

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 10 SEPTEMBER 1986**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**WEDNESDAY, 10 SEPTEMBER 1986**

---

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

**PETITIONS**

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

**Community Mental Health Support Services**

From Mr Row (22 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will provide improved funding for community mental health support services.

**Proposed Development, Magnetic Island**

From Mr McElligott (1 249 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will not allow a proposed development on Magnetic Island to proceed.

Petitions received.

**PAPERS**

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

Reports—

Department of Harbours and Marine for the year ended 30 June 1986

Beach Protection Authority for the year ended 30 June 1986

The Director, Department of Children's Services for the year ended 30 June 1986.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Orders in Council under—

Explosives Act 1952-1981

Health Act 1937-1984

Regulations under—

Mining Act 1968-1986

Food Act 1981-1984

Hospitals Act 1936-1984.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Terrorist Bases in Australia**

**Hon. Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (11.3 a.m.), by leave: Yesterday in this House Opposition members resorted to the tired, old socialist tactics of personal smear in an attempt to hide their association with policies and attitudes that can only foster the activities of terrorist groups in Australia.

Outside this House the temporary Prime Minister of Australia resorted to the same defence, which is of course no defence at all. Mr Speaker, this is a very serious issue and needs to be highlighted in the minds of all Australians. It is high time that the need to have in Australia bases, offices, outlets—call them what you like—for groups and organisations—

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! It becomes tedious to have to remind honourable members practically every day that, when Ministers are making ministerial statements, all honourable members must listen to them in silence.

**Mr R. J. Gibbs:** Just ignore this for now.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I assure the honourable member for Wolston that he will certainly be warned this morning if he continues in his present vein.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I repeat that it is high time that we questioned the need to have in Australia bases, officers, outlets, headquarters—call them what you like—for groups and organisations that have a blatant association with violence and terrorist activities. What is the purpose of those offices? Do they raise money? What sort of groups do they set out to influence? In short, why are they here at all?

Yesterday, honourable members were treated to the spectacle of the ALP screaming that no such thing was happening in Australia. Of course, it has been caught out once again. My purpose is simply to draw public attention to what is going on and to generate a public examination of the issues involved.

I seek leave to table a number of documents that support this purpose.

Leave granted.

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

In yesterday's *Brisbane Telegraph*, the Prime Minister is reported as having said that there are no PLO offices in Australia; but today the Prime Minister admits, as is reported in *The Courier-Mail*, that there is a Palestine Information Office in Melbourne. Mr Hawke talks about people being sick, but perhaps it is he who should seek some medical attention to overcome what would appear to be a rather serious memory lapse in this instance.

The other documents that I have tabled all serve to confirm a PLO presence in Australia—a presence that is approved and therefore harboured by the ALP Government and supported by honourable members opposite. The report that I have tabled from *The Courier-Mail* criticises the Foreign Minister (Mr Hayden) for taking a soft attitude to terrorist organisations. It says that Mr Hayden had talks with a man named Kazak, who claimed to be a PLO representative. When Mr Hayden tried to deny that the man was a PLO representative, Mr Kazak, according to the document tabled, very quickly sent a telex to Australian newspapers confirming that he was in fact the PLO representative in Australia and that he had given Mr Hayden greetings from the PLO chairman, Mr Yasser Arafat. Isn't that lovely! Yet we are told by the ALP that anyone who suggests that the PLO has a presence in Australia is sick. What is it trying to hide?

Another document that I have tabled shows that Mr Hayden held talks in New York with a PLO official, Mr Terzi. The document from *The Courier-Mail* of 4 November 1985 states that the contact was the first that an Australian Government Minister had ever had with the PLO—the very first! Mr Hayden was the Minister.

A further document that I have tabled came from *The Australian* of 14 August 1986. It features a photograph and interview with Mr Abu-Lughod, a US-based academic involved in the Palestinian cause. The document states that Mr Abu-Lughod has important PLO connections as a member of the Palestinian National Council, which is chaired by none other than Mr Yasser Arafat himself. According to the report, the council meets annually to set PLO policies. That council has 394 members. So this man is in Australia. His photograph appeared in the paper only last month. Yet, in this morning's *Courier-Mail* the Prime Minister is reported as saying that his Government has not permitted PLO representatives to visit Australia. Again, what a sick joke that is. The document that I have tabled shows that Mr Abu-Lughod——

**Opposition Members interjected.**

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** He is the friend of Opposition members. Opposition members are trying to laugh this matter off, but it is something that they will not be able to remove from their plate easily. Not only do some of these people have strange names, but our friends on the opposite side of the Chamber have strange bedfellows.

Mr Abu-Lughod claims that Australia has warmed to the Palestinian side of the Middle East issue by easing restrictions that denied visiting access for PLO supporters. He says that the restrictions have been eased by the ALP Government—yet the Prime Minister says that the Federal Government does not recognise the PLO. Surely an explanation is required; or is this just another memory lapse by the Prime Minister?

Another document on the table suggests that because of his visit, Mr Abu-Lughod scored a significant public relations triumph in Canberra by winning some new friends and influencing some useful people amongst the politicians in Canberra. The document says that Mr Abu-Lughod was the first Palestinian propagandist to be admitted to Australia under the Federal Government's newly relaxed policy which allows in PLO supporters on temporary entry visas. The same document also confirmed the existence of the Palestine Information Office in Melbourne.

Again Australians are entitled to ask what is the purpose of that base or headquarters. Surely those people are not sick and visiting Australia just for their health. Are Australians to believe that they have no contact with other PLO supporters overseas; that they somehow have a different charter or objective to their parent organisation; that they just sit there and do nothing; or do they sell apples, oranges and so on? They are here for a very sinister purpose.

The documents already tabled also refer to the decision by the ALP Government to allow the African National Congress (ANC) and the South West African People's Organisation (SWAPO) to establish offices in Australia. That decision is well known. Those two organisations have much blood on their hands.

Although I fully support opposition to apartheid, I do not believe that such opposition should be used as an excuse to give tacit support to such organisations and their violent measures. However, they are supported by the Prime Minister and the State Opposition.

A further document on the table, in the form of a newspaper report, also lists the seven organisations that security authorities have identified within Australia as potentially capable of terrorist activities. Yet the ALP would have people believe that they do not exist.

The final document on the table is from yesterday's *Canberra Times* newspaper. It quotes a spokesman for the Federal Police Association and refers to the drastic shortage of Federal police and the campaign to alert the public to the non-existent security at some airports. It also refers to what is described as the absence of domestic intelligence in Australia concerning the movement of suspected subversive figures and politically violent activists. All honourable members would be aware that the Federal Government partly demolished ASIO, and that comment is therefore understandable.

It is simply not sufficient for the ALP to attempt to dismiss this issue with a few verbal barbs. Questions of importance have to be addressed and assurances need to be provided that Australia is being protected by its Government from association with organisations that deal in violence and terrorism. This is a very serious issue. Again I address my remarks to the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition.

#### **Sunmap Display at *Telegraph* Boat Show**

**Hon. W. H. GLASSON** (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying) (11.14 a.m.), by leave: In this House yesterday, the honourable member for Lytton (Mr Burns) made a number of statements concerning maps on sale at the Sunmap display at the boat show. The Department of Mapping and Surveying, Sunmap centres and agents distribute maps produced by a number of Government departments, including the Department of Harbours and Marine.

I believe that the maps that the honourable member referred to are the Moreton Bay (Caloundra to Dunwich) and the Coochiemudlo Island to Mooloolaba editions. The former is a traditional line map priced at \$3. It was released in March 1984. The second is a map based on a Landsat image, developed using the latest computer-based technology.

Since the release of the 1986 Landsat base chart, the Department of Harbours and Marine has been conscious of public and/or user acceptance of Landsat image-based charts as against the 1984 line-drawn base. At the point of sale, the buying public have been kept informed that the 1984 version has been superseded by the 1986 chart.

**Mr Burns:** Not true.

**Mr GLASSON:** It is true.

**Mr Burns** interjected.

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

**Mr GLASSON:** There was no intention to revise or update the 1984 line-drawn chart. For that reason, the price had been maintained at \$3 per chart. This version has now been withdrawn from all Sunmap centres and agents.

In the last year, eight new Department of Harbours and Marine maps have been released. Four of those were completely new maps and four were revisions of the existing maps. This type of map takes a considerable time to produce, owing to the amount of research required. Two other revised maps are due to be released in the near future.

The point must be made that, from the time of release of this type of new map, it is literally out of date, as the navigation beacons are continually being improved in the interests of the safety of the boating public.

#### **Appointment to the Council of Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education**

**Hon. L. W. POWELL** (Isis—Minister for Education) (11.17 a.m.), by leave: Close to the hour of midnight last night, round the witching hour before he crawled back into his pumpkin, the honourable member for Brisbane Central (Mr Davis) mounted a cowardly, scurrilous attack on my appointing Mr D. Osborne to the Council of the Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education.

**Mr Casey:** The Minister for Education makes a good Cinderella.

**Mr POWELL:** The honourable member for Mackay condemns himself out of his own mouth by joining with the honourable member for Brisbane Central.

**Mr Casey** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I give the honourable member for Mackay his last warning.

**Mr POWELL:** By doing so, the member for Brisbane Central demonstrated his complete and utter ignorance of the dedicated people who freely give of their time to serve on such councils. Prior to last night, Senator Black and the member for Sherwood (Mr Innes) at least had the courage to raise the issue outside the House. This dealer in dirt allegedly representing Brisbane Central, however, chose to make his cowardly accusation under the protection of the House in the death throes of the day's sitting. Clearly, the honourable member for Brisbane Central is approaching the end of his parliamentary career.

The facts speak for themselves—

- Mr Greg Jabs advised the chairman of the institute on 30 April 1986 of his intention to resign from his posting as a member of the Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education Council.

- The director of the institute, Dr Lindsay Barker, requested that Mr Jabs's replacement be a resident of the Wide Bay region, as a significant proportion of the institute's students come from that region. Other members of the council include the managing director of Queensland Nickel in Townsville, a taxation agent from Murgon and a retired orchardist from Stanthorpe.
- Mr Jabs is a successful businessman and a respected member of his local community, quite unlike his accusers in the Parliament. It was my intention to replace Mr Jabs with a person of similar integrity, experience and community standing.
- Because of the economic doldrums that the member for Brisbane Central's party has placed this country in, such people have less time to devote to outside interests. Their very economic viability depends on their concentrating all of their time on survival. As a consequence, it took from 30 April 1986 until July 1986 for me to find a replacement for Mr Jabs.
- Mr Osborne has a background of wide business experience in Sydney and in Hervey Bay and, being retired, is an ideal person to represent Hervey Bay and the Wide Bay region on the council.

**Mr Davis** interjected.

**Mr POWELL:** In answer to the interjection from the temporary member for Brisbane Central, I point out that Mr Osborne is not a real estate agent.

It is interesting to note that the official Opposition spokesman on education, who has some understanding of the system of councils in the tertiary education sector, realises that Mr Osborne has nothing personal to gain as a result of his appointment. Indeed, serving on such a council will consume a significant amount of Mr Osborne's time in preparing for meetings, travelling to and from meetings and contributing to the meetings themselves. He receives no payment for his services.

**Mr Davis:** What about the mileage charge?

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

**Mr POWELL:** Mr Osborne is one of 215 leading Queenslanders who unselfishly give their time and experience to helping guide Queensland's 10 tertiary institutions. They are to be commended for their dedication, and members of the Opposition are to be condemned for their accusations.

The chairman of the institute's council, Mr Griffiths, of his own accord, and presumably out of a sense of justice and decency, stated in *The Chronicle* in Toowoomba on 3 September 1986 that attacks by Senator Black and the honourable member for Sherwood (Mr Innes) were unwarranted, and reflected ignorance of the composition of the institute council and the need for outlying areas to be represented. In that article, Mr Griffiths acknowledged the difficulty in getting people to take up a council position. He confirmed the job was unpaid, and involved time, effort and considerable travelling. He concluded by saying that Senator Black and the honourable member for Sherwood appeared to be attempting to make political capital out of a ministerial decision which fulfilled an institute council request.

It is therefore clear that the mealy-mouth dealer in dirt from Brisbane Central has again made a fool of himself.

**Mr DAVIS:** I rise to take a point of order. The expression "dealer in dirt" is completely unparliamentary. Not only is it offensive, but it also should be withdrawn. I want it withdrawn, and an apology.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Minister to withdraw the term "mealy-mouth".

**Mr POWELL:** Mr Speaker, I was unable to hear which remarks were objected to by the honourable member.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has asked for the remark to be withdrawn. I think he refers to “mealy-mouth”.

**Mr POWELL:** In that case, I withdraw “mealy-mouth”. I am sorry that it connects him with other people of a like mind.

It is therefore clear that this dealer in dirt, the honourable member for Brisbane Central, has again made a fool of himself.

**Mr DAVIS:** I rise to take a further point of order. I want the expression “this dealer in dirt” withdrawn: I can take it as well as anybody else can, but I want the Minister to withdraw the remarks that imply that I am a dealer in dirt. All I did was ask about dad-in-law getting the job.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Brisbane Central has taken an odd point of order. I ask the Minister to withdraw also the remarks referred to.

**Mr POWELL:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I withdraw that because of the objection taken by the odd member for Brisbane Central.

It is therefore clear that the honourable member for Brisbane Central, who deals in innuendo and lies, has again made a fool of himself.

**Mr DAVIS:** I rise to take a further point of order. I ask the Minister to withdraw his reference to lies, because I quoted from an article in the *Sunday Sun*. The Minister admits that the appointment has been made, so how could I be lying? The expression is unparliamentary, and I ask for it to be withdrawn.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! On a further point of order, I ask the Minister to withdraw the word “lies” because the honourable member finds it offensive.

**Mr POWELL:** I withdraw the language that is unparliamentary. It is therefore clear that this dealer in untruths and innuendo deals in information that has been proved to be untrue by the statements I have made in this Parliament. His constant interjecting when Ministers speak in this House indicates that he would only receive a very low achievement rating for listening skills and comprehension, and a very high achievement rating for dealing in inaccuracies, innuendo and misinformation. What the honourable member lacks in intelligence he makes up for in stupidity.

Finally, Mr Speaker, may I suggest that for a man who chooses to make his attacks late in the night, he—like his accusations and innuendo—does not scrub up very well in the full light of the morning.

### SMC International

**Hon. V. P. LESTER** (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs) (11.23 a.m.), by leave: On a happier note, I preface my ministerial statement by giving a very special welcome to bowlers from the Central Highlands who have attended Parliament today. Honourable members welcome them.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Minister to please continue.

**Mr LESTER:** It is very clear that members of the Australian Labor Party do not recognise good talent; nor do they recognise the most progressive region in Queensland.

**Mr Casey** interjected.

**Mr LESTER:** The ALP obviously does not like it. I am proud of the people from central Queensland, even if members of the Labor Party are not.

I rose primarily to inform honourable members that a company called SMC International has been preying on the vulnerability of young people by placing newspaper advertisements which give young people hope of part-time employment. Instead, young people find it necessary to buy sales samples, often at a cost of thousands of dollars.

Only yesterday, I was made aware of the difficulties encountered by an 18-year-old youth who agreed, under pressure, to sign a contract for over \$4,400 with SMC International.

With hindsight, I suppose the youth was foolish to sign that contract, but that youth did not expect to be pressured by a high-pressure sales person to sign such a contract when the youth was only looking for a job.

Currently, officers of my department are investigating the company and, in the interim, daily newspapers have been asked to withhold any future classified advertisements by that company in the "Positions Vacant" column. I advise all honourable members that SMC International has been holding its briefing sessions at 1990 Logan Road, Mount Gravatt. My suggestion to members on both sides of the House is to tell any young people whom they know not to have anything whatever to do with this company—

**Mr R. J. Gibbs:** Why—don't—you—act—and—close—them—down?

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

**Mr LESTER:** . . . because obviously problems are ahead and the Government is trying to investigate the matter.

For the benefit of the honourable member for Wolston, I point out that I am simply trying to give some information in doing my job as Minister in charge of consumer affairs, and it might be a very good idea if the honourable member listened and then told his constituents the good words from the Minister.

#### **Boating Safety in Queensland**

**Hon. M. J. TENNI** (Barron River—Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services) (11.26 a.m.), by leave: The State Government has a first-class record in promoting small craft safety in Queensland. Contrary to the statements of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and member for Lytton, Mr Tom Burns, the State Government was very conscious of its responsibility to promote safe boating at all times. The honourable member for Lytton is aware of that.

**Mr Burns** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Lytton is warned under Standing Order No. 123A.

**Mr TENNI:** If the honourable member for Lytton bothered to take the time to visit the Queensland Boating and Fisheries Patrol's excellent display at the boat show, he would not have made such a foolish statement.

I congratulate the Department of Mapping and Surveying and my department on the excellent quality of the maps that they produce. It has always been the State Government's policy to remind boat-owners to carry the latest charts whenever they venture to sea. The honourable member for Lytton knows that as well as everyone else does. That policy is distributed in leaflet form and it is also made known on radio and television. The honourable member for Lytton knows that, too. He has deliberately mislead the people of Queensland.

**Mr Burns** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Lytton!

**Mr TENNI:** To suggest that the Government would attempt to save a few dollars by selling obsolete charts, when lives could be at stake, is ridiculous and is a smear on the great work that is done by the Department of Harbours and Marine in promoting boating safety at all times. The department was not involved in any chart sales at the Brisbane boat show.

The State Government has a good track record in promoting boating safety throughout this State, and the honourable member for Lytton, as a boating man, knows that.

The Queensland Boating and Fisheries Patrol has 95 officers who regularly give talks on boating safety to clubs and community groups throughout the State. I have instructed those officers to talk to the kids in schools, in the not-too-distant future, when time permits and where the principal of the school will allow it. That will enable young people in this State to be taught boating safety.

Some \$251,000 will be spent by the patrol in 1986-87 on promoting boating safety by way of literature, media advertisements and attendance at every major boat show in Queensland. That is what the Government is doing now, and the honourable member for Lytton knows it. He knows that the Government is doing a good job. For the honourable member for Lytton to come out with his statement was to completely and deliberately mislead the people of this State.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**Mr DAVIS** (Brisbane Central) (11.29 a.m.), by leave: This morning a dreadful performance by the Minister for Education (Mr Powell) was seen——

**Mr Elliott:** Were you personally aggrieved?

**Mr DAVIS:** The Minister did not do a real bad job of insulting my integrity.

Mr Speaker, I would like——

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I would like the honourable member for Brisbane Central to make his personal explanation.

**Mr DAVIS:** I would also like quietness too, Mr Speaker, the way I give quietness to the——

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! While I am on my feet would the honourable member for Brisbane Central please resume his seat? If he does not get on with his personal explanation I will rule him out of order.

**Mr DAVIS:** This morning, the Minister for Education (Mr Powell) attacked me personally, all because last night, in this Chamber, I asked whether the members for Toowoomba North, Toowoomba South, Lockyer, Condamine and Warwick had been consulted about his family appointment. During the debate, those members said that they were not consulted.

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

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

**Mr McPHIE:** The honourable member is misleading the House. I did not make any statements.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

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

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Toowoomba North might think that rising to a point of order is as hilarious as is indicated by the way he is now laughing. I do not think it is at all hilarious. I call the member for Lockyer to state his point of order.

**Mr FITZGERALD:** The member for Brisbane Central said that I denied being consulted. That is inaccurate. *Hansard* makes no reference to that. By way of interjection I said that the chairman of the council comes from my electorate. That was in answer to the honourable member's statement that my electorate was not represented. To represent me as saying that I was not consulted is inaccurate and untrue.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's point of order is noted. The honourable member for Toowoomba North also wished to raise a point of order.

**Mr McPHIE:** I rise on a similar point of order in that I have been misrepresented. I made no statement whatsoever last night about whether or not I was consulted.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's point of order is noted. I ask the honourable member for Brisbane Central to continue with his personal explanation.

**Mr Prest:** A back-down.

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

**Mr DAVIS:** As those honourable members have now stated to the House that they were not consulted, I rest my case. Obviously it was a family appointment, so I ask the Minister for Education if he has another half a dozen that he would like to appoint to somewhere else.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! That is very funny—very funny indeed!

**Mr POWELL:** Mr Speaker, I was wondering if that was a question without notice.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

## QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

Questions submitted on notice were answered as follows—

### 1. Manly Boat Harbour

Mr SHAW asked the Minister for Corrective Services, Administrative Services and Valuation—

“With reference to proposed developments at Manly Boat Harbour and the granting of freehold title of an area of land to the Royal Queensland Yacht Squadron—

What valuation for rating purposes has or will the Valuer-General place on the land?”

*Answer—*

The area in question has not yet been determined and there is no registered survey plan lodged for this land. Until such time as the area has been determined and a registered plan lodged, a value will not be determined for rating purposes.

### 2. Liberal Party's Policy on Coal Rail Freight Charges

Mr NEAL asked the Premier and Treasurer—

“With reference to overtures being made by the Liberal Party to the mining industry indicating promises of reduced rail freights on coal—

Are these overtures an exercise in double standards, considering the role played by the present Liberal member for Nundah in setting rail freight charges when he was responsible for the charges as Treasurer of this State?”

*Answer—*

I must say that I have been amazed at a lot of the comments the honourable member for Nundah has been making on various subjects recently in the lead-up to the election, but nothing has surprised me more than his promises to the mining industry to reduce rail freights on coal.

During the period when he was Deputy Premier and Treasurer of Queensland, from 1976 to 1978, and when he was Minister for Transport, from 1965 to 1971, the honourable

member for Nundah was associated closely with all discussions and decisions in respect of Government policies relating to rail freights on coal.

His recent comments would indicate he has always been the mining company's friend and that he did not support the policies of the Government of which he was a Minister. He has tried to make that point to the mining companies. Of course, the facts spell out a very, very different story. I am sure that the mining companies would very much like to know the real story of what occurred during the time that he was in the Ministry.

Let me quote certain extracts from a report that the Honourable the member for Nundah made on 21 April 1978, when he was Deputy Premier and Treasurer, when dealing with one of the companies on this subject. The report states—

“I am satisfied the arrangements now offered are most reasonable and they will be accepted by the company.”

Later, he said—

“However, the company has asked for still further amendments to proposed arrangements and, although I do not consider that such be agreed to, I have undertaken to advise Cabinet of their request.”

He further stated—

“The reason for the State's refusal to agree to such a freight rate reduction has been explained to the company on many occasions. There is no basis for further argument on the matter.”

That is what the honourable member said to the coal companies. Need I say any more. The honourable member's own words condemn him for his duplicity.

### 3. Upper Ross Sewerage Treatment Plant

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

“With reference to a letter dated 4 April 1986, in which the Director of Water Quality, Mr H. F. Desmond, warned the Thuringowa City Council that the discharge locations for its planned Upper Ross Sewerage Treatment Plant would have a devastating effect on the environment and would pose a continuing cause of concern to citizens—

Why has the advice of the Water Quality Council been ignored, particularly when its report concludes that the estuary of the Bohle River, recognised as a Wetland Reserve will be downgraded as a nursery for fish and crustaceans and that the Bohle River and its tributary are unsuited as permanent locations for major conventional sewerage effluent discharges?”

*Answer—*

Advice from the Water Quality Council has not been ignored by the Thuringowa City Council.

In reviewing a report dealing with the discharge of sewage effluent from two proposed treatment plants, the Water Quality Council took into consideration the heavy financial burden that would be imposed on rate-payers of Thuringowa city if works had to be undertaken immediately to carry effluent to the ultimate disposal point.

The Water Quality Council decided therefore that, whilst a temporary discharge to the upper reaches of the Bohle River would be approved, diversion of the effluent would be required within six years to a downstream location to be determined following further investigations.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### Terrorist Bases in Australia

**Mr BURNS:** In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to his ministerial statement this morning. I refer also to the Premier's claim that Hayden spoke to the PLO and that that was his reason for saying that the Federal Government approved of and promoted terrorist groups.

