Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 31 MARCH 1987

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 31 MARCH 1987

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. K. R. Lingard, Fassifern) read prayers and took the chair at 10 a.m.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Assent to the following Bills reported by Mr Speaker—

Sugar Milling Rationalization (Far Northern Region) Bill;

Universities and Colleges (Higher Education Administration Charges) Bill.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Presentation

Mr SPEAKER: I remind all honourable members that tomorrow at 10 a.m. the Address in Reply to the Governor's Opening Speech will be presented to His Excellency. Cars will depart from Parliament House at 9.45 a.m. sharp. I ask all honourable members to indicate to the parliamentary attendants today if they wish to attend.

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

Resumption of Land at Dellwood Street, Nathan

From **Mr Ardill** (23 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take action to resume land at Dellwood Street, Nathan for forest park purposes.

Freeholding of Barrier Reef Islands

From **Mr Innes** (816 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will not proceed with that section of the Land Act Amendment Bill of 1987 which relates to freeholding of Barrier Reef Islands.

Similar petitions were received from **Sir William Knox** (89 signatories), **Mr Gygar** (1 440 signatories), **Mr Schuntner** (266 signatories) and **Mr Beanland** (19 signatories).

Petitions received.

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Board of Architects of Queensland for the year ended 30 June 1986

Intellectually Handicapped Citizens Council of Queensland for the period 1 January 1986 to 30 June 1986

Prince Charles Hospital Development Centre Trust for the year ended 30 June 1986

Minister for Education for the year ended 31 December 1986

Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation for the year ended 30 June 1986.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Proclamations under—

Queensland Marine Act 1958-1985

Sugar Milling Rationalization (Far Northern Region) Act 1987

Orders in Council under—

Jupiters Casino Agreement Act 1983

City of Brisbane Act 1924-1986 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Explosives Act 1952-1981

Grammar Schools Act 1975-1984 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Harbours Act 1955-1982

Harbours Act 1955-1982 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Canals Act 1958-1984

River Improvement Trust Act 1940-1985 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Water Act 1926-1986 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Queensland Grain Handling Act 1983-1986 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

National Parks and Wildlife Act 1975-1984

Land Act 1962-1986

Regulations under—

Brands Act 1915-1979

Companies and Securities (Interpretation and Miscellaneous Provisions) (Application of Laws) Act 1981

Securities Industry (Application of Laws) Act 1981

By-laws under—

Harbours Act 1955-1982 and the Port of Brisbane Authority Act 1976-1986

Reports—

Schedule of Appendices to the Report of the Commissioner of Main Roads for the year ended 30 June 1986

Cheese Marketing Board for the year ended 30 June 1986

Central Queensland Egg Marketing Board for the year ended 30 June 1986

Legal Aid Commission of Queensland for the year ended 30 June 1986

Torres Strait Protected Zone Joint Authority for the period 15 February 1985 to 30 June 1986

Trust Deed under—

Casino Control Act 1982.

(a) Proposal by the Governor in Council to revoke the setting apart and declaration as State Forest under the Forestry Act 1959-1984 of:—

(a) All that piece or part of State Forest 207, parishes of Conondale, Monsildale and Yabba described as portion 82, parish of Yabba as shown on plan FTY. 1211 prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the Office of the Conservator of Forests and containing an area of about 0.6760 of a hectare—and,

(b) All that piece or part of State Forest 168, parishes of Bendidee and Moogoon described as Area "A" as shown on plan FTY.1337 prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the office of the Conservator of Forests and containing an area of 169.7 hectares—and,

(c) All that piece or part of State Forest 1004, parishes of Como, Goomboorian, Tagigan, Toolara, Ulirrah and Womalah described as Lot 104 on plan MCH 5043 deposited in the office of the Department of Mapping and Surveying and containing an area of 5.141 hectares—and,

(d) All that piece or part of State Forest 779, parish of Gregory described as portion 159, parish of Gregory as shown on plan FTY.1340 prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the office of the Conservator of Forests and containing an area of about 102 hectares.

(b) A brief explanation of the Proposals.

REPORT OF INTELLECTUALLY HANDICAPPED CITIZENS COUNCIL OF QUEENSLAND

Tabling, Error in Speech

Hon. M. J. AHERN (Landsborough—Minister for Health and Environment) (10.06 a.m.): Mr Speaker, I draw attention to a statement made by me in the House on 18 March 1987 during the debate on the Medical and Paramedical (Amendment of Inspectorial and Audit Provisions) Bill. On that occasion I said that I had recently tabled the report of the Intellectually Handicapped Citizens Council of Queensland. I made that statement in good faith but on a mistaken premise, and I apologise to the House for the error.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Management of Queensland Housing Commission; Allegations against Commissioner of Housing

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Works and Housing) (10.12 a.m.), by leave: Honourable members would be aware of recent media coverage given to allegations made by a senior officer of the Queensland Housing Commission against the Commissioner of Housing, Mr Stewart Hall.

Certain allegations were first raised orally with a senior officer of the Department of the Public Service Board on 1 July 1986 by Mr A. G. Hutchison, Director (Technical) of the Queensland Housing Commission. These allegations concerned the Commissioner of Housing, Mr Hall, both personally and in relation to his management of the Queensland Housing Commission.

Because of the nature of the allegations, Dr C. K. Brennan, Chairman of the Public Service Board, on that same day arranged for Mr V. Doyle, the Auditor-General, to be briefed concerning the details of these oral allegations from notes taken during interview. The Auditor-General arranged for the Housing Commission auditor to interview Mr Hutchison at length, but, owing to lack of specific information, it was not possible to establish whether there was any substance to Mr Hutchison's allegations. It was not until 10 November 1986 that Mr Hutchison put his allegations formally to the Chairman of the Public Service Board; and indeed, on 27 November 1986 he provided a revised version of this formal submission.

Since that time, the allegations have been the subject of investigation and analysis by very senior and long-experienced officers of the Department of the Public Service Board. This investigation has necessarily involved a number of lengthy and detailed interviews with Mr Hutchison and with certain officers of the Queensland Housing Commission. Liaison has also been maintained with the Auditor-General and the Solicitor-General throughout the course of the investigations to date.

Although the Commissioner of Housing has been informed that allegations have been made against him, on the specific advice of the Solicitor-General's Office the Commissioner has not, to this point of time, been informed of the details of the

allegations, pending the outcome of preliminary investigations. On Monday, 30 March 1987, I received from Dr C. K. Brennan, the Chairman of the Public Service Board, a preliminary report, including appendices, prepared by senior officers of his department, which details the progress to date of their investigations and analysis. This report has been reviewed by the Auditor-General and the acting Solicitor-General, and I have been advised that it is now appropriate for the Commissioner of Housing to be asked to respond formally to the allegations. I am sure, Mr Speaker, that all honourable members will agree that until such time as the Commissioner of Housing has had the opportunity to respond, and had his responses considered carefully against the allegations made, it would be most unjust for any speculation or debate to occur concerning this matter. I must stress that this matter has been, and is being, dealt with thoroughly and properly by the authorities involved.

The acting Solicitor-General has advised that release of the preliminary report prepared by the Department of the Public Service Board could be prejudicial to the future conduct of the inquiry and would be unfair to various parties mentioned in the report who, to this stage, have not been afforded the opportunity to be heard. I will advise the House further on this matter at the earliest appropriate opportunity.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Railway Main Line Electrification Project

Hon. D. F. LANE (Merthyr—Minister for Transport) (10.15 a.m.), by leave: Today I would like to bring honourable members up to date on the rapid progress being made on the $1 billion main line electrification project. It always has been my practice to keep members and the public informed of the advancement being made on this massive scheme, which will lead Queensland Railways operations well into the twenty-first century.

In early May, we will reach another major milestone in the project when the first full-length coal trains pulled by electric locomotives are expected to be hauled from central Queensland mines. Huge coal trains, up to 2 kilometres in length, will haul from the Curragh mine on Stage 1 on the main line electrification and Peak Downs mine on State 2 during the first runs planned for May.

The latest reports show that all facets of the project are well under way and no significant delays are anticipated. The first three stages are well advanced, while preliminary work on the fourth and final stage is progressing on schedule.

Contracts for the construction of modern passenger cars have been let to Walkers-ASEA Pty Ltd in Maryborough. These will be in use in time for Expo 88 on the Nambour to Brisbane route and extended to Rockhampton by September 1989. All major contracts for civil works, telecommunications, signalling and the overhead traction system have been awarded, and no delays are expected.

On completion of all stages, due in September 1989, it will bring to fruition the largest electrification project in the Western World, reaping enormous benefits in expenditure, haulage times and staff utilisation. For example, Queensland Railways fuel bill will be cut by a conservative half a million dollars each week, high-speed intercity passenger trains will slash almost six hours off travelling-time between Brisbane and Rockhampton, and there will be estimated staff savings of 250 personnel or more.

Stage 1 of the project, valued at $327m, is fast reaching completion and, as mentioned, will accommodate the first of the high-tech coal trains in early May. When this section is fully finished, 720 kilometres of track between the Blackwater mines and Gladstone will be electrified. Testing of sophisticated locotrol equipment for the remote operation of locomotives in the middle of normal length trains is also about to commence on Stage 1. Stage 2, costing $325m, involves the electrification of 775 kilometres of the Goonyella mine system to the ports of Hay Point and Dalrymple Bay. While the first electric coal haulage is planned for May, already the energisation of part of the line has enabled extensive driver-training and trial haulage.

Construction work on the $36m Stage 3, extending Stage 1 from Blackwater to Emerald, is proceeding on schedule, with the first service programmed to operate in September. The fourth and final stage of the main line electrification, costing an estimated $362m, will see the electrification of the line from Caboolture to Gladstone, with the additional wiring of a number of yards and lines in the Brisbane area associated with the operation of freight on the main North Coast Line.

When completed, the $1,050m main line electrification will ensure the maximum use of new-technology electric locomotives without cost to the Queensland public and with great savings for the Queensland Government.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Green Paper on Invasion of Privacy Act

Hon. P. J. CLAUSON (Redlands—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (10.19 a.m.), by leave: Mr Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to table the Green Paper on the Invasion of Privacy Act prepared by the Privacy Committee.

