses.

A fee of \$80 is off the planet, particularly when it is compared with the annual permit fee for the commercial operator, although \$10 for one visit to the island is all right because the person who goes once a year—and many people do—can afford to pay that amount. However, for the people who regularly visit the island, because of the cost and the problem in getting a permit when it is needed, and all the variables involved, there should certainly be a multiple visit permit.

The Liberal Party suggests that the Minister needs to get the whole thing back under control. Not only must the fee be reduced but also the Minister must consider the application of such fees to a variety of destinations. The stage must not be reached at which the four-wheel-drive vehicle enthusiast—the person who is likely to visit multiple destinations—will have to pay \$80 for Fraser Island, \$10 or \$15 for Noosa beach, so much for Moreton Island and so much for national parks.

Not only would that deprive the Government of revenue but it would also cause the loss of the most desirable people who have access to these places. The 4-Wheel Drive Clubs of Queensland Association has codes of conduct, training sessions for rescues and proper behaviour in parks and other areas, proper camping techniques, and rules on the proper use of tracks. The members of that association are the best educational vehicles that the Government has.

The Liberal Party warned the Government. I am sure that the Government has had feedback. A fee of \$80 for multiple visit permits is far too much, whether it is for a person living in the electorate of the honourable member for Maryborough, who wants to visit the island frequently, or for a member of the 4-Wheel Drive Clubs of Queensland Association, who might visit Fraser Island two or three times a year, Moreton Island once a year and a variety of other destinations.

This whole business of charging fees must be brought back under control. For the person who frequently visits the island, there should be a centrally available authority to cover any Government-controlled destination that people might want to go to. The sum of \$25 per vehicle per year is as much as the average family can afford.

The short point is that members of the Liberal Party home in on the parts of the regulations that refer to the fee payable under the second schedule for multiple use. That is the part to which we object, and we think it requires a rethink by the Minister, having regard to the other considerations that I have mentioned.

**Mr COMBEN (Windsor) (2.35 p.m.):** This afternoon, honourable members have heard the National Party, in the customary way, declare war on the environment. The honourable member for Maryborough said that Fraser Island will be logged, as it has been logged for 100 years, so “She’ll be right, mate! We will keep logging it”, because that is the only way that jobs in Maryborough can be preserved.

The truth is that, if the National Party in this State had a decent decentralisation policy of regional development that provided real jobs for people, the honourable member would not have to worry about a few jobs at the sawmill.

**Mr Alison:** Five hundred jobs.

**Mr COMBEN:** Those 500 jobs, that members of the Opposition are also worried about, could be protected by the implementation of a proper forestry regime of forestry management programs on the mainland.

Fraser Island is the greatest asset that Maryborough has. The number of tourists who travel through Maryborough in any year on their way to Fraser Island far outweigh the number of people who travel to Maryborough for any other reason, yet the person

who claims to represent the interest of the electors of Maryborough—the people and environment of Maryborough and its surrounds—advocates destroying the island.

**Mr Alison:** Are you aware that, for many years, the Department of Forestry has had a policy of managing on a sustained-yield basis? In fact, there is more timber in the commercial forest on the island now than there was four years ago.

**Mr COMBEN:** Having listened to the second speech made by the honourable member for Maryborough, I take the point that the Department of Forestry has had a sustainable-yield policy in operation, but I point out that, for the past 20 years, the Department of Forestry has not been able to recoup its costs associated with Fraser Island. Because the forestry projects have been unsuccessful on Fraser Island, the township of Maryborough loses revenue. The tourists who come into the area say, “We don’t want to see an island that is being logged, that has had the guts ripped out of it.”

The Government should introduce a decent forestry-management plan. The Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts is well aware of past management plans that have been devised for Fraser Island. However, despite the establishment of the recreational authority, no overall plan has been proposed since the year 1974. Those plans should be examined in the light of the Fraser Island Public Access Regulations, but nothing is known about them.

The Opposition will continue to call for the protection of Fraser Island as a wilderness area, because of its attraction as a tourist destination. Because it is the largest sand island in the world, it attracts the attention of world travellers.

**Mr Simpson:** Do you object to the regulations?

**Mr COMBEN:** I say that the overall concept of the regulations should not be agreed to. Although the concept is good, the Government mouths platitudes without carrying out any substantial work that is necessary.

During the debate on the Fraser Island Public Access Bill, the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts gave an undertaking that consultations would be held with a proposed advisory committee about the regulations. It is unfortunate that, to date, no public consultation in any form has taken place.

**Mr Simpson:** There has been.

**Mr COMBEN:** There has been no public consultation. I hear the Minister bleating about it, and saying, “I have had public consultation.” I wish to quote a press release issued by the Minister on 5 September 1985, which reads, in part—

“Mr McKechnie said he deliberately sought the views of ‘people who counted’ before deciding on the fees.

‘The opinions I sought were from rational and sensible people who regularly visited the island.’”

That statement is worth nothing. When has the Minister ever consulted four-wheel-drive clubs? The honourable member for Sherwood has taken a group to consult with the Minister, and that is the first time that I have heard of a consultation taking place. When has the Minister had a consultation with the Fraser Island Defenders Organisation? Has the Minister consulted with the Queensland Conservation Council or the Wildlife Preservation Society? When has the Minister consulted with environmentalists, who are concerned about Fraser Island?

The Minister claims to have consulted local people, so let me indicate what has been said about consultation with local people. I quote from an article published in the *Maryborough-Hervey Bay Chronical* by Angela Burger, under the heading “Fraser Island Angles”. The article refers to the opinions of island residents, and states in part—

“Quite frankly they are sick of being treated like mushrooms about how the new management plan is going to affect them.”

The Minister does not need to be told how mushrooms are treated. The article continued—

“Very little effort has been made by the Government to tap the experience of long-time residents or tourist operators.”

**Mr Alison:** Have you spoken to Angela Burger lately?

**Mr COMBEN:** I have read her article.

**Mr Alison:** No; have you spoken to her lately?

**Mr COMBEN:** It must be a true newspaper, because it always contains articles contributed by the honourable member. If he appears in it, it must be a true newspaper. I will believe what is in the newspaper.