I refer also to the fact that the head of the Palestine Information Office in Melbourne, Mr Ali Kazak, is a frequent caller on National and Liberal Party politicians. He was received by Doug Anthony when he was the Premier's Federal leader; he saw the Premier's present Federal leader (Ian Sinclair) about seven weeks ago; and he has also met with Andrew Peacock and Ian Macphie in their roles as shadow Foreign Ministers.

As the Premier has claimed that his basis for saying that the Federal Government approves of and promotes terrorist groups was that Hayden as Minister for Foreign Affairs was talking to the PLO, will he explain what action he intends to take against his own politicians—National and Liberal—in view of their comments about and their meetings with the Palestine Liberation Organisation?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The interesting situation has arisen in which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition now admits that the PLO spokesman was spoken to by Mr Hayden. Yesterday he said that that was not true. The honourable member is now admitting that it is true.

**Mr Burns** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Lytton!

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** If this gentleman had not been allowed into Australia, nobody would have been able to meet him. If members of the Labor Party meet with him, that is something for which the honourable member should take them to task. I certainly do not support them if they have met with him.

Unless that gentleman was trying to get his visa extended or something, I do not know why Hayden would have wanted to meet with him. I can assure honourable members that I would not meet with him. There is no way in the world that I would meet with him. It is a difficult job for me even to meet with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

### Terrorist Bases in Australia

**Mr BURNS:** Yesterday in this Parliament and in other places the Premier and Treasurer said that he knew of six or seven terrorist groups operating in this nation. I ask: Will the Premier name those six or seven terrorist groups, instead of tabling a few newspaper cuttings, as he did this morning? The Premier should put his money where his mouth is.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** There should not really be any need for me to name those groups because I am sure that the honourable member knows them.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! A question has been asked of the Premier. He will answer it.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** What amazes me in this whole episode is how violently members of the Labor Party defend these people. That is what I cannot understand. Why is that?

**Opposition Members:** Name them.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** To save time, the groups were named in the documents that I tabled. Seven groups are listed in those documents.

**Mr Burns:** They are newspaper cuttings.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** All right, they are newspaper cuttings.

Why is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition defending them? The main point, of course, is that the Federal Government has probably got the man under surveillance. It is trying to find out something about him so that it can have him deported. That is probably the reason why members of the Federal Labor Government talk to him.

### **Bill of Rights; Human Rights Commission**

**Mr NEAL:** I ask the Premier and Treasurer: Does he accept the declaration of the Federal Government that it has abandoned its proposed Bill of Rights? Is the Premier concerned by the Federal Government's plan to extend the Human Rights Commission beyond its original five-year term to work towards including part of the Bill of Rights in the Australian Constitution?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** As everybody knows, debate on the Bill of Rights in the Federal Parliament has taken an enormous amount of time. It has been debated and argued about across the nation. It has torn people apart and asunder in so many different ways.

Nothing will ever convince me that the Federal Government will desert its ideals and objectives as exemplified by the Bill of Rights. Whether the Federal Government extends the term of the Human Rights Commission, expands its charter or converts it to something else is a subject about which I am not particularly worried simply because not only will this nation get rid of the Labor Government at the next Federal election but also all those other bodies. We will not chop their toes off, as it were, to get rid of them; we will chop their heads off later on and get rid of all of them.

### **Terrorist Bases in Australia**

**Mr MACKENROTH:** In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to his statements in the House yesterday and today that terrorist groups were operating from bases in Australia and I ask: Since he has failed to provide proof to support his claims, do those claims have the same credibility as the claims the Premier made in 1982 that Aboriginal terrorists were ". . . being trained in terror tactics in Libya", which were rejected out of hand by the then Liberal Prime Minister, Malcolm Fraser?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** At that time the Government was in possession of very interesting information that I sought to highlight, just as it has today. I do not care if it was Malcolm Fraser—whoever it was at that time—but some of this activity occurred in Fraser's time also, and I do not mind stating that. I was just as much against it then as I am now.

Opposition members cannot sweep this matter under the carpet to get rid of it. They have a hot potato on their plate. I am asking the Prime Minister again to deport these people back to the countries from which they came. The Federal Government will not be allowed to lie down to sleep and forget about this matter. It has to do something about this matter in the interests of safety and security in Australia.

There was the Hilton bombing, the Melbourne bombing and the shooting of the Turkish ambassador. Something has to be done. The ALP supports these terrorists. It helps and encourages them, looks after them and defends them in this House.

### **Economic Policies of New Right**

**Mr MACKENROTH:** In addressing my second question without notice to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to the so-called alternative Federal Budget outlined by a leading light of the New Right in last week-end's *Sunday Sun*. I table a copy of the article for the information of honourable members.

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

Apart from that being a classic exercise in the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer, and following the Premier's statements yesterday that he was 100 per cent behind the New Right, I ask: How can the Premier justify the New Right's economic policies, when those policies would result in a massive cut in Queensland's funding of \$400m and hardship for pensioners, families, ex-servicemen and all other Queenslanders?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** When the honourable member for Chatsworth refers to the poor, it has to be remembered that the greatest generator of poverty is the Federal Government in Canberra. There has never been a Government like it for creating poverty, anxiety, uncertainty and destroying confidence in this nation, as the ALP Government has done. It is the greatest destroyer of confidence and creator of poverty.

**Mr Mackenroth** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has asked the question and he will listen to the answer.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** It does not matter how the honourable member argues. The fact is that the policies his colleagues have created are sick, have made this nation sick and have made people very concerned and depressed. That is why Australia is heading in the direction it is, as the last deficit has shown and as the figure of \$1,700m released today also shows. Why do the figures go that way all the time? It is simply because the Queensland Opposition and the ALP in Canberra support a policy that is wrong in every direction. The Opposition cannot escape that fact.

#### **CEP Funding for the Control of Feral Animals**

**Mr McPHIE:** I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: Is he aware of a recent announcement by the Commonwealth Government to the effect that money will be provided under the Commonwealth Employment Program for nine people to control feral animals in the Charleville area as part of that Government's commitment to rural industry? What impact does the Minister expect the project to have on the feral population of Charleville? It is likely to achieve cost-effective results?

**Mr TURNER:** I have read the article and am amazed and appalled at the gross stupidity and lack of knowledge of primary industries, rural people and rural areas that the ALP has displayed. It is a very short, stupid article and I would like to read it into *Hansard* so that all honourable members are aware of it.

It is headed "Nine CEP workers to control feral animals" and reads—

"Nine people will be employed for 26 weeks to control feral animals in the Charleville area, Senator John Black said yesterday.

They will be employed under the Community Employment Program.

Senator Black said the campaign had been targeted to areas"—

**Mr Scott:** The council would have applied for it.

**Mr TURNER:** If the honourable member for Cook waits until I have finished reading this article, he may not be so keen to sing out. It continues—

"Senator Black said the campaign had been targeted to areas of high rural unemployment where high concentrations of feral animals had been identified. 'Feral animals are responsible for considerable agricultural and environmental damage,' he said.

'They cause livestock losses, kill native wildlife, contribute to soil erosion and can act as carriers of diseases in an exotic disease outbreak.' "

Now I come to the interesting part—

"Senator Black said the campaign was a further demonstration of the Commonwealth Government's commitment to the rural sector."

I come now to another classic—

“Under guidelines laid down by the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Mr Willis, all the jobs under the campaign would be targeted to the most disadvantaged groups in the community, including migrants with English language difficulties, Aborigines, the disabled and the rural long-term unemployed.

Half the jobs would be targeted to women.

All recruitment will be through the Commonwealth Employment Service.”

I suggest that if the ALP genuinely wanted to help control the feral animal population in rural areas, it should firstly increase the kangaroo quota, which is a matter that comes under the control of my colleague Mr McKechnie.

The ALP talks about its commitment to rural areas; I would call it a callous contempt for rural areas. If one equates nine workers for six months to 4½ years' work for one person, one will see that the project will cost approximately \$45,000. If that money was given to professional trappers or doggers, there would be some value in it; but that could be too sensible for the Australian Labor Party. It wants a percentage of Aborigines, women, non-English-speaking migrants and disabled people to be used. Imagine those people trying to catch wild dogs and wild pigs in the outback. I am not against the provision of employment for the unemployed; far from it.

**Mr De Lacy:** Of course you are.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr TURNER:** The honourable member would have to be sick to make that statement.

If the ALP wants to provide those people with employment, it should provide them with meaningful, constructive worthwhile employment, and not try to employ them in areas in which they will be of no benefit to themselves or to the eradication of the feral animal problem in that region. It is a clear indication of the abysmal lack of knowledge of the Australian Labor Party.

**Mr De Lacy:** Why don't you just tell the Commonwealth Government you don't want any more CEP grants in your area.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Cairns!

**Mr TURNER:** If the honourable member listened for a while, he might learn something.

The Federal Government's contemplation of employing people who could do nothing in that area when they could be employed on something constructive is a clear indication of its lack of understanding, which highlights the basic difference between the Labor Party and the National Party.

**Mr De Lacy:** Where did the application come from?

**Mr TURNER:** It is a matter of the difference between the policies and the philosophies of the Australian Labor Party and the National Party.

**Mr De Lacy** interjected.

**Mr TURNER:** The honourable member for Cairns is a great socialist thinker. He is one of the members in this Chamber who believe that this country should be turned into a socialist republic. His thinking is in line with the thinking of his Canberra colleagues who are paranoid about changing our flag, our national anthem and the Constitution, and turning this country into a socialist republic. I ask: Where in the world is there a socialist republic that has more freedom and affluence than Australia or is a better country to live in than Australia? It is not East Germany or Poland. My wife has relatives overseas who will tell Opposition members how good it is in those countries.

It is not Czechoslovakia or Hungary or anywhere else. Opposition members believe that Australia will be a different type of Utopia if it is their type of socialist republic.

**Mr De Lacy** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Cairns under Standing Order No. 123A for interjecting constantly. I have warned him on several occasions.

**Mr Smith:** Just tell us who made the application.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Townsville West!

**Mr TURNER:** The system in Australia, with any imperfections that might be in it, is still the best system in the world. It is the envy of most countries. Before that system is thrown out to implement something in which Opposition members believe, the alternatives should be examined.

I believe that at the forthcoming election the majority of people will consider those issues and, if they believe in the future of this country, as I am sure that they do, and are interested in the future of their children and their children's children, will vote for the National Party and not the ALP.

#### **Housing Commission Rental Accommodation, Rockhampton Area**

**Mr YEWDAL:** In directing a question to the Minister for Works and Housing, I refer to a recent communication that I sent to his office in which I requested statistics regarding Housing Commission rental properties in Rockhampton and Rockhampton North. I refer also to his subsequent answer to my letter, in which he said—

“I refer to your letter of 8 August, 1986 requesting details on housing in the Rockhampton and Rockhampton North area.

I understand the Queensland Housing Commission does not record statistics by local areas and to extract the information would be a time consuming and costly exercise.

In the circumstances it is not possible to supply the information you have requested.”

I now ask: Does the Minister stand by his reply, wherein he stated that to extract such information would be a time-consuming and costly exercise, and does he suggest that the Rockhampton office of the Housing Commission would not have such records in its files and available on request?

**Mr WHARTON:** I am surprised that the honourable member for Rockhampton North has asked that question, because the policy is a standard policy applying to all members. It would be a waste of time. This Government is in the business of providing quality housing for people, not wasting a lot of time and quoting statistics that will only be used to the disadvantage of the community.

The Queensland Government promotes housing. Last year, \$145m was expended on housing—private buildings. This year it is expected that the figure will be even higher. The availability of rental accommodation throughout the whole of the State has been increased. The Government intends to increase that availability even further during this year.

As I said a couple of days ago, because of the high interest rates that have been imposed by the Commonwealth Government, people cannot afford to pay for their houses. That is a terrible thing.

The honourable member for Rockhampton North is prepared to ask silly questions. However, he is not prepared to do anything about reducing interest rates. If honourable members were to speak to Mr West, he would claim that he is not going to increase interest rates; but he does. Whatever the ALP in Canberra does, the Queensland ALP supports. The ALP is obviously against home-ownership and housing in general. It is trying to fiddle around with a lot of figures, and that will get it nowhere.

The facts speak for themselves. The Queensland Government is providing increased and better housing for people, as well as providing more rental housing accommodation. It is catering for the people and providing roofs over people's heads. However, the ALP does not like that.

#### Department of Works, Townsville

**Mr YEWDAL:** In directing a question to the Minister for Works and Housing, I refer to the work-force of the Department of Works in Townsville. I ask: Has the Department of Works embarked upon a program to decimate the work-force currently operating in Townsville? If so, to what degree does the Minister intend to reduce that work-force in favour of reverting to private contractors? Does he intend to totally eliminate the present employees, thereby contributing to the unemployed numbers in Queensland?

**Mr WHARTON:** No.

#### Brisbane Olympic Games Bid

**Mr HENDERSON:** I ask the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts: Is he aware of recent episodes of *State Affair* in which doubts were cast on the viability of Brisbane's Olympic Games bid? The Minister has previously suggested that it would be wise for the Brisbane City Council to have a second set of figures on hand in case boycotts cause a reduction in revenue from TV rights. Will the Minister give his assessment of the TV rights controversy?

**Mr McKECHNIE:** I believe that every Queenslander and every Australian would hope that Brisbane will be successful in its Olympic Games bid.

Both the State and Federal Governments have made their positions very clear. The bottom line is that the final risk rests with the rate-payers of Brisbane. What must be understood are the negotiations for TV rights and how they operate.

It is well known that when the TV rights were negotiated for the Seoul games the television stations attempted unsuccessfully to have written into the contract a proviso that, if four out of 10 of the major competing nations pulled out, those rights would be renegotiated.

Since that time we have witnessed the serious boycotts of the Commonwealth Games. Regardless of whether or not the Seoul Olympic Games are boycotted, the TV rights for the Brisbane games will be negotiated after the Seoul games. If in October Brisbane is successful in being awarded the games, then it goes into the games not knowing what the TV rights are. It does not require any imagination at all to understand that, if further boycotts are imposed at Seoul, the negotiations for the TV rights will be very difficult.

I will not deal with specific figures. They have been well documented by the media recently. However, Brisbane has to face the possibility that, if it is awarded the Olympic Games and if boycotts occur at Seoul, following boycotts of the Commonwealth Games at Edinburgh, the TV rights will be difficult to negotiate. It will also be difficult to negotiate the TV rights without having saving clauses for late boycotts that may eventuate just before 1992, as occurred with the Commonwealth Games at Edinburgh.

I heard the Premier of South Australia saying on TV that the projected TV rights for the gala three-day world equestrian event were 25 per cent of the amount that had been budgeted for; so the recent history of TV rights in Australia is not good.

I am well aware that the original bid for the Olympic Games was made by the Labor city council, but the present city council has endorsed the bid and has assured everybody that it is happy with the figures. I hope that it is possible for it to put in a viable bid, but it should level with the rate-payers of Brisbane as to the risks on the TV rights, bearing in mind the difficulties that were associated with negotiating the TV rights for the Seoul Olympics.

In today's paper, the Olympic strategist, Mr John Coates, talks about a \$372m profit. He relies very heavily on exchange rates for that profit. Again, the rate-payers of Brisbane should be made aware that it is fallacious to rely on exchange rates as the basis for calculation of profit, because the Hawke Government will not be in power following the next Federal election. Surely to goodness the dollar will not remain at its present level when Australia gets a Government in Canberra that will restore common sense to the administration of the country.

When people try to write into the bid figures that rely on the present low value of the Australian dollar to demonstrate a profit, that is quite mischievous. I hope that Mr Coates is not predicting that in 1992 the dollar will be at today's exchange rate.

#### **International Passenger Terminal, Brisbane Airport**

**Mr BORBIDGE:** I ask the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts: Is it correct that the Federal Government has rejected a proposal from a private consortium to build a new international passenger terminal at Brisbane Airport following its earlier decision not to incorporate such a facility in the airport redevelopment? Does that mean that international passengers will have to continue to use the existing tin shed into the 1990s and beyond?

**Mr McKECHNIE:** It is well known—I have made a statement about it in the House—that the Commonwealth Government has been hopelessly out in its projections of international tourists visiting Queensland. The Federal Minister for Tourism (Mr Brown) has now acknowledged that Queensland is the fastest-growing State. The existing facilities at the airport are just not adequate. The Federal Government has had the opportunity to do something positive by allowing private enterprise to build the terminal. It has not agreed to that proposal.

I call upon the Federal Government to negotiate a sensible arrangement so that private enterprise can build an international terminal at the Brisbane Airport. It is intolerable that planes that could be diverted to Queensland must fly around Sydney Airport, not being able to land, because Queensland has not adequate facilities to receive international guests, who would be welcome here.

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

### **MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST**

#### **Payment of Compensation by Water Resources Commission for Land Resumptions**

**Mr BRADDY** (Rockhampton) (12 noon): The people of Queensland deserve a Government that treats all Queenslanders equally. Patronage and cronyism that favour a few at the expense of the majority should have no place in Queensland. Unfortunately, the National Party Government has a long history of favouring its friends and associates.

Evidence given in a recent Land Court hearing at Townsville raises yet again serious questions concerning cronyism and wrong financial dealings by this Government. In 1982, David Cox, a resident of Ayr, sold land to the Commissioner of Water Resources for \$2,448,000. The land was required by the commissioner for purposes associated with the construction of the Burdekin Dam. David Cox has strong National Party connections, and is the brother of Vicki Kippin, former National Party member for Mourilyan.

Certain aspects of the sale attracted attention at the time, and were discussed and questioned in this House. On 1 December 1982, the honourable member for Townsville West (Mr Smith) questioned the Minister for Water Resources and Aboriginal and Island Affairs (Mr Tomkins) about the matter.

*Hansard* of 1 December 1982 records the Minister advising as follows—

“My inquiries revealed that the price Messrs D. Cox and A. Christensen paid Messrs Parker was \$700,000 or \$334 per hectare for the property in its then condition. It is not possible to directly relate unimproved capital value to a sale price.

The Queensland Water Resources Commission has negotiated to purchase Mr D. Cox's share of the property amounting to 1 651 ha for a total price, including substantial improvements carried out in the past year or two, of \$2,448,000. The improvements on the block have been valued at almost \$1,000,000.

The purchase price for the land was negotiated on the basis of accepted valuation principles and techniques and in the light of recent land sales in the area. No general land valuations have been carried out by the Queensland Water Resources Commission as suggested by the honourable member."

This House and the Queensland people were therefore told to accept that the sale by Cox to the commission was "negotiated on the basis of accepted valuation principles and techniques". Recent evidence given by David Cox and Gary Rosser, the valuer employed by the Commissioner of Water Resources, seriously questions the sale price of the property.

Both men were witnesses in a Land Court hearing unrelated to the Cox land sale. The Cox sale to the commission was examined during the hearing as a possible precedent for compensation to be paid to other land-holders following the resumption of land by the Queensland Water Resources Commission for Burdekin Falls Dam purposes. The other land-holders were Mr and Mrs Zandonadi, whose compensation case is otherwise unrelated to the Cox case.

David Cox gave evidence that prior to his sale to the commission, he both wrote to and saw the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) seeking an early settlement and sale of his land. He said he was concerned about lengthy delays that otherwise would be involved in protracted negotiations and a long-delayed Land Court compensation hearing.

No question is raised by Cox seeking a settlement in itself, but both the amount and circumstances of the payment in settlement raise serious questions for the Premier and the Government to answer. During the recent hearing that ended in July 1986, Gary Rosser gave evidence that he was the Queensland Water Resources Commission valuer who, in the course of his duties, had valued the Cox land at the time of the purchase in 1982.

In the transcript of the Land Court case of Zandonadi, the following evidence given by Rosser is recorded relating to his valuation of Cox's land—

"Question: Did you inspect this property—or have you inspected this property in the past?

Rosser: Yes, I have on a number of occasions, yes.

Question: And did you, in fact, prepare a valuation of it for the purpose of the surrender of the lease?

Rosser: Yes. I prepared a valuation when the commission purchased the land.

Question: Can you tell me just in brief details what your valuation figure was for the land?

Rosser: I've got some brief details here which indicated that my valuation was \$1,228,413.

Question: And you analysed that out and broke it up in appropriate fashion?

Rosser: That's correct, yes, I did that valuation on a hypothetical subdivision basis."

The valuation included improvements, and was done on the basis of a hypothetical subdivision of the land after rezoning, which was the intention about which Cox had informed Rosser prior to valuation.

During the Zandonadi case, Rosser stated, "I assessed the highest and best use of that land at the time to be subdivisional into smaller blocks". Rosser told the court that

he was not aware of any valuation other than his own which had been obtained by the Queensland Water Resources Commission. The commission was, of course, a party to the hearing. Rosser is employed by the commission and would have been in a position to know if another valuation had been obtained.

How, therefore, does a Government that paid public money for the Cox land justify a purchase for \$2,448,000 when its own valuer recommended a purchase price of \$1,228,413? What proper valuation principles, as claimed by Mr Tomkins in Parliament on 1 December 1982, were applied in that case?

The valuer, Rosser, was questioned in the Land Court about the suitability of the Cox purchase and its relevance to any other related purchase by the commission. In the transcript the following evidence appears—

“Question: In fact, did you take part in any negotiations for the settlement of that matter?

Rosser: I took part in some early negotiations, yes.

Question: And was it finally determined at commissioner and Minister level?

Rosser: It was determined with their involvement in some of the negotiations, yes.

Question: Would you regard that as a straight sale on which reliance could be placed for comparative sale purposes or are there special features in the sale?

Rosser: Well I think the purchase of that particular property was outside the realms of a prudent purchaser involvement with a sale.”

They were the words of the Government valuer. He said that the Government's purchase of the Cox land, being twice the price he recommended, was outside the realms of a prudent purchaser involvement with a sale.

That recent evidence in the Land Court gives vital information that was not available to the Parliament and the people in 1982. It raises serious questions about the Government's position in the Cox sale to the Queensland Water Resources Commission in 1982, namely—

- (1) Why was David Cox paid double the amount of the valuation of the property approved by the Queensland Water Resources Commission's own valuer?
- (2) What relationship was there between that excessive payment to Cox and the letter to and the visit by Cox to the Premier prior to the sale?
- (3) Did the sale price, which was almost double the valuer's valuation, have anything to do with Cox's strong National Party connections?
- (4) Given recent evidence of the commission's own valuation of the Cox land at only \$1.2m, what “accepted valuation principles and techniques” was the Minister referring to in the Parliament on 1 December 1982 when he confirmed the negotiated sale price at \$2,448,000?

This is the latest issue to highlight the need for greater accountability over the spending of public funds.

The National Party State Government has no commitment whatsoever to improving and upgrading accountability procedures and practices. It does not believe that a parliamentary public accounts committee—as exists in every other State in Australia—is necessary for Queensland. It is quite happy with the way things are at present. It is quite happy to stand by and see the public's money wasted and squandered. It is quite happy to see tax-payers' funds misused, misspent and misappropriated, without taking action to prevent such misuse.

It is happening not only in Government departments but also quangos under its control. Problems have arisen in the Peanut Marketing Board and, more recently, the public funds scandal within the Premier's Department, namely the Queensland Day Committee, has occurred. Charges of misappropriation of public funds against the head of a Government department are now before the courts.

Serious questions have now been raised about the payment of a land compensation claim by the Queensland Water Resources Commission.

I stress that public funds are being dealt with. As such the Government has a clear duty to immediately provide full details of the circumstances surrounding this payment.

**Councillor J. Mealing; Kuranda Honey House**

**Mr MENZEL (Mulgrave) (12.9 p.m.):** I draw to the attention of the House the criminal dealings of certain members of the ALP and, in particular, the ALP candidate for Tablelands, Councillor Jim Mealing of Kuranda.