The Invasion of Privacy Act is an important piece of legislation which contains a number of significant provisions which protect and enhance the right of Queenslanders to privacy. This Act, which was passed in 1971, was the first of its kind, and other States followed Queensland's lead in enacting legislation to protect the privacy of persons.

The Privacy Committee itself was also a trend-setter, as only New South Wales had previously established an ongoing body to monitor privacy matters and make recommendations to the Government. This paper is the committee's first major report, and honourable members will recognise that it contains recommendations which will be of vital interest to all Queenslanders.

The committee has recommended that the Invasion of Privacy Act be amended in the following ways—

- the licensing provisions should be tightened and improper behaviour of licensers proscribed;
- a specific offence of wrongfully remaining in a dwelling-house or yard of a dwelling-house should be created;
- junk mail either placed in letter boxes or gratuitously distributed about the environs of a dwelling-house should be regulated and, when a house-holder indicates that he or she does not want this material, it would be an offence to distribute junk mail to such a house-holder; and
- the development of legislative guide-lines for the collection, storage, access and disclosure of personal information.

The Green Paper canvasses many other matters of significance, and both honourable members and interested persons are encouraged to peruse this document and write to the secretary of the Privacy Committee. The committee has requested a cut-off for the receipt of submissions as from 29 May 1987.

Whereupon the honourable member laid on the table the document referred to.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Retirement Villages

Hon. P. J. CLAUSON (Redlands—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (10.21 a.m.), by leave: A Green Paper on retirement villages, which I tabled in this House on 26 February 1987, has received an overwhelming response from a broad range of persons, including the elderly, financiers, developers and other persons interested in this important area. Over 2 500 copies of the Green Paper have been released, with some 200 responses being received on the draft legislation.

I have also received numerous requests from many people and organisations for more time to consider the content of the document and to prepare detailed submissions. Mr Speaker, for a number of reasons I propose to accede to these requests and extend the deadline for submissions to 30 April 1987.

The responses received to date have been most helpful and clearly vindicate my decision to release a Green Paper and call for submissions from the public. The extension of this deadline will give many others the opportunity to contribute to the development of appropriate legislation.

It is my present intention to make a number of refinements to the draft Bill and make copies of that document available to interested persons prior to 30 May. A Bill will then be introduced into this House during the Budget session.

As I informed this House in my earlier statement when the Green Paper was tabled, it was intended that regulation of those schemes falling within Division VI of Part IV of the Companies Code cease on 30 June 1987. I am presently initiating discussions with my counterparts on the Ministerial Council of Companies and Securities with a view to having regulation under the Companies Code continue until Queensland legislation is in place.

After 30 June, the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs will continue to examine all documentation submitted to him by the industry. I anticipate that there will be a smooth and trouble-free transition phase after the legislation is in place, with schemes approved or sanctioned under the Companies Code and as a result of compliance with the requirements of the existing policy continuing without disruption.

Prior to introducing the Bill, I will also take into consideration the report of the New South Wales Department of Consumer Affairs into retirement villages, which was released on 18 March 1987. That report is presently being considered by a consultative committee which is to produce a detailed proposal for legislation and/or a code of practice for New South Wales.

In concluding, I would indicate quite clearly that it is the Government's intention to enhance the continuing growth of the retirement villages industry in Queensland by not acting in an arbitrary fashion and failing to give adequate consideration to the views of the industry and those who are served by it.

FORM OF QUESTIONS

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I refer to questions 2, 10 and 15 on the notice paper, which are long and contain many parts. Honourable members will be aware that I have been trying to make answers to questions both short and relevant. I do not believe that questions such as 2, 10 and 15 are fair to the Ministers or to other members in the Chamber who wish to ask questions. I trust that members will co-operate in the future.

Mr Burns: What about ministerial statements? Be fair, Mr Speaker—25 minutes of ministerial statements this morning in one hour for question-time.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has not even brought his note for being absent for the three days.

Mr Burns: Twenty-five minutes for ministerial statements. It is about time you were fair.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Be seated.

Mr Burns: I am seated.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Answers to questions upon notice.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

1. Oxenford-Hope Island-Pine Ridge Road

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

"With reference to the Oxenford-Hope Island-Pine Ridge Road (including bridgework)—

(1) What was the total cost of works on the project?

(2) Which parties, including companies and local authorities, contributed to the cost of these works, how much did they provide and when was the payment of the contribution made?"

Mr HINZE: (1) The project for the construction of two bridges and approach roadwork to connect the Oxenford-Hope Island Road with the Pine Ridge Road at Paradise Point is anticipated to cost $4.7m.

(2) Contributions towards the cost of these works were received as follows—

(a) Development Equity Corporation, $1m, paid between January 1986 and May 1986.

(b) Sanctuary Cove Development, $1m, paid between October 1985 and April 1986. This was received through Treasury, whereby subsidy payments for dredging work carried out by the developer were paid direct to Main Roads.

(c) Gold Coast City Council and Albert Shire Council each paid approximately $0.5m between November 1985 and March 1987. This contribution by the local authorities is based on the actual cost of work, and minor adjustments are still to be finalised.

2. Builders Registration Board

Mr WARBURTON asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

"With reference to the Builders' Registration Board's activities relating to the home that belonged to V. P. and M. A. Lester at 9 Blamey Street, Clermont—

(1) Is it not correct that there was never any formal contract between the Lesters and the builder, O'Brien and Sons?

(2) Is it not correct that the Builders' Registration Board always rejected approaches by applicants for insurance if no formal contract existed?

(3) Is it not correct that the board was never told of the value of the dwelling?

(4) Is it not correct that the board was never told of the contract value of the dwelling or the terms of the 'monetary agreement' reached between the Lesters and O'Brien and Sons in respect of defective work?

(5) Is it not correct that the board sought this information but no reply was ever received from the Lesters?

(6) Is it not correct that the board requires that any owner who makes a claim under the home owner's insurance provisions of the relevant Act, and holds any of the contract monies, must contribute that money towards the cost of the rectification?

(7) Is it not correct that the board received advice that money had been withheld by the Lesters from the builder and is it not also correct that there is no evidence to suggest that there was any contribution towards the rectification as required?

(8) Is it not correct that the roof of the dwelling was constructed in accordance with the approved plan and the pitch of the roof was in excess of that required by the manufacturers of the roofing material?

(9) Is it not correct that the board's building inspector Mr G. Neumann made it clear in his report of 1 August 1984 that the roof had been built in accordance with the plan and he recommended that no action be taken?

(10) Is it not correct that Mr G. Neumann's estimate of cost for necessary work on the Lester's dwelling was $2,700?

(11) As an amount in excess of $23,000 was paid out in insurance to, in the main, improve the aesthetics of the roof and in view of the clear evidence that this should never have occurred, will he act immediately to retrieve the amount of over $20,000 that should never have been paid out for work done on the Lesters' residence?"

Mr I. J. GIBBS: (1) Whilst no written contract existed, a verbal contract was confirmed by all parties and evidenced by the Form 9 Notice of Building Construction submitted by the builder to the board.

(2) No, it is not correct. However, it is up to the individual to provide evidence that a contract, verbal or otherwise, existed.

(3) The insurance Form 9 showed the value of the contract as $52,000.

(4) The board was never informed of the final agreed price between the builder and Mr and Mrs Lester. However, the builder wrote to the board on 6 August 1982 advising that the items referred to in the board's letter dated 2 April 1982 had either been rectified or resolved by mutual agreement.

(5) Confirmation of a settlement was received from the builder.

(6) Yes, it is correct. However, in this instance confirmation was received from the builder that, by agreement, a monetary settlement had been reached in relation to certain aspects of Mr and Mrs Lesters' 1982 complaint. This indicated financial settlement of the contract for all parties.

(7) Money was withheld only until the previously mentioned settlement was reached. No contribution was requested of the owners towards rectification.

(8) The roof was constructed as shown on a plan drawn up by the builder which met the roofing-manufacturer's specifications. However, the pitch on the plan was not the same as that of the house roof that Mr and Mrs Lester used to illustrate their requirements.

(9 and 10) The estimate was provided after inspection on 18 July 1984 and before it was discovered that the state of the roof sarking necessitated replacement, which involved removal of the roof sheeting and did not take into account that the pitch of the roof was not in accordance with Mr and Mrs Lesters' requirements.

(11) The Builders Registration Board considered this matter at a meeting on 6 November 1984. It had all the evidence before it, including the fact that 48 houses constructed in the area by this builder needed rectification work costing in excess of $108,000.

The board decided that sill flashings, roof repitching and bathroom tiles would be rectified under the insurance provisions on the understanding that any claim relating to the non-provision of damp course and incorrect dimensions be waived. The undertaking was received from Mr Lester by letter dated 14 November 1984.

I am fully satisfied with the decision taken by the Builders Registration Board in this matter.

3. Ground-water Levels in Lockyer Valley

Mr FITZGERALD asked the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services—

"(1) What do the latest readings of ground water levels in the Lockyer Valley indicate?"

"(2) Are all areas affected to the same degree?"

Mr TENNI: (1) Ground-water levels in the Lockyer Valley were last measured by the Queensland Water Resources Commission in mid-January. These measurements clearly show that, as a result of well below average rainfall and the increased demands placed on ground-water supplies, water levels in the alluvia of Lockyer Creek, from Grantham to Kentville, and its tributaries are the lowest ever recorded.

Although ground-water levels in Lockyer Creek, upstream from the junction with Flagstone Creek, are as low as any previously recorded, the situation is not quite as serious as there is still a reasonable depth of water available.

Levels in the lower end of Lockyer Creek, from Kentville to the Brisbane River, are also low and are approaching the lowest recorded to date.

The commission has advised that the available ground water has been seriously depleted for most of the area. Although supplies in these areas are still available, existing bores cannot be pumped at anywhere near their designed rates.

To assist local property-owners, the State Government has constructed 15 ground-water recharge weirs in the Lockyer Valley, and additional works, costing more than $25m, are under construction or being investigated.

These weirs have played an important part in increasing the recharge of the ground-water storage from local stream flows. When the current extended dry period breaks and stream flows occur, those weirs will ensure that the ground-water levels respond very rapidly.