The article continued—

“Instead, what occasionally happens is that a Government employee will get in touch with someone and ask what he or she thinks of such and such an idea.”

The residents are saying that there had been no consultation. The commercial tourist operators are still waiting for that consultation.

**Mr Alison:** Come and talk to them now, please.

**Mr COMBEN:** I am not yet ready to be shark food. I will not go up to see Sid Melksham. I know what would happen to me on the way to Fraser Island. That article showed that the residents are upset.

I turn now to a front-page article that appeared in the *Maryborough-Hervey Bay Chronicle* of 27 November.

**Mr Alison:** That is months ago.

**Mr COMBEN:** It was still at the time when it was announced that these regulations would be debated. We on this side of the House cannot be responsible for the fact that three months went by before the regulations were discussed. If the House met more frequently, the regulations could have been debated on 28 November. The article was headed, “New FI levy due before facilities are provided” and stated—

“Maryborough and Hervey Bay ratepayers who regularly visit Fraser Island are angry that they would have to pay access fees for facilities before they exist, a Fraser Island ferry operator said yesterday.”

The Minister is saying that he has spoken to the operators, yet there were the operators going to the public saying that the Government they normally support was not doing the right thing. The article continues—

“‘They are angry because they will have to pay the fees from February 1, long before the camping amenities and other services will be built or operated,’ he said. ‘Perhaps we could all stockpile our receipts, and claim a discount on trips in years to come.’”

Where is the consultation? It seems to me that every user group and consumer group is saying, “You are not talking to us. You are not doing your job.”

**Mr McKechnie:** How many yarns have you had with Burger in her own establishment and Sid Melksham?

**Mr COMBEN:** Before or after this article?

**Mr McKechnie:** Before.

**Mr COMBEN:** She did not think much of it.

**Mr McKechnie:** It depends which one. She has written several.

**Mr COMBEN:** She is obviously a journalist of integrity who is reflecting what the local people think.

Apart from the honourable member for Maryborough, I am unable to find anyone who thinks that the Minister has done the right thing. The only reason why the honourable member for Maryborough is saying that the Minister has done the right thing is that he wants continued National Party endorsement. He has tried endorsement for every other party and he just wants to maintain his endorsement with the National Party now.

Let me now turn to the regulations themselves. They provide for the first fees to be imposed for access to a national park in Queensland. That is the user-pays principle, with which I can agree in certain circumstances. Unfortunately, as is often the case with this Government, what would be a good concept if Queensland had an honourable, honest Government may well not turn out to be an appropriate course of action, because this Government's use of such principles, and the way that it might use the user-pays principle, could be disagreed with.

In a press release of 1 December, the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts stated—

“The fees to be paid will go toward the improvement of safety, health, camping area and picnic facilities on Fraser.”

If the Minister is saying that that is what the fees will be used for, I would agree with them without any problem at all.

I want to know what will happen when the public decide that they want a different type of approach, that they want a different character of tourist facilities, that they want another Hope Island, Douglas River or Shute Harbour development with multimillion-dollar expenditure on bitumen roads, electricity and so on. Will the Government then say, “Oh, well, the user pays. We are getting this money, so we might as well just finish the logging, knock the trees down in the middle of the island and put in another tourist development like Iwasaki or something like that.”? That is the way in which I foresee this Government using the user-pays principle. As it is at present, we on this side of the House agree with the Minister's statements, but, because this Government cannot be trusted, we reserve the right in future years to say, “We told you so.”

I referred to the Minister's press release of 1 December 1985, and I want to make particular reference to another part of it where he said—

“Sixteen workers under a \$280,000 Community Employment Program task are tackling a legacy of litter left by countless visitors along the beaches and roadsides.”

That is a wonderful concept and one with which I agree totally. I am glad that it was done. But where in the press release is mentioned the fact that that money came from the Federal Government? Almost \$2m of CEP funds has now been spent on Fraser Island, yet not once has the Minister ever acknowledged that it was Federal Government money. Typical Government duplicity!

The Minister is virtually saying, “The Government is doing the right thing,” but he is not giving any credit to the Federal Government. He believes that if he can kick the Federal people below the belt, he should do so.

The Minister's time is coming to an end. He has not been on the island for any length of time, apart from when he visited it to launch a clean-up and stayed there for three hours. I understand that the Minister prefers visiting New Zealand. Opposition members will have more to say about that.

The other announcements in the Minister's press release about how the money is to be spent are commendable. Reference was made to the employment of five national park rangers and two forestry officers. Indeed, I understand that some of them have been appointed. It is a pity that more staff cannot be appointed to preserve this wilderness.

**Mr Alison:** When do we get your environmental policy?

**Mr COMBEN:** The Government will get my environment policy very shortly.

*Time expired.*

**Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (2.46 p.m.):** I am pleased to take part in the debate on the motion for disallowance of the regulations. It should be noted at the outset that Opposition members appear to be drawing the long bow when voicing their objections to the regulations and the whole idea of Fraser Island control.

In his opening remarks, the honourable member for Wolston referred to the holding of public meetings on Fraser Island. I point out to the honourable member that conditions on Fraser Island are no different from those that apply in all other national parks throughout the State. The honourable member for Wolston read the relevant by-law, which is in these terms—

“A person shall not in the Recreation Area organise, hold or cause to be held a public meeting, procession, public entertainment, fete or similar gathering of people unless he has first obtained authority from an Authorized Officer.”

The honourable member should realise that many people want to enjoy the facilities offered on the island and in its national park. Why should they be disrupted by a rowdy, organised public meeting? The honourable member for Wolston expressed his concern about fishing.

**Mr Davis:** What about the people of Tin Can Bay?

**Mr STEPHAN:** I am surprised that the honourable member even knows the location of Tin Can Bay.

The regulations contain an interpretation of the term “animal”, which reads—

“‘Animal’ means all mammals, birds, reptiles, freshwater marine life, insects and all other species of animal life and the eggs and young thereof but does not include any species of salt water marine life;”

It is obvious that salt-water marine life is not included in the meaning of “animal”, and therefore fishing operations will be able to continue in the normal way.