Councillor Mealing previously owned the Honey House at Kuranda, where markets are held twice a week. The markets are held regularly on a Sunday, with about 150 stalls, and on a Wednesday, with 80 stalls. From the beginning, the markets have operated under the cloak of an organisation known as the Kuranda Markets Association, of which Mareeba Labor Shire Councillor Jim Mealing is president.

In late 1984 Mealing received from the Lands Department, arranged by the ALP-controlled Mareeba Shire Council, a permit to occupy, which costs \$100 per annum. Income from the land is estimated to be between \$25,000 and \$30,000 per annum. Income from the entire markets is about \$60,000 per annum. That is not a bad little business. These facts have been confirmed by Councillor Mealing and Phil Cohen. Following the increases in rents recently announced, the income will be considerably more. Councillor Jim Mealing and his cronies have refused to produce the books—if any exist, that is. Mealing says that it is a non-profit organisation, yet he says that it is a company.

**Mr Tenni:** Do you think they might be tax-dodgers?

**Mr MENZEL:** I am getting to that. I have a letter signed by Mealing, which proves that.

A Mr John Wheatley arrived on the scene from Perth, Western Australia, and very quickly had a stall built at the Kuranda markets, yet other people have waited for years to obtain a stall. Did Councillor Mealing, the endorsed ALP candidate for Tablelands, and his other crooks——

**Mr Hamill:** How is Babinda going?

**Mr MENZEL:** I ask the honourable member to worry just about this.

Did those people pay Paul Keating tax on the \$55,000 to \$60,000 per year income, or was there another bottom of the harbour deal made by that ALP man? I call this the bottom of the Barron Falls deal.

About 20 months ago Councillor Mealing sold the Honey House to his sister, Mrs Margaret Jones, and her husband, Kingsley Jones.

**Mr Tenni:** She rang me up. She reckons that Mealing put it over her.

**Mr MENZEL:** I know that. I have it all documented.

However, Councillor Mealing and other ALP associates continued to collect the money from stalls that were conducted on land owned by the Honey House. It is estimated that in an 18-month period the money collected illegally amounted to \$55,000. Mealing admits that he collected this money illegally before 1 July, and says so in the letter I have tabled. He said—

“Until that date, the Kuranda Markets Association does not have legal control of the Honey House section of the markets.”

The Joneses claim that they found the markets were costing them money in maintaining the grounds, cleaning toilets, paying rates on the land and in electricity costs. They asked Mealing where the money was that had been collected from the stalls on their land and asked if they could see the books. On both counts they were refused. They then asked if they could be paid \$1 per stall to cover costs, and were refused again.

The Joneses state that they were given to understand that, if they rocked the boat, the Mareeba Shire Council would make them upgrade the premises to Health Department standards.

**Mr Tenni:** That is right. That is what happened.

**Mr MENZEL:** Yes, it is true. In fact, it is widely suggested that Councillor Mealing told the Joneses to keep quiet or he would see that the ALP-controlled council at Mareeba would have their premises condemned. What a terrible thing that is! They are stand-over tactics.

**Mr Tenni:** He is a real hit man, that fellow.

**Mr MENZEL:** That is right.

However, approximately four days before Councillor Mealing and his associates, through their stand-over man, Mr John Wheatley, approached the Joneses with an offer to purchase their property, the Mareeba shire health inspector visited them. It seems more than a coincidence that the Jones's premises were singled out of all the premises in the town of Kuranda with concrete floors in their kitchens. In my view, Councillor Mealing obviously sent the council health inspector to pressure the Joneses to sell by intimidation.

**Mr Tenni:** Mr Mealing now owns it, with sewage running down beside the stalls where the food is.

**Mr MENZEL:** That is true.

The health inspector found faults that would have cost several thousand dollars to rectify. The Joneses received their letter from the council on 2 June—after contracts had been signed.

The new owners, Jim Mealing and Associates, were given 60 days to rectify the problem. As the new owner, Councillor Mealing was aware of the orders set by the council and accepted them as part of the sale. As the honourable member for Barron River has said, these jobs have not yet been done.

**Mr Tenni:** He is protecting himself as a councillor.

**Mr MENZEL:** That is right. He is totally corrupt, yet he is a candidate for the ALP. The time for that rectification work has long expired.

After the council health inspector condemned the place, the Joneses were approached by Mr John Wheatley. Honourable members should listen to this. He said that he was representing a Perth syndicate, and he offered \$420,000 for the Honey House. The Joneses decided to sell. Of course, before the contract was finalised, they realised that Mealing was behind it. The Joneses said that they would not have sold it if they had known that Mealing was behind it because they knew that he would rip off the stall-holders.

Councillor Mealing said that the vacancies in the market were filled by appointment as they occurred, that the books were not made public but that they were not secret, and that precise records had been kept since the beginning of the markets.

**Mr Tenni:** Most of the stall-holders there are Labor Party supporters.

**Mr MENZEL:** Yes, they were, but they are not now.

No-one is allowed to see the books of the association. That is incredible, to say the least; yet no money has been put into the markets. Where is the money?

Before the sale contract went through on 1 July, the stall-holders were advised that they would be charged \$1,500 and upwards to secure the market sites for five years. In June, the stall-holders formed the Kuranda Rainforest Stallholders Association. A committee member of that association was contacted by Mealing and told, "I am the boss."—these are the words of Councillor Mealing—"It is my market." Real stand-over tactics!

He said, "You will not form an association and you will not have any meetings. If you do, I will call the police." Words of wisdom by an ALP candidate!

**Mr Tenni:** That is what you call ALP democracy.

**Mr MENZEL:** That is right; ALP democracy. Councillor Mealing said that the association would not have any meetings. Those are stand-over tactics. A public accounts committee is needed for that.

**Mr Tenni:** Hitler did the same thing.

**Mr MENZEL:** That is right. Hitler was an angel compared to this guy.

The group of stall-holders is of course seeking a new life. It is understood that, while the Joneses owned the Honey House at Mareeba, two Mareeba shire employees and three CEP workers were putting down a paved pathway for the Kuranda Markets Association—owned by Mealing—on Honey House land, which is private land.

**Mr Tenni:** CEP funds.

**Mr MENZEL:** That is right, using CEP funds. Tax-payers' money—that is, CEP funds—is allowed to be used on private land to feather their own nests. It is not legal.

Councillor Mealing has threatened committee members of the Kuranda Rainforest Stallholders Association with expulsion from the markets.

Phil Cohen is another henchman for Councillor Mealing. Twice he has evicted the president of the stallholders association, and on 3 August 1986 he told him to move his stall. The president of the association arrived at the markets to find his stall partly smashed up and thrown into the forest. A week or so later his stall was smashed by sledge-hammers and crowbars and thrown on the edge of the road by Councillor Mealing and his henchmen.

This is Australia 1986 and, as the honourable member for Barron River (Mr Tenni) says, not 1940.

**Mr Scott:** That is a pack of lies.

**Mr MENZEL:** It is not lies, and the honourable member knows it. Mealing has admitted half of it in the letter that I have referred to.

Phil Cohen has been forcing stall-holders to pay \$1,500 and making threats against them. There is a permit to occupy the other part of the land, which is illegal under the conditions imposed by the Land Department. The actions are totally illegal.

**Mr Tenni:** They have cut trees down and dug holes in the land.

**Mr MENZEL:** That would be right.

As the honourable member for Barron River has said, sewage is running down the streets through the markets, past all the food and the goods for sale. The Labor council at Mareeba does nothing about it. Councillor Mealing is the head of the Kuranda Markets Association—

**Mr Tenni:** The chairman, Cedric Davies, has been trying to do something about it.

**Mr MENZEL:** I am aware of that. He is not a bad sort of a bloke, but he is outvoted by the ALP.

*Time expired.*

#### **Allegations Against Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing**

**Mr GOSS (Salisbury) (12.19 p.m.):** I wish to reassert the principle that to mislead the Parliament in relation to a matter that is under debate and of key importance is a grave offence indeed, for which there can be only one penalty.

I turn to serious allegations that were raised almost a year ago in this Parliament in relation to the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze).

One of the allegations related to the relocation of the Tamborine-Oxenford Road. The allegation was that it was re-routed for the benefit of the Minister or his family company.

I refer to a ministerial statement made on 15 October 1985 by the Minister. In that carefully prepared statement, which was made some six days after the allegations were made, the Minister said—

“I categorically deny that I have been guilty of abusing my ministerial office for private gain.”

The Minister went on to assert that—

“Because of the requirements of the Albert Shire Council’s rezoning approval, Maralinga accepted responsibility for building a new crossing to the same flood immunity as the old crossing.”

The final cost of the road, according to the Minister’s statement, was \$885,000, with Maralinga Pty Ltd contributing 30 per cent of that cost and the tax-payer paying over half a million dollars. It was then revealed that Maralinga Pty Ltd did not pay its contribution in cash, but its contribution was, to quote the Minister again—

“... the use of its plant and equipment, and supply of materials.”

My sources at the Albert Shire Council suggest that the contribution was only a token contribution of some gravel and the limited use of some trucks. The production of a detailed report from the engineer at that time would dispel the suggestion that is circulating in the area that the figure is highly exaggerated. I invite the Minister to produce the original report of the engineer assessing the value of the contribution. In June of this year, I delivered to the Premier copies of three development agreements between the Minister or his company and the Albert Shire Council in 1975, 1977 and 1982. I will table an extract from the second schedule of the 1982 agreement between the Albert Shire Council and Maralinga Pty Ltd. I draw the attention of the House to clause 5 of the second schedule, which provides that the Minister’s company, Maralinga Pty Ltd—

“... is to make arrangements satisfactory to the Department of Main Roads and Albert Shire Council to construct previous to the removal of the existing road an alternative road and river crossing. . .”

The agreement goes on to provide that the road shall be to a standard of not less than that provided by the existing road.

This agreement, signed by the Minister, requires an explanation. The agreement purports to bind the Main Roads Department and the Albert Shire Council to bear the cost of such a road if the Minister—or Mr Hinze, as he appears in the agreement—can arrange it. In other words, he arranged through his own department for the tax-payer to bear the greater part of the cost of the road. He is entering into an agreement in his private capacity with the council which requires him, in his ministerial capacity, to make a decision to spend what turned out to be over half a million dollars of public money in relocating the road. Surely this requires an explanation. These matters were raised in some detail by my colleague the honourable member for Ipswich. In my opinion, they have never been adequately answered.

What the Minister failed to disclose in his carefully prepared statement, and what makes this matter serious today, is that one year before the Main Roads Department’s approval for the relocation of the road, he had already signed an agreement stating that he would be seeking to make arrangements to have the new road constructed and the additional cost borne by the other authorities, that is, the department and the council. This failure to disclose the 1982 development agreement to this House, and in particular the Minister’s agreement under clause 5 of the second schedule, is a serious matter.

Even more serious matters arise from another document that has been supplied to me, which I will table, namely, the 1975 development agreement between Russell James Hinze and the Albert Shire Council. This document is signed "R. J. Hinze". I will table a copy of page 16 of that agreement, and particularly clause XIV of the second schedule.

Before coming to that clause, I would like to look firstly at the statement made by the Minister to this House on 15 October 1985. This statement was carefully prepared and delivered six days after the allegations from the honourable member for Ipswich (Mr Hamill) where the Minister talked about the history of the operation and said—

"... on 29 March 1976 I entered into an agreement with Farley and Lewers (Qld) Pty Ltd, which allowed that company to have the exclusive right to win, extract, process and remove sand and gravel."

The Minister went on to state that this 1976 agreement with Farley and Lewers (Qld) Pty Ltd—and I stress the date—

"... was entered into long before any proposals to relocate the road, ..."

The Minister's prepared statement says that the first suggestion of any necessity to replace the road crossing was in 1979 when the council engineers, Cameron McNamara and Partners, reported that fact to the council. The Minister said that was June 1979.

The Minister went on in his prepared statement to say that the next development was August 1981 when the Minister's personal engineers met with representatives of his own department and the Albert Shire Council to discuss relocation options. As a result of that meeting, a preliminary proposal was formulated and on 3 December 1982 the council submitted that proposal to the Main Roads Department district engineer.

According to the Minister, the first suggestion that the road needed to be replaced was made in June 1979. The first preliminary proposal was made in 1981. In his prepared statement the Minister failed to disclose to the Parliament and to the people of Queensland the provisions of the agreement that he personally signed in 1975. I will table an extract from it. In other words, that occurred a year before the agreement in 1976, which, he says, was "long before any proposals to relocate the road".

The relevant section of the second schedule of the 1975 agreement states—

"The Applicant (that is R. J. Hinze) shall provide at no cost to Council a suitable river crossing the nature and position of which shall be to the reasonable satisfaction of the engineer."

That is a reference to the council engineer.

As honourable members now know, that cost—half a million dollars—was borne almost overwhelmingly by the tax-payer. In other words, because of the rezoning of his own land from rural to extractive industry, and the benefits that flowed to him from the development agreement and the gravel operation, which all honourable members would know would be considerable, he agreed in that development agreement to those benefits. He agreed to provide the new river crossing at no cost to the council. The nature and position of that crossing would have to be to the reasonable satisfaction of the council engineer. In other words, the whole of the obligation for the new river crossing was Mr Hinze's personal obligation. As honourable members now know, that 100 per cent personal obligation has subsequently been transformed into an alleged 30 per cent contribution, proof of which has not yet been made available, with a contribution of half a million dollars by the tax-payer.

In view of the substantial obligation that the 1975 agreement imposed on the Minister, namely, to provide the crossing at his cost, his statement in this House that the agreement in 1976 was "long before any proposals to relocate the road" is clearly wrong and a matter of grave concern.

Given the 1975 agreement, which bound the Minister to pay 100 per cent, the reduction of the original obligation to 30 per cent of the final cost is clearly an important benefit. There has been a clear benefit.

If the Minister's prepared statement is put alongside the 1975 development agreement, what explanation can there be other than that the House has been seriously misled on a point of critical importance when it judged the way in which the Minister dealt with his personal interest when spending tax-payers' money and exercising the power and influence of his high office? The member for Ipswich made out a clear case of personal benefit. The Minister categorically denied that. The matter has never been explained properly.

The documents that I now table show a 100 per cent obligation on the part of the Minister. That agreement was never disclosed by the Minister when he gave his explanation to the House. In a case in which the House has been seriously misled, there can be only one penalty. Honourable members must remember that day after day the House was considering very carefully the role and the conduct of the Minister in the administration of his department and the relocation of a road at a cost to the tax-payer of over half a million dollars. However, the Minister failed to disclose two development agreements, particularly the one in 1975 that was signed personally by him. That reduction from 100 per cent to 30 per cent was worth over half a million dollars. It was not even disclosed to the House.

The Minister has hidden a key point in respect of which he was under attack. He has hidden a vital part of the truth. It is not just a failure to disclose, it is a deliberate misleading, because he said that the 1976 agreement was "long before any proposal to relocate the road". He said that the first suggestion was in 1979 and that the first preliminary proposal was made in 1981. From the documents that I have tabled, it can be seen that in 1975 the Minister agreed personally to relocate the road at his cost. The only reason for his doing that was that he had to cover up the benefit of over half a million dollars. That is what has occurred in this case. He has seriously misled the House. He has failed to disclose the whole truth. In doing so, there has been a clear personal benefit. The House demands, the Parliament demands and the people are entitled to an explanation and either a resignation or a sacking.

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

### **Interest Rates; Wheat and Dairy Industries**

Mr ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (12.29 p.m.): I wish to raise a matter of tremendous concern not only to the farming community but also to the most important employment-generating sector in this country, namely the small-business community.

I am particularly concerned at the high interest rates that are being charged on normal commercial loans. I urge the Federal Government to come to grips with the problem and to review some of its policies.

When the decision was first made to float the Australian dollar, I believe that most thinking people felt that that decision was of considerable merit. Regrettably, that float has turned out to be a Claytons float, because the Reserve Bank has acted to support the dollar; it is buying the dollar and trying to maintain its value above 60c relative to the American dollar.

The end result of the Federal Government's decision to float the dollar is that interest rates within Australia have been artificially pushed up. Many people are now being forced to pay interest rates approaching 20 per cent per annum.

If one examines the main competition to Australia's rural community, namely the United States and Canada, one discovers that their interest rates are approximately 7 per cent. The farmers and small-business people of Australia are being put at a tremendous disadvantage by the Federal Government's interest rates policy.

I challenge all those Federal Government members who are supposedly representing country electorates to mention this particular problem in the Federal Parliament, to stand up and be counted and to do something about it.

Mr Beddall, whose Federal electorate includes the electorate of the honourable member for Warwick (Mr Booth), runs around posing and trying to pretend that he is doing something for country people. What is Mr Beddall doing in respect of this issue?

Those people who have the most problems, and who will be most affected by increased interest rates, are those people who have been taking risks and have been out there having a go. They are the doers. They are the people who have been borrowing the money, and they are the people that everyone lauds and commends and says of them, "Look at this fellow. He is having a go."

What is happening now? If a businessman is paying 20 per cent interest, he is effectively buying his entire business every five years. What chance does any businessman have of surviving under those conditions?

**Mr Hamill:** What is the solution?

**Mr ELLIOTT:** If honourable members were to look at the US Farm Bill, they would find that the solution is to float the dollar properly. If the dollar is to be floated, let it float. It should not be interfered with, nor should the market-place. If the dollar is to be fixed, then it should be left alone. In that way Australians will know where they stand.

The Federal Government claimed that it would float the dollar, but it has not done so. It has propped it up through having the Reserve Bank buy the dollar and keep it above US 60c. That has the effect of pushing up interest rates and, therefore, destroying people in rural areas and small businesses. It is absolutely decimating them.

Honourable members should take note of what is occurring with bankruptcies and those people who are being asked to show cause why they should not be removed from their farms. It is a tremendous problem, and if something is not done about it then Australia is going to lose the most important sector of its community, namely those people who have been game enough to have a go.

I am greatly concerned about the contents of the US Farm Bill and the policies of the EC. The immediate effect of those policies has been a drastic drop in income received from Australia's grain exports.

The price of wheat has been underwritten to a certain extent, but it is related to last year's domestic price and then related to the world price. Because of the tremendous stockpile, each year the price will decrease. The stockpile will not disappear after a year or so; it will take some time to work through the system.

I applaud the buy Australian-made campaign. I suggest that the consumers of this country look very hard at their food commodities—cheeses and other dairy products—and ask themselves from where the products have come. If the experts on nuclear problems are correct, over a period 2 000-odd people will die following the Chernobyl disaster. Consumers should ask themselves what sort of effect that disaster has had on the produce of European nations.

Would honourable members want their children to be eating cheeses that are produced in any of those areas? Would they want their children to be eating specialty foods or canned foods from those areas?

The Australian Government should be making certain that the community is aware of the potential problems. Quite frankly, the Government can exert tremendous leverage over the problem. The Government should be going hammer and tongs to convince people that they should buy Australian produce, because at least it is guaranteed not to be radioactive, which is absolutely essential. Not enough is being done.

**Mr Palaszczuk:** Why don't you buy Ford LTDs for your Ministers?

**Mr ELLIOTT:** The honourable member's colleagues are doing nothing. The Beddalls of the world are doing absolutely nothing about the problem. I have not heard Mr Beddall say one thing or do anything about it.

The Australian dairy industry could benefit tremendously from the Chernobyl disaster. Perhaps the information is starting to flow through. It is of the utmost importance that we, as responsible members of the State Parliament, should point out to the public that they face a very serious potential health risk if they eat foods that are produced in any of the countries that were affected by the radioactive fall-out.

**Mr Palaszczuk:** Give us some types of food.

**Mr ELLIOTT:** Obviously, cheese is the first on the list. If honourable members heed the advice from health authorities, they would realise that over a period, through its milk, the cow is a great transmitter of radioactivity. When the Chernobyl scare was on, for weeks and weeks the European Community threw milk out. The Australian people should be looking very hard to see that the EC has not dumped any products that could have been affected in this nation, because it is dumping its products in Australia at give-away prices and the ALP is doing absolutely nothing about it. I ask Opposition members what the ALP is doing about it. It is a scandal and Opposition members should be ashamed of their lack of action on this particular problem. I urge the public to look very seriously at the problem.

I also ask the State Government to look at the QIDC in respect of interest rates. A tremendous number of farmers and small-business people are at risk because of the high interest rates they have to pay. They are very concerned. If the Government is not seen to be doing something about this problem, it will go down in history as having not had the courage to stand up and be counted on a most vital issue.

#### **Administration of Northern Development and Community Services Portfolio**

**Mr SCOTT (Cook) (12.39 p.m.):** Of all the disasters that the National Party Government has imposed on the good people of Queensland, the greatest disaster of all has been in Aboriginal affairs and northern development, through the style of the Minister who has been chosen to represent that important portfolio. The Honourable R. C. Katter is a hopeless case as a Minister and he has just played around in both Aboriginal affairs and northern development. He certainly should no longer occupy that position. Of course, after the next election he will not. A member of the Australian Labor Party will be given the portfolio of Northern Development and Community Services, and I look forward to some common sense being applied to its administration.

Insufficient time is available for me to examine thoroughly the ramifications of the Minister's maladministration. In the short time I have—10 minutes—I will attempt to itemise the areas that have been most strongly affected by the Minister's disastrous administration. To begin with, a total conflict exists between the two aspects of the portfolio, Aboriginal affairs and northern development. The interests of two totally different groups have to be taken into account. It is certainly beyond the capacity of the present Minister to do justice to the two aspects of the portfolio, particularly in matters relating to far-north Queensland.

**Mr FitzGerald:** Get stuck into him. Don't be gentle.

**Mr SCOTT:** I will get stuck into him. I have pages and pages of information, but unfortunately I have insufficient time to use all the material.

Shelburne Bay is a classic example. The Australian Labor Party is opposed to silica-mining at Shelburne Bay because sufficient silica is being exported from Cape Flattery, which is totally supported by the ALP. The Aborigines have an interest in Shelburne Bay because it is a place that has very strong traditions of Aboriginal culture vested in it. Because the Minister supports silica-mining at Shelburne Bay, he has opposed representations that have been made by Aboriginal people in an attempt to prevent the mining from going ahead. Moreover, the Minister has demonstrated an irresponsible attitude to the use of Government resources.

Recently, he was swanning around the countryside, inspecting some of the projects that he is supposed to take an interest in. He wanted a helicopter to be made available

to him. A helicopter engaged in mustering in the Weipa area had to be diverted to take the Minister to Shelburne Bay, and it was paid for by the Department of Community Services. Instead of making sensible arrangements and travelling to the area in a sensible manner, he called the helicopter out of the Weipa area.

The Minister is not in a position to reconcile the conflict. Neither side is satisfied; neither side trusts the Minister.

**Mr Eaton:** He would not be able to find his way, if he had to go on his own.

**Mr SCOTT:** That is certainly true. The Minister would be lost in the bush.

The biggest problem is the Minister's total lack of honesty. When instances of his dishonesty show up, he either does not care——

**Mr LESTER:** I rise to a point of order. I believe that that remark should be withdrawn. "Total lack of honesty" is unparliamentary, and it is not a term that should be applied to a Minister.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** Order! I suggest to the honourable member for Cook that his remarks come close to being in breach of Standing Order No. 120, which contains a reference to a personal reflection being cast. I think that, to some extent, the honourable member should modify his references to the Minister.

**Mr SCOTT:** I accept your ruling, Mr Deputy Speaker. Why is the Minister not in the House so that he can rebut these claims?

I have to use the word "dishonest" because during my speech I will be able to show that the Minister is dishonest. On occasions that he has been proven to be dishonest, he appears either not to care or he claims to have been defeated by Cabinet. These matters can be verified by the Aboriginal people. How can anyone ascertain whether or not the statement made by the Minister is honest? The Minister has said those things on so many occasions that one can only assume that he is not telling the truth.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has admitted that there is some doubt about his references to dishonesty. I suggest that the honourable member exercise discretion in what he is saying.