(2) As already indicated, the areas most affected are the upstream section of Lockyer Creek, from Grantham to Kentville, and the alluvial deposits of its tributaries. Ground water is still available at present in the deeper sections of these alluvials. However, in the shallow sections of the alluvium, very little water, and in some cases no water, is available. The alluvium of the Lockyer Creek, from just downstream of Kentville to O'Reilly's Weir, normally benefits from regulated water released from Atkinson Dam. However, the surface water supplies in this storage have now been virtually exhausted. It is expected that in a few months the ground-water levels in Lockyer Creek, downstream of Kentville, will deteriorate to a point lower than the previous lowest levels ever recorded.

The ground-water storage in Lockyer Creek, upstream of the junction with Flagstone Creek, is almost constantly supplied from natural springs in the local basalt formations. For this reason, this area is not expected to be a major cause for concern, at least over the next few months.

The commission is currently obtaining updated water-level measurements from bores throughout the Lockyer Valley, and these are expected to indicate a worsening situation over much of the area as the dry spell continues. There is very limited potential for developing major additional water supplies in the Lockyer Valley. However, considerable scope exists for better overall management of this resource. This can be achieved only if the area is proclaimed as a subartesian district under the relevant section of the Water Act. I will be very pleased to consider such a move, if there is broad community support for this proposal. Such a proclamation will certainly allow for more effective development and equitable use of the local ground-water resources.

4. Two-train Accident, Fry

Mr PREST asked the Minister for Transport—

"With reference to a recent two-train mishap at Fry on the Gladstone-Moura line—

(1) Has an investigation been held into the cause of this mishap?

(2) What was the cause of the accident and was it in any part due to lack of maintenance?

(3) How long was traffic delayed?

(4) How much damage was caused to property?

(5) Was any person's life endangered in this mishap?"

Mr LANE: (1) Yes.

(2) The cause was a broken left-hand rail switch. It was found to have a slight flaw in the middle of the switch rail which was not visible on the outside of the rail and which caused the switch to break suddenly. It was in no way attributed to a lack of maintenance.

(3) Traffic was delayed from 1.05 a.m. to 10.30 a.m. on 18 February.

(4) Two diesel-electric locomotives (Nos 1337 and 1339) were damaged. Both of these engines have since been returned to traffic after repairs in the Rockhampton Railway Workshops.

(5) This was not considered to be a life-endangering situation. Fireman E. Schulz of the stationary train hurt his right ankle and suffered abrasions to his left leg in jumping from the locomotive as the derailed diesel approached him. There were no other injuries. Driver Bianchi and fireman Schulz of the stationary train could have been considered to be in some danger from the approaching derailed locomotive, but no injury occurred as a result of the collision.

5. Local Government Funding

Mr PREST asked the Premier and Treasurer—

"As local authorities are concerned with changes recommended to the Grants Commission, for budgetary purposes, will he assure local authorities that the same level of funding under the new principles to be used in the allocation of funds will be retained as that which exists under the present system of distribution?"

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: In accordance with the provisions of the Commonwealth's Local Government (Financial Assistance) Act of 1986, the principles for the allocation of funds to local authorities must be approved by the Commonwealth Minister, Mr Tom Uren. As this has not yet been obtained, it is not possible to comment further at this stage.

6. Harvesting of Kangaroos

Mr LITTLEPROUD asked the Minister for Tourism, National Parks and Sport—

"Is a book written in Queensland on the kangaroo species and giving information about a responsible harvesting program recognised throughout the world as a credible authority on the species?"

Mr MUNTZ: The honourable member is obviously referring to the book *The Kangaroo Keepers*, which is the only major published work on the management of kangaroos anywhere and one of the few treatises ever produced on responsible, large-scale harvesting of native animals. This book was written by leading kangaroo-researchers of the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service and published in 1985 by University of Queensland Press, one of Australia's most respected publishers. It is the culmination of 30 years of field studies on kangaroos. The book has been distributed worldwide in libraries, Government agencies and conservation bodies, as well as for public sale. I understand these sales are progressing very satisfactorily.

The National Parks and Wildlife Service now holds correspondence from acknowledged world authorities in the area of marsupial biology and ecology commending the action taken in presenting the facts for public information. Reviews have been universally in favour of the book and its presentation.

The Commonwealth Minister for Arts, Heritage and Environment would be well advised to take notice of the expertise of the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife

Service officers responsible for the book when considering Queensland kangaroo management programs, rather than be guided by so-called experts in the animal conservation lobby.

7. Cost of Premier and Treasurer's Trip to Japan

Mr BEANLAND asked the Premier and Treasurer—

"(1) Has he seen the various press reports claiming that while he was in Japan on his recent trip his room in the Imperial Hotel, Tokyo, cost the taxpayer of Queensland $2,380 a night and that the bill for his personal accommodation was $18,800?

(2) Given his calls for a reduction in Government expenditure and an end to Government waste, (a) what was the true cost of his accommodation in Japan and that of his accompanying staff and (b) will he detail the total cost of his recent trip to Japan?"

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: (1 and 2) I appreciate that the honourable member has only recently been elected to this House. Obviously, he is not aware that after 30 June there is laid upon the table of the Legislative Assembly the *Departmental Accounts Subsidiary to the Public Accounts.* Included in the information which is furnished in these accounts are details of my travelling and expense allowance when travelling in Australia and overseas.

I also remind the honourable member that, on the first sitting day after my return from overseas, I reported to the House on my visit and I outlined details of a number of new and important investment and trade prospects for Queensland. I would have thought that the honourable member would realise that visits overseas by a head of Government are necessary at times to encourage new foreign investments. Nothing can be accomplished without a great deal of effort, endeavour and cost.

I would have been more impressed if the honourable member had asked what my visit had achieved for the State and the nation and how much more employment would be created. The honourable member obviously brands himself as a typical negative-thinking points-scorer.

8. Queensland Government Development Authority Loans

Mr BEANLAND asked the Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police—

"With reference to the Premier's statements to this House that the Queensland Government Development Authority has, on a limited number of occasions, been involved with lending funds for private sector developments—

What are the dates of the loans, what were the establishment costs, the amount of stamp duty paid, the names of persons or companies receiving the loans and the amounts involved?"

Mr GUNN: May I suggest that the honourable member start doing a bit of work in this House. This is a recycled version of a question that was asked by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Warburton, on 18 March and answered on that day. As this question is basically a repeat of the one that was then asked, I do not propose to add anything further to what was said on that occasion.

9. Psychiatric Patients

Mr McELLIGOTT asked the Minister for Health and Environment—

"With reference to the book 'Surviving Schizophrenia' by the Washington psychiatrist, E. Fuller Torrey, in which he wrote: 'when the history of human services is written, the plight of discharged schizophrenics in the 1980s will surely

be cited as a national disgrace' and to the Health Department's practice of returning psychiatric patients to the community where appropriate—

(1) How many patients were released from psychiatric institutions and units during 1985 and 1986?

(2) How many of those were placed in community hostels or group homes and how many were discharged as cured?"

Mr AHERN: I am delighted with the reference to Dr E. Fuller Torrey's book *Surviving Schizophrenia*, which deals mainly with the mental health services in the United States of America. I congratulate the honourable member on his choice of this reading material, which is well known to my senior officers and many people in this State.

With reference to Dr Fuller Torrey, I should add that at the Sheraton Hotel in Brisbane on 7 March 1987 he addressed a public meeting of more than 600 people from all parts of the State. It was the largest meeting of its kind in Australia. He made some encouraging comments about the direction of psychiatry service development in Queensland and about our mental health legislation. The Schizophrenia Foundation of Australia or the Schizophrenia Fellowship of South-East Queensland may be able to provide the honourable member with a recording or transcript of that address.

The specific answers to the honourable member's questions are—

(1) Between July 1985 and June 1986, there were 6 362 discharge events from public psychiatric hospitals and the psychiatry units of general hospitals. The actual number of patients involved would be somewhat less because a small proportion of this group had more than one discharge.

(2) During this time, there were about 3 000 contacts with the support program of the community psychiatry service and it is estimated that about two-thirds of these contacts involved intensive assistance with accommodation in hostels, group homes, flats, etc. Again, the actual number of people involved would be somewhat less because some had more than one contact. At least 300 other patients throughout the State would have been assisted by staff of other services, such as general hospitals, private hospitals, the Division of Community Medicine, etc., in finding similar accommodation during this time.

It is impossible to determine the number of patients who were discharged as cured, unless the honourable member provides a definition of "cure". All patients, or the vast majority, would have improved as a result of their hospital treatment. However, since there are many different kinds of psychiatric illness of varying severity, some of which tend to be fluctuating or relapsing, a definition of "cure" is essential. It should be noted that modern scientifically based treatments and care of patients with mental illnesses are very useful and effective in most cases. Every patient can be helped to some degree. Hospital and community-based psychiatric services are steadily expanding at present in Queensland.

10. Mining Lease 681, Cooktown

Mr VAUGHAN asked the Minister for Mines and Energy and Minister for the Arts—

"(1) Who are lessees of ML681 Cooktown?

(2) Has there ever been any disagreement over the boundaries of ML681 Cooktown?

(3) If so, what action was taken by the Mines Department in relation to that disagreement?

(4) Were the lessees directed in June 1984, to carry out, at their own expense, a survey by an authorised surveyor within three months of the date of direction?

(5) Have the lessees carried out the survey as directed and, if so, when was the survey information received by the Mines Department?

(6) If not, what action is the Mines Department taking to have the lessees comply with the Mines Department direction?

(7) Were the boundaries of ML681 Cooktown changed to include an area which was not included in the final description of the lease submitted by the lessees?

(8) If so, did the previous Director-General of Mines direct that the boundaries be changed?

(9) If so, for what reason did the previous Director-General of Mines change the boundaries of ML681 Cooktown?

(10) Has the Mines Department been supplied with detailed information of illegal mining in the Palmer River area involving minerals worth hundreds of thousands of dollars?

(11) If so, what action has been taken to prosecute the offenders?

(12) What action is being taken to prevent further illegal mining in the area?"

Mr AUSTIN: (1) Chase Minerals NL, 49 per cent; Leighton Resources Pty Limited, 51 per cent.

(2) Yes.

(3) The lessee was directed to carry out a survey of the lease.

(4) Yes.

(5) A survey was carried out and a survey report lodged with the Department of Mines on 21 June 1985. At that time the lease was replotted.

(6) See (5).