**Mr Davis:** Why don't you support the Tin Can Bay Progress Association?

**Mr STEPHAN:** The Tin Can Bay Progress Association has been operating for some time. I do not know that it has made any public statements on Fraser Island. If the association has written to the honourable member about Fraser Island, perhaps he will be able to bat for it. To my knowledge, the association has not mentioned Fraser Island in any correspondence.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** Order! I draw the attention of the honourable member for Brisbane Central to the fact that if his interjections are not relevant, I will give him an opportunity to go and look for himself.

**Mr STEPHAN:** Once again, the member for Windsor got onto his hobby-horse about the harvesting of timber on Fraser Island. It appears to me that the member for Windsor is against job creation. He is against the 500 jobs that are made available through the timber industry on Fraser Island. Why does the member for Windsor continue to oppose, or deny, the great value of the contribution that these workmen make? Most people realise that the Forestry Department has done a fantastic job in harvesting timber on Fraser Island. However, many people fail to realise that the private millers have been operating on the island for years in conjunction with the Forestry Department. The private millers have played their part by providing facilities, services and jobs, without causing any harm to the island or the timber industry. If the honourable member was familiar with the growth pattern of the timber on the island, he would know that it is equal to that of the fastest-growing timbers in the world. The timber was being harvested every three years. That caused concern to nobody other than the few people who thought that it should remain there for posterity.

Those comments can be ignored, as can the comments about there being no public consultation. There has been a great deal of public consultation. Individuals and organisations from Rainbow Beach to Maryborough have been keen to know what has

been going on, and they have made contributions. They have been interested enough to attend meetings that have been called. They have also sent letters to the member for Maryborough and to me outlining their ideas about Fraser Island.

I compliment those people who have played a part in keeping Fraser Island as clean as possible. I refer, in particular, to Gordon Elmer, who, until recently, distributed plastic bags to people who travelled on his barge to Fraser Island. Of the \$3 that he collected, he kept \$1 for disposing of the rubbish. Unfortunately, he is not doing that now. His efforts were responsible for reducing the amount of rubbish on Fraser Island. It is a pity that some of the people who are knocking what is being done on Fraser Island did not make as positive a contribution as Gordon Elmer has made. Sure, Gordon Elmer and others are making a living from transporting people by barge or ferry to Fraser Island or from operating other tourist facilities; but they know that unless they put something back, the opportunity to earn a living will not be there.

The moneys collected will be paid into the Fraser Island Public Access Fund. The user-pays principle has been mentioned many times. Why should not people make a contribution to the cost of maintaining the area in which they get so much enjoyment? It is possible that the charges that are being imposed on Fraser Island will be extended to other areas in which people enjoy free holidays at the moment. In such areas, people are able to obtain fresh water and have their rubbish collected. Unless rubbish is disposed of adequately, great health problems can arise and disease can spread throughout national parks and other areas.

Reference has been made to the availability of permits. I have discussed this matter with the Minister. I know that people will arrive at Inskip Point without a permit and want to travel across to Fraser Island on Elmer's barge. I have been informed that permits will be available at various centres and also from mobile units on the island. They will be available also at Central Station, Eurong, Bundaburra and the Rainbow Beach Information Centre.

**Mr Davis:** When was the last time you were on Fraser Island?

**Mr STEPHAN:** It is not long since I visited Fraser Island. The visitors going there are keeping the front counters busy with inquiries about the issuing of permits.

The permit-issuing centres are being used also as information-gathering centres by people wishing to find out where to go when they get to the island. This legislation will play an important role in enabling equipment to be supplied to gather rubbish and in informing the people where to go.

This disallowance motion has been moved by the Opposition; yet when the legislation was first put through the House, honourable members opposite did not call for a division. This is nothing more than an exercise in futility on the part of the Opposition. It is an effort to highlight what it considers might eventuate so that it can say, "I told you so.", without making any contribution in relation to this legislation.

I compliment the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Forestry Department on the efforts that have been made so far.

**Mr SIMPSON (Cooroora) (2.56 p.m.):** I oppose the motion for disallowance of the Fraser Island Recreation Area By-laws. It is interesting to see the democratic process in operation. For the motion to be effective, it should have some substance that was not thought necessary or foreseen when the legislation was debated originally. I do not believe that it has.

The point made by the mover of the motion was that public meetings that are political and could be for entertainment should be allowed. That is completely out of context with the whole management program being established on Fraser Island and with the whole purpose of the legislation. I believe that the motion for disallowance has no foundation whatsoever.

The legislation has been brought forward to preserve the environment of that great sand mass, Fraser Island, and enable people to enjoy a unique holiday—a holiday

completely different from what they experience in Albert Street in the city of Brisbane, where they can have their political meetings or their entertainment. I am not saying that a group of people on Fraser Island cannot have a sing-song, because that is not entertainment in the context of this legislation. That is one point that I make.

The other point relates to how the money is to be spent. A large amount of the original funding is to be used to set up additional facilities so that visitors to Fraser Island can have a satisfying and rewarding experience which they will tell others about. That will bring more visitors to the island, and the problem of wear and tear on tracks and facilities will have to be overcome. That is what those funds will be spent on. My ambition is to see Queensland work towards a situation in which facilities will be provided in national parks and forestry areas that will warrant camping fees being charged and in which there will be no worry about access fees to parks. In some parks and recreation areas, it is not economic to administer the collection of such fees. If funds cannot be collected, that defeats the purpose of the legislation.

The Noosa Shire Council has suggested that a charge be levied on those who wish to gain access to the beach north of Noosa. I am not in favour of that. I am in favour of those who wish to use that area paying a reasonable fee for camping. Facilities need to be provided in that area. I hope that those sorts of facilities will soon be provided on Fraser Island. I know that the department is experimenting to determine how human effluent from beach campers can be properly disposed of, so that even in the future, when more people will visit the area, it will remain a wonderful wilderness area, not one that has obviously been used by human beings. The provision of those sorts of facilities will maintain Fraser Island in such a way that it will remain a beautiful attraction. I am sure that it will be used as a future example for the management of other park areas in Queensland—both national parks and State forests. The Forestry Department has done a tremendous job in providing parks for the use of the public.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

**Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (3.1 p.m.):** Mr Deputy Speaker, as you know, the problem with motions for disallowance is that a member can agree with the major substance of the motion but not with a particular part of it. It is not possible to amend the motion. That is quite proper and the Liberal Party is not complaining about that at all. The only way in which the regulations can be debated is to move for their disallowance, which the honourable member on the Opposition side has done.