**Mr SCOTT:** Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. I will certainly exercise my discretion.

Another classic example is the ancillary property associated with Woorabinda that involves the telling of blatant untruths. The Minister is promoting a totally dishonest man—an employee of the Department of Community Services. I refer to a man named Lindsay Kimber. Recently, Mr Kimber was removed from a position of responsibility, that is, the control of a cattle operation at Edward River. Although people were happy about that, they were horrified to learn that Mr Kimber had been placed in charge of one of the Minister's pet million-dollar schemes at Lockhart River by the Minister personally. I intend to show that Mr Kimber is dishonest and that he should not be in charge of public money. I say that because he owes thousands of dollars to people who live throughout areas of Cape York Peninsula.

I have written to the Minister about one of the instances to which I have referred. I now draw another instance to the attention of the House. Mr Kimber owes \$4,000 to a person involved in the cattle industry, but he will not repay the debt. Recently, he received goods valued at more than \$1,000, which he proceeded to sell to Aboriginal people at Edward River. He was supposed to send the money back to an entrepreneur in the Tablelands area, but that money has not been returned. The person involved has approached me and has asked me to take the matter up with the Minister.

Lindsay Kimber has the power to summon the Minister from any meeting that he might be attending in the precincts of Parliament House. All he has to do is ring up, and the Minister will attend the call. I am pleased to note that the Minister has entered

the Chamber. I will be pleased to accept any points of order that he may care to draw to my attention. Mr Kimber must have something on the Minister when he can——

**Mr KATTER:** I rise to a point of order. The honourable member for Cook said that I am dishonest. He will remove that from the record.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** Order! I have asked the honourable member for Cook to use more discretion in his reference to the Minister; but, if the Minister now demands the deletion of the “dishonest” reference, I will insist that it be removed. I ask the honourable member for Cook to withdraw the word “dishonest”.

**Mr SCOTT:** If the Minister asks, I will withdraw the word “dishonest” and I ask that it be replaced in my speech with the word “untruthful”, which is a parliamentary word, and the Minister cannot deny that.

The man Kimber must know something shady about the Minister, because he just has to ring and he can get the Minister out of a meeting.

**Mr KATTER:** I rise to a further point of order. The honourable member for Cook has cast aspersions upon Mr Kimber, who was employed by the department. Therefore it is a reflection upon me when he says that Kimber has been dishonest.

Let me state to the House that, in the year before Mr Kimber went to Edward River, 300-odd cattle were mustered, and the year after he went to Edward River 4 000 head of cattle were mustered. I do not know about Mr Kimber’s being a dishonest man or a terrible employee, but I wish that the Department of Community Services had more people like him. The honourable member for Cook would not know much about cattle-mustering, so he could be forgiven for not understanding that point.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Northern Development and Community Services should not make a speech. He has raised a point of order. I suggest, as I suggested before, that if the honourable member for Cook insists on referring to people as being dishonest, he must expect some denial from the Minister and he must expect me to adjudicate. At times I will suggest that he prevent the argument from recurring in his speech.

**Mr SCOTT:** I am not sure what a point of order has to do with defending the integrity of a dishonest man employed by the Minister’s department.

A third example——

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

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Minister to state his point of order.

**Mr KATTER:** I rise to a point of order. If it is implied that Mr Kimber is a dishonest person, I consider that a reflection upon me. What he does in his private life in entirely his business. As an employee of the Government at Edward River, Mr Kimber mustered more than 4 000 one year after only 300-odd cattle had been mustered.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair is not particularly interested in the number of cattle that might have been on a property that is associated with the Minister’s department. The Chair is interested in the fact that, if a member attributes dishonesty to a person who is employed by the Minister’s department, that reflects upon the Minister.

**Mr Scott:** The Minister admitted that what the man does in his private time is his business.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister is entitled to object to the use of the word “dishonest” in that context. I suggest that the honourable member for Cook withdraw that word, as it reflects upon the Minister.

**Mr SCOTT:** A third example of the Minister’s untruthfulness was when he broke the confidence of a proposed barge-operator and spread his private proposals amongst a group of competitors. The Minister has no honesty; he has no integrity.

A councillor wrote a private letter, with some degree of praise, to the Minister. The Minister arranged for a paragraph of totally laudatory words to be added to that letter and then, without the writer's approval, had it published in a paper. The Minister is capable of anything.

**Mr KATTER:** I rise to a point of order. Again the honourable member has called me dishonest. I ask him to withdraw those remarks. I again state that the person that the honourable member is talking about, Mr Kimber, trained a black person to take his place. Mr Kimber is one of the very few employees in the State of Queensland who has done that for the Government. He should be applauded for it. Carlo Edwards now takes his place at Edward River.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! If the Minister wishes to make a ministerial statement about this matter, he may do so at an appropriate time. In the meantime, the member for Cook has withdrawn a comment that he made suggesting that the Minister was dishonest.

**Mr SCOTT:** Just ask the people of——

*Time expired.*

### Gold-mining

**Mr FITZGERALD (Lockyer) (12.50 p.m.):** I rise in this Matters of Public Interest debate to draw attention to the potentially disastrous consequences of the Federal Labor Government's proposed tax on the Queensland gold-mining industry. As a member of the ministerial mines and energy committee, I see this as one of the greatest threats not only to Queensland employment but also to Australia and its position as a nation that trades throughout the world.

The Queensland Government's position on this is very clear. It vigorously opposes any move by the Federal Labor Government to remove the income tax exemption on the mining of gold and related activities. The Government does not take this stand lightly. The introduction of a tax on gold-mining in Queensland will bring a promising industry that is still in its infancy to its knees. It will cause gold production in Queensland to fall by as much as 44 per cent. The State will see 18 per cent of those now engaged in gold-mining become unemployed, a decline in exploration and the development of new mines all but cease.

If the Federal Government tax on the gold-mining industry goes ahead, Queensland will not see the development of projects like Kidston or even the smaller proposed operations like Mount Leyshon or Pajingo. Ironically, these proposals will hit hardest at the income and employment opportunities presently available in the remote parts of this State and will do so at a time when these areas are highly dependent upon gold-mining activities and are extremely vulnerable to the slightest changes in their current cost structures.

World-wide, the past decade has witnessed a resurgence in gold exploration and gold-mining activity, a resurgence in which Queensland has been very much to the forefront. During the last financial year, gold production in this State doubled to \$170m. Since 1979-80, gold exploration expenditure has increased sevenfold. In 1978, gold was being sought in only 6 per cent of all authorities to prospect for minerals. By 1983, this had increased to 45 per cent and by the end of 1985 it had reached an all-time high of 67 per cent. In this State, 67 per cent of all authorities to prospect are being used in the search of gold. I do not think many members of the general public realise the importance that is placed upon this matter that I now raise in the House.

During the 1984-85 financial year, the Queensland gold industry experienced a dramatic 74 per cent increase in employment, to 761 persons employed. Of those, 331 lived in the far-north region of Queensland. I am interested to note that the Minister for Northern Development is presently in the House to listen to this speech. Another 140 lived in the north Queensland region. These figures fail to take into account the

number of small miners, estimated at June 1985 to be 200, who are not recorded in the official statistics of the Queensland Department of Mines.

By applying respective multipliers to the initial stimulus provided by the industry, it is found that the benefits of gold-mining to the Queensland economy are staggering. On the \$66.2m earned by gold in 1984-85, aggregate output would have risen to \$102.67m, with aggregate household income totalling \$29.7m, and with 1 708 people living off the gold industry in this State.

Honourable members should not forget, however, that the Kidston project, which has become widely known as a relatively low-cost producer, does not reflect the performance of the industry in general. The gold-mining industry in Queensland is characterised by a large number of small producers working alluvial deposits widely distributed over the State. These producers are exploiting deposits of marginal grades and tonnages that are too low to interest large mining companies.

Significantly, according to royalty returns lodged with the Department of Mines from 40 producers, almost 40 per cent declared a royalty loss for the last financial year. In other words, under the regulations that control royalty payments on gold-mining in this State, those companies did not earn enough profit to become eligible for the payment of royalty. The remainder reported profits ranging from \$1,000 to \$100,000. The Kidston gold mine is the only one that earned a profit, on which royalty is payable, of more than \$1m.

The Queensland Government's strong opposition to the proposed taxation of the gold-mining industry arises from a survey of the State's 80 producers that was undertaken over the Christmas/New Year period last year. The survey considered employment and current production levels, estimates of economic and recoverable reserves, details on past capital costs and estimates of future capital expense. The response from the industry towards the proposed tax is alarming and should be a matter of deep concern to us all in this House.

Honourable members should listen to what the gold-producers said. Thirty-four per cent of mines said that they would close. A further 65 per cent of mines said that they would reduce production. That does not leave very many, does it?

Among the smaller producers there will be reductions of 44 per cent. Many producers indicated that they would not go ahead with planned future production increases if the industry was subjected to the proposed tax.

Seventy-five per cent of the industry expected a decline in profitability as a result of the tax. That indicates that almost all producers were not in a position to benefit from the various tax deductions or tax loss offsets associated with the proposed tax.

Many producers indicated that they intend to revise or defer capital expenditure plans, while others reported that they would raise their mine cut-off grades and not work lower-grade reserves.

Sixty-seven per cent of the gold mines indicated that they would reduce their number of employees if the proposed additional tax on gold-mining was introduced, with an estimated reduction of 90 people or 18 per cent of the work-force.

A large number of miners indicated that they would not be able to engage in prospecting for or mining of other minerals, nor would they be able to find employment outside the mining sector. Hence, if a gold tax were introduced, those miners would need to apply for unemployment benefits.

Currently, a number of gold prospects are under active investigation and, provided that favourable economic and cost conditions continue, they are expected to come on stream within the foreseeable future. However, development of these prospects will be placed in jeopardy if the proposed tax goes ahead. I have not heard any denials from Federal sources that the Federal Government is interested in this tax. It is still hanging over the whole mining industry.

These projects include the Red Dome deposit near Chillagoe, with reserves of 9m tonnes, averaging 2.35 grams of gold per tonne; the Mount Leyshon deposit south of Charters Towers, with 6.3m tonnes of ore and an expected output of 35 000 to 40 000 ounces of gold per year; the Starra deposit east of Duchess, with published mineable reserves of 4.6m tonnes, averaging 6.5 grams per tonne; the Horn Island deposit near Thursday Island in Torres Strait, with a potential resource in excess of 1m tonnes of a grade exceeding 4 grams of gold per tonne; and the Pajingo gold prospect, where preliminary drilling yielded some spectacular results, which could lead to one of the largest new developments in Australia in the near future.

However, it must be remembered that these projects will never be another Kidston. They are deposits containing low-grade ores, which are currently at a very sensitive stage of development. Any changes, however slight, in the existing cost structure would reduce returns to investors and could adversely affect the progress of feasibility studies and jeopardise development.

Considering the depressed state of mining generally, the purported benefits of increased efficiency in the area of resource allocation resulting from the removal of the gold tax exemption must be doubtful. In addition, funds invested in gold-mining from overseas sources might not be switched to other areas of investment within Australia should gold be taxed.

Currently, gold is the major growth area of Australia's foreign trade, with an export value in 1984-85 of \$506m. I understand that it is projected to be \$1.2 billion in 1986-87. It is further projected that it could even go to \$3.6 billion in about two years' time if the present trend continues.

It must be remembered that when Australia's commodity prices tend to go down, gold tends to go up, and that it plays a very important part in our balance of trade. It is counter-cyclical, to put it one way. When prices go down, the price of gold goes up. That is an enormous benefit to Australia.

It would be absolutely foolish to tamper with the present conditions relating to the gold-mining industry. It would be absolute stupidity. However, I would not put it past the Federal Government to do so. That Government is looking for another dollar. The short-term gains would look very, very attractive to the Federal Government.

Australia has the potential to increase gold exports and gold export earnings significantly. That is particularly important in view of the stagnant export markets for most other metals, the expected decline in production from the Bass Strait oil-fields and the need, in due course, to import increasing quantities of oil to satisfy domestic demand.

In conclusion, I remind honourable members that there can be no doubt as to the effects upon the gold industry should the Federal Labor Government's proposal to remove income tax exemptions on the mining of gold proceed. The effects upon the economy of Queensland have been illustrated most clearly. The effects will be immediate and disastrous. The Queensland Government and I—and I hope all honourable members—support the gold-mining industry.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** Order! Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 36A, the time allotted for the debate on matters of public interest has now expired.

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

## PRIVILEGE

### Comments by Sir Robert Sparkes about Leader of the Opposition

**Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate—Leader of the Opposition) (2.15 p.m.):** I rise on a matter of privilege. My attention has been brought to comments made about me by the National Party President (Sir Robert Sparkes) on Brisbane radio. He said—

“There is not the slightest skerrick of evidence to support the baseless and malicious allegations that have been made by Warburton and the ALP generally.”

Sir Robert Sparkes also stated—

“I know the facts of the matter.”

Both quotes relate to a matter that is now the subject of a writ issued against me by the Premier, and both quotes relate to the alleged defamation settlement of \$400,000 or thereabouts.

Firstly, I believe the Sparkes statement to be prejudicial to a fair trial of this matter and that he is in contempt of court. Secondly, the Sparkes comments are themselves defamatory. Thirdly, if Sparkes has been given the facts of the matter as he stated on radio, then surely the Parliament and Queenslanders should be able to receive equal treatment. Obviously, confidentiality does not apply when the Premier talks to Sparkes.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** Order! The Leader of the Opposition's matter of privilege is noted.

### **PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

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

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Pay-roll Tax Act 1971-1985 in certain particulars and for a related purpose.”

Motion agreed to.

#### **First Reading**

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

#### **Second Reading**

**Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police)** (2.17 p.m.): I move—

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

This Bill gives effect to the increase in the pay-roll tax exemption level from \$300,000 to \$324,000, which was announced in the 1986-87 Financial Statement. This change will take effect on and from 1 January 1987.

On a full-year basis, this increase will mean that an employer with an annual pay-roll equal to or less than \$324,000 will be exempt from pay-roll tax. For those employers with pay-rolls exceeding \$324,000 the exemption will reduce by \$1 for every \$3 by which the pay-roll exceeds the maximum exemption level until the exemption is eliminated for pay-rolls of \$1.296m and over.

This new exemption level of \$324,000 is substantially higher than the exemption levels currently applying in the other States and with Queensland's already generous tapering arrangements, the Government continues to demonstrate its commitment to assisting the small employer. Further, all employers benefit from the Government's policy of not imposing a 1 per cent surcharge on larger pay-rolls.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Prest, adjourned.

### **PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

**Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg)** (2.18 p.m.), by leave: This morning during question-time the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) answered a question concerning the feral animal control campaign at Charleville, which was a CEP project. I found that answer personally offensive.

The Minister said that the Labor Party supported that project as a wasteful and inappropriate project for the rural people of Queensland. His remarks were personally

offensive to me as a member of the Labor Party. The applicant of this federally funded CEP project was the Federal Department of Primary Industries, together with its Queensland agent, the Lands Department Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board. The Federal Government will provide \$113,000 and the Queensland agent, the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board, will provide \$50,000.

The Minister for Primary Industries should apologise to Opposition members. Also, the Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying should demand an apology from the Minister for Primary Industries for his unmitigated attack on the officers of the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board who supported and will supervise that CEP project.

## FARM PRODUCE MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 9 September (see p. 1122) on Mr Turner's motion—

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

Mr KRUGER (Murrumba) (2.20 p.m.): My contribution to the debate on this legislation will be brief. However, I feel that I should mention some matters. I read with interest the Minister's second-reading speech in which he said—

“A licensed farm produce commercial seller can operate as either an agent or as a merchant or he can operate as both.

As an agent, the farm produce commercial seller receives produce from his principal, the grower, sells it and returns the proceeds, less commission and other allowable charges, to the grower.

As a merchant, the commercial seller buys the produce from the grower and resells it on his own account.”

That practice has been followed for some time.

I am concerned about a practice that occurs in the markets to a minor extent. Merchants who are up to date with the movement in prices and values are able to purchase goods from farmers who are not always aware of a possible increase in prices. The merchant then buys the goods from the grower at a price determined between them. Although that is a fair and reasonable operation, the principle of which cannot be knocked, one can certainly knock the practice of unscrupulous merchants buying at a price lower than the price they should be paying to the grower. Those circumstances arise occasionally because the produce is not purchased at the point of sale where a normal price structure would obtain. I am concerned about the growers. Although this legislation cannot overcome that problem, I would like to think that those people who operate unfairly can at some time be dealt with over the way in which they approach people.

Recently I heard about another problem that has occurred in the markets that I hope could be solved or legislated for. I understand that a few growers use more than one name. That practice is used to dodge tax. A grower might sell 200 cases of tomatoes. A reasonable number would be accepted as being expected to come from the grower. The balance would be supplied under a different name. Although that is not directly connected with the Bill before the House, it is a practice at the markets that ought to be examined and eliminated. Someone should make sure that people use their proper names so that they do not dodge tax. I am always worried about that because if somebody is dodging the payment of the correct amount of tax, it means that somebody else, including me, is paying more than he should. I hope that it is possible to overcome that problem.

The matter of trading hours has been brought to my attention on several occasions. Over the years trading hours have been adjusted to enable householders to go to the markets to buy goods. The purchasing power of the normal shop dropper or the combines

has changed. One section of the community always seems to be affected by the trading hours at the markets. If problems are being encountered, maximum sales benefits at the markets are not being achieved. I would like to think that the Minister will again examine that problem. As the matter has been brought to my attention, I would hope that a suitable arrangement could be arrived at. At this stage I am not sure what the solution to the problem is, so I am not going to tell the Minister or his staff what to do to overcome it. As the problem does exist, I would be grateful if it could be examined and a new arrangement entered into.

On 18 October 1978 in this Chamber I made a speech about the marketing of fruit and vegetables. On that occasion I referred to the purchasing power of combines. Those combines are still creating a problem for me and other people throughout this State. When I speak about combines, I refer to Coles, Woolworths and other retailers that used to have in their shops as a matter of convenience for persons purchasing grocery lines a small section that was devoted to fruit and vegetables. I understand that the value of a product is generally judged by the floor area that it takes up in a shop. If honourable members were to visit combines they would find that the largest floor area is taken up by the fruit and vegetable section. That is because there is such a massive turnover of fruit and vegetables.

In the past the combines and the people who were selling their produce used to say, "We have X amount of waste. The line has gone off and we have to cop the waste problems. Therefore, we must charge a bigger mark-up."

Nowadays vegetable-growers are more up-to-date with the sprays that are used to overcome fungus problems and other factors that cause break-downs. As a result, those problems do not arise to the same degree as they did in the past.

The person who purchases goods from the markets and resells them to the public does not have the wastage that used to occur. The power of those people is enormous, and I will elaborate on that aspect later.

The Minister in his second-reading speech referred to the fidelity bond, which is something that all members believe to be reasonable. I believe that the people who have not been responsible in relation to the fidelity bond should be brought into line so that if problems arise money will be available to meet their responsibilities. I compliment the Minister for mentioning that matter and updating the fidelity bond.

Members speak about consignment notes, which have been around for quite a long time. For a long time I have supplied the markets with fruit and vegetables and I have always completed a consignment note. They are always available from the agents. In relation to packaged lines, the crates or cases are marked according to the regulations that were laid down. Once that is done, a consignment is safeguarded.

A different situation exists with relation to loose lines such as pineapples, cabbages and cauliflowers that are not packaged. The only way in which a person consigning to a particular agent can achieve an honest declaration of what is contained in consignments of that type is to have a consignment note. That is one aspect that needs tightening up.

In the past I used to worry about consignment notes because of the way in which they were handled and whether the correct contents were stated on the consignment note.

I turn now to some figures that were produced in this Parliament in 1978. The producers of fruit and vegetables are aware of the thrashing they are receiving. Those people who purchase fruit and vegetables also complain about the price of the goods that they have purchased. Commission agents at the Brisbane Markets claim that they are not making much commission.

In 1978 I stated that the rip-off at the market is caused in no small way by the combines that purchase there. The combine operation completely dominates the price of fruit and vegetables at the market. Some people will deny that, but from my own

experience I know that they do have a major effect on prices. Unfortunately the results of the dealings of the combines are felt by the house-holder a day or two later.

I now wish to give some examples of what I was growing in 1975. At that time I was growing cabbages fairly extensively. I took to the market a load of cabbages that would have averaged 15 pounds a head. Those cabbages sold at the Brisbane Markets for 9c a head. On the same day those cabbages were sold at the K-Mart at Chermside for 9c a pound. That represents a significant mark-up. At that time I stated that there was something wrong with the system of marketing when 15-pound cabbages were sold for 9c a pound as against the price at the market of 9c a head.

I believe that somewhere along the line the price structuring in the market should be examined, together with the combines, the other purchasers and the mark-ups to the public in general.

When I was a lad it was common to buy oranges or apples for approximately £3 or £4 per case—which is now \$6 or \$8. In the *Telegraph* of 4 October 1978—which was some time after I was a lad—oranges were quoted at \$4 to \$4.60 per case. Despite inflation and the fact that the cost of cases and sprays has increased considerably over the years, oranges were being sold for less than they had been 20 years previously. That demonstrates that there is something very wrong with the marketing and distribution of fruit and vegetables.

On 4 October 1978 cabbages were advertised in the newspapers as bringing 10c to 15c per head. However, the recommended price in the retail outlets was 15c to 20c, which is almost double the price. What occurs is that the higher price is being quoted as the purchase price and the lower price as the selling price. The system does not work like that. Goods are bought in bulk. If the going rate is 10c to 15c, most of those items will be purchased at 10c and will be sold on the top range of the scale, which is 20c. That represents a doubling-up effect. Carrots sold at 15c to 25c a kilogram were expected to sell at from 30c to 50c a kilogram. Those prices were taken out of the *Telegraph*.

**Mr De Lacy:** That is the red net bag.

**Mr KRUGER:** With onions, the red net bag always causes a class distinction, particularly when compared to the yellow bag. Now, the brown bag has also crept in. I am not sure how that will be handled.

At the same time, tomatoes were selling at between 20c and 34c a pound in the markets and bringing 40c to 85c a pound in the shops. Cauliflowers, at 15c to 40c, were selling in the shops at 40c to \$1.25. Cases of oranges containing 150 were selling at the markets at \$5 a case, or 3½c each, and were expected to be sold at the shops at up to 12c each.

The problem at the markets is that merchants are selling at a large mark-up, and the customers are paying for it. A line that merchants sell readily is pumpkins. They were selling at that time at \$4.50 for a 140 pound sack, which is 3c a pound, and were selling at the shops at 12c a pound. That is a 400 per cent mark-up.

Honourable members know who is paying for those mark-ups. It is certainly not the grower who is getting it. When I was growing produce, people would say to me, "Hey, look what we are paying for your pumpkins. God, you must be making a fortune." That was not so at all. The farmers are being accused of making a fortune, when in fact many receive very limited income.

I will not mention all the details, because many were mentioned before. I have a graph that I want to speak about. I will make some comparisons with that. In 1964, Granny Smith apples had a mark-up of 61.3 per cent, in 1974 it was 105 per cent and in 1986 the mark-up is about 233 per cent. If honourable members were interested in perusing those figures with me, I would be prepared to show them how it works. In beans and some of those lines, increases of up to 263 per cent have occurred. On the prices that I took out, tomatoes had a 200 per cent mark-up.

As, under the Farm Produce Marketing Act, merchants are involved—it used to be the agents only—the matters of pricing structure and mark-ups have to be investigated. The problem will take more than five minutes to sort out, but it has to be kept in front of the public, the Department of Primary Industries and the legislators so that efforts will be made to provide a fairer and better operation for the people generally.