(7) The information contained in the survey report matched the original sketch plan submitted with the application indicating the intent of the original applicant. The description was amended accordingly in line with comments from the surveyor.

(8) Departmental policy was followed on the direction of the chief surveyor.

(9) See (7) and (8).

(10) A report was received in November 1984 suggesting illegal mining in the vicinity of Mining Lease No. 681, Cooktown.

(11) A full investigation was carried out by the Inspector of Mines, Cairns, but following inspection it was not considered possible to determine sufficient details of the alleged illegal activities relative to dates and parties which would substantiate a successful prosecution.

(12) Since the definition of the boundaries of the lease, no further complaints have been received. However, the inspectors at Cairns monitor mining operations and compliance with the Mining Act on an ongoing basis.

11. Supply of Coal to Turkish Power Station; Bligh Coal Ltd

Mr VAUGHAN asked the Premier and Treasurer—

"With reference to my question to him on 24 February (No. 22) regarding Queensland's involvement in construction of a power station in Turkey and his answer that the exact source of the coal for the Turkey power station will not be known until the requirements in terms of coal specifications, etc., have been established—

(1) Is the Ensham coal deposit one of the likely sources of supply being considered by the Government?

(2) Have there been any discussions with any of the directors of Bligh Coal Ltd., viz.—William Robert Stubbs, Sir Robert William Mathers, Francis Thomas Moore and Rodney Foxhill Cormie, regarding the preparation of a tender for the supply of coal from Ensham for the Turkey power station?

(3) Have there been any discussions with any other coal company regarding the supply of coal to the Turkey power station?

(4) If so, what are the names of the companies with whom such discussions have been held?

(5) Is he aware of any reason why the Brisbane Stock Exchange would have queried a sharp increase in the share price of Bligh Coal Ltd. as was reported in *The Courier-Mail* on 31 January?"

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: (1) The Governmnent has not yet specifically considered any particular sources of coal supply. However, it would be expected that, as a large and prospective steaming coal deposit in Queensland, Ensham could, of course, be one of the deposits worthy of consideration.

(2) I am not aware of any discussions with any representatives of Bligh Coal Ltd—whether directors or not—regarding the preparation of a tender for the supply of coal from Ensham for the Turkey power station.

(3 and 4) I am not aware of any discussions at this stage with any other companies regarding their supplying coal to the Turkey power station.

(5) No.

12. Upper Mount Gravatt Police Station

Mr SHERRIN asked the Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police—

"With reference to the Upper Mt Gravatt Police Station—

(1) What plans are in place, if any, to upgrade this station to 24 hour-a-day status?

(2) What additional services and staff can local residents expect to be provided if the station is to be upgraded?"

Mr GUNN: I thank the honourable member for the interest that he has shown in this matter and am pleased to announce that—

(1) A new police station at Upper Mount Gravatt is on the Police Department's five-year building plan and construction is due to commence in the 1987-88 financial year.

(2) The provision of the new station will allow for a 24-hour service with the additional functions of mobile patrols, traffic police, criminal investigation branch and juvenile aid bureau.

13. Premier and Treasurer's Taxation Policy Presented to National Taxation Summit

Mr SHERLOCK asked the Premier and Treasurer—

"With reference to the document 'Queensland's Taxation Reform Package' presented by him to the National Taxation Summit in July 1985—

(1) Does he still support his policy as presented to that summit?

(2) If his present policies differ from that proposal, what are the details of any differences?"

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: (1 and 2) As I indicated to the National Taxation Summit in July 1985, there was then, and there still is, an urgent need for tax reform

in Australia to reduce the burden on all Australians and to increase incentive and economic growth.

However, as the detailed proposals in the earlier submission are now out of date, tax policies designed to achieve this reform are being reviewed and will be announced when I consider the time is appropriate.

14. Gateway Arterial Road

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

"With reference to the Gateway Arterial Road—

(1) What is the current traffic volume utilizing this road?

(2) To what extent does this traffic volume vary from his departments' projections?

(3) Is he aware of any traffic problem associated with the Mt Gravatt-Capalaba Road intersection with the arterial road?

(4) Is the Main Roads Department giving consideration to the construction of an overpass over this busy intersection and what plans are in place to duplicate the Gateway Arterial Road on the southside of Brisbane?"

Mr HINZE: (1) Traffic volumes vary from one section to another and from day to day. Perhaps the best indicator of patronage on the Gateway Arterial is the volume using the Gateway Bridge, which is currently in the range of 150 000 to 165 000 vehicles per week.

(2) Anticipated volumes on the Gateway Bridge were in the range 90 000 to 100 000.

(3) The volume of traffic using the section of the Gateway Arterial intersecting with the Mount Gravatt-Capalaba Road is also higher than anticipated. This has resulted in there being insufficient queue length for vehicles standing at the signals in some peak periods.

Mr Burns: Are you going to reduce the toll, then?

Mr HINZE: No, it will be made four lanes.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HINZE: (4) The provision of additional standing lanes is being designed by Main Roads to overcome current problems. It is acknowledged that, as traffic volumes increase further, there will be a need for overpass structures at this location. The design of this intersection and of the whole Gateway Arterial allows for duplication in the future as traffic volumes warrant.

15. Tick Fever Vaccine

Mr D'ARCY asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

"With reference to the batch of tick fever vaccine prepared by his department's Tick Fever Research Centre in 1986 which was found to be carrying the EBL virus—

(1) Have all animals treated with the faulty vaccine been identified?

(2) How many animals treated with the vaccine have reacted positively to tests?

(3) Were some animals sold to Malaysia?

(4) What is the total number of cattle for which compensation has been paid and what is the value of this compensation?

(5) How many stock remain for which compensation claims are still pending?

(6) Why are farmers compensated for beef cattle infected with the faulty vaccine when these cattle have not been previously tested and beef cattle are not included in the EBL free accreditation scheme?

(7) Is the disease a danger to human beings and, if not, why has his department established the EBL free scheme?

(8) Why has his department not been purchasing stock from accredited EBL farms in order to manufacture vaccine?

(9) Will he indicate what ongoing research is being undertaken by his department and what publications have been produced on this subject in order to justify his statement on ABC Television on 18 March that Queensland is leading the world on EBL eradication?

(10) What steps have been taken to ensure that further batches are not infected?"

Mr HARPER: To answer the honourable member's question in a manner which I choose requires considerable detail. Accordingly, with the permission of the House, I propose to summarise my answer verbally and to table my complete answer, seeking the approval of the House to have the complete answer recorded in *Hansard.*

In his lengthy 10-point question——

Mr Burns: What about the lengthy 20-point answer?

Mr HARPER: I could take up the whole morning.

The honourable member for Woodridge refers to a television program *7.30 Report* and it is apparent that in framing his question the honourable member has been in consultation with the reporter involved with that telecast. When interviewed for *7.30 Report,* I said that the report was "without equivocation, misleading and inaccurate". Because the honourable member has referred to this program, I seek leave of the House to incorporate in the answer to this question, and to have included in the *Hansard* record, a letter which I have addressed to the Australian Broadcasing Commission substantiating my claim on the program that the report was both misleading and inaccurate.

Leave granted.

Mr HARPER: Dealing now briefly with the honourable member's question point by point—

(1) All owners of stock vaccinated with the contaminated batch of vaccine have been identified and contacted. In all cases they are aware of the cattle which were vaccinated.

(2) Some 1 800 vaccinated cattle have reacted to the test for EBL. A total of 8 600 head have been tested but this includes some unvaccinated animals tested for control purposes.

(3) No, there have been no live cattle exports to Malaysia since April 1986. However, that is an interesting question by the honourable member.

(4) I have approved compensation in the amount of $438,170 to date. This is for 404 head, including some highly valued stud cattle.

(5) There are some 1 400 known reactors for which compensation claims either are being processed or are expected to be submitted. Undoubtedly, further claims may be expected.

(6) Compensation is being paid for beef cattle when testing of unvaccinated cattle demonstrates that the herd has a nil or very low prevalence of EBL and when the producer can demonstrate that the enterprise is disadvantaged as a result of the use of the contaminated batch of vaccine. Compensation also encourages the producer to remove vaccinated animals infected with EBL virus from his breeding stock and so prevent the establishment of infection in the herd.

(7) I believe it is reasonable to state that human beings are unaffected by bovine leucosis virus, and enzootic bovine leucosis is therefore totally unrelated to human health.

(8) Cattle used in tick fever vaccine production must come from tick free country. Any previous exposure to cattle tick makes them unsuitable.

(9) Current research on enzootic bovine leucosis (EBL) by the Queensland Department of Primary Industries—

(a) Tests to detect infected animals
Antibody detection
Virus detection

An Opposition member interjected.

Mr HARPER: I had nothing to do with the length of the question. The answer continues—

(b) Epidemiology of EBL

(c) Development of an EBL vaccine

(d) Immunology of EBL

(e) Departmental publications on enzootic bovine leucosis.

They are listed over four pages. If honourable members wish, I can read them.

(10) Tick fever vaccine is produced from the blood of donor calves at the Tick Fever Research Centre, Wacol.

Mr Speaker, as I indicated at the outset, I ask that the balance of the answer, including the letter to the ABC, be incorporated in *Hansard.*

Leave granted.

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

Answer—

(1) All owners of stock vaccinated with the contaminated batch of vaccine have been identified and contacted. In all cases they are aware of the cattle which were vaccinated.

(2) Some 1 800 vaccinated cattle have reacted to the test for E.B.L. A total of 8 600 head have been tested but this includes some unvaccinated animals tested for control purposes.

(3) No, there have been no live cattle exports to Malaysia since April 1986.

(4) I have approved compensation in the amount of $438,170 to date. This for 404 head including some highly valued stud cattle.

(5) There are some 1 400 known reactors for which compensation claims either are being processed or are expected to be submitted. Undoubtedly, further claims may be expected.

(6) Compensation is being paid for beef cattle when testing of unvaccinated cattle demonstrates that the herd has a nil or very low prevalence of E.B.L. and when the producer can demonstrate that the enterprise is disadvantaged as a result of the use of the contaminated batch of vaccine. Compensation also encourages the producer to remov-evaccinated animals infected with E.B.L. virus from his breeding stock and so prevent the establishment of infection in the herd.

(7) I believe it is reasonable to state that human beings are unaffected by Bovine Leucosis Virus and Enzootic Bovine Leucosis is therefore totally unrelated to human health.