In this case the regulation is excessive. It is bureaucratic. It is inhibitive of the intention of the legislation, which was to allow people free access to Fraser Island and, at the same time, provide funds for the maintenance of one of the beautiful islands of the world. For the benefit of the honourable member for Windsor (Mr Comben), I might say that industry has existed very successfully on that island for well over 100 years. In fact, the manner in which that industry has been conducted over that long period has been complimented by environmental studies and even by quite radical environmentalists. A true sense of conservation predominates the philosophy of the use of the resources of that island. Far from the honourable member for Windsor deploring the harvesting of timber on the island, he should be commending the way in which that has been handled over the years.

With the original legislation, which was generally supported, it was hoped that Fraser Island would continue to be available to everybody in the community on reasonable terms. Unfortunately, the regulation now under debate tends to inhibit that and, because of the cost of travelling backwards and forwards all the time, prevents those who want to use it most from having access, by virtually making them prisoners on the island once they are there. The regulation makes the cost prohibitive for those who want to visit the island regularly and return to their homes.

As the honourable member for Sherwood (Mr Innes) has pointed out, there is a much simpler way in which this matter can be handled. Firstly, provision should be

made for the multiple visitor, as has been done in north America and Europe in similar national park type operations without any difficulty at all. I have visited a number of parks in Canada and the United States of America that cater for the multiple visitor. Indeed, it is the multiple visitor who gives the operators of those parks the greatest revenue in total, so it is a pity that they will be priced out of using this facility.

There is no difficulty in collecting such a permit fee, tax, levy, or whatever one likes to call it. It is no more difficult for it to be collected on the barges or at the airports used by aircraft that fly to Fraser Island. The airstrip on Fraser Island is used frequently for charter flights to the island. There is no reason why the operators of those services should not have the authority to collect the fees, in the same way as the departure tax is collected at airports.

People who operate barges and ferries in other parts of Australia and overseas collect fees on behalf of those who have the responsibility for management of a park or special facility. The cost of collecting that permit fee is very small. It would guarantee that authorities gather the money without exceptions. Administratively, there is a simple way of handling the matter.

As the honourable member for Sherwood pointed out, it is critical that urgent action be taken to protect the interests of the multiple user. As the Minister said, the matter is being monitored. I understand that he has received several representations on this matter, which he is considering. On several occasions in this House when a regulation is found to be inadequate, it has been the practice for the Minister to withdraw it and to return with a new regulation, even during a debate of this nature. Because it has been pointed out successfully to Ministers that a particular matter needed attention, a regulation has been withdrawn. That has happened on several occasions since I became a member of this Assembly.

The Minister has indicated that the matter may well need attention. I say to him that it needs attention now. He cannot keep saying, "We will monitor it for another year or so and see how it works out." The people who want a better deal with access to Fraser Island are not ratbags; their traditional association with the island goes back many years. They have had free and easy access to the island and do not object in any way to paying a fee for the collection of rubbish, the provision of sanitation, management, and vehicular access and the facilities that attach to it.

**Mr Innes:** They have built board drives on Fraser Island.

**Sir WILLIAM KNOX:** As the honourable member pointed out, they have contributed substantially over the years. They have no objection to fees being collected to provide facilities. However, they object to being discriminated against because they happen to be frequent users of the island. As I said, they are the major users.

In the light of the submissions made by the honourable member for Sherwood and other persons, I ask the Minister to reconsider this matter.

I move—

“That the debate be adjourned for seven sitting days.”

Question put; and the House divided—

AYES, 34		NOES, 41	
Braddy	Scott	Ahern	Lester
Campbell	Shaw	Alison	Lingard
Comben	Underwood	Austin	Littleproud
D'Arcy	Vaughan	Bailey	McKechnie
De Lacy	Veivers	Bjelke-Petersen	McPhie
Eaton	Warburton	Booth	Menzel
Fouras	Warner, A. M.	Borbidge	Miller
Gibbs, R. J.	White	Cahill	Muntz
Goss	Wilson	Chapman	Newton
Hamill	Yewdale	Clauson	Powell
Innes		Cooper	Randell
Knox		Elliott	Simpson
Kruger		FitzGerald	Stephan
Lee		Gibbs, I. J.	Stoneman
Lickiss		Glasson	Tenni
Mackenroth		Gunn	Turner
McElligott		Harper	Wharton
McLean		Harvey	
Milliner		Henderson	
Palaszczuk	<i>Tellers:</i>	Jennings	<i>Tellers:</i>
Prest	Davis	Katter	Kaus
Price	Gygar	Lane	Neal

Resolved in the negative.

**Hon. P. R. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon—Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts) (3.17 p.m.), in reply: I thank all honourable members for their contributions to the debate and assure them that their comments will be taken on board. In particular, I noted that the Leader of the Liberal Party (Sir William Knox) tried to defer the debate for a week. I do not think there is any necessity for that, because my department is gathering figures and, as far as can be ascertained, the information indicates that the administrative costs are running at only 10 per cent. Because it would probably cost as much if a private enterprise company were to collect the fees, I consider those costs reasonable. The officers of my department are endeavouring to do everything possible to make it convenient for people to obtain permits, and I am told that the system is operating fairly well at present.

I thank the spokesman for the Opposition. I suggest that the examples that he gave were not examples of public meetings. In any case, permits can be obtained for public meetings. That rule applies not only to Fraser Island but to any national park. The honourable member also mentioned the State Budget. The honourable member for Maryborough dealt adequately with that matter, and I see no sense in reiterating the Government's policy, except to say that the funds allocated for Fraser Island are usually spent in the vicinity of the island, if not directly on the island itself.