I was concerned at a statement by one speaker last night about the problems of the fruit and vegetable industry and the horticultural industry caused by strikes at the wharves. Several instances were mentioned. I point out that, in many instances, over-production still creates a greater problem for the producer than do strikes at the wharves. Occasionally, a strike has caused commodities on the wharf to deteriorate, embarrassing the supplier; but a problem also occurs when an oversupply or break-down occurs on the farm. Although the product has not been packaged, the problem is still significant. Honourable members must consider how control of some sort might be gained over the amount of produce that is available.

**Mr R. J. Gibbs:** It applies particularly to tomatoes; people pick them green.

**Mr KRUGER:** There is another problem with tomatoes. Many people are picking them in a green state; but, once they are ripe, that is it. Within a few days the fruit is lost completely. Break-downs and other losses on the farm are significant.

A problem exists with greengrocers. Mention has been made frequently in this place about trying to ban the material that is coming from New Zealand and other places. Greengrocers have been purchasing imported lines from the markets. I would like the Minister and his staff to note that the greengrocers are purchasing lines from New Zealand—Kiwifruit and that type of thing—because they are packed and presented better.

The greengrocers take imported lines to their stalls because they are able to sell products from a well-presented and well-packed line of goods. I am confident that the people I spoke to know what they are talking about. They have told me that Queensland and Australian products are not as attractive as some of the imported produce. If that is so, the matter should be investigated. The packaging of produce for display should be upgraded to make Australian products competitive. Not only is imported produce more attractive but it is also better protected while in transit. The purchaser can be assured that the article is in good condition; that it will not crumble or crack up because it has been battered and bruised in transit.

The Department of Primary Industries should be constantly aware of the importance of packaging. I acknowledge that there has been much improvement in the style of packaging fruit and vegetables over the last few years. A greater variety of packaging materials is available today that has replaced the wooden cases that were used to pack tomatoes, for example.

It is also important to ensure that Australia's produce is of a standard that will make it competitive with other countries. There is no point in complaining about other countries being able to produce a better product and present it in a better way. Australia has to meet the challenge and lift its standards.

Marketing is another very important aspect that should be taken into account, in particular, in the sale of produce overseas. Recently, concern has been expressed about scientific treatment of fruit and vegetables to provide a competitive advantage for produce that is to be sold on the open market. Leaving aside the controversy associated with treatment of produce, I draw to the attention of the House the fact that Queensland produces a product that is not much affected by fruit-fly or disease that has created the need for that treatment. I refer to pumpkin. When I toured New Zealand recently, I asked whether or not pumpkin was eaten in New Zealand, because it was not presented as part of a meal. I was told that it is not available because New Zealand's pumpkin crops are exported. A person involved in farm produce remarked to me that, because Queensland is one of the biggest producers of pumpkin or has in the past been one of the largest areas involved in growing pumpkins, it must be madness that prevents

Queensland from exporting its pumpkin crops. The markets that have been found by New Zealand have not been touched by Queensland producers. If producers are not able to obtain access to overseas markets for their product, something must be wrong with Queensland's marketing.

I suppose that the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) will tell the House that, because of the policies of the Federal Government, farm produce is not exported. I point out to the Minister, however, that the Queensland Government also operates a department concerned with primary industry production and marketing.

**Mr Milliner:** There are a lot of pumpkin heads on the Government side.

**Mr KRUGER:** Everybody knows about the problems that have occurred in the National Party Government; the issues have been well canvassed, and do not require any comment by me.

The purpose of my contribution to the debate is to direct the attention of the Minister to improvements that could be effected so that positive results can be achieved. I suggest that the Department of Primary Industries should pursue the matter of obtaining overseas markets for farm produce. The marketing of pumpkins by New Zealand highlights the inability of the Queensland Government to break into new markets. That is a downright disgrace. I do not know how the New Zealand Government dropped on to its efficient method of marketing. I was not able to obtain any details.

If my information is correct, however, Queensland ought to avail itself of overseas markets. Some time ago, even before I was elected to Parliament, Queensland was renowned for its early spring production of pumpkins. At that time, the growers would have appreciated the opportunity of selling their product on an overseas market. Instead, they had to rely on southern markets, which become a bit tetchy from time to time over the issue of contamination by disease or fruit-fly, in spite of the fact that damage to the produce is limited. The purpose of the example I have given is to draw to the attention of the House that there is one line at least that could benefit from improved techniques of production and exporting.

I pay tribute to officers of the Department of Primary Industries for improvements that have boosted the yield of crops of tomatoes and for improvements in the variety of products that can be grown in Queensland. Crops that have never before been grown in Queensland are producing excellent yields. Further improvement could be made to access to marketing outlets, although I acknowledge that a good deal of research has already been undertaken. The development of marketing techniques is in its early stages, and more attention should be given to that field of endeavour, to ensure that Queensland producers will benefit.

I turn my attention now to market activities that are carried on at the Brisbane Markets. There is need for a review of the span of trading hours and accessibility to the market's operations. I am aware that some people hold the opinion that agents are not entirely honest in their dealings. I have heard it said that there would not be one honest agent operating at the markets. Of course, that is not right: there are at least a couple.

Some of the problems caused by agents' methods of carrying on their business ought to be investigated by the Minister and officers of his department with a view to providing benefit for not only the producer and the middle-man, but also the house-holder. Moreover, control should be exercised over the activities of combined interest groups that dictate the margin of mark-up on fruit and vegetable produce.

**Mr INNES (Sherwood) (2.38 p.m.):** The Bill relates to the operations carried on at the Brisbane Markets. The Brisbane Markets are situated in the electorate of Archerfield, abut the electorate of Yeronga, and are adjacent to the electorate of Sherwood. Some of the people who operate in the markets live in my electorate. I have been a regular visitor to the markets and speak with the agents from time to time.

I wish to point to the significance to my electorate of some of the developments that have taken place. I will have a few words to say about the actual operations engaged in at the markets.

The Act seems to have provided a battleground for the fears, suspicions or paranoia of producers who constantly assert or claim or believe that they are being ripped off by the agents.

**Mr R. J. Gibbs:** It is called free enterprise.

**Mr INNES:** I am about to deal with that. I am glad that the words "free enterprise" are intruding into the consciousness of the honourable member for Wolston.

The reality is that the maintenance of the markets and of a significant number of agents—the availability of the different stands; the different sections—is one of the best protections that the grower will have in relation to the establishment of reasonable prices and reasonable efficiencies with regard to the disposal of his produce. The Brisbane Markets, or any markets of their size, are a very remarkable operation. The amount and diversity of produce that goes to those markets from every corner of Australia and is distributed from them is immense. It is a tribute to the entire industry, from producer through agent to retailer, that such a sophisticated operation can be conducted with such a perishable product.

From my knowledge of agents within the market, I do not agree with, and would refute, the suggestion that there might be two honest agents in the markets. I think that is a pack of rubbish. If people have evidence of specific deception or dishonesty, they should be allowed to put it before the Minister and the people who are empowered under the Act to do something about it.

In a previous debate I recalled an occasion on which I went to the markets early in the morning when a consignment of peaches, in that instance from Victoria, had to be condemned because when one that looked magnificent on the outside was broken open, it was found to be completely soft round the stone. That was not restricted to just one peach. Peach after peach was totally soft round the stone and absolutely unsaleable. I was present when the agent rang the principal in Victoria to explain that. Quite clearly, the fellow at the other end was quite horrified because it was a very big consignment. That incident illustrated the sort of things that can happen.

The maintenance of the market system—and certainly I strongly support the maintenance of large numbers of sections and bays—is the protection for the producer. If the agent is found to be doing the wrong thing by the producer, the producer should darn well change the agent. It would be quite proper for word to get around and for such an agent to lose his repeat trade, his credibility and goodwill. There is obviously an incentive to the agent to do the right thing by his grower by remaining as his agent. There is also an incentive to the agent to get a good price, if the agent is in the business of agency as opposed, perhaps, to merchanting. The higher the price, the higher the fee.

The chamber involved does a magnificent job in attempting to impose ethics, standards, responsibility, liaison, consultation and arbitration on behalf of the agents, and also in dealing directly with growers and others. I speak up on behalf of the agents, who generally do a very good job.

I was glad to see in the Bill a provision that relates to softening the automatic consequences of minor breaches of the Act. I think the Minister is fully aware of a recent incident concerning somebody in the markets who was used to operating in another State. At the end of an inspectorial function, some discrepancies of as little as literally \$2 or \$3—it might have been \$10—were found in a stack of consignments of produce. The consequences of a conviction as a result of those discrepancies could have been fatal—a conviction for what, in a whole balance of transactions and very large amount of money, was really not indicative of fraud or dishonesty but amounted to some minimal discrepancy.

**Mr Turner:** It shows how forward thinking you can be.

**Mr INNES:** I regret that the Minister for Primary Industries is retiring from Parliament, and I have said that before. He displays practical good sense. I regret that he will leave this place after the coming election and will pass on control of the general markets area to somebody else. I hope that that somebody else is someone with the same common sense as the Minister has.

I wish to speak briefly about the site of the Brisbane Markets and the consequences that flow to the surrounding area, which, of course, is the place covered primarily by this legislation. The markets were established before the 1974 floods. Obviously, after major investment and the tremendous upheaval in moving from the old Roma Street site, it is reasonable that the markets expand their activity on or about the present site.

Honourable members will recall that after the 1974 flood what was called a regulation line was established and development was to be restricted within it wherever possible. It defined more or less the height to which the flood rose in the Brisbane area. The Oxley Creek flood plain was a primary site of that flooding and, in residential terms, my electorate was one of the most, if not the most, severely affected electorates in the State. About 1 000 homes lie along the Oxley Creek frontage. The area is an active flood plain. It is a very large flood system. The Blunder/Oxley system goes right back beyond Greenbank. By itself and under local conditions, it is quite capable of flooding—apart altogether from water brought down the Brisbane River in a flood. Therefore, my constituents and I are very sensitive about what goes on along the flood plain.

We accept that there are people with private property rights established before the 1974 flood. Those people established themselves, having forgotten about the 1893 flood and having perhaps not realised that a flood of the severity of the 1974 flood could occur once every 50 years. There are people who have private rights to development and have pursued those rights since 1974.

I do not want to argue the point, but the Brisbane Markets were supposed to have developed since 1974 by removing soil from one part of the flood plain to provide the pad for the more recent development, so that in overall terms there is no volumetric change in the flood plain to aggravate any further flooding. Because I fear the possibility of another flood, I have looked at the area pretty closely. I have found that the situation of the flood plain has deteriorated markedly because of the extent of development since that time.

Very recently, flood-mitigation works have taken place in an area adjoining the Brisbane Markets site, through the research farm of the Department of Primary Industries, which is across Sherwood Road, and down to the creek mouth. The general effect of that action is to accelerate the rate of flow-off rather than to reduce the amount of flooding. It is the activities that will potentially increase the height of future floods about which I am most concerned. Certain car-wrecking and scrap facilities have developed in the area. The stockpiles of materials have increased enormously since the floods. Others have used their pre-existing private property rights for development within the regulation line.

The Department of Primary Industries occupies a large area of substantially uncommitted ground across Sherwood Road from the markets. On that site is a beef cattle research facility. Until very recently there were also pig and poultry research facilities. I understand that they have been removed elsewhere. Some earthworks have taken place on the site of the old poultry facility immediately opposite the markets.

In recent years there has been some suggestion that the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze), on behalf of trotting interests, had an interest in acquiring the land. On behalf of the interests of the people in my electorate and on behalf of many of my constituents, I urge the Government, which is capable of taking corporate, responsible decisions, to maintain the present farm, which is the largest area of uncommitted land right in the guts—right in the centre—of the lower flood plain. That land is used perfectly as a beef cattle research facility and for such low-rise structures as poultry runs. My constituents and I believe that it would be wrong to release that land for substantial building development purposes, because that would be contrary to the lesson of 1974 and contrary to what was intended in the few years immediately after

1974, when people remembered the devastation, the loss and the horror. Unfortunately, time is moving on and people are forgetting the reality that, in a geological time-frame, that can and will happen again. It is bound to happen again. Even using human time-frames, the 1974 flood was a once-in-50-year flood. In the last century, floods occurred a number of times. So, my constituents and I consider that the present use of the Department of Primary Industries land is exactly the sort of use to which it should be put.

The Government is a corporate landlord with special responsibilities, without the stringent financial constraints imposed on owners of small parcels of private land. The Government is in a better position to act responsibly in the interests of the area. It would not be desirable for the markets to undertake substantial development across Sherwood Road from their present site.

Of course, it has been rumoured or suggested that it might become the site of an irradiation plant. I would object to that. Although that would facilitate certain functions of the markets, many other people in my electorate and I urge upon the Government that, if such a plant is to be built, it should be built somewhere other than on the flood plain.

I will not become involved in an argument about technology. I accept that there is a very substantial body of scientific opinion that would suggest that that technology is safe. Clearly, an irradiation plant could be of benefit to our export trade for horticultural and farm produce generally. So be it. I encourage the expansion of trade from Queensland; however, I and many of my constituents believe that the facilities should be built outside the Oxley Creek flood plain.

From fishing around, I understand that it was suggested that some sort of understanding was arrived at with the Under Treasurer that if certain things were done in regard to funding the relocated pig and poultry experimental facilities, the Department of Primary Industries would relinquish part of its land on Sherwood Road, which could be sold, thereby offsetting the financial losses.

I can understand why the Under Treasurer would wish to make the Government dollar go as far as possible. However, if making that dollar go as far as possible goes against the interests of my constituents and involves the sort of development that will aggravate future flood conditions, I oppose it. I call on the Government to honour its broader community obligations and responsibility to stop such development.

About two years ago, a study was undertaken to find an alternative to the Willawong noxious and hazardous chemical dump. That study, apparently with some deliberation, considered a variety of sites, two of which, astonishingly, were even lower down the Oxley/Blunder Road flood plain and were only about 400 to 500 metres away from the DPI farm to which I have referred.

**Mr Davis:** Build on the flood plains.

**Mr INNES:** Yes, on a flood plain.

Within two months of that becoming public knowledge, I was able to take television cameras in to show both of those sites under water. One really begins to despair about the lack of local knowledge of the people who supposedly are professionally qualified to draw lines on plans and demonstrate realistic expertise in these matters.

Local people in my electorate know what devastation a flood can cause. The DPI farm there is the perfect use in that situation. So those local people and I urge the Minister and his department not to listen to the blandishments of the markets—the markets can develop their own side of the road—and not to facilitate intensive development beyond the type that is presently permitted there. That development is perfect for the area and, in view of the 1974 flood, is in keeping with the overall responsibilities of the Government.

**Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (2.54 p.m.):** I endorse the remarks of the Opposition spokesman (Mr De Lacy) and the honourable member for Murrumba (Mr Kruger) in regard to the proposed amendments to the Farm Produce Marketing Act.

It is very important to realise that this legislation is catch-up legislation and that it complements legislation already operating in New South Wales and Victoria.

The legislation is very important to the Bundaberg district, which is the largest expanding horticultural district in Queensland. Many of the farmers who send their produce south, when they put their produce on the trucks or the trains, feel vulnerable and susceptible to the actions of the commercial sellers.

The amendments made under the Farm Produce Marketing Act Amendment Bill will improve the safety and reduce the vulnerability of farmers from the commercial problems of selling their products.

The horticultural industry in Bundaberg has increased more than tenfold in less than a decade. That is due to the innovative and efficient farmers in the district. Bundaberg produces a very wide range of products, including avocados. Last year the Bundaberg district sold 38 100 containers of avocados with a value of \$388,000. Pineapples were also produced in Bundaberg for both the fresh and processed markets. A total of 6 000 containers of fresh pineapples were sold for \$73,000, and 3 390 tonnes of processed pineapples for \$806,000. The bean industry has also increased markedly over the past decade. The district produced 16 800 bags of fresh beans valued at \$426,000 and 1 780 tonnes of processed beans valued at over \$425,000. The Bundaberg district produced 54 100 containers of button squash valued at \$584,000. Supplies of capsicum are sent to all the eastern coastal States and Bundaberg produced 286 200 containers of fresh capsicums, worth—

Mr Wharton interjected.

Mr CAMPBELL: Yes, it did.

They were valued at \$1,721,100. 343 tonnes of processed capsicums valued at \$139,000 were also produced. I appreciate the comments made by the honourable member for Burnett (Mr Wharton) because it did take him a while to appreciate the horticultural industry in this district. Within the last three years the honourable member for Burnett, and the Queensland Government, have supplied, due to very strong representations made by me, new Government offices in Bundaberg for the Department of Primary Industries staff, together with a horticultural research station. The people do appreciate that kind of effort that is now being made by the Queensland Government.

The Bundaberg district provided 216 100 cases of cucumbers valued at \$1,218,000. Last year 273 100 cartons of rock-melons were sold for \$3,170,200 and 10 230 tonnes of water-melons for \$818,300. The district produced 3 650 tonnes of pumpkins valued at \$730,000. The district's largest income comes from fresh tomatoes, and 5 504 000 cartons were sold for \$44,475,000.

The total value of the horticultural crops from Bundaberg was \$65,629,280 and that is a great achievement by the innovative farmers in the district. Over \$65m-worth of produce leaves Bundaberg each year, and the farmers have to ensure that they do get paid for it.

The Labor Party does welcome these amendments, particularly the fidelity bond, which will improve the protection of growers against possible default by commercial sellers. The ALP welcomes the streamlining of the administration of the registration of the commercial sellers of farm produce and the fact that the two problems that have arisen with merchant transactions under the existing Act—that is the established price and the time within which payment is made to the grower—will be better defined and will offer better protection for the growers. It is very important that these amendments have been made.

The Minister commented on the export of fruit and vegetables from Queensland. It is very important that this aspect of Queensland export markets is looked at. As the member for Murrumba (Mr Kruger) said, more work has to be done in that area. It is very important for farmers to get their act together in the development and promotion of export markets for their produce. As the honourable member said, one thing that is

lacking in Queensland is good packaging. In the past, many farmers have adopted a farm-gate mentality. They must overcome that mentality and examine what is being put on the consumer's table.

The COD ought to be congratulated on the way in which it has promoted its different products. One matter that is not being examined frequently enough is the setting of a standard for the quality of fruit and vegetables. In other words, a consistent quality is needed, as is a consistent size, a consistent keeping quality and a consistent taste to ensure that when Queensland's fruit and vegetables are exported overseas the customers know what they are getting. If a quality product is not produced, new markets will not be penetrated. It is very important that the market knows that when a producer decides to export a Bowen tomato that that is the same as a Bundaberg tomato; otherwise, if different gradings and standard apply, markets will not be retained.

The Opposition endorses the amendments being made to the Farm Produce Marketing Act, because the legislation will catch up with what has been done in Victoria and New South Wales. It will provide more safety and reduce the vulnerability and susceptibility of farmers in the sale of their produce.

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (3.1 p.m.): During the debate some very important remarks, particularly about the marketing of primary products in Queensland, have been made. I want to destroy some myths that surround farming in Queensland. Firstly, it is not insignificant that at a time when the former representative party of farmers in this State, the old Country Party, has changed its name to the National Party, it has in many respects turned its back on the traditional farm base from which it came.

It is also significant to note that, coinciding with that political turn against the farmer, there is also a deliberate change in the real power base so far as agriculture in this State is concerned. Fruit and vegetables and many other commodities are coming under corporate control. In many places this is known as agribusiness. Huge corporations completely dictate and control agricultural industries. Despite the Farm Produce Marketing Act and many other Acts relating to primary producers in this State, farmers in Queensland and generally in Australia no longer have control over their own farms. That is one of the very real problems now being encountered.

Frequently I hear Opposition members talking about the special consideration that should be given to farmers. I know that my colleague the honourable member for Brisbane Central (Mr Davis) has carried out a special study on taxation concessions given to farmers in this State. It could well be that the honourable member will introduce those matters into this debate at a later stage. The study shows that farm produce is in some respects the old sacred cow of industries. What is really happening is that a change to corporate control of agriculture is taking place. I cite Elders as one example. The old Elders-Smith/Goldsbrough Mort/IXL Henry Jones—whatever one likes to call the conglomerate that has been put together—is a classic example. Such organisations have complete control over plant control and farmers. Once a farmer ties himself to one of those corporate structures, it dictates to him right along the chain. It goes from the plant stock to the chemicals, insecticides, pesticides and fertilisers that are used on the crops. It includes the machinery and parts that are used to cultivate, process and harvest the crops. In many instances the corporate structure has control over harvesting dates and, in some cases, crop selection. They control the processing industries, insurance, finance, marketing, consumer sales and other sectors right down the line.

As I said before, because of the old Country Party's style of farm-gate philosophy, the farmer no longer controls his own farm or farm produce. That philosophy was that once it left the farm someone else ought to worry about it.

That is one of the major problems of the agricultural industry in Australia in general, but more particularly in Queensland because of our heavy reliance on agriculture. In Queensland, more than in any other State, the agricultural industries have been the sacred cow of the old Country Party, the predecessor of the National Party.

At the present time farmers are dictated to by the corporate structures. They are controlled in every aspect. The corporate structures, of course, are not worried about droughts, floods, fluctuations in prices or the problems that are being created for the man on the land. Those problems do not interest the corporate structures. If the corporate structures cannot obtain sufficient products from the farmers with whom they are dealing in order to feedstock their processing industries and their consumer outlets, they simply import those products. That is why Australia has such a huge balance of trade problem. The last statistics that I saw showed that each year Queensland purchases \$760m worth of food from other States of Australia. Of course, a great deal is also imported from overseas.

Much has been said in recent times about the New Right, or what I call the tired old Right. Members of the New Right are always speaking about the need to help the Australian farmers and their markets and to do everything possible for the people involved in primary industries. I refer to people such as Katharine West, Des Keegan and Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen. Perhaps the worst offender of all is the National Farmers Federation President, Mr Ian McLachlan, who also happens to be a director of Elders IXL, which is one of the biggest agribusinesses of all. It is one of the biggest corporations controlling agriculture in Queensland. Elders IXL keeps on deriving profits from the toil and sweat of farmers. Whether there be flood or drought, good times or bad, Elders IXL still gets its pound of flesh from all farmers in Australia. Of course, Ian McLachlan gets his share of that, yet he runs round the countryside claiming that the terrible things that are happening to farmers have been caused by other people. He never blames the corporate structures within the agricultural industry. I blame the corporate structures more than any other entity for the problems that exist within the farming community at the present time.

**Mr Davis:** Mr Elliott is well involved in IXL. What is his role?

**Mr CASEY:** I understand that Mr Elliott, who is also the treasurer of the Federal Liberal Party—many Liberal Party members in this House would like to see him promoted to Federal leader of the Liberal Party—is the managing director of Elders IXL. I will give more details about that later.

Of course, Elders IXL is not the only large agribusiness. Another, which controls the frozen fruit and vegetable industry in particular, is Adsteam, previously known as the Adelaide Steamship Company. Adsteam has a direct tie with Elders IXL. If an examination were to be made, it would be found that many of the people are members of both boards. Adsteam controls approximately 90 per cent of some farm commodities in Australia.

Much criticism has emanated from Mr McLachlan and other members of the so-called New Right—or the tired old Right. However, there has been no criticism of the farm control that is imposed by corporations over the farmers of Australia and their marketing.

As I understand it, the biggest problem these days is the cut-back in wages and the discounting of wages. People are having problems finding enough money to purchase their food, whether it be fresh or processed. Unless the Bill is oriented towards the consumers of this State, enabling them to walk into a supermarket and purchase quality food at prices that they can afford, it is a waste of time.