The Queensland Department of Health has stated categorically that there is no evidence that the Enzootic Leucosis virus can cause disease in humans (18 March 1987). This is in accord with the world literature on the bovine leucosis virus (BLV).

Surveys, based on the detection of antibody and cell culture techniques, have been undertaken in several countries for evidence of BLV infection in man. No antibodies to BLV have been detected in any of the thousands of sera tested from healthy people.

including those exposed to infection such as laboratory personnel, veterinarians, meat inspectors and farmers, or in human patients.

Studies in European countries, where careful records of cases in lymphosarcoma and leucosis in cattle and humans had been kept since 1943, found that the prevalence in humans was no higher in rural areas that in urban areas. Studies in America have reported similar results.

The survival of virus in animal products has been examined.

Pasteurisation of milk destroys the virus which would be present at a low level in milk from infected cows. Experimental work done at the Animal Research Institute has confirmed overseas studies and shown conclusively that following pasteurisation, milk from infected cows is not capable of transmitting infection to recipient animals. The virus is killed by heating to 73°C for 20 seconds, so cooking of meat would most certainly be effective in destroying it, *if it were present.*

The E.B.L. accreditation scheme was established in Queensland to defend our international and domestic markets for live cattle and dairy produce, and to prevent the further spread of a disease of livestock which had become a matter of concern to some Queensland producers and which appeared likely to become much more widely entrenched in the absence of positive action.

(8) Cattle used in tick fever vaccine production must come from tick free country. Any previous exposure to cattle tick makes them unsuitable.

Before January 1985 there were no herds which were accredited free for E.B.L. and also tick-free, and which were situated within practical distance of the Wacol laboratory. A year later (January 1986), there were four suitable herds on the Darling Downs, but these were totally inadequate for supplying a constant demand of 15 calves monthly throughout the year. Towards the end of 1986, when the number of properties had increased to seventeen, it became possible to purchase all calves from accredited properties. It has nevertheless been difficult to obtain adequate numbers of calves from them to maintain vaccine production.

(9) Currect Research on Enzootic Bovine Leucosis (E.B.L.) by the Queensland Department of Primary Industries:—

(a) Tests to Detect Infected Animals

Antibody Detection

Following successful development of the agar gel immunodiffusion test (A.G.I.D.) using locally produced reagents (at a cost saving over imported USA test kits of $1.21 per test) attention has turned to developing more sensitive, or more readily automated methods of antibody detection. An enzyme-linked immunoabsorbent assay (ELISA) procedure is showing considerable promise and is presently undergoing primary validation. Exhaustive testing will be carried out before any new procedure is adopted as the A.G.I.D. test has successfully reduced the prevalance of infection in accreditation herds from 15.58% in the first round of testing to 0.8% by the fifth round of testing. These figures are based on results of 234,828 tests. A very specific immunoblot assay for P24 antibody has also been developed, but this has mainly research applications.

Virus Detection

It will be remembered that the first isolation of bovine leucosis virus (BLV) in Australia was made by scientists within my Department in the late 1970's. Few other isolations have been made in the world. For obvious practical reasons, there is a pressing need for a rapid, accurate and sensitive *in vitro* test to detect virus infected animals. Subinoculation of blood into sheep is very sensitive, and we are heavily reliant on this procedure to screen animals destined for use in the production of tick fever vaccines. However, it is laborious, slow to give a result and expensive. An immunoblot method to detect vircus in infected sheep takes about five days and is very accurate, but it is much less sensitive when applied to cattle. The search for an alternative to sheep inoculation is continuing; a labelled DNA probe is one of our objectives in which good progress has been made, and there is still hope of improving the immunoblot method for cattle.

(b) Epidemiology of E.B.L.

Studies of the spread of BLV under natural conditions in co-operator herds have indicated that the incidence of infection tends not to increase significantly in those herds with low initial infection rates. However, the incidence does increase once infection rates have reached a moderate, but as yet undefined level.

Producer co-operators have also helped evaluate control and eradication procedures recommended under the accreditation scheme. Segregation and isolation of reactors detected by testing at four-six monthly intervals has been proved to be an efficient method of elimating infection from a herd.

(c) Development of an E.B.L. Vaccine

The Australian Dairy Research Foundation has funded an ambitious programme to develop a non-infective vaccine for E.B.L. The approach has been to isolate and purify protective antigens from BLV. Should such antigens be shown to prevent infection in cattle, the next step would be to produce the antigen by genetic engineering. Because only part of the virus is being used, it will be possible to distinguish vaccinated from infected animals by serological tests developed in our departmental laboratories. Similar work is being done in Japan. An effective vaccine against E.B.L. has not been developed anywhere in the world as yet. It is regarded as a long term but worthwhile objective.

(d) Immunology of E.B.L.

These studies are progressing, mainly in sheep, and include identification of lymphocyte types invaded by the virus and mechanisms by which the host prevents of succumbs to tumour development.

Because less than 5% of infected cattle develop tumours, there is considerable interest in identifying factors responsible for this variation in response to infection. There is much evidence to suggest that genetic factors play a role in susceptibility to the oncogenic effects of BLV. Lymphocyte histocompatibility antigens have been studied to this end by my departmental scientists both at the Animal Research Institute, Yeerongpilly and at the Australian National University in Canberra.

(e) Departmental Publications on Enzootic Bovine Leucosis

Queensland Department of Primary Industries scientists have *published 19 scientific papers on E.B.L.*, namely:—

Chung, Y.S. (1980a)—Isolation of bovine leucosis virus from cattle. *Aust. vet. J. 56:* 42-43.

Chung, Y.S. (1980b)—Isolation of bovine leucosis virus from cattle. *Aust. vet. J. 56:* 301-302.

Chung, Y.S. (1985)—Immunology of enzootic bovine leucosis. Proc. Applied Immunology in Animal Science: 90-92. Conference and Workshop Series. Qld. Dept Primary Industries QO 85012.

Chung, Y.S. and Rogers, R.J. (1985)—The effect of heat treatment and pasteurisation of milk on bovine leucosis virus. *Aust. Avd. Vet. Sci.* 21. *Aust. vet. Assoc.*

Chung, Y.S., Harrower, B.J. and Everson, J. (1984)—Establishment of bovine leucosis virus producing cell lines, using a Queensland isolate of the virus. *Aust. vet. J. 61:* 306-307.

Chung, Y.S., Dimmock, C.K. and Rogers, R.J. (1984)—Enzootic bovine leucosis. Standard Diagnostic Techniques. SCPLO. Aust. Bur. An. Hlth., Canberra, ACT.

Chung, Y.S., Prior, H.C., Duffy, P.F., Rogers, R.J. and Mackenzie, A.R. (1986)—The effect of pasteurisation on bovine leucosis virus-infected milk. *Aust. vet. J. 63:* 379-380.

Clague, D.C. and Granzien, C.K. (1966)—Enzootic bovine leucosis in south east Queensland. *Aust. vet. J. 42:* 177-182.

Dimmock, C.K. (1985)—Enzootic Bovine Leucosis. Proc. Applied Immunology in Animal Science 86-89 Conference and Workshop Series. Qld Dept Primary Industries QO 85012.

Dimmock, C.K., Waugh, P.D. and Rogers, R.J. (1979)—Haematological investigation of a multiple case leucosis herd. *Aust. vet. J. 55:* 278-281.

Dimmock, C.K., Geeves, J.S. and Mohamed, Y.J. (1985)—Experimental bovine leucosis virus (BLV) infection in sheep. *Aust. and N.Z. Societies Immunol.* Abstract 87.

Dimmock, C.K., Rogers, R.J., Chung, Y.S., Mackenzie, A.R. and Waugh, P.D. (1986)—Differences in the lymphoproliferative response of cattle and sheep to bovine leucosis virus infection. *Veterinary Immunology and Immunopathology. 11:* 325-331.

Granzien, C.K. (1968)—Leucocyte values in Queensland cattle. *Res. vet. Sci. 9:* 544-550.

Rogers, R.J., Dimmock, C.K. and Chung, Y.S. (1981)—Enzootic bovine leucosis: the current Queensland situation. *Aust. vet. Assoc.* year Book: 194-195.

Rogers, R.J. (1985)—Enzootic Bovine Leucosis. Proc. no. 78: 76:19—76:26 Dairy Cattle Production Refresher Course. Post Graduate C'tee Veterinary Science, U. of Sydney.

Rogers, R.J., Chung, Y.S. and Dimmock, C.K. (1984)—Development of lymphosarcoma in sheep after inoculation with bovine leucosis virus. *Aust. vet. J. 61:* 196-197.

Trueman, K.F., Rodwell, B.J., Eaves, F.W., Flanagam, M. and Naprasnik, A. (1984)—The serological prevalence and control of enzootic bovine leucosis in Queensland dairy cattle. *Aust. Adv. Vet. Sci.* 45-46. Aust. Vet. Assoc.

Walker, P.J. (1985)—Future trends in the diagnosis and control of BLV infections. Proc. Applied Immunology in Animal Science: 93-95. Qld. Dept. Primary Industries QO 85012.

Walker, P.J., Molloy, J.B. and Rodwell, B.J. (1987)—A protien immunoblot test for detection of bovine leukaemia virus P24 antibody in cattle and experimentally infected sheep. *J. Virological Methods* accepted for publication 16.10.1986. Galley proofs checked and returned.

(10) Tick fever vaccine is produced from the blood of donor calves at the Tick Fever Research Centre, Wacol.

From the early '60's when E.B.L. was recognised in Queensland, all mature cattle kept at the Tick Fever Research Centre, Wacol for vaccine diluent production and other purposes were examined for E.B.L., using the haemotological test. This test has poor reliability but was the only method available at that time. No positives were ever found. The test was unsuitable for calves but since 1981, when the A.G.I.D. test first became available all calves used including the one which is now believed to have transmitted E.B.L. to the vaccine last April, have been subjected to the A.G.I.D. test with negative results.

Whilst its apparent failure on that occasion had serious consequences, it must be accepted that biological tests do not necessarily achieve perfection. The A.G.I.D. test for E.B.L., while no exception, is nevertheless regarded as one of the more reliable serological diagnostic tests in use in the field of veterinary medicine. It is the test which is used throughout the world for E.B.L. eradication.