The temporary commercial tour-operator permits are designed to cater for a non-regular tour-operator who travels to Fraser Island on a one-off situation. As I mentioned previously in relation to the costs associated with collection of fees, less than 10 per cent of the overall administrative costs are involved. The benefit derived from the fees will be substantially directed towards facilities on the island for use by visitors.

The matter of boating and fishing permits has been raised, and the position is that if a fisherman is off shore, for instance at low-water mark, he will not be liable to a penalty. However, if the fisherman comes ashore and casts his line, the matter will be handled by taking a practical approach. That is one of the matters that will have to be ironed out during a short trial period.

The debate has been a good one, and I assure all honourable members that I have listened to the advice of many people and listened to the contributions made in the debate today. However, I am absolutely amazed that the honourable member for Windsor

(Mr Comben) suggests closing down the sawmill, which would have an adverse effect on the timber industry.

Generally, I think that the regulations have support from members on both sides of the House, provided that the situation is monitored.

Motion (Mr R. J. Gibbs) negatived.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### Leader of Opposition's Conversation with Commissioner of Police

**Hon. W. A. M. GUNN** (Somerset—Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police) (3.21 p.m.), by leave: In response to an interjection from me this morning, in which I intimated that the Leader of the Opposition had telephoned Sir Terence Lewis over the Mr X affair, the Leader of the Opposition accused me of lying in this House and said that at no time did he ever contact Sir Terence Lewis. I now have in my possession a telex from Mr Ian Hatcher of the media office of the Police Department.

It states—

“Police Commissioner, Sir Terence Lewis was angered today by an attack on the credibility of the Queensland Police Department in State Parliament.

Sir Terence said he understood that Opposition members had accused the department and his officers of being stooges of the National Party.

‘I find this sort of allegation most offensive and nothing could be further from the truth. Anyone with any intelligence would know that no police force in this State could hope to be effective if it allowed itself to become a tool of the Government of the day.’ ”

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr GUNN:** I will see whether Opposition members laugh at the next couple of sentences. The telex continues—

“‘The Queensland Police Department is made up of officers from a multitude of backgrounds, religions and political beliefs. It is to their credit that they have always impartially served the people of Queensland and their record in crime clear-up is second to none in this country. This is indicative of widespread public support,’ he said.

Sir Terence also said that from reports he had received, the Opposition Leader, Mr Nev Warburton had denied a conversation which they had had last Friday week on the Callaghan affair.”

Perhaps now Opposition members will start laughing. The telex continues—

“‘Mr Warburton telephoned me in my office to express concern at certain rumours he had heard that Mrs X was not going to be charged. I told him she would be charged in the very near future.’ ”

Perhaps Opposition members will laugh again. The telex continues—

“‘Mr Warburton also questioned me about possible charges against Mr X and I told him it would be some time before investigations were completed.’ ”

He is an unmitigated liar! The telex continues—

“‘It is only natural that I would have been expected to advise my Minister of such a conversation in a matter which so deeply concerns the Government.’ ”

The Commissioner said it was normal practice in investigations of such a sensitive nature that the department canvassed the assistance and co-operation of both Government and Opposition members—”

I put it to you, Mr Speaker, that the Opposition has never co-operated in this matter—  
“as well as any other individual or organisation, in an effort to ensure that police inquiries were not unduly influenced by outside pressures.”

That is just what Opposition members have done in this matter. The telex continues—

“He said his concern that public debate on this issue could affect the present police investigation was explored in his press statement of 17 February when he told the public that Fraud Squad investigations were invariably complex, time consuming and could not be rushed.”

The Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts has been saying that all morning in answer to questions. The telex continues—

“‘The sensitive nature of such inquiries are not well served by the ceaseless glare of media speculation or the translation of rumour and innuendo into tomorrow’s headlines.’”

That is all that Opposition members are doing, looking at tomorrow’s headlines. They are desperate. The telex continues—

“‘The officers handling the investigation are thoroughly professional and dedicated to arriving at the truth of this matter. Pressure, from whatever source, can only make their difficult job even harder,’ Sir Terence said.”

## MOTION OF CENSURE

### Leader of the Opposition

**Hon. W. A. M. GUNN** (Somerset—Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That the House censures the honourable the Leader of the Opposition for misleading the House in claiming that he had not telephoned the Commissioner for Police in relation to possible charges against Mr X.”

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** I rise to a point of order. The Opposition was faced with the same problem earlier in the week. A very serious pre-planned motion has been moved by the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer, but no copies are available to any member in the House. I put it to you, Mr Speaker, that the House deserves copies of the motion immediately. I therefore move—

“That the motion be adjourned until copies be made available.”

**Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen** interjected.

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** I have moved that the motion be adjourned until copies be made available.

**Mr Gunn:** You have to seek leave of the House before you move a motion.

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** I seek leave to move that motion.

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

In division—

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** I rise to a point of order. On the question that members are voting on, that is, the adjournment of the motion until the issue of copies of the motion, no honourable member has yet received a copy, but copies have just been circulated to members of the press gallery. And we have not yet got a copy!

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

AYES, 29

Braddy	Wilson
Campbell	Yewdale
Comben	
D'Arcy	
De Lacy	
Eaton	
Fouras	
Gibbs, R. J.	
Goss	
Hamill	
Kruger	
Mackenroth	
McElligott	
McLean	
Milliner	
Palaszczuk	
Price	
Scott	
Shaw	
Smith	
Underwood	
Vaughan	
Veivers	<i>Tellers:</i>
Warburton	Prest
Warner, A. M.	Davis

NOES, 48

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

Resolved in the negative.

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

**Hon. Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (3.30 p.m.): Mr Speaker—

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** No, Mr Speaker.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! There is another point of order, Mr Premier. Are you rising on a point of order, Mr Premier?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Yes, I am rising to a point of order, Mr Speaker.

Honourable Members interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member for Ipswich West to resume his seat.

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Mr Speaker—

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** Mr Speaker—

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Mr Speaker—

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Mr Speaker, the honourable member does not seem to realise—

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** Mr Speaker, I was on my feet first.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Mr Premier, I have a point of order on my left from the Opposition. Yours is not a point of order? You are seconding the motion, is that correct?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I am seconding the motion, but I want to also point out, on a point of order—

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** —that the honourable member is not in order in interrupting the seconding of a motion.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Unfortunately, Mr Premier, I have to listen to a point of order.