The financial pages of *The Australian Financial Review*, *The Courier-Mail*, *The Australian* or any other paper reveal that the corporations that control the agribusiness in Queensland are still making huge profits. In fact, Elders IXL and Adsteam are making so much profit that they have finished up embroiling themselves in a fight to see who will own BHP, Australia's biggest company. Between them, those companies have billions of dollars, not just a few hundred thousand, in turn-over every year from agribusiness in Australia. Those companies are now trying to buy overseas corporations. Elders is trying to buy Allied-Lyons in the United Kingdom.

A moment ago, the honourable member for Brisbane Central (Mr Davis) referred to Mr Elliott's recently buying a new, small \$11m jet. Only two people in Australia can afford that—the managing director of Elders IXL and the leader of the Queensland Government, the Premier. They are the only two in Australia to have a jet of that type and size.

Agribusinesses are making money out of the farmers in the State of Queensland by coming in over the top and controlling the market. Honourable members only have to study history to discover how the huge corporations control the agribusiness. The best example is in the United States of America. Research on agribusiness in the USA has been very well developed over the years. It cannot be questioned that, where corporate farming prevails, the rural community declines. In the areas in the United States that were formerly occupied by mixed farming and fruit and vegetable businesses—and problems are occurring in the large grain areas now—rural poverty prevails and Government support services for the community are poorer than anywhere else in the United States. Researched facts show clearly that that occurs in the United States. It is starting to occur in Queensland also. Because of the decline in population brought about by people leaving rural areas and the more intensified farming in other sectors, the small farmers—the fruit and vegetable farmers, as they were once known—will perhaps in a few years completely disappear. That segment of farming will be controlled absolutely by the large agricultural businesses or corporations.

Farmers tend to blame everybody except the agribusiness firms for their problems. They blame the unions and the Government—especially Labor Governments—as well as the marketing style of the EC; but the simple fact is that the future of many aspects of agriculture in this State lies in their own hands. The people who are responsible are those who are supposed to be leading them. The president of the National Farmers Federation is a classical example.

As corporations increase their vertical structure control of food, from farms through to supermarkets, they make more profits and the farmers make less. I urge honourable members to visit the local supermarket and observe the way in which the food is displayed and marketed. I have done that. That is the end product and that is where to start—with the consumers.

As many people know, one of the easy ways of marketing peas and beans these days is in frozen packages. In the large supermarkets, a tremendous number of product brands can be seen in the large freezers—for example Diamond, Edgell, Birds Eye, and Hy Peak. In actual fact, however, they are all manufactured by the same processing group—Petersville. Who owns the Petersville group? Adelaide Steamship, or Adsteam. So no competition really exists at all. The housewife does not have a range of choice in products that line the supermarket shelves because they are all produced by one organisation.

A recent article indicated that approximately 90 per cent of the frozen vegetable market in Australia is controlled completely and absolutely by Adsteam. The remaining 10 per cent is controlled by McCain Foods Australia Pty Ltd, which is an Australian subsidiary of a Canadian company. That is typical of the arrangements that operate to market products for sale in supermarkets. The products are merely the processed form of food that is grown in Queensland. Another example is jam that is sold in Queensland. The main brands are Elders, IXL and Cottee's. It should be noted that the parent company that controls Cottee's operates in the United States of America.

The matter I wish to refer to next may not fall strictly within the scope of the legislation, although some of the commodities that I will mention could be affected by the Bill. Pies and pastries produced under the brand name of Wedgewood Pies are produced under the control of Adsteam, which has complete control over the marketing outlets for that product. The organisational activity of Adsteam stretches as far as retail outlets, such as David Jones Limited. Companies such as Adsteam derive profits from every stage of the vertical integration process that is applied to primary produce. The end result is that the farmer is paid a fraction of the price charged for the completed

article. As soon as a large organisation obtains a monopoly control over an industry, it can manipulate the prices that are charged in supermarkets.

The so-called specials in the supermarkets are not really specials at all. Some particular brands are simply marketed in such a way that a large quantity will be sold quickly. An alternative to that kind of system does exist. Unfortunately, the alternative has been lost sight of in Queensland. The Queensland Parliament has provided a legislative framework that will enable more producer co-operatives to become involved in the marketing process. Unfortunately, the legislative structure has been cast aside: instead, people try to work round the legislative provisions. I do not refer to the strict marketing control that is engaged in by the various marketing boards that operate in Queensland.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** Order! I do not think that that is a matter that relates to the legislation that is presently before the House.

**Mr CASEY:** I am attempting to draw a comparison. The legislation that is presently before the House is very important because the original Act has implications for the operation of other provisions that relate to farm produce. An attempt should be made to integrate all the provisions so that a successful future for agriculture can be assured. The principles enshrined in the various Acts must be integrated so that farmers receive a better return for their product.

I believe that is one of the important matters that the Minister has turned his mind to in presenting the legislation that is before the House today. He remarked during his second-reading speech that the intent of the legislation was to ensure a better and more secure return to Queensland farmers. I believe that that can be achieved. Rather than allowing matters to breeze along by implementing the provisions of this legislation only, I believe that the provisions of the Bill will be successful only if they can be implemented in conjunction with the provisions of other Acts that presently operate in Queensland.

Mr Deputy Speaker, you would be aware of one of the best examples of the efficient processing of agricultural products in this State. I refer to the operations of sugar-mills that are controlled by co-operatives. On the whole, sugar-mills are operated successfully. The exception may not be an appropriate topic that is for discussion in this debate.

As an example of the kind of integration I refer to, I instance the dairy co-operatives that have produced yoghurt and other dairy products in conjunction with the fruit and vegetable industry. Products such as puddings can be sold in supermarkets and conveniently prepared for consumption. As indicated by purchasing trends, that is the way that consumers require products to be marketed. The housewife no longer has time to go home and make a custard for dessert. Nowadays, housewives expect to be able to open a carton that has been obtained from the supermarket shelf that can either be used immediately or heated. The modern system of marketing accentuates the convenience factor, and it is dictated by consumer demand.

The consumer end of the production and marketing chain should also be taken into account. Whatever happens in the production process is dictated by consumer demand. A classic example is the brand name of Safcol that was associated with fish products but has now diversified. It is one of the leading processing co-operatives of South Australia, if not the nation. It is one of Australia's most successful exporting companies and enjoys enormous profits derived from overseas. For various reasons, I will not deal with companies that were similarly structured but have since ceased to trade in Queensland. Everyone knows about the problems experienced by the Peanut Marketing Board, and problems encountered by the Queensland Cane Growers Council when it diversified its activities and was involved in the production of fertiliser.

It is very, very important that, if the Government wants to ensure that producer co-operatives are successful on the marketing side and that the large corporations are cut out so that the vertical structure is owned by the growers themselves, it has to make sure that the boards are not just composed of growers. The opportunity is there for that to be done so long as modern expertise is used. A great many things have gone wrong

with grower/producer boards. Some have been very good, but it is a tough and very hard business world out there and people with marketing expertise are needed. Research into consumer demands is needed so that information can be relayed back along the production chain to the farmer.

These days, every time I pick up a newspaper I see a warning that Australia is not properly marketing its produce. Quite recently the *Queensland Country Life* featured an article about a fellow from New Zealand, Mr Westbrook Haines, who has been given credit for the remarkable increase in the demand for kiwi fruit both in New Zealand and also in Australia.

**A Government Member:** Chinese gooseberries.

**Mr CASEY:** Yes, the old Chinese gooseberries. Of course, they were taken to New Zealand to be grown and are now marketed as kiwi fruit. The consumer accepts them as kiwi fruit. If I started talking to a young housewife today about Chinese gooseberries, she would not know what I was talking about. If I mentioned kiwi fruit—spot on. New Zealand has adopted kiwi fruit and aggressively marketed it world-wide under that name.

I often think that we in Australia ought to get together, through the new Austrade board, and put a single label on everything that is exported from Australia. It could be called Kangaroo brand or whatever one likes. In fact, that would not be a bad name—Kangaroo brand—because it is something that identifies with Australia. A kangaroo identifies with Australia.

**Mr FitzGerald:** On the meat?

**Mr CASEY:** The honourable member for Lockyer says, “Well, let’s put it on the meat.” I think that he was brought up on a bit of lean kangaroo-tail somewhere along the line judging by some of the expressions that he sometimes uses in this House. He has only just walked into the Chamber and, of course, as the honourable member for Lockyer, he should be more concerned about good ideas for the marketing of the produce of his electorate and his area rather than being facetious about these matters.

**Mr Davis:** The Government had only one speaker on this very important marketing Bill.

**Mr CASEY:** That is dead right. It emphasises the point that I made earlier that in the debate on this very important farm produce marketing Bill only one back-bench Government member has spoken or put forward suggestions.

**Mr FitzGerald:** It was me. I spoke on this Bill. I was the last speaker before the debate was adjourned last night.

**Mr CASEY:** The Premier has just walked through the door so the member for Lockyer jumped up and said, “It was I, oh Lord, it was I.”

**Mr FitzGerald:** I spoke on this Bill.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I suggest to all honourable members including the honourable member for Lockyer, that a member only speaks once on a Bill.

**Mr CASEY:** That is very true. The sad and unfortunate aspect of this Bill is that the honourable member for Lockyer is the only bloke from the Government side of the Chamber who has spoken. It shows the quality of the Government members so far as this industry is concerned.

Returning to the point that I was making, I can remember being with the army in Malaya in 1958. Australian vehicles, uniforms and other equipment were distinguished from British vehicles and uniforms by the kangaroo sign. Everybody knew the Australians because they knew and understood the kangaroo sign. So why cannot everything that is exported from this country carry a kangaroo emblem and be called a Kangaroo-brand

product. On that basis, kangaroo butter, kangaroo oranges, kangaroo mandarins, kangaroo peas, kangaroo beans and kangaroo whatever-you-like could be sold world-wide. That is the sort of thing that ought to be done in Australia if it is to become aggressive in the marketing field.

Returning to Mr Haines, he states that there is huge potential for Australian cherries, oranges, grapes, asparagus, mangoes, papaws, onions and avocados on the markets of the northern hemisphere. All that has to be done is to really look at the way in which such products can be marketed. Mr Haines suggests the growing of those crops as an alternative to sugar-cane in some areas of this State.

Most certainly, the opportunities are there and the industry has to be prepared to take them. What happens in Queensland? We stick to the same old tired habits. These days in business there is no place for cobwebs. However, what do we find? The classic example in the fruit and vegetable industry is the COD cannery or the Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing itself. All that organisation seems to want to do is make sure that there are no retail surpluses and that the crop that has been produced for the last 20-odd years is the crop that it markets through its cannery.

**Mr De Lacy:** They get no competition from overseas. They are always working on that.

**Mr CASEY:** I will come to that in a moment.

All the COD is doing is canning in the same old style. In many ways I believe that the COD is restricted by Government regulations, including those of this Government. Just as the cobwebs are being brushed away from the sugar industry in legislation that is currently before the House, there is a need to brush the cobwebs off the legislation that covers the marketing of the State's fruit and vegetables and off organisations such as the COD and the cannery that plays such a very important role in its operations.

The COD still has the old farm-gate philosophy. The honourable member for Cairns (Mr De Lacy) referred to the fact that the COD complains about the importation of juices, yet in some respects it does not cater for its local market. In recent years there has been an enormous increase in demand for unsweetened pineapple juice, yet at some times in the year housewives are unable to find it on Queensland's supermarket shelves. I have taken this matter up with the COD, and its marketing manager has admitted that it is not fulfilling this part of its operations on its production line. If it is not properly fulfilling that function, it has no right whatsoever to complain about imported juices coming into Australia and filling the market that it cannot itself supply.

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

**Mr CASEY:** The member for Caboolture says that that is not right. Of course, he is a fruit and vegetable-grower in this State, yet he has not made any effort at all to involve himself in this debate to put forward constructive ideas by which the industry in this State can be helped to get back on its feet again and by which the fruit and vegetable industry of Australia can be helped to become an export-earner for this country.

Australia has an enormous potential and an enormous opportunity to supply overseas markets, particularly those in the northern hemisphere, at times when they cannot supply their own markets. All honourable members know that the growing of fruit and vegetables is cyclic, that they are produced on a seasonal basis. Australia can supply northern markets when they cannot be supplied by their local producers.

**Mr De Lacy:** Why do you think Mr Newton isn't speaking on this Bill?

**Mr CASEY:** That ties in, as I have said before, with the old farm-gate philosophy of the National Party.

Coming back to the marketing of unsweetened pineapple juice, which is a problem with a very simple solution for the COD—I have stressed, and I stress again, that Queensland is capable of fulfilling its own market demands.

If honourable members were to have a look on supermarket shelves, they would find that the South Australian co-operatives such as the Berri co-operative, the Sunraysia co-operative from along the Murray River banks in Victoria and also co-operatives from the Murrumbidgee Irrigation Area market their fruit juices in plastic containers so that the housewife can put them in the refrigerator, pull them out, unscrew the cap, pour a glass of juice, screw the cap back on and replace them in the refrigerator. What is happening here in Queensland? The COD is still marketing its juices in a can. Every time consumers want to use a can of juice, they slosh some of the juice out and then pour the rest of it into some sort of Tupperware container for keeping in the refrigerator. If that is not done, the quality is spoilt. Queensland has not moved even into the use of plastic bottles for pineapple juice.

I know that there is a coloration problem, but that can easily be overcome by using a coloured plastic bottle. The simple way of overcoming that problem is to use a pineapple-coloured plastic bottle. That would be no trouble and it would cause no problems, but it would make for a better product for housewives to use. If that were the case, they would be more likely to use pineapple juice than orange or other juices. Pineapple juice is a Queensland product; it is one that should be marketed in a much better way.

Queensland is still marketing its jams in tins instead of in jars. Supermarket shelves have cans of Golden Circle jams but the Cottees jams are in jars. Which does the housewife prefer? She prefers the jam in the jar because it is cleaner, it is not as messy and there is not the likelihood of cutting her thumb while opening, as with the tin. She can open the sealed jar and reseal it with no problems at all. The same can be said about cordials, flavourings and many other items.

A better system of marketing these products must be introduced. The produce must be marketed for the consumer, and nobody else. Export markets must also be tapped.

Last year I visited New Zealand. I spoke with the people involved in Australian trade with that country. I went round New Zealand supermarkets and examined the products that were available.

New Zealand would dearly love to be able to buy Queensland water-melons at this time of the year. New Zealanders love water-melons, however nobody in Australia is prepared to produce for that market. No organised structure exists for the supply of fresh water-melons to the New Zealand market at this time of the year.

Water-melons can be produced in the far northern regions of this State in areas that perhaps have gone out of cane-growing or are unsuitable for cane-growing. As a result of the increase in tourism and flights between Queensland's three international airports—Cairns, Townsville and Brisbane—an air freight system has been developed that could transport that produce. The area is not out of reach.

Australian corporations could set up chains of supermarkets in South East Asia to ensure that this country can sell its farm produce. They could sell direct to consumers. There is no reason why companies such as Coles and Myer could not be approached to see if they cannot work out something in that regard.

That is one way to provide opportunities for our primary producers, and to provide better markets for our fruit and vegetables.

**Hon. N. J. TURNER** (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) (3.31 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions.

Of course, the debate on the Bill commenced last night, and several honourable members spoke about the Bill then. The debate has been wide-ranging. I did not detect any opposition from any member to the introduction of the Bill or the reason behind its introduction.

The honourable member for Cairns (Mr De Lacy) clearly does not understand the reasons for some of the amendments contained in the Bill. He accused the officers of the Department of Primary Industries of being less than diligent in enforcing the

legislation. The position regarding the granting of exemptions from fidelity bonds is that the registrar has no choice but to grant an exemption to a wholesaler selling solely as a merchant. As the honourable member stated, merchants will no longer be exempted.

In regard to the level of fidelity bond, I personally agree with the honourable member's view that the minimum level should be set to provide adequate safeguards. I have told industry that I will consult fully with it in formulating the regulations covering fidelity bonds. That will be done.

Wholesalers will welcome the removal of some of the provisions currently applying to trust accounts, while keeping a clear audit trail. I believe that marketing organisations and private enterprise in Queensland are well ahead of the honourable member for Cairns in recognising the need for diversification and the need for adding value to products by processing and developing joint ventures and offshore marketing initiatives.

The honourable member for Lockyer (Mr FitzGerald) referred to problems that have arisen in the past and the need for adequate fidelity cover. He referred also to some of the issues involved in developing export markets for fruit and vegetables.

My department has been working closely with the various industry bodies to help overcome problems associated with air freight and shipping. I believe that some opportunities exist already in horticultural exports. My Government is taking steps to provide more support for wholesalers and growers, and is taking the initiative in finding new markets.

I have indicated to industry that should it find any provision of this legislation does not accord with what is required in export fruit and vegetable marketing, the Government will consider introducing further amendments.

The honourable member for Murrumba (Mr Kruger) made a contribution. Of course, the honourable member is the disendorsed former ALP spokesman for primary industries. I understand why the ALP sacked him. It was because he is too knowledgeable and too right wing for many of his former colleagues.

I thank the honourable member for Murrumba sincerely for the contribution that he has made over the last three years in this Parliament as the Opposition spokesman on primary industries. I believe that on many occasions he made a meaningful, well-researched contribution to debates in this Assembly. I thank him for his useful comments in support of the Bill.

The matter of market timings has been discussed often with the industry. The only point that I make is that the official timing set for the Rocklea markets was set by the people actually involved in order to maximise sales and returns.

I thank the honourable member for Murrumba for the comments he made about cabbages. The problem is that sometimes the seller has a different view of the value of the produce than the buyer. I am sure the honourable member knows his own cabbages.

The honourable member for Sherwood (Mr Innes) supported the Bill and the role of agents and the Queensland Chamber of Fruit & Vegetable Industries Co-op Ltd. I concur with his remarks. He mentioned the innovative changes in the legislation, which have the support of industry, and expressed his concern over flood plain management. At this point, no decision has been made about what will happen with that land of the Department of Primary Industries. The honourable member also mentioned the possibility of an irradiation facility being built on that land. I remind the House that the Government has made no decision at all about the construction or siting of an irradiation facility. I make that point quite clear. I concur with the comments of the honourable member for Sherwood about the efficiency of the Rocklea markets. They are as efficient as any market operating in the world and are a credit to the Brisbane Market Trust, the sellers and the staff.

The honourable member for Bundaberg (Mr Campbell) suggested that the Bill is catch-up legislation—catching up with similar provisions in New South Wales and Victoria. I prefer to say that the Queensland legislation will be the most up-to-date of

the three States and is meeting the needs of the market-place. The Victorian legislation has not been amended since 1965. The honourable member for Bundaberg tried to discredit the fantastic record of the honourable member for Burnett (Claude Wharton), achieved through dedication in his area over a long period. The honourable member remarked that he was successful in having Government offices established in Bundaberg, when in fact those were opened in spite of the honourable member for Bundaberg and his usual inane remarks and representations.

The honourable member for Mackay complained about the demise of the ordinary farmer and the build-up of the corporate enterprise. If his colleagues in Canberra had their way, all farmers would be taxed out of existence, both ordinary small farmers and corporate farmers.

**Mr Davis:** You are all right. Don't worry about them. You are doing all right on your property. You have been able to write off a fair bit.

**Mr TURNER:** The honourable member for Brisbane Central has never been out and seen what it is like in the country. He has never been off the concrete footpath and would not know anything about it. It would be better if the honourable member just sat there. I know that his shoes are pinching and hurting and that he wants to sing out, but he should just relax. Everything will be all right.

The honourable member for Mackay was highly critical of the National Farmers Federation. I do not blame him, because the federation is constantly drawing attention to the obvious deficiencies in the ALP's rural policies and the overall economic mismanagement of this great nation. If honourable members opposite would like examples of that, I cite interest rates of more than 20 per cent, the greatest collapse in the dollar of all time and a national debt at its highest level ever, having escalated threefold in the last three years. It took 82 years for this country to amass a national debt of \$23 billion. Canberra friends of the honourable member for Mackay have trebled that debt in three years.

The honourable member for Mackay commented on the need for improved marketing performances for fruit and vegetables. I suggest that he get himself up to date. Through the COD, the Queensland industry has made major strides in the development of improved domestic and export markets and has had considerable success. I remind him that the COD and the Golden Circle cannery were separated in 1964, which is 22 years ago. The honourable member for Mackay also took the opportunity to have a dig at the honourable member for Lockyer (Mr FitzGerald), who he said took no interest in the legislation. The honourable member for Lockyer was not in the Chamber last night to hear the honourable member for Mackay making that statement.

**Mr Casey:** I did not say that.

**Mr TURNER:** *Hansard* will record what was said.

No-one takes a greater interest in horticulture than the honourable member for Lockyer. In my time as Minister he has made an important contribution to primary industries, both inside and outside the House. I take this opportunity to thank him personally for that contribution.

The honourable member for Mackay also took the opportunity to try to denigrate the honourable member for Caboolture (Mr Newton) by saying that he had not spoken in this debate.

**Mr Casey:** The onion-growers up in the Lockyer are really crying these days.

**Mr TURNER:** I repeat that the honourable member for Lockyer has made a tremendous contribution to his electorate and to primary industries in general. I thank

him again for that. As the honourable member for Mackay tried to denigrate the member for Caboolture because of his not speaking to this legislation—

**Mr CASEY:** I rise to a point of order. There is no way in the world that I would denigrate the honourable member for Caboolture. I simply said that he was not doing his job.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** Order! There is no point of order. I take it that the honourable member has withdrawn his remarks about the honourable member.

**Mr TURNER:** Wasn't that a clever little answer!

The honourable member for Mackay tried to denigrate the honourable member for Caboolture by saying that he had not spoken in the debate on the legislation and that he had made little contribution to the industry. I would like to clarify some issues. The honourable member for Caboolture makes a tremendous contribution. He is a member of my parliamentary Bills committee and had much input into this legislation. The honourable member for Caboolture has not spoken on this occasion because I have asked a number of back-benchers to refrain from speaking, as I knew that Opposition members would waffle on for a long time on irrelevant issues. For that reason I did not want him to speak about the legislation. I thank the honourable member most sincerely for his contribution over the years.

Motion (Mr Turner) agreed to.

#### Committee

Mr Booth (Warwick) in the chair; Hon. N. J. Turner (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 11, as read, agreed to.

Clause 12—Repeal of and new s. 23; Purchase of farm produce—

**Mr De LACY (3.42 p.m.):** Clause 12 refers to the repeal of section 23 of the Act. The proposed subsection (2) states—

“A . . . merchant who purchases farm produce from the person by whom it was actually produced shall not fix the price by reference to any other transaction of that merchant in respect of that farm produce.”

I wonder why there is a necessity for that provision in the Bill and how it would ever be enforced or policed. Perhaps the Minister can answer the observation that I have made.

Another issue I raise is the sale of farm produce and the policy of COD. In the Townsville area there is a great deal of dissension in the private sector about the trading policies of Sunshine Produce, the marketing arm of COD. I make that observation on the basis of the number of people who have approached me about the matter. It has been suggested that COD is selling produce, specifically potatoes, at a price below the purchasing price. It has been said that everybody is purchasing Woodstock potatoes at a price of 52c per kilogram, yet COD is selling them for 49c loose and 46c packed in a plastic bag. I realise that an organisation such as COD, which is a statutory organisation, is “damned if you do, and damned if you don't”. If it sells at a price that is too high, the private sector says, “Bureaucracy has gone mad.” If it is efficient and competes, the private sector claims that it is unfair. The concern is that COD may be subsidising its commercial operations from some of its other transactions, such as levies. I am not suggesting that that is so. I do not know whether representations on that matter have been made to the Minister. However, I would like to give him an opportunity to say something about the matter.

**Mr TURNER:** This clause tightens and clarifies the provisions relating to grower/merchant transactions. Under the existing provisions, because of the absence of written evidence, disputes arise between growers and commercial sellers about whether a transaction was on a merchant or agency basis. Under the new provisions the price of produce

is to be set on the farm, agreed to before delivery, or set in terms of a written and signed agreement between the parties.