Since December 1986, in addition to examination for antibodies with the A.G.I.D. test, all calves involved have also been transmission tested for the actual presence of Bovine Leucosis Virus. This test is cumbersome and expensive, but it is very sensitive.

The calves are kept in a special isolation shed separate from the vaccine production unit for the entire testing period. If a positive calf is ever detected, all the animals in the shed will be disposed of immediately. To minimise the risk of E.B.L. infection entering the isolation shed, all vaccine donor calves are now purchased from accredited free herds. As stated in the answer to part 8, this became possible in November 1986. Furthermore, all stock at the Centre are tested fortnightly or monthly for the presence of antibodies to E.B.L., and vaccine is produced in a quarantine unit specially constructed for the purpose.

Postal G.P.O. Box 46 Brisbane, Qld. 4001
Office State Law Building.
Cnr. Ann & George Streets, Brisbane
Telephone (07) 227 4800 Telex: 145352
Facsmile (07) 229 0260
30th March, 1987.

Mr. R. Hailstone,
General Manager for Queensland,
Australian Broadcasting Corporation,
Broadcast House,
41 Sherwood Road,
TOOWONG Q. 4066

Dear Mr. Hailstone,

On Wednesday 18th March I appeared on the ABC television programme "The 7.30 Report" being interviewed by Mr. Andrew Caroll on a subject which he introduced by stating that "The Queensland Department of Primary Industries has been accused of inadvertently spreading a form of leukaemia to thousands of valuable beef and dairy cattle."

At the outset of the interview I expressed the opinion that the report was extremely misleading and inaccurate. I also indicated that if Mr. Caroll was prepared to provide me with an opportunity I would go through it sentence by sentence to prove to him the inaccuracy.

Subsequently your officers refused to make available a transcript of the programme but demanded that I use State Government resources to obtain a transcript on which to comment. In fact, during Thursday afternoon, an ultimatum was issued to a member of my staff indicating that such comment must be sent via facsimile to the ABC within twenty minutes.

At least ten days prior to this programme being telecast Mr. Caroll appeared on television to invite the attention of viewers to a forthcoming "The 7.30 Report" dealing with a Government scandal and cover-up regarding the spread of a disease. Even as late as the evening before the telecast, that is on 17th March, the following words were used in a promotion by Mr. Caroll for the Report: "It has been kept quiet up to now. There's a lot at stake, but the people involved say it is too important to keep quiet any longer".

Thus was set the pattern of inaccuracies for there could be no suggestion of either scandal or cover-up by the Queensland Government in this matter. Indeed on the 16th September, 1986 my predecessor made a statement in the Parliament drawing attention to the distribution of tick fever vaccine which had accidentlly been contaminated with the enzootic bovine leucosis virus. Since then a number of newspapers have reported responsibly and progressively on this matter including compensation being offered to affected producers by the State Government. I made a statement to the Parliament on 12th March, 1987.

Having heard Mr. Caroll's advertisement for the pending programme I was concerned that fair treatment to the subject may not be given and that, in any case, nothing constructive would result from such a programme being telecast. As a result I spoke by telephone with the producer indicating to her my concern, acknowledging that she had a right to proceed with the programme and would undoubtedly do so but asking that I be given an opportunity to sit down with her, the reporter, and Mr. Caroll to ensure that the facts of the event were not distorted. I also asked that, at the very least, I be given an opportunity to appear live to comment on the Report if it proceeded.

That latter request was acceded to and I appreciated the co-operation extended by the producer and your support staff in facilitating my appearance by arranging for me to be interviewed at your Parliament House studio. It was unfortunate that the land line was lost at the last minute necessitating a hurried car journey to your studio at Toowong where, again, courtesies were extended by your staff.

There is a need to understand the event around which this Report was built and I shall enclose a copy of the statements made by my predecessor and by me to the Parliament of Queensland—each of which was available to, and in fact known to, your officers responsible for "The 7.30 Report" prior to this programme being broadcast.

It seems that emotonalism was to be the order of the day but I do understand the feelings of the young girl whose "pet" jersey heifer accidentally became infected with EBL virus.

Whilst there is no compulsion for the owner of this heifer ("Hayley") to keep her isolated from other cattle such isolation should avoid spread of the virus in the herd and her retention should include such management procedures.

Your reporter claimed that 13,000 young beef and dairy cattle had become diseased almost overnight—in fact cattle actually infected with the virus will probably be about half that number. The reporter's comments at this stage are generally misleading as is the claim that if the inoculated cattle "are allowed to live about 10% would develop tumours in their bodies. Their calves would be born with the disease and other cattle could become infected." Research indicates that less than 5% of infected cattle develop tumours and that calves are not born with the disease.

Your reporter made the claim that "Bill Isler was warned his income could be jeopardised by speaking out because industry and Government did not want television publicity about the disease contamination." I challenge Mr. Cassuben or Mr. Isler to demonstrate that anyone with authority gave such a warning in regard to Mr. Isler's income.

Your reporter's comment beginning "That this batch had not been fully screened" is misleading and I shall deal at length with these facts in a statement I shall be making to

the Queensland Parliament, a copy of which I shall forward to you after it has been delivered to the Parliament.

Your reporter implies that Mr. Isler lost his life savings of $2500 which he had decided to invest in five cows and a bull. Mr. Isler is entitled to claim compensation for the cost of replacing the five cows and bull if, in fact, they were infected with EBL as a result of the contaminated tick fever vaccine.

Whilst interviewing me Mr. Andrew Caroll said, "Nobody is suggesting that there is a cover-up," although some ten days earlier he was on ABC television claiming that there had been a State Government cover-up of some form or another.

If the producer of your "The 7.30 Report" had accepted my invitation for her, Mr. Caroll and Mr. Cassuben to sit down with me and discuss the matter before the report was put to air I believe an accurate report could have been developed which may have been of benefit to your viewers rather than the misleading and inaccurate report which undoubtedly caused some concern among those unfamiliar with the EBL virus and the facts of this particular matter.

Yours sincerely,
N. J. HARPER
Minister for Primary Industries

16. Power Generation

Mr D'ARCY asked the Minister for Mines and Energy and Minister for the Arts—

"With reference to his answer to Question No. 14 on 26 February, regarding the planned all-year generating capacity of the State's power stations for the years 1987 to 1997 inclusive—

For each of the years 1991 to 1997 inclusive (a) what new generating capability will be added to the State's generating capability and (b) what existing generating capability will be removed from the State's generating capability?"

Mr AUSTIN: For the years 1991 to 1997 inclusive—

(a) New generating capability will comprise the four 350 MW generating units at Stanwell Power Station to be commissioned in each of the years 1993 to 1996 and a new power station, the size, location and timing of which has not been determined.

(b) There are no plans to decommission any plant.

It must be recognised that in the period to 1997, growth rates could vary from those currently forecast. Plans have been developed for new generating capacity to meet alternative scenarios.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Premier and Treasurer's Campaign to Become Prime Minister

Mr WARBURTON: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to his failed campaign to become Prime Minister, and specifically to his humiliating defeat at the week-end at the hands of the Federal National Party Leader, Mr Ian Sinclair.

Bearing in mind that to date most of the Premier's expenses have been paid by Queensland tax-payers, I ask: can we now expect the Premier to give his undivided attention to the job for which he was elected? Or is it his intention to continue with his campaign using the State Government jet and State Government resources and facilities at further expense to Queensland tax-payers?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: As I have in the past, I will continue to do what I believe is necessary as Leader of the National Party and Government in this State to counter the policies of and the destruction perpetuated by the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues, supported, aided and abetted by the Democrats and the ACTU, who

are also supported and furthered by the Hawke Government. I will continue to do what is necessary in the interests of the Australian people. I will change the policies and the direction.

Mr Warburton: You got a belt though, didn't you?

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable Leader of the Opposition is trying to direct my attention to him as against my directing it to you, Mr Speaker. He cannot succeed at all. Mr Speaker, as you can see, I am speaking directly to you. By asking a question such as that, the Leader of the Opposition is treading on dangerous ground. Australians are crying out for something different from a new type of Government with new policies and attitudes that will lighten their taxation burden. I will continue to work towards that.

The Leader of the Opposition asked if I intend to direct my attention to Queensland. I do not go playing bowls in Tasmania. I do not run around at tax-payers' expense, as does the Leader of the Opposition. I work all the time in the interests of both Queenslanders and, indeed, Australians.

Hundreds of thousands of dollars of tax-payers' money is spent every year on the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues, just as millions of dollars is spent on Mr Hawke and his travelling around. That money is spent on visits to Queensland, going fishing in the Torres Strait and doing all those things that, because I work all the time, I do not have time to do. I do not travel interstate to play golf at the expense of tax-payers. My colleagues and I are not like those members of the Labor Party. We concentrate on doing a good job. Because of that, we have the respect and support not only of Queenslanders but of Australians.

I am determined to continue doing those things that will make life better, even for the Leader of the Opposition.

Ministerial Rezoning of Land for Noosa North Shore Resort Development

Mr WARBURTON: In directing a question to the Minister for Local Government, I refer to recent reports that the Noosa Shire Council has passed the matter of rezoning of land for the Noosa north shore resort development proposal by Leisuremark Australia to the Minister and his Local Government Department. That report appeared in the local Noosa media.

I ask: is it correct that one of the persons involved in the venture, and who holds options over much of the land involved, is National Party MP Mr Ian Cameron? Is it also correct that one of Mr Cameron's partners is a Mr Barry Loiterton, who, it is claimed in those media reports, is responsible for a string of failed companies with unpaid debts and whose land sales were barred by the real estate institutes of Oregon, Hawaii and California? Is it the Minister's intention in the circumstances to proceed with the consideration of a ministerial rezoning?

Mr HINZE: I am blamed considerably for introducing rezonings which are now referred to as ministerial. Approximately one rezoning application is made each day. Those applications are made for all sorts of reasons.

The Government's policy and attitude is that the Local Government Department gives me its opinion. I then take that opinion to Cabinet, which then makes a decision, and that rezoning becomes ministerial.

In this particular instance, the answer is no, it is not intended to proceed with any rezoning request relating to the Noosa development. The matter has been referred back to the Noosa Shire Council. That is the way it will be dealt with.