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** I refer to the matter that I raised previously. We still have not been provided with copies of the motion, and we do not have a copy of the telex. I move—

“That the telex be tabled.”

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. I will see——

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** Mr Speaker, I have moved, under the rules of the House, that the telex be tabled.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat.

The honourable member for Ipswich West has asked me whether a copy of the motion has been circulated. There are no copies at the moment, as far as I know, but I will look into that aspect of it.

**Mr WARBURTON:** I rise to a point of order. The honourable member for Ipswich West has moved that the relevant telex be tabled. There is a motion, I put to you, before the Chair.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Mr Speaker, today there is an extraordinary situation in which the tables have been turned.

**Mr UNDERWOOD:** Mr Speaker, I have a motion before you to be considered and put to the House.

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

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I am advised that the telex was read out as a ministerial statement. Therefore, we should proceed.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Today, honourable members have witnessed an extraordinary turn of events in this whole episode. The Labor Party and honourable members opposite have tried to capitalise on an issue that is outside the matter for which they are trying to place blame on the Minister. The Opposition has proceeded day after day and week after week, irrespective of the fact that statements have been made by the Minister, myself, the Commissioner of Police and the Auditor-General in a statement that has been given out, that silence should be recognised as being vital to the outcome of justice and fair play in the matter that is under consideration by them. During those days and weeks, the Leader of the Opposition and honourable members opposite have tried to make political capital out of the situation. Now, the man who has led the attack has been caught out telling a lie in this Chamber. If the Leader of the Opposition were a Minister, he would have to resign on the spot.

**Opposition Members interjected.**

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** It is interesting to hear the honourable members opposite laugh at even the thought of the suggestion that the Leader of the Opposition would become a Minister. That is laughable, because he never will be a Minister. I can understand honourable members' mirth and glee at that suggestion. If he were a responsible person and a Minister—which he will never be—he would have to resign because this morning, deliberately and consciously, he deliberated the whole question for some minutes and then said that he had never spoken to the Police Commissioner. He indicated clearly that he knew nothing about it. If the Leader of the Opposition had any decency he would abide by the rules that he has been trying to apply to the Minister

up to date about resigning. He has been caught red-handed and the evidence is here today.

**Mr Warburton:** Watch the heart. Take another pill.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** That is quite good. The Leader of the Opposition will need more than a pill to fix himself up after this.

The Leader of the Opposition is given to telling lies. He told a whole lot here in the House a few months ago. I met the Leader of the Opposition outside and I said, "Nev, gee you told a string of lies." He said, "Joh, that's politics. It's politics to tell lies. If it's too hot in the kitchen, you ought to get out of it." He told me that just round the corner. To tell lies is the Leader of the Opposition's trade; it is his profession. Today the House learns that he has been caught out. His ploy did not work and the evidence that he has been caught out has been provided in the statement of the Commissioner of Police of this State.

I second the motion moved by the Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police that the Leader of the Opposition be censured. If the Leader of the Opposition has any sense of decency, he will resign. There is no argument about the fact that he has been caught red-handed. He has been well and truly caught at his own game.

**Hon. C. A. WHARTON** (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—

"That the question be now put."

Question put; and the House divided—

AYES, 41		NOES, 36	
Ahern	Lester	Braddy	Price
Alison	Lingard	Campbell	Scott
Austin	Littleproud	Comben	Shaw
Bailey	McKechnie	D'Arcy	Smith
Bjelke-Petersen	McPhie	De Lacy	Underwood
Booth	Menzel	Eaton	Vaughan
Borbidge	Muntz	Fouras	Veivers
Cahill	Newton	Gibbs, R. J.	Warburton
Chapman	Powell	Goss	Warner, A. M.
Clauson	Randell	Gygar	White
Cooper	Row	Hamill	Wilson
Elliott	Simpson	Innes	Yewdale
FitzGerald	Stephan	Knox	
Gibbs, I. J.	Stoneman	Kruger	
Glasson	Tenni	Lee	
Gunn	Turner	Lickiss	
Harper	Wharton	Mackenroth	
Harvey		McElligott	
Henderson		McLean	
Jennings	<i>Tellers:</i>	Miller	<i>Tellers:</i>
Katter	Kaus	Milliner	Davis
Lane	Neal	Palaszczuk	Prest

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the motion (Mr Gunn) be agreed to—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 42		NOES, 35	
Ahern	Lester	Braddy	Scott
Alison	Lingard	Campbell	Shaw
Austin	Littleproud	Comben	Smith
Bailey	McKechnie	D'Arcy	Underwood
Bjelke-Petersen	McPhie	De Lacy	Vaughan
Booth	Menzel	Eaton	Veivers
Borbidge	Miller	Fouras	Warburton
Cahill	Muntz	Gibbs, R. J.	Warner, A. M.
Chapman	Newton	Goss	White
Clauson	Powell	Gygar	Wilson
Cooper	Randell	Hamill	Yewdale
Elliott	Row	Innes	
FitzGerald	Simpson	Knox	
Gibbs, I. J.	Stephan	Kruger	
Glasson	Stoneman	Lee	
Gunn	Tenni	Lickiss	
Harper	Turner	Mackenroth	
Harvey	Wharton	McElligott	
Henderson		McLean	
Jennings	<i>Tellers:</i>	Milliner	<i>Tellers:</i>
Katter	Kaus	Palaszczuk	Davis
Lane	Neal	Price	Prest

Resolved in the affirmative.

## PRIVILEGE

### Motion of Censure against Leader of Opposition; Closure of Debate

**Mr WARBURTON** (Sandgate—Leader of the Opposition) (3.52 p.m.): I rise on a point of privilege. Today's performance by the National Party Government has been quite remarkable, to say the least.