The price in a merchant transaction will be determined and recorded by the merchant in a purchase memorandum note not later than the close of trading on the next available trading day after the receipt of produce, unless otherwise agreed to in writing. When an agreement on price cannot be reached by the merchant and the grower within those periods, the transaction will be conducted on an agency basis.

I have not had any representations made to me in relation to the questions raised by the honourable member for Cairns on the other issue. However, I will look into the matter and advise him of my findings.

Clause 12, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 13 to 28, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

### Third Reading

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

## INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 20 August (see p. 468) on Mr Lester's motion—

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

**Mr McLEAN** (Bulimba) (3.47 p.m.): In putting forward the views expressed by Opposition members in relation to this legislation, I point out that this appears to be a machinery amendment.

In his second-reading speech the Minister said that the legislation seeks to remove an anomaly that presently exists in respect of long service leave. The Minister stated—

“An employer who employs persons bound by the State legislation as well as persons bound by the Federal award may grant all employees long service leave in accordance with the Federal award to preserve harmony in the work-force.”

I stress the word “harmony”. The Minister also referred to the oil industry and said—

“It is understood that various oil companies are considering granting to those of its employees not covered by awards long service leave more beneficial than the State Act provisions. This action will bring the long service leave arrangements for non-award employees of the companies into line with its award employees.

The Solicitor-General has expressed the opinion that such action would not preclude those employees from making further claims for long service leave in accordance with the State legislation even though they had already been granted long service leave . . .”

The Opposition does not argue with that, because that is obviously the case.

One thing that this legislation has probably done in my favour is that it has given me the opportunity to make comparisons between State and Federal legislation in regard to long service leave. Most States have already introduced legislation providing for the taking of leave in advance. Under the Metal Industry—Long Service Leave Award in New South Wales, leave of not less than one month may be granted in advance by agreement between employer and employee. The same applies in Victoria where leave may be granted by agreement between both parties. Of course, in Queensland there is no such provision but this legislation will remedy that. South Australia and Western Australia are covered by that type of provision. There are no provisions similar to this legislation that apply to Tasmania, the Australian Capital Territory or the Northern Territory. The Opposition has no particular objection to the legislation.

I return to the Minister's second-reading speech, in which he said that the Bill would help to preserve harmony in the work-force. I find that quite humorous, to say the least, when the Government's actions over a long period have been aimed at quite the opposite result. That comment brought to mind immediately the present situation in Western Australia with the Peko-Wallsend dispute and the emergence of the New Right. Honourable members have seen the emergence of the H. R. Nicholls Society, the new Ku Klux Klan of the industrial relations scene.

**Mr Davis:** Supported by this Government.

**Mr McLEAN:** Exactly. It seems quite hypocritical to read that the legislation is aimed towards harmony in the work-force, particularly when I see emerging out of the woodwork the Hays, the Copelands, the Stones, the Petersens, the Minister—and, of course, all the little Hitlers in the world. That sort of a statement about legislation introduced by the Government more than amazes me.

Attacks have been made on penalty rates, the time-and-a-half penalty added to the overall wage structure in Australia. That has been attacked viciously by the Minister and the Government. Attacks have been made on the holiday pay loading. The Minister has made continued attacks on penalty rates, living standards and working conditions overall.

I find it amazing that legislation is said to be aimed at preserving harmony in the work-force. I hope that it is a trend for the future, but I cannot help but think that it is another piece of hypocrisy from the Government.

Over the last few years, the national accord, a document that was drawn up particularly with the idea of creating harmony within the work-force between employer and employee, and to lay a foundation for that, has been met on every occasion by the Government with a non-co-operation and confrontationist attitude.

I hope that that comment is a sign of the future. Perhaps when the Minister replies he will ease the Opposition's mind by confirming that from now on the Government will take a very soft attitude towards the workers and workers' conditions in this State. I hope that that is the case, but I feel that it is just another piece of the hypocrisy that the Queensland people have become used to.

Industrial relations most certainly can only be conducted on the basis of arbitration and conciliation, a fact that this Government forgot a long time ago. Another fact that it has most certainly forgotten and does not know about is that the Government cannot legislate for good industrial relations.

In the Bill, the concept of long service leave, which is now accepted throughout the whole of the Commonwealth and is a standard prescription throughout the country, is for 13 weeks' long service leave after 15 years' continuous service, together with a pro rata entitlement after five or 10 years' that varies from State to State. In each State three distinct types of long service leave exist, the first being that that is prescribed by the Federal awards, the second by State legislation for all employees not covered by a Federal award, and the third by agreements that have been considered by an exemption from the operation of the State legislation by reason of its prescription being superior to that prescribed by that legislation.

It should be noted that difficulties arise in the enforcement of agreements. The Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester) may wish to address part of his reply to answering some of the queries that I have raised. I will refer to them briefly at a later stage.

The prescriptions that relate to leave provisions are more or less identical in legislation that has been passed by the various State Parliaments. The provisions relate to entitlements to leave and the transmission of business from one employer to another, pro rata leave entitlements, payment for a period of leave at the time the application is made, notice, broken periods of leave and several other matters that arise from time to time, such as holidays and annual leave, and prohibition on employment during periods

of long service leave. The latter category is one instance of legislation that seems to vary among the States.

There is also a prescription that relates to prohibition of employers offering employment to people who they know are on long service leave. Other provisions contain reference to payment upon termination of services for leave that has not been taken, the granting of leave in advance, and benefits to be taken into account in records that have to be kept. Some of those provisions differ among the States. I cannot understand why a uniform set of rules does not apply. I acknowledge that the present system makes uniformity fairly difficult, but it should be one of the objectives of the Government.

Continuity of service provisions in Federal awards gives an inalienable right to employees to a long service leave entitlement after 15 years' service, although it may not be available until the period of leave amounts to 13 weeks. That provision is not reflected in State awards. For example, in Victoria, the right to that leave does not arise until the entitlement is to a period of 13 weeks.

Location of service is another matter that the Minister may be able to enlighten the House about. Questions have arisen in the past about the location of an employee's service, which is a common occurrence in instances in which an employer operates in more than one State. In Federal awards the locality of the service would seem to be irrelevant, but the matter may not be so clear-cut under the provisions of State legislation. Differing viewpoints about that matter are frequently expressed to members of Parliament.

I referred earlier to the transmission of an employer's business. The original conception was that the service had to be rendered to the same employer, but all of the prescriptions cover employment not only engaged in with the original employer but also with transmittees of that employer's business as well. That is a matter that affects building workers and I understand that steps have been taken recently to solve the problems that have arisen.

In all of the prescriptions that relate to forfeiture of pro rata entitlements, provision is made for recognition of a pro rata entitlement if service is terminated after 10 years' service. The period of service nominated in New South Wales is five years. Forfeiture arises if employment is terminated either by the employer, for any reason other than serious and wilful misconduct, or by the employee on account of illness, incapacity, or domestic or other pressing problem caused by illness of such a nature as to justify termination.

One of the grey areas that causes most of the problems is what constitutes "serious and wilful misconduct". Various interpretations have been offered, and various prescriptions apply. I offer an example of a court case that involved deliberate disobedience. In Queensland, a truck driver regularly used a truck owned by his employer for his own purposes, in spite of the fact that he knew that the employer took a serious view of his doing so. In another State, such an instance would not be regarded as constituting disobedience. I could quote many more instances to demonstrate that that interpretation is a grey area.

Part-time workers are probably covered by long service leave legislation by virtue of their being employees. A part-time worker is entitled to leave at the part-time rate of pay. Where he is prohibited from working whilst on leave, that probably means that he cannot work for that employer during the hours which are his normal working hours. There would be nothing to prevent his working part-time for other employers at other than his normal working hours. I am not familiar with that section of the Act or the problems that arise from it. I would be interested to hear the Minister's interpretation of that section of the Act.

In summary, I point out that for almost 30 years long service leave has been one of the main employee benefits in Australia. As long ago as 1884, New South Wales public servants received long service leave under the Civil Service Act, though at that time it was granted at the discretion of the Government. The benefit was eventually extended to all employees in New South Wales. After that development, long service

leave was enacted for all employees in each of the six Australian States, and in 1964 provisions were made for employees covered by Federal awards.

In 1951, when the Bill was introduced into the New South Wales Parliament, the then Minister for Labour and Industry made this statement about the extension of long service leave to private sector employees—and I think it covers the position pretty well—

“The Government has taken action with several aims in view—

- (1) It will be an influence tending to reduce labour turnover which today is costing employers a considerable waste of effort and money;
- (2) It will reward long and faithful service with a single employer; and
- (3) It will enable an employee half-way through his working life to recover spent energies and return to work renewed, refreshed and reinvigorated.”

That quote by the Minister when he introduced that legislation is so true. That sort of thing is now being overlooked in so many areas, especially when attacks are made on workers' conditions.

I hope—and I refer to what the Minister said in his second-reading speech—that this legislation is aimed at preserving harmony in the work-force. I also hope that the Minister continues along that line with other industrial relations legislation that he brings before this House. The Labor Party has no great opposition to the legislation that is before the House. I end on the note that I sincerely hope that this is a sign of the times for the future.

**Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (4.2 p.m.):** The Liberal Party supports this legislation. One of the surprising factors is that, in spite of the general application of long service leave, very few people in the community actually enjoy it. Long service leave is not unlike superannuation, where again very few people in employment actually qualify to receive superannuation payments.

**Mr Davis:** What is the percentage? About 60 per cent?

**Sir WILLIAM KNOX:** It is interesting to note that only 30 per cent of members of Parliament throughout Australia receive superannuation, because most of them do not qualify. When the honourable member for Brisbane Central was thrown out of this House, he did not qualify.

**Mr Davis:** But I returned.

**Sir WILLIAM KNOX:** The honourable member has returned but he is about to be thrown out again. He will be the regurgitated member for Brisbane Central, never actually qualifying but frequently appearing.

**Mr FitzGerald:** It is very hard to come back.

**Sir WILLIAM KNOX:** No. It is just that the honourable member for Brisbane Central has powerful friends in the faction of which he is a member and they look after him.

**Mr Gygar:** And a powerful wife.

**Sir WILLIAM KNOX:** And a wife who is also a powerful official in the Labor Party. Even though the honourable member was her campaign director, he could not get her up as president of the party. No doubt she will change her campaign director and next time she will be successful and look after him better.

**Mr McLean:** If he could have held that meeting in a phone box like your group, he might have been successful.

**Sir WILLIAM KNOX:** Yes. That is about his limit. That is about as many people as he controls—five. As the Opposition Whip, he has no control at all. He cannot even

keep members of the Opposition here for divisions. That is the limit of his capacity. After the coming election, the Liberal Party's numbers will be expanded many times. No doubt he will be one of those who is sacrificed in order to make room for the Liberals.

Now that I have made that comment, I should say that in the course of time there are people entitled to these benefits. The honourable member for Bulimba (Mr McLean) has read out the various preconditions for entitlement to long service leave in awards in the various parts of Australia. It is a matter that has been condoned not only by legislation but also by variations by the various industrial tribunals.

This is not the only circumstance in which there is a clash of different working conditions between people working under Federal and State awards under the one roof. It might be worth the Minister's time to have one of his officers look at those anomalies, not only in regard to long service leave but also in regard to quite a number of other working conditions where there is a potential for industrial demarcation disputes caused by jealousy and friction that come from different working conditions applying to people who work side by side.

The one that I bring to the Minister's attention again is the circumstance of people in the electricity industry. Under State awards that industry has some employees who work under two, and possibly three, different sets of conditions. One set of conditions comes from the award of the new tribunal. Another comes from the old award, and yet another is for those who are employed by private contractors and who do work similar to that carried out for electricity undertakings by the day-labour force, but under different circumstances.

The Liberal Party approved and supported the legislation that passed through the House to set up the new tribunal as it believed that the legislation would improve the workings of the electricity industry. I am sure that it has and that it will continue to do so. However, in that industry there are people working under different conditions under the same roof under State awards. The potential for friction is there and no doubt the Minister is very much aware of that.

**Mr Vaughan:** What about the contracts?

**Sir WILLIAM KNOX:** I mentioned the contracts.

**Mr Vaughan:** Not contractors, people in SEQEB who have signed contracts—200 of them.

**Sir WILLIAM KNOX:** That is even another variation.

No doubt the Minister is aware of this possibility. One day that matter will have to be resolved so that the potential for discord is ultimately removed.

What surprises me is how anomalies such as the one in the legislation before us arise. So often one hears the cry of "like with like" and one set of circumstances compared with similar circumstances in the same industry or similar industries. In those cases, when one rule is made, it generally applies to similar work in similar industries. That these anomalies can occur is amazing but, in fact, they do.

There is one other item relating to this matter that I wish to raise, and that is the question of the 17½ per cent leave loading. The Minister should offer explanations to the House, and perhaps to people in the community who were encouraged by him to apply to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission for a variation of the 17½ per cent leave loading. The Government stated publicly that it would support applicants seeking that variation, but the Government recently decided not to support them and, indeed, not even to appear before the tribunal. Over the years, when there has been a possibility of a general ruling, which the 17½ per cent leave loading is, it has been the practice for the Government's advocates to appear, not necessarily to take sides with either party, but to put before the tribunal the relevant information concerning

the economy, that is the facts and figures available from research that would not otherwise be available to the tribunal, to assist it in making its determination.

I do think that on this occasion the Government has neglected its duty. It has absolutely nothing to fear from appearing before the tribunal and playing the customary and traditional role that it has played for many years in matters of this nature.

I know perfectly well that the Government has not appeared before the tribunal on all occasions. However, any amelioration of the 17½ per cent holiday loading as a result of this application to the industrial tribunal will have far-reaching consequences. Therefore, the Government has a duty and a responsibility to appear before the tribunal. It is regrettable that it will not do so.

I suspect that the Minister advocated that the Government appear before the tribunal and was perhaps overruled because of other considerations. Nevertheless, that is a traditional role that government has played over many, many years, and it is a very effective role.

That role is necessary mainly because the information that is available to Government sources is not available to the Industrial Commission from any other source. After all, the economy of the community, the ability of industry to pay—including the Government, of course, as an employer—and the consequential changes that might result from a general ruling do have far-reaching effects. Therefore, it is important that information be provided to tribunals of this nature.

**Mr DAVIS (Brisbane Central) (4.11 p.m.):** I always have pleasure in speaking to a Bill that affects the working people of this country.

It is not often that I give credit to the honourable member for Nundah (Sir William Knox). However, by making quite clear the Liberal Party policy on the 17½ per cent holiday loading at least he has the honesty to admit that his party is an anti-worker party. In the lead-up to the forthcoming State election, he has made quite clear that he is dead-set against the 17½ per cent holiday loading. That is certainly much different from what the weak, jelly-like National Party has done.

As the Opposition spokesman on industrial relations mentioned, the Labor Party supports any change that will make it easier to clarify an award or clarify legislation, particularly in regard to long service leave, that applies in both the Federal and State spheres.

If by any chance this National Party Government is returned to office after the election, for how long will workers in this State have long service leave? I know that people say, "They will not knock off long service leave straight away." However, from what the Minister has said in the past, I think that honourable members can rest assured that he is personally against the 17½ per cent holiday loading.

Time and time again the Minister has stated in this Chamber that he is dead-set against penalty rates. I do not think it takes much imagination to realise the road that this Government will take.

Recently honourable members saw the Minister display a miserable exhibition of weakness at a press conference. For about a half-hour, he was asked to come clean on where he stands in regard to the 17½ per cent holiday loading. It was a pathetic performance. On other occasions I have seen the Minister trying to dodge questions in television interviews. However, that was the most pathetic performance of any Minister in this State that I have witnessed in the time that I have been a member of Parliament.

I know that the Minister is dictated to by the Premier. However, if, as a Minister of the Crown, he genuinely believes that the 17½ per cent holiday loading should be abolished and that workers' conditions in this State should be eroded, surely he should have the courage to say so. He should not avoid the subject just because an election is imminent.

As I have said, the Liberal Party has made it quite clear that it will fight the forthcoming election in part on the 17½ per cent holiday loading, the abolition of penalty

rates and the general deterioration of workers' conditions in this State. I assure the House that the Labor Party will take up the challenge.

What will happen with the National Party? Is it all of a sudden not going to support the policy of the New Right? Is it going to come in to see this issue through? The retailers' organisation must have got nasty with this Government, otherwise why would that organisation introduce this matter into the Industrial Commission? Surely the Government, which implements the policy of the National Party, should be the first one to support that application. Furthermore, the National Party's other friend in business, the Confederation of Australian Industry, has decided that it wants to get into the act and attempt to eliminate the 17½ per cent loading.

I will not go into the reasons why the 17½ per cent should be retained, as they have been well and truly stated. I want to see whether this Government has really got the intestinal fortitude to come out and make a statement before the election. I do not have to look any further than the actions of the conservative parties. For example, in Tasmania, under that arch-conservative Gray—I do not know whether he is a member of the Liberal Party or the National Party—what was the first thing he did after he was elected for a five-year stint? He got straight into the public servants themselves and involved the Industrial Commission in bringing down a decision to stop the 17½ per cent loading for 12 months, otherwise he would sack 400 or 500 public servants. As soon as that 12 months is up, the next thing he will do will be to take the 17½ per cent away permanently.

Mention was made by the Opposition spokesman of penalty rates. It is all to do with the Industrial Commission. Mr Acting Speaker—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** Order! "Deputy Speaker" would be more appropriate.

**Mr DAVIS:** All right, Mr Deputy Speaker. We all want to be known by our correct titles, as I do.

**Sir William Knox:** Which faction do you belong to?

**Mr DAVIS:** The faction that is progressive—not like the honourable member for Nundah, who belongs to a party that, in view of some of its policies of knocking the worker, is more in keeping with the 1870s.

The Opposition spokesman mentioned penalty rates. I ask the Minister: What has this House heard over the last few months about penalty rates? The Minister is not alone on this issue; he is supported by some fairly big men in the National Party, including the trustee. I show the House a copy of the front page of the *Gold Coast Bulletin* on which it is stated that Jupiters Casino did not make the huge financial return that was expected. The article states that the casino is going to seek a tax cut and that "penalty rates must go, too".

One does not have to be too bright to realise what this Government will do if it is elected at the next election. I will forecast that it will do three things immediately: firstly, the 17½ per cent loading paid to workers will be history; secondly, the penalty rates will go; and, thirdly, the 40 to 44-hour week will be reintroduced in line with the policy of the National New Right movement.

**Mr McLean:** Would that affect the harmony in the work-place?

**Mr DAVIS:** I should say there would be problems with that.

The Queensland Government is not concerned one iota about the working class; it is concerned only with some of those cow-dung farmers on their side of the Chamber who rort the taxation system. I have a booklet in my hand that will prove that, but that is another issue. The Government is not worried about the working-class people.

One cannot say that the Government will not do those things. The Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs is purely and simply a robot who is computerised

to do what his master tells him to do. It should be remembered that during the SEQEB dispute the Government suspended the SEQEB award under its emergency services legislation. The Queensland Government can show everyone what it can do if it wishes. Neither the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs nor the Minister for Mines and Energy referred to the practices that have resulted from the suspension of the SEQEB award.

The honourable member for Nudgee (Mr Vaughan) will be interested to learn that recently at Kedron I spotted one of the so-called new contractors. He would have had the oldest truck in Queensland. He had climbed a ladder to fix a light on a pole. He had no cherry-picker or person below, which was the traditional safety procedure to follow. No person was allowed to climb a pole unless he had some assistance. The Government does not worry about conditions; it worries only about lower cost for a job.

Who is one of the members of the New Right? Gilbert himself! He is a member of the H. R. Nicholls Society. I also saw a SEQEB subcontractor towing a U-Haul trailer behind his utility.

The Opposition supports the long service leave provisions. I implore the Minister to have some intestinal fortitude to state where he and his Government stand on workers' conditions and the 17½ per cent loading. Is he for or against the 17½ per cent loading, penalty rates and an increase in workers' hours? He should have the initiative to table the information for incorporation in *Hansard* so that it appears in the record for future purposes.

**Mr VAUGHAN (Nudgee) (4.22 p.m.):** I want to go on from where the honourable member for Nundah (Sir William Knox) concluded. I was surprised by some of the comments that he made about the current position in SEQEB. He referred to the need for harmony. He said that a number of different work practices and provisions apply in SEQEB. It is Liberal Party policy to deregulate the whole of the labour market. The Liberal Party wants three or four different groups of workers working side by side but receiving different conditions and being subjected to different provisions that apply only in SEQEB; it wants the practices to apply from factory to factory. It wants to destroy the Federal and State arbitration commissions. It wants a wide-open market to be created so that individual workers will negotiate their wages and conditions with their employers. It wants to see complete chaos.

The member for Nundah commented on the practices adopted in SEQEB. At the moment, the situation in SEQEB is untenable. The old employees who worked for SEQEB enjoy all the previous provisions provided under the Electrical Engineering Award—State, including a 36¼-hour week/nine day fortnight. The employees who were engaged during the dispute are working a 40-hour week/10-day fortnight. The former employees and the new employees work alongside each other in line gangs and that sort of thing. Earlier, the honourable member for Nundah referred to the contractors who are working under all sorts of provisions. Some of them are not receiving the correct award wages, conditions and entitlements.

Honourable members know what goes on with some contractors who are out to make a quick quid. Contractors cut corners. With the exception of union action, very little, if anything, is done towards ensuring that those small contractors provide their employees with proper conditions and correct wages.

In addition, there are those employees who have signed contracts. Recently in this House I asked a question of the Minister for Mines and Energy in relation to the number of employees of SEQEB who have entered into contractual arrangements and have signed those three-year contracts that SEQEB wanted them to sign. The Minister refused to answer that question because he said the matter was confidential. He said, "We do not want to divulge what the situation is in regard to SEQEB."

I have since discovered that only 200 employees of SEQEB have signed those contracts. Those contracts virtually make those employees slaves of SEQEB. They have

to be prepared to work anywhere within SEQEB and to work any hours as determined by SEQEB, and as well to be subject to many other obnoxious provisions. Approximately 15 per cent of the outside labour-force of SEQEB has signed contracts. All that SEQEB has after almost two years is 15 per cent of its outside labour-force working under contractual arrangements. As I have said in this House before, any person who enters into those contracts is not right in the head.

In relation to the Liberal Party policy of deregulating the labour market, much has been said recently about the New Right organisations. Those organisations have plenty of money and can afford full-page advertisements in the newspapers. I refer to the H. R. Nicholls Society, the Australian Free Enterprise Foundation and the RACE organisation. I want to ensure that the workers of Queensland and Australia know exactly where they stand as far as those organisations are concerned.

In the full-page advertisement that appeared in *The Courier-Mail* of Saturday 16 August, the Australian Free Enterprise Foundation made it clear that its aims and immediate targets are the removal of penalty rates and holiday loadings. That is also the policy of the National Party.

A letter from the leader of the National Party of Australia was mentioned in this House last week in relation to an attempt to raise funds for the National Party. That letter stated that the National Party's policy is to support the abolition of the 17½ per cent holiday loading and penalty rates.

As the honourable member for Brisbane Central (Mr Davis) said, that is the policy of this Government, although it does not have the intestinal fortitude—particularly on the eve of an election—to remove the 17½ per cent loading and penalty rates.

I do not believe that the National Party will win the forthcoming election. I believe that the Labor Party will be occupying the Treasury benches after the election, particularly in view of the way in which the Premier and Treasurer has been ranting and raving. However, if the National Party does win the election, as a matter of course it will simply amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to reduce annual leave, long service leave and sick leave entitlements. The National Party has shown its true colours.

I turn now to the argument that has been put forward by the Liberals, the Nationals and the super-right-wing organisations in support of reducing living standards for the workers of Australia. I might mention that I have been keeping an eye on press reports in *The Courier-Mail* during the last week or so.