In relation to the people involved in the venture, I do not think it is fair for me to refer to any of them. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition knows more about those individuals than I do.

Australian National University Orientation Handbook

Mr FITZGERALD: In directing a question to the Minister for Education, I refer to the 1987 ANU orientation handbook. I ask: has the Minister read the section of that publication titled "Drugs, Modes of Ingestion"? If so, as the publication clearly encourages 17 and 18-year-old students to break the law, could the Minister inform the House as to who pays for that publication?

Mr POWELL: My attention has been drawn to a publication that has been produced by the Australian National Union of Students. It is an orientation handbook that was presumably handed out at the Australian National University in Canberra. It contains a number of pages outlining how its readers might take drugs such as heroin, cocaine, marijuana and LSD.

The frightening thing about the publication is that it leaves young people who read it with the impression that the normal thing to do is to take those sorts of drugs. It does, however, add a note of caution to 17-year-olds that drug-taking should be of a recreation nature and should not be done as a matter of course. I wonder about the irony of that to the number of young people in the country who are drug addicts and who are caught in the habit simply because somebody said to them that it was something that could be undertaken for a recreation purpose. I cannot understand a group of people who proclaim to be the intelligentsia of any country advising young people that drugs can be taken without addiction necessarily following.

Typical of the advice given regarding LSD is that acid is occasionally cut with strychnine in small doses. It is claimed that this will not harm the user but will give him the odd stomach cramp and maybe make him grind his teeth a bit.

This is a disgusting piece of literature that is produced by a students' union as an orientation document at a university where one would hope that the people involved would have enough intelligence to ignore such bits of paper.

The cost of the publication is taken from the fees compulsorily obtained from students through an Act of the Federal Parliament. It is high time that the people who run the universities and the colleges of advanced education in this country through the councils and the senate accepted their responsibility in the matter and really spoke out against this type of publication being distributed to the students. I draw the matter to the attention of the House and point out that, although the Federal Government claims to have a drug offensive, it is supporting a publication such as this to be delivered to impressionable 17 and 18-year-olds in Australia's national university.

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

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Collection of Funds for "Joh for PM" Campaign; Sir Edward Lyons

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (11 a.m.): I wish to speak about two matters, both of them relating to matters financial. One relates directly to government and the other relates indirectly to government.

I wish to deal, first of all, with a matter that I have raised since Parliament last sat. I refer to the fact that funds for the "Joh for PM" campaign are being solicited through a weekly money letter titled *Your Money Weekly* published by a Mr Ian Huntley. It is circulated throughout New South Wales.

The purpose of that newsletter, which is substantial, apparently is to give advice to intending investors. One would hope that the quality of advice given to intending investors in shares and other commodities is better than the advice that he gave—in an unqualified way—when he suggested that people might dispose of money by sending it to the "Joh for PM" campaign. The address that he gave in the edition circulated on 5 March was Kaldeal Pty Ltd, attention P. Anemaat, care of Premier's Department, Floor

15, P.O. Box 185, Brisbane, Queensland, 4000. It would clearly appear to be improper that any such address was circulated.

First of all, the address is that of a private company shown as care of a public servant, who is in fact the principal private secretary of the Premier. In the second place, the address is care of the Premier's Department, which is situated in a Government building and is a place funded and financed by the Queensland tax-payer.

It is improper for there to be a fusion of the private fund-raising campaign of a party or a faction of a party, which this apparently is, with the functions of government. One does not quite know whether the "Joh for PM" campaign is part of the National Party's campaign or is separate from that campaign.

I do not for a moment suggest that Mr Anemaat was complicit in having his name inserted in the advertisement, but the compromising of a public servant is clearly a matter for regret. I have always said outside this House and I will say it in here: politicising of the Queensland public service is taking place to a level that is absolutely unrivalled.

One recently became aware of a public servant who went to the Northern Territory to take part in the Joh Nationals' campaign; in that case, unsuccessfully. A face-saver was created by a Minister within two or three days when he said that the public servant had taken leave of absence without pay. Frankly, that excuse appeared lame.

It would seem that there are certain positions in this State in which the coincidence of party operation and Government operation or Government pay is so connected as to be indistinguishable. Indeed, a situation arose in which the northern director of the National Party—a senior office-bearer—received a loan—a little loan of a "lousy $145,000" last year.

This incident is the latest. As I said, I do not suggest that Mr Anemaat was party to it but it is absolutely objectionable, particularly within an experienced party structure. People who know the political ropes usually go to great lengths to separate the function of campaigning and fund-raising from the function of government.

I suppose I am typical—I hope that I am typical—by paying for my own post office box; by setting up a different post office box at the time of elections; by making sure that all funds or any donations are dealt with by other people who are separate from my own operation as a member of Parliament; by having everything totally divorced, including a separate campaign office and a separate telephone that is funded by the campaign. It is totally wrong that a public servant and the public service should be involved in handling, dealing with, transporting, opening envelopes or in any other way dealing with funds for a campaign.

It was interesting to have a search done of the company involved, Kaldeal Pty Ltd. I understand that as from 18 August 1986, it was a shelf company. In other words, the company was set up by people whose business it was to set up companies so that solicitors have them quickly available for persons who wish to use a corporate entity for their dealings. A shelf company was set up by two people by the name of Graham, and the company was sold, as I understand it, to Sir Edward Lyons. On 18 August 1986, when Sir Edward Lyons purchased the company, he became a director with George William Roberts, an accountant, of Murgon, who also became secretary of the company. I understand that Mr Roberts is a long-serving member of the National Party. As I recall, he is a member of the management committee and is certainly a person who is well known to the Premier.

That is a matter of some interest because, as I understood it, Sir Edward Lyons had been "sanitised" from the National Party because of his indiscretions and the embarrassment which he appeared to have caused the National Party and its organisation. Before this incident, the trouble had been in relation to funds.

Sir Edward Lyons was chairman of the TAB when, in contravention of the rules set up in legislation passed by this House that govern dealings with that body and betting

with that body, he lodged credit bets of very significant amounts, and on more than one occasion. Indeed, it was revealed that on certain occasions, rather than betting on form, which one might have expected from an intelligent person with business acumen, Sir Edward Lyons had apparently bet on the seventh horse in the seventh race of every meeting in Australia on a particular afternoon, wagering and losing tens of thousands of dollars.

People who are, by one means or another, being asked to contribute funds to political movements via corporate entities should be aware of the people who direct those entities and certainly should be aware of any indiscretions in relation to finances with which those people have been associated. It might be a matter of interest to people who give to a body called Kaldeal Pty Ltd to find that Sir Edward Lyons is a director and to know that he was in fact a person who had, in contravention of legislative provisions and not just articles of association of a company, committed financial indiscretions.

In the course of the debate about this matter, it would appear that a disclaimer has been made by Mr Roberts that the company has anything to do with the "Joh for PM" campaign. If that is so, that suggests that the campaign was set up for the purposes of the last State election. In other words, it can only be described as the repository of a slush fund. If the National Party gets rid of this man as a trustee because of the continual embarrassment he has caused it, how is it that a company is set up and directed by the same person who has caused the embarrassment? Is that the Joh Bjelke-Petersen private slush fund for the purpose of political campaigns, or in fact does it still form a secret link with the National Party? I do not suggest that the latter is the most likely alternative. I think that, for political reasons, the National Party did try to shed itself of Sir Edward Lyons.

It is interesting to note that Mr Huntley claimed it was all a mistake and that that was the address he was given by a friend. These are addresses of a company that exists and a person who exists in the Government department headed by the Premier. Mr Huntley said that it was given to him by a personal friend. That was corrected some hours later when it was stated that a hurried deadline was necessary for the newsletter. Despite the fact that he is advising his contributors—his subscribers—to give to a fund with no brake, no limitation on the amount of money that he is suggesting they send to an address that is wrong, he took no steps, before I publicised this matter, to correct it in the eyes of his subscribers. It was an outraged subscriber who came to me and objected to the Queensland Government's funds being used to finance a repository for a political party and campaign to which that person, being a staunch coalitionist, objected. It is found that last week he wrote to the *Australian Financial Review* and said that the address was incorrect, that it all happened in a terrible hurry, and that the correct address should be the "Joh for PM" Fund care of the Premier's Department. That vindicates the point that I originally made, and to which my constituent took great exception, and to which we take great exception, about the use of Queensland public offices, their staff, their time and everything else for the soliciting of funds for a private political campaign. What is more, it is not a campaign on which the Premier was elected in this House. He was elected a National, not on some private political foray of "Joh for PM". There is no propriety. It is totally improper to use Queensland tax-payers' money, which comes from people of all political persuasions, for the purpose of the repository of funds for a private political campaign.

Time expired.

Zoning of Delan Street, West Chermside

Mrs NELSON (Aspley) (11.10 a.m.): I raise a matter of public interest in the electorate of Aspley. Delan Street at West Chermside is a quiet and peaceful, somewhat secluded, area. It is a dead-end street. It lies adjacent to a rather beautiful tree-studded park area, through which part of Downfall Creek runs. It also contains quite a number of rare species of trees, as sourced by Mr Jonathan Marshall of the Department of Zoology at the University of Queensland.

Because the Brisbane City Council has today started work on a Residential A rezoning immediately adjacent to this area and, as newspaper reports from the local alderman indicate, hopes to sell land at a fairly high price in about October of this year, it also views it in this way. However, somewhat surprisingly, in June or July last year on that site some activity commenced which really has been cloaked in secrecy. In fact, the activities of the Brisbane City Council in relation to this matter could well be regarded as somewhat analagous to an Agatha Christie novel.

I wish to run through the matters that have been raised by my constituents who are extremely aggrieved at what has been proposed for this site, which is owned by the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Brisbane. On the far right-hand side of the land is a very beautiful church and a presbytery. On a zoning subdivision map that I have here, the land adjacent to the school is clearly marked "Future Urban" and the land behind the school and church is clearly marked "Residential A". People who purchased land in that area in the last seven to eight years would have clearly believed that the land would be used in the future for Residental A purposes. Until recently, obviously that was the true position.