Firstly, honourable members have witnessed a refusal by the Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police (Mr Gunn) to table the so-called evidence in his possession and, secondly, the refusal of this Government, I believe in an unprecedented fashion—it is the first time I have ever heard of it—

**Mr Lane:** It happens in Canberra and New South Wales all the time under Labor.

**Mr WARBURTON:** What about a 123A now?

Honourable members have witnessed the refusal of this Government, in an unprecedented fashion—certainly since I became a member of this Parliament—to allow a person whom it has attacked the right to respond. The action of this Government, and particularly that man sitting over there who purports to represent the people of this State—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition will refer to the Premier by his correct title.

**Mr WARBURTON:** The Premier of this State is the man to whom I refer. His action will be properly recorded. I am sure that the action of this National Party Government today will be properly recorded, and that the people of this State will ensure that it regrets what it has done.

The motion that has been moved is a desperate attempt to take the heat off a Minister who has got a blowtorch to his belly. I refer, of course, to Mr McKechnie. And, fortunately for him, because summonses have been issued, because of the sub judice convention, the Opposition is prevented from getting stuck into the Premier of this State.

As far as the Opposition is concerned, the Premier is just as culpable as the Minister for Tourism (Mr McKechnie).

It is unfortunate that the Commissioner for Police (Sir Terence Lewis) has been used as a pawn by the National Party. It is very clear that he should have a clear and concise explanation of the matters. That is a consequence of what has occurred.

The Government is very desperate to prevent headlines. That is what this is all about—preventing the headlines in the media that will allude to the unscrupulous, unauthorised and illegal use of public money in this State. The motion moved by the Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police is further evidence to support my claims that the National Party Government is on the ropes. This Government is tired, worn out and bereft of ideas. Over the past three days, it has been obvious that the Government is bereft of ideas and is falling apart at the seams.

This National Party Government has had the opportunity——

**Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen:** What has this to do with your telling a lie?

**Mr WARBURTON:** I am coming to the point.

The Government has had the opportunity to brief me confidentially, as Leader of the Opposition, on the contents of the Auditor-General's report, and the Government has not even considered that course. In fact, the Government has refused to do it.

I now want to make an explanation, because the accusation has been made against me. I understood from what Mr Gunn said this morning——

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! "The Deputy Premier".

**Mr WARBURTON:** I understood that the Deputy Premier had accused me of having the conversation with the Commissioner of Police that resulted in the commissioner's giving me the so-called rounds of the kitchen and advising me of what I should do in my capacity as Leader of the Opposition. I want to make this point clear—and I assert that the record will show this—that at no stage did I deny that I had telephoned the Commissioner of Police (Sir Terence Lewis).

**Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen:** You could have fooled me.

**Mr WARBURTON:** Anybody could.

My contact with the Commissioner of Police was by telephone.

**Mr Gunn:** Why didn't you say so?

**Mr WARBURTON:** I am informing the House now, if the honourable member will listen.

It is my right, and the right of any honourable member in this House, to do so; and that contact was made by making a normal telephone call one or two days prior to the issue of summonses upon Judith Callaghan. I asked the Commissioner of Police a simple question. I asked whether the commissioner was in a position to advise whether summonses were to be issued against Judith Callaghan. The reason I did so is obvious. It was because rumours were rife and I had received information that day that that would occur.

If my memory serves me correctly, the commissioner's response was something to this effect, "Well, try me out." The commissioner said that charges were imminent, but that he would telephone me back, that he was not in a position to tell me at that stage, or words to that effect. I explained to the commissioner that my main concern was to ensure that the sub judice convention was respected, and that that was the reason for my telephone call.

The Commissioner of Police did not telephone me back then or on the following day. Consequently, I telephoned his office again. I was told by an officer of the Police Department or an officer in the Commissioner's section that the police media unit had released a media statement to the effect that Judith Callaghan would have had summonses

issued upon her on that particular day. Since the day I telephoned to make that very simple inquiry, I have not spoken to the Commissioner of Police.

The motion moved by the Deputy Premier is a result of the desperation of this Government. Unfortunately for the Government, at the request of members of the media earlier today, the media were given a full explanation in line with what I have just said in this House in respect to my telephone call to the Commissioner of Police.

This morning, the Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police made some assertions, and I have covered those matters. Unfortunately, I understand that Mr Gunn, in his usual fascist style——

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WARBURTON:** Well, he called me an unmitigated liar and you did nothing about it, Mr Speaker.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr GUNN:** Mr Speaker, I ask for a total withdrawal of that remark. I find it offensive.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Premier will both resume their seats. I will now hear the Deputy Premier's point of order.

**Mr GUNN:** I take offence at the remarks of the honourable member and ask that they be withdrawn.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Premier asks that the words be withdrawn, and I ask the Leader of the Opposition to do so.

**Mr WARBURTON:** I do so, in due deference to you, Mr Speaker. I hope, though, that you ensure that his references to me earlier today, about which you did nothing, I understand, are also withdrawn. I hope that I do not have to go to the extent of asking that that happen. I am sure, Mr Speaker, that you know the words to which I am referring.

**Honourable Members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WARBURTON:** Mr Speaker, I said that, unfortunately, the Deputy Premier, in his usual style, has chosen to try to besmirch my reputation. Fortunately, that is something that no Government member can do, although Government members have been trying to do so for a long time.

**Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen** interjected.

**Mr WARBURTON:** I will tell the Premier what I am prepared to do. I am prepared to agree that the Commissioner of Police be summoned before the bar of the House to give evidence on the issue in question involving me. However, I am prepared to bet that the Government does not have the guts to accept that challenge.

#### **DIRECTOR OF PROSECUTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

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

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Director of Prosecutions Act 1984-1985 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

#### **First Reading**

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

### Second Reading

**Hon. N. J. HARPER** (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (4.3 p.m.): I move—

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

Honourable members will recall that, in November 1984, I introduced a Bill providing for the creation of Director of Prosecutions, and that since that date Mr Des Sturgess, QC, has been appointed to that position.

A number of other barristers have been appointed now to positions in the director's office. Many of those officers were previously employed in the State Public Service.

The Bill that I introduce today is mainly concerned with provisions of the Act that affect those officers. It aims to more clearly state some of the conditions under which those officers have been appointed.