The Prime Minister and other people have already announced nationally that companies are enjoying record profits. In *The Courier-Mail* of 2 September 1986, on page 23, it was reported that FAI Insurances made a profit of \$72.53m, which represented an earnings lift of 155.8 per cent. The group issued a 1 for 10 bonus to its shareholders and increased dividend. Boral made a profit of \$161.36m over the same period, which represented a 37.2 per cent rise in profit. Boral also issued a 1 for 5 bonus, its seventh bonus issue in nine years. Ariadne Australia Ltd made a \$54.9m profit, a 447 per cent increase, with a 1 for 6 bonus issue.

On 3 September, *The Courier-Mail* reported that Amcor Ltd made a \$95.28m profit, a 13.7 per cent increase. On 5 September, it reported that Coles Myer—a real good one—made a \$178.6m profit, a 43 per cent lift. On 6 September, the same newspaper reported that Pacific Dunlop Ltd made a profit of \$106.12m, a 32.4 per cent increase, also with a 1 for 10 bonus issue. On 9 September, it reported that Brambles Industries Ltd made a \$64.5m profit, a 53.5 per cent increase. On 10 September, it reported that Mathers Enterprises Ltd had a 14 per cent increase, which is not as high a profit as the companies I just mentioned, with sales jumping 23.1 per cent. Of course, the daddy of them all was BHP, which topped the \$1 billion mark. It showed \$1,009m profit. All of its ancillary companies that have also made a profit are listed. So much for the necessity to curb wages and conditions in this country, when honourable members see the huge profits being made by industry.

If the Liberal Party is fair dinkum about wanting to deregulate the labour market, it is hypocritical for the honourable member for Nundah (Sir William Knox) to cite in the House the example of SEQEB.

The Minister should come clean, as the honourable member for Brisbane Central (Mr Davis) said, and outline the Government's policy. I know what the Government's policy is. It wants to do away with the 17½ per cent holiday loading. Let the Minister go to his electorate and tell all the workers—I will certainly be telling them during the forthcoming election campaign—that if Queensland is unfortunate enough to have a National Party or even a coalition Government after the election, the Minister for Industrial Affairs in this State is intent on reducing the wages and conditions of the workers, particularly those in his electorate, and the workers in the coal-mining industry. The Government will be wanting to eliminate the 17½ per cent holiday loading and the penalty rates. A major attack will be launched on the provisions of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act on long service leave, annual leave and sick leave. There is no limit to what the anti-Labor forces in this State want to do as far as the working people are concerned.

Let there be a general warning to the electors of this State that their working conditions are under threat. In the unlikely event that there is a National Party Government or even a coalition Government in this State after the next election—and I do not think that will be the case—there is no way in the world that their working conditions will not suffer.

**Hon. V. P. LESTER** (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs) (4.34 p.m.), in reply: I say to the honourable member who has just completed his oration, "Let there be no day when business does not make a profit, because that will be the day that this country will perish." I can assure him of that.

I also suggest that small business is under threat as never before. That does not seem to worry the Opposition. All it ever seems to want to do is knock the rights and destroy the incentive of small business with its capital gains taxes, fringe benefits taxes and all of the other 40-odd tax benefits eliminated or additional taxes imposed since the Federal Labor Government has been in power. In addition, in the other Labor States, in particular New South Wales, small business has been subjected to a horrific onslaught. Workers' compensation is one area in which small business has recently been hit. Although in some instances people in business pay six times as much as Queenslanders pay for premiums, I am led to believe that the insurance companies have said that if they are not given a premium rise of some 70 per cent they will pull out and the business will be taken over by the New South Wales Government Insurance Office. Those companies face a prospective pay-out of some \$500m. Imagine that—\$500m! So people in business in New South Wales and, for that matter, in Victoria and the other Labor States are in big trouble.

A record number of applications has been received from people who want to migrate to Queensland. The notion of profit should not be derided. Honourable members should look toward the provision of larger profits in the future so that businesses will expand and more people can be employed.

Federal awards in some instances provide 13 weeks' long service leave after 10 years' service. I instance the oil industry in Queensland. The Act provides an entitlement to 13 weeks' leave after 15 years' service. The amendment contained in the Bill will provide uniformity and will bring harmony to the application of leave entitlement provisions. The honourable member for Nundah (Sir William Knox) made the point that although people work side by side in industry, different leave provisions apply. The intent of the Bill is to address such anomalies, and provide a clear basis of uniformity.

Part-time workers are also entitled to long service leave on a basis that is similar to conditions enjoyed by people who receive a weekly wage. The amendment that is presently before the House will not affect the rights of a part-time worker to long service leave.

A number of specific queries were raised by the Opposition spokesman for employment and industrial affairs, the honourable member for Bulimba (Mr McLean). I have made notes of all his queries and I have arranged for a written reply to be furnished to the honourable member. The honourable member will be free to table that document in the House if he so desires. The provisions of the Bill do not affect existing entitlements in any way.

The honourable member for Nundah (Sir William Knox) made the prediction that the honourable member for Brisbane Central would be defeated at the next State election. I emphatically agree with the honourable member for Nundah. The contest between the candidates for the Liberal Party and the National Party will be very interesting. I believe that the National Party candidate, Mr Peter Peters, will win the seat. I do not assert that he will win by a large majority, but I am confident of the outcome. Because the present honourable member for Brisbane Central has been quite a character, I am sure he will be missed to some extent. However, it should be remembered that politics is politics and business is business. The National Party is out to beat the honourable member for Brisbane Central.

**Mr DAVIS:** I rise to take a point of order. I honestly did not hear what the Minister said.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** Order! The Minister did not say anything derogatory.

**Mr DAVIS:** I thought that the Minister mentioned something about defeat and then mentioned the name of a candidate.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! No point of order has been made out.

**Mr LESTER:** The reference to the honourable member for Brisbane Central was not derogatory. It is more of a prophecy that will be fulfilled.

Members of the Liberal Party have tried to convey the impression that the Liberal Party espouses a very definite policy on the payment of a 17½ per cent leave loading. One can assume, from statements made by the President of the Liberal Party, that there is no definite policy. Mr John Moore has not given a clear-cut commitment to a policy statement, according to an article that was published in the *Telegraph*. Although Mr Moore indicated disapproval, he has also made various assertions about problems associated with the holiday loading entitlement. He has merely said that the matter should be addressed at the appropriate time. In my book, that does not amount to a clear-cut commitment to a stand being taken by the Liberal Party on the issue of the 17½ per cent leave loading. I simply refer to that article as an indication of the attitude adopted by the President of the Liberal Party toward that issue.

The parliamentary leader of the Liberal Party, the honourable member for Nundah (Sir William Knox) suggested that there is no need to give a commitment either way. He also said that the Department of Employment and Industrial Affairs should make officers available in the Industrial Courts to provide necessary information. I point out to the honourable member that necessary information is readily available from the Industrial Affairs Advisory Unit. Anybody who attends a court hearing can make use of the facilities provided by that unit to obtain information. I point out also that I can see no impediment whatever to officers of the department giving evidence before the Industrial Commission, if it is considered that that evidence would be of assistance to the Industrial Commission in making its determination. I make it very clear that when officers of my department are needed, they will be there.

It is worth mentioning that the policy adopted by the Queensland Government is almost identical to the policy adopted by the Labor Premier of Western Australia (Mr Burke). Mr Burke indicated that the matter of the 17½ per cent leave loading should be addressed on a Federal basis. I point out to honourable members that I am merely quoting what was said by the Premier of Western Australia. I doubt that anyone would suggest that I have not attempted to quote sources accurately this afternoon. Let me

point out also that I am not trying to be facetious: I am simply quoting what other people have said.

Mr Burke indicated that if the State moved in and was successful in having the leave loading removed, that would severely disadvantage 60 per cent of the workers living in Queensland or, for that matter, Western Australia. He was of the opinion that, if this matter was to be addressed, it should first be addressed on a Federal basis. I want to make it very clear that I am giving a clear-cut policy similar to that proposed by the Labor Party in Western Australia, and a policy that has come into the open simply because the Labor Party——

**Mr Innes:** Does that mean that you will oppose the application by the Retail Traders and Shopkeepers Association?

**Mr LESTER:** Again I want to make it very, very clear to the House as a whole that the matter should first be addressed on a Federal basis because Queensland does not want to be totally disadvantaged.

I have also pointed out that superannuation and associated issues are much more important than the loading. Because superannuation could cost employers as much as 15 per cent more in wages, it could mean fewer jobs.

As the honourable member for Sherwood (Mr Innes) would know, the Retail Traders and Shopkeepers Association has not asked the State Government to involve itself. That should not be forgotten. It has been reported in the newspapers of this State that the retail traders have said that they want to do it on their own and do not want the State Government to be involved at present. But the Government has made the offer that if either the commission or the retail traders need assistance by way of information, it will most certainly be made available. I imagine that that policy is identical with the policy indicated by the member for Nundah (Sir William Knox). The Government is playing its role, and I believe that is the correct way to go.

I now refer to some of the suggestions made by the honourable member for Bulimba (Mr McLean), who is not at present in the Chamber. He spoke about harmony in the work-force and what the Government could be doing to provide it. Perhaps the honourable member for Bulimba should have checked his facts just a little bit better than he did because today—I am very disturbed about it, I might add; I am horrifically disturbed—Mr Dempsey of the Trades and Labor Council is trying to cause industrial confrontation in this State. He has asked for industrial confrontation in this State. He has challenged the State Government to an all-in war with the unions. What an irresponsible thing for a trade union-leader to say.

If the Government is to be forced into an all-in confrontation with the unions and, with the election coming up, make industrial relations an issue, that almost inevitably will result in a great number of strikes at a time when people are looking for stability, as is the Government. The State will not be stable if the State Government manufactures an issue that causes all the unions to strike so that the Government can say to the people, "We have got the unions out on strike; there is an industrial confrontation." No way in the world will the Government cause such a problem at a time when, in fact, in the last month, Queensland's industrial relations record was the best in Australia. The Government will not change that. The strong and dedicated policy of the National Party has enabled that position to be achieved. Everybody clearly knows that that policy is that if the unions put one foot out of line the Government will hit them. It is as simple as that: if the unions put a foot out of line the Government will act.

Everyone knows that recently petrol strikes occurred in the rest of Australia but not in Queensland. The union-members were not game to go on strike in Queensland—no way in the world—because they knew that the Government would hit them very, very hard. The petrol industry workers knew that the public would support the Government just as happened in the SEQEB dispute, when approximately 75 per cent of the public of this State got behind the Government and said, "You beauty. We support you. It's time these people were stood up to. It's time these people obeyed the laws of the land.

It's their own fault that they lost their jobs. Good on the Queensland Government." Everybody remembers that since then the lights have been turned on, they have remained on and they will remain on for all time. Had the National Party Government in Queensland not taken such a strong stand, that would never have happened. Although the National Party Government has taken a strong stand, it has been humane; those who have got into trouble have asked for it. It is the Queensland National Party Government that has given the lead for the rest of Australia to follow.

When Mr Pendarvis wished to make a deal with the unions that would have meant better conditions of employment for employees, who under his deal would have doubled their wages, guaranteed a continuity of supply of orders and made the employees very much better off, the unions, with the support of the Labor Party opposite, voted against the wishes of their own work-force. They said to them, "You cannot improve your conditions." That is the sort of thing that the National Party in Queensland has stood up to.

When the unions commenced to go out on strike in other parts of Australia, they did not go on strike in Queensland, because the Government told them it was wrong and that they would be hit if they went on strike. That was an instance in which the union-members had an opportunity to improve their conditions and we in the National Party said, "You beauty; we will support you." The Labor Party said, "No, you cannot. You have to stay with the miserable conditions that you have at present." So nobody can talk to the National Party about conditions in the work-force; it is the National Party that has made conditions better.

The member for Nudgee (Mr Vaughan) has spoken about all of the conditions that I am supposed to have taken away from the coal-miners. He knows very, very well that, since I have been the member for Peak Downs, the conditions of the coal-miners have improved dramatically. Their conditions are now very much better. They now have excellent housing, excellent towns in which to live, excellent schools, Olympic-sized swimming-pools, better sporting facilities than most other towns and cities in Australia and up-market high schools. For example, the Moranbah State High School had the first free-standing school library in the State. The people know that a new one will be built in Emerald. They also know that better conditions will be coming to the towns of Tieri, Capella and Clermont. There is no way in the world that the member for Nudgee can go on with such claptrap that, while I have been the member, their conditions have become worse. He has made that challenge in the House and, as is my prerogative, I intend to answer it in the House so that it will be in *Hansard* for everybody to read. The people in Tieri, Moranbah, Clermont, Capella and Emerald will be able to read just what the Labor Party has been trying to do.

**Mr YEWDAL:** I rise to a point of order. If the Minister continues to ramble on in the way he is doing at the moment, we will have to call a doctor. His blood pressure is very high. If he does not sit down, I think he will have a heart attack.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** Order! There is no point of order.

**Mr LESTER:** I thought I had been very controlled. I thought I must have been smiling at the Opposition because I could see them scowling and whimpering and being very concerned about what I have said. In no way was I out of control. I was simply stating a few facts. If I have to get a little out of control to stick up for the people of my electorate when they are attacked by the Labor Party, so be it, because I believe that they are worth sticking up for.

This morning the House witnessed the incredible behaviour of the members of the Labor Party, who made fun of the visiting lady bowlers from the Central Highlands area. That was a shocking exhibition—one of the worst that I have ever seen from the Labor Party. When those women went outside, they vowed that they would never, ever do anything to support the Labor Party. That is an example of the behaviour of members of the Opposition.

The Bill is a good one. It will work. I thank all members for their support.

Motion (Mr Lester) agreed to.

### Committee

Mr Randell (Mirani) in the chair; Hon. V. P. Lester (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of s. 17; Long service leave—

Mr DAVIS (4.50 p.m.): This clause deals with long service leave and other conditions under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

Questions were asked of the rather spineless Minister—and that is all that I can call him—

Mr LESTER: I rise to a point of order.

Mr DAVIS: The Minister is spineless. He should admit it.

Mr LESTER: I rise to a point of order. I think that my conduct during the period that I have been a member of Parliament has been anything but spineless. I find the remark offensive, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Randell): Order! The Minister finds the remarks of the honourable member for Brisbane Central offensive. I ask the honourable member to withdraw them.

Mr DAVIS: I will withdraw them, Mr Randell. However, later I will think of a word that I may be able to get away with. It is very hard to describe somebody who has not got courage.

The Minister is in charge of one of the most important portfolios in this State, because it involves dealing with people. He is always saying that he has the courage of his convictions.

In his reply, the Minister ranted and raved but did not answer the questions that were asked of him by the honourable member for Nudgee (Mr Vaughan) and me. The Minister was asked three simple questions. The first was: Where does he stand on the 17½ per cent holiday loading, which is part of the conditions—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to return to the clause.

Mr DAVIS: The second question related to long service leave, and the third question, to penalty rates, which are dealt with in the long service leave provisions. The Minister should have the courage of his convictions and at least be man enough to state in this Chamber where he stands. If he will not do so, he should resign, because that would prove that he does not have the courage of his convictions.

Mr LESTER: All of the matters referred to by the honourable member have been addressed. If the honourable member had been listening, he would have heard what I said.

Mr MILLINER: I endorse the remarks made by the honourable member for Brisbane Central. It is remarkable that a Minister of the Crown in this State is not prepared to express an opinion on such a very important issue as the conditions of Queensland workers. It is deplorable that the Minister, who is so very keen to bash the Federal Labor Government about everything, says, when an important issue such as workers' conditions arises, "Oh, it is Canberra's fault. The Federal Government should take some action."

I repeat that it is deplorable for the Minister not to express an opinion on such a very important issue as the conditions of the workers of this State. It is about time the Minister did so.

**Mr Davis:** Gutless.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the honourable member for Brisbane Central not to bring the Chamber into disrepute by using words such as that.

**Mr DAVIS:** I do not bring the Chamber into disrpute. I bring something to the Chamber on behalf of workers. The Minister is bringing down workers' conditions.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member for Brisbane Central will resume his seat.

**Mr LESTER:** Thank you, Mr Randell. I am quite astounded by the reaction of the Opposition. While I have been Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs in Queensland, the conditions of workers have improved dramatically. Everybody knows that. I emphasise that. I am proud of my record.

**Mr Vaughan:** You are spineless.

**Mr LESTER:** I rise to a point of order. I find that remark offensive, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

**Mr VAUGHAN:** I will withdraw it. However, I point out that the Minister lacks intestinal fortitude, as demonstrated by what he did to the SEQEB workers.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! I would like a little bit of order in this Chamber. I will not tolerate any more interjections on this matter.

Clause 2, as read, agreed to.

Clause 3, as read, agreed to.

**Hon. V. P. LESTER** (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs): Mr Randell, I move—

“That you do now leave the chair and report the Bill, without amendment, to the House.”

Motion agreed to.

**Mr Davis:** It's lucky you have got the protection of the chair, you weak animal.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the honourable member for Brisbane Central to withdraw that remark.

**Mr Davis:** I withdraw the remark. I thought that you had left the chair, Mr Randell.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member for Brisbane Central has withdrawn that remark. I ask him to resume his seat.

**Mr DAVIS:** I rise to a point of order. I thought that this Chamber had resolved, “That you do now leave the chair”.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member for Brisbane Central will resume his seat.

Bill reported, without amendment.

### Third Reading

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

**CRIMINAL LAW (REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS) ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL**

**Second Reading—Resumption of Debate**

Debate resumed from 4 September (see p. 980) on Mr Wharton's motion—

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

**Mr GOSS (Salisbury) (4.56 p.m.):** The Opposition is happy to accept this legislation and does not oppose it. The original legislation has been the policy of the Australian Labor Party in Queensland for many years. Some years before entering Parliament, I personally advocated this policy and, at the time the original legislation was introduced, I gave the Minister credit for finally introducing it after it had lain idle for some considerable time with the previous Attorney-General, and possibly Attorneys-General before him. The legislation had simply been placed in the too-hard basket. That was the best reason I was given. The fact that he was unable to bring this legislation into the House was a very poor reflection on the previous Attorney-General.

The legislation was eventually presented and passed. For the life of me, I do not know why the matters that were addressed in the amendment could not have been addressed in the original legislation. Notwithstanding that, the provisions that are introduced in the amendment are matters that the community will regard as reasonable, given the particular categories of occupation to which they apply and the types of offences that are indicated, such as sexual offences committed by applicants for a job as teacher, and so on. The provisions reflect community standards and should be given support.

This is the type of legislation that will require monitoring over the years. In a couple of years' time I would like to see the 10-year provision for adults reduced to five years, but I will not harp on that, because I made that point quite clearly during the original debate.

In his speech the Minister gave credit to the efforts of the parliamentary justice committee, Parliamentary Counsel and the officers of the Department of Justice who have brought to fruition the desirable benefits of the legislation. It is desirable that the legislation is before the House, and the only criticism I have is that it has taken such an inordinate length of time to actually happen. At least the job has been done, which is more than can be said for the previous Liberal incumbent.

The Bill makes specific provision to enable the police to disclose details of convictions—for example, to a Crown prosecutor—so that those matters can be taken into account on sentence. It is my opinion that that is not a necessary provision and that the police would have been entitled to do that in that limited case under the original legislation. It may well be that there is some debate between various departments and authorities on that. I suppose that there is no harm in clarifying that provision so that there is no doubt or uncertainty about revealing that information.

I have referred already to sexual offences being disclosed when people apply for the position of registered teacher. Similarly, I think that it is important for previous offences to be disclosed when persons seek to become members of the police force. I would not argue with that. I think that the provisions relating to justices of the peace are also reasonable. Generally, I would support them. However, one should be careful about extending that kind of exception too far, otherwise too many people will be removed from the opportunities that this socially desirable legislation is designed to bring about. One of the main problems relates to employment in the public service. I think that we should be careful to open the back door to the old practice where people who had proved themselves to be law-abiding citizens were unfairly prejudiced because of some offence in their youth. I hope that that will not happen in this case and that the mere fact of a previous conviction will not automatically disqualify a person. It remains to be seen how that will operate in practice. Because of the Labor Party's long-standing policy on this legislation, which the Opposition is pleased to see the National Party has

finally recognised, the Opposition is pleased to offer its support to the legislation in the hope that it will be effective and that it will achieve its goals.

Members of the Opposition stress their view that the legislation should continue to be monitored and that honourable members should be just as wary of the need not to let inappropriate people, for whom this legislation is designed, to slip through the net. We should be just as wary of the unfortunate consequences of the unfair penalties that can arise from disclosure of previous convictions of someone who has earned his right to a second chance.

The Opposition supports the legislation.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (5.2 p.m.): The Liberal Party supports the legislation.

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (5.3 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions and for the support indicated by the Opposition Justice spokesman and the spokesman for the Liberal Party. I assure the honourable member for Salisbury that the legislation will be monitored. As he indicated, it will be required and a response will be given, as necessary. I have always indicated that I have no hesitation in acknowledging any need for further amendment as a result of monitoring. That assurance holds with this legislation regarding the rehabilitation of offenders.

The honourable member for Salisbury mentioned delay in the introduction of legislation. I am sure that he did not intend to imply criticism of my officers, although one reading *Hansard* could perhaps believe that he had. I do not think that that was the case. I make it quite clear that any delay in the introduction of legislation is not the responsibility of officers. As the responsible Minister in this instance, as with other legislation, I gave instructions for it and other legislation to be brought forward. I am quite sure that officers of the department would have acceded to similar directions from my predecessors if those instructions had been given.

Mr Goss: I accept your statement.

Mr HARPER: I accept what the honourable member said. I am sure that that was his intention. I wanted to make it clear that no other inference could be drawn from his remarks.

Clause 4 was designed to satisfy the concerns of the police in relation to making case histories available to prosecutors at the time of sentencing of offenders. The Government did not believe that it was totally necessary. However, I took the attitude that, rather than have any doubt, the opportunity should be taken to clarify the position in order that there could be no misunderstanding.

I again thank all honourable members for their contributions.

Motion (Mr Wharton) agreed to.

#### Committee

Clauses 1 to 6, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

#### Third Reading

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

### NATIONAL COMPANIES AND SECURITIES COMMISSION (STATE PROVISIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the National Companies and Securities Commission (State Provisions) Act 1981-1984 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

### First Reading

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

### Second Reading

**Hon. N. J. HARPER** (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (5.3 p.m.): I move—

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

The National Companies and Securities Commission (State Provisions) Act provides for the operation of the National Companies and Securities Commission within Queensland. The Act deals with the formal and procedural matters necessary to enable the commission to exercise its powers within the State.

Sections of the Act set out the procedure to be followed by the commission when conducting a hearing. Under the present provisions three members of the commission must conduct a hearing, although the commission can resolve itself into divisions to carry out its functions, with each division having a quorum of two members. However, under the present provisions it is not clear whether a division of the commission is able to conduct a hearing. The resources of the commission are being strained by the requirement for three members to conduct hearings.

The purpose of this Bill is to provide for the more efficient utilisation of commission members at hearings by providing that a division of the commission may conduct a hearing and that the commission may delegate to one of its members its power to conduct a hearing.

The Bill also removes from the definition section of the Act the term “investment contract”. That expression is redundant in that it is not used elsewhere in the Act and, accordingly, it has been omitted.

The other purpose of this Bill is to place the same restrictions on members and staff of the commission, with respect to their personal dealings in futures contracts, as are presently placed on their dealings in other securities. The Act currently prohibits members and staff who have available to them information that is not generally available to the public from dealing in securities. This Bill extends that prohibition to dealings in futures contracts.

The amendments contained in the Bill are a consequence of changes to Commonwealth legislation made pursuant to arrangements under the Commonwealth/State co-operative scheme for the companies and securities industry. All States involved in the scheme will make similar amendments to their respective Acts.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Goss, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 5.11 p.m.