The Act lays down the procedure to be followed if a deputy director or Crown prosecutor is to be removed from office.

The amendments contained in clauses 3 and 4 of the amending Bill are merely a rearrangement of the existing provision. This has been done so as to dispel any suggestion that the provision represents a separate method, from that contained in section 22 of the Act, by which a deputy director or Crown prosecutor can be removed from office.

The Act also deals with the retention of public service rights by officers of the public service who accept appointment to positions in the director's office.

The amendments contained in clause 5 of the amending Bill are designed to state more clearly the original intention that such officers should be entitled to retain their existing and accruing public service rights, such as their rights to various forms of leave, as if service in the director's office was a continuation of their service in the public service.

If, during such officers' service in the director's office, public servants generally should become entitled to further rights, such as improved leave entitlements, it is intended that such officers should also be entitled to those further rights.

The amendments contained in clause 5 also deal with the public service seniority of such officers should they seek to apply for positions in the public service or be re-appointed to such positions. Their service in the director's office, for public service seniority purposes, is to be treated as a continuation of their previous public service appointment.

These provisions do not, of course, derogate from the provisions of section 29 of the Act, which deals with the reappointment of public service officers to the public service upon termination of their director's office appointment.

Under that section, such officers who wish to re-enter the public service have to notify the under secretary of their desire so to do before the termination of their employment.

The amendments contained in clause 6 of the amending Bill will allow such officers to exercise their right to enter the public service by notifying the under secretary within seven days after the termination of their director's office employment.

It can be seen that these amendments will further enhance the position of any public servant who has chosen or who chooses to accept appointment to a position in the director's office. He will gain the benefits which will flow from performing the specialist and unique functions of that office while not being disadvantaged by his decision to cease or interrupt his public service career. This has always been my intention but there are some who were concerned that the intention was not sufficiently clear in the Act.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the Director of Prosecutions, his two deputy directors, his team of prosecutors—for it is a co-ordinated team achieving results with

a dedication and a pride that team work engenders—and all within the office of the Director of Prosecutions on their very real achievements.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Goss, adjourned.

### **SANCTUARY COVE RESORT ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

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

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act 1985 in a certain particular; and that so much of the Standing Orders relating to private Bills be suspended so as to enable the said Bill to be presented and passed through all its stages as if it were a public Bill.”

Motion agreed to.

#### **First Reading**

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

#### **Second Reading**

**Hon. N. J. HARPER** (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (4.9 p.m.): I move—

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

Members will recall that the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act was passed by the Parliament during its last sittings and that there was general support for the provisions contained in the draft legislation and, in particular, the proposed method of development by way of stages of the lands included in the residential zones within this site.

Members may also recall that, when the Bill was first introduced into this House, it was clearly stated that residential development would only be permitted pursuant to the Building Units and Group Titles Act and that each stage of the development would in fact be a separate group title plan requiring establishment of its own body corporate. Provision was also made for the private roads within that development to be transferred to a principal body corporate to ensure that the lands comprising such private roads were adequately maintained for the benefit of all residents and could never be alienated from their intended purpose.

Subsequent to the passing of the Bill, which was assented to on 18 November 1985, a question was raised as to whether or not the legislation does in fact permit the progressive subdivision of the residential lands in the manner originally intended.

In relation to this matter, the Solicitor-General has advised that the provisions contained in the Act do not extend sufficiently far to allow the original proposal to be implemented and that in fact one body corporate only could be established for each of the residential zones identified in schedule C to the Act.

The Sanctuary Cove resort development will be a major intergrated resort which, by its very nature, will have to provide a high degree of alternative housing styles in the market-place and which will have varying needs and demands by way of contributions to the ongoing maintenance and operations of the residential areas of the resort. Accordingly, if the legislation is allowed to stand as drafted, it will result in certain land-owners in residential areas being financially disadvantaged.

Members will be aware that under the Building Units and Group Titles Act, a body corporate is entitled to recoup costs of operation and maintenance associated with the administration of the building unit plan or group titles plan for which it is responsible. Of course, these charges have to be fair and equitable and the concept embodied for the Sanctuary Cove resort development was that each body corporate would be responsible

for the administration of particular building units or groups titles developments, having regard to the nature of their building title.

The amendment to section 15 of the Sanctuary Cover Resort Act is designed to overcome any inadequacy of the existing legislation with respect to the staging of development insofar as it relates to the establishment of separate bodies corporate.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Goss, adjourned.

## PRIVILEGE

### Ministerial Statement by Minister for Primary Industries

**Mr KRUGER** (Murrumba) (4.12 p.m.): Mr Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. This morning, in his attack on me and on the Federal Minister for Primary Industry, the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) purposely misled this House. In his statement, when referring to assistance schemes to rural industries, he said—

“The State bears the costs of administration and must also be responsible for any debts.”

That is directly contradicted by the report of the Rural Reconstruction Board for 1984-85. That report states—

“PARTS A and C

The Agreement with the Commonwealth provides for the equal sharing of costs of administration between the Commonwealth and the State of up to 2 per cent of the value of approvals in each year for all loans under Parts A and C of the scheme and from 1st July, 1980, the Commonwealth agreed to include approvals from recycling funds.

. . .

### PART B

Costs of administration of the carry-on finance provisions and any shortfall of either principal or interest payments by borrowers, are shared equally with the Commonwealth.”

Those statements were supported by the statement in the same report on the Beef Cattle Industry Assistance Scheme, under which the Commonwealth meets half the cost.

The Minister for Primary Industries misled the House in his statement this morning, and I ask you, Mr Speaker, to take note of the matters that I have raised. Further, I call for the resignation of the Minister for Primary Industries for misleading the House this morning in his statement about rural assistance.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I point out to the honourable member for Murrumba that what he has just said to the Assembly is a personal explanation and will be recorded as such.

**Mr KRUGER:** Mr Speaker, I was not personally aggrieved by it, and that is why I raised it as a matter of privilege. I was not personally aggrieved; but the statements were incorrect. I still believe that raising the matter as a matter of privilege was the correct procedure.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Unfortunately, I do not agree, and it will be recorded as a personal explanation.

The House adjourned at 4.15 p.m.