In June last year surveyors appeared on the site. A number of local residents inquired about the reasons for the survey and were told to mind their own business. In mid-June, because they were concerned about what may have been proposed, a number of local residents decided to take legal advice. In July the site was pegged. The local alderman, John Goss, was contacted about his knowledge of any application either to construct a sporting venue or to undertake any sort of redevelopment on the site. At this stage the council advised these people that no approval had been granted for any construction and there was no knowledge of any proposal for the site. Interestingly enough, a few days after this call to the local alderman, the survey pegs were removed and the residents in that street received a hand-delivered letter from the surveyors which asked for a meeting with them.

Legal advice was again taken and people by the name of Weston had their solicitor telephone the surveyor and arrange a meeting between the Catholic Lawn Tennis Association, the surveyors and my constituents. At that meeting my constituents had put to them that nine tennis courts and a sports amenities building were planned for this site. I have some sympathy for the Catholic Lawn Tennis Association in its desire to find a suitable location to conduct permanent tennis fixtures. The association has been moving around and for five or six years has been looking for a permanent site. Obviously early last year it seized upon this site as being an appropriate one. My argument is not with the Catholic Lawn Tennis Association, with the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Brisbane or with the local parish; my argument is quite clearly with the Brisbane City Council, which should have told these people from the outset that this site was unsuitable and inappropriate.

Between July and September last year considerable correspondence was exchanged. A letter from a Mr Eltherington indicated that he and his wife strongly opposed any recommendation for the construction of tennis courts on the site. Courteous replies were received from the Lord Mayor's assistant and from the former Deputy Lord Mayor, Mr Beanland. However, the reply from the person then acting for the local alderman was not so courteous. I wish to read to the House the response from Mr Barnes—

> "Firstly may I advise you that at this time, there has been no approaches to Council about the construction of tennis courts or any other buildings on the site you have mentioned."

There already was approval for the construction of two tennis courts and an amenities building on that site. That approval was given in 1980 and the local alderman should have been aware of that. It took legal searches on behalf of my constituents to find that out. A large number of people in the area presently believe that the only tennis courts being proposed for that site are those two tennis courts and the amenities building for the parish. Those people are wrong.

I shall now continue to quote from the reply of Mr Barnes—

"While I can fully appreciate your concerns, I feel that you should wait until an application has been made and then form your opinion.

Might I further say that I take great umbrage at your suggestion that this alleged project has been passed by Council without the normal requirements being met. This is not only an insult but patently untrue."

He clearly misunderstood the first letter. His reply continues—

"May I further add that comments made by yourself as well as Mr. Weston and Mr. Wilkes could quite easily be deemed to be slanderous and/or libelous."

He really hopped right into them. Mr Weston and Mr Wilkes had never heard of Alderman Barnes. They had been dealing with Alderman Goss, who at that time was apparently overseas attending the Commonwealth Games.

In September Mr Weston and Mr Wilkes lodged a petition with the council on behalf of many local residents and they only received a courteous acknowledgement of that. Nothing more was heard until 13 March when a sign went up on the land saying that tennis courts and a building were to be erected. A large number of people in that area still think that this notice applies to the two tennis courts and amenities building for which approval was given in 1980.

The Noise Abatement Authority has now been notified. Someone who has served on that authority for five years has looked at the plans. He has made it very clear that the whole proposal is totally unacceptable in its present form. There will be too much noise and there will be major traffic problems.

The proposed venue is to be situated in Maundrell Terrace. Those honourable members who know the northern suburbs well would know that that is a very heavily utilised road. Allegedly, the only access to this venue is through Delan Street, which is currently a dead end. It is used only on Sundays for access to the church. The people who live in Delan Street believe, quite rightly, that their whole life-style will be shattered by the development of nine tennis courts right on their fences.

If the proposed plan as presently before the council goes through, tennis courts will be right on their fences. Three of these courts will immediately abut residences, and they will be 6 metres or 18 feet from the existing houses in the area.

On 17 March I wrote to the council to voice my objection. In fact, the expiry date for objections is today, 31 March. The council has wasted almost a year of the Catholic Lawn Tennis Association's time by not telling it the facts at the outset. That association has had meetings with council officers, which apparently was denied by letters from council aldermen. Meetings have been held with the council. The local alderman who now says he opposes it has actively supported it for the last nine months. He is now trying to bail out of it because he has realised that hundreds of his constituents are very concerned about the matter.

The fact of the matter is that the proposed site is unsuitable. The council should have done its homework. It should have behaved professionally. The council should have looked at the subdivision map for the area and instead of spending $400,000 developing Residential A land behind this area where there are no houses, and which is abutted by a park, it could have done an exchange with the Archdiocese of Brisbane. The council could have put the nine tennis courts on the land off Hamilton Road and Whites Road where it is now spending a very large amount of rate-payers' money on development. Undoubtedly, the council hopes to be reimbursed for that when it sells the land. However, it could have swapped that land, allowed the tennis courts to be put up there, and everybody would have been satisfied.

In fact it has really been like watching an "amateur hour" exercise to see how appallingly this whole matter has been handled. The Catholic Lawn Tennis Association has incurred considerable expense. The local residents are outraged. I hope that the Lord Mayor will intervene in the matter. I now believe that the council has an obligation to

see that the Catholic Lawn Tennis Association is provided with plans and support for the relocation of the tennis courts on a suitable site elsewhere in Brisbane.

Queensland Commissioner of Housing, Mr S. Hall

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (11.20 a.m.): I raise a matter of vital importance to the people of Queensland. There can be no worse offence committed by a public servant than to deliberately mislead the Parliament and to falsify reports presented to this House. Regrettably, that is the action that has been carried out by Mr Stewart Hall, the Commissioner of Housing in Queensland. Shortly I will table documents that will prove and substantiate absolutely what I am saying.

First of all, I want to touch on another matter relating to Mr Hall which is in clear breach of section 40 of the Queensland Public Service Act. In 1986 Mr Hall attended the Hardies 1000 motor race at Bathurst. It was an all-expenses-paid trip by the James Hardie company. Mr Hall received lodgings and first-class air fares. He was looked after lavishly for the entire race program on that particular trip.

Interestingly enough, on 12 September 1985, a technical report presented to Mr Hall by a senior officer of the Queensland Housing Commission—bearing in mind that at this time the Queensland Housing Commission, through its Commissioner, Mr Hall, had already issued a document which stated that he wished to have completely maintenance-free homes built by the Queensland Housing Commission—showed that certain products used by James Hardie and Company Pty Ltd in the building of Housing Commission homes were inappropriate for that maintenance-free program. On 13 September 1985, Mr Hall received that document and made notations on it to the effect that he basically agreed that these products were inferior, that there was something wrong with them and that they were not to be used in the construction of Housing Commission homes.

It is amazing that between 13 September 1985, when Mr Hall agreed basically with this technical document from one of his own officers, and 31 January 1986, when he wrote a memo retracting his original idea and instructing the Queensland Housing Commission to use these products, he attended the James Hardie 1000 at Bathurst as a guest of that company. This is a clear breach of section 40 of the Queensland Public Service Act, and an offence has been committed.

More importantly, there has been a falsifying of reports and documents presented to this Parliament. I refer to page 6 of the Queensland Housing Commission annual report for 1985-86 where it states that a total of 1 066 dwellings were built in Queensland in that financial year. I shall refer to certain documents as the Hall documents, as they are distinctly different from the official Queensland Housing Commission documents. I will table the Hall documents for all honourable members to see. In the Hall documents, the construction figures for the month ending 30 June 1985 show that during that month a total of 350 dwellings were completed. When one looks at the Hall figures for the following month ending 31 July 1985, one sees, amazingly, that the figure of 350 dwelling completions in June reduces to only eight for the month of July. According to the Hall documents, those July figures clearly show that no pensioner units were finished, completed or under construction in Queensland at that time.

I have here official documents from the Queensland Housing Commission, which clearly show the number of units completed in July 1985 as follows—

Detached Houses—

Longreach	6
Bundaberg	13
Mackay	6
Townsville	9
Yamanto	2
Browns Plains	4
Gatton	3

Detached Houses—*continued*		
	Roma	2
	Bowen	2
	Carins	10
	Mudgeeraba	2
	Carrara	3
	Proserpine	6
	Warwick	3
	Kingston	9
	Carole Park	2
	Cloncurry	1
Units—		
	Margate	14
Pensioner Units—		
	Caloundra	14
	Enoggera	8
	Total	119

In other words, Mr Hall has been cooking the books and transferring figures around each month not only to confuse the members of this Parliament, but also to cover up the inadequacy and inefficiency that is occurring in the Queensland Housing Commission.

In order to prove absolutely and beyond any reasonable or questionable doubt that what I am saying is correct, I quote further from official documents from the Queensland Housing Commission, in comparison with the Stewart Hall figures, which show that no pensioner units were completed for the month ending 31 July 1985. These official Housing Commission documents will be tabled in this Parliament. They show that for the month of July 1985, at 6 West Terrace in Caloundra, on 12 July 1985 14 pensioner units were completed. They show further that, on 24 July 1985 at Howard Street and Taylors Road, Enoggera, eight pensioner units were completed.

What is even more alarming is that that annual report, which the Minister tabled in this Parliament, shows that 1 066 dwellings were completed in Queensland in that financial year. In fact, in that year, only 944 dwellings were completed in Queensland. That shows a deficiency of 122 dwellings.

The questions have to be answered. It was not good enough for the Minister to stand up in this Chamber this morning and make a disgraceful, impassioned plea. He stated that he hoped that in the name of fair play, goodness and charity these matters would not be raised in the House until the report was prepared. I was told that it was completed and handed to the Minister last Thursday week. According to the Minister, the report will not be completed for another week and a half. Of course, it is only coincidental that it will be completed when Parliament is not sitting. Honourable members have heard that Parliament will not resume until August. So the heat will be off the Minister. That is why the issue of the report has been delayed.

A report was presented to the Minister about 26 charges against Stewart Hall, the Commissioner of Housing in Queensland. The people of Queensland and, most certainly, the members of this Assembly are entitled to know what findings were made and what recommendations followed the investigation that was conducted into the activities of the Commissioner of Housing, Mr Stewart Hall. That is the first thing that all honourable members are entitled to know.

I will certainly be contacting my colleague in the Federal Parliament, the Minister for Housing, Mr Stewart West, to ascertain what has happened in relation to the deficiency of 122 dwellings in this State. Has Federal Government funding been provided

for those phantom homes? Has a subsidy been paid to the Queensland Government for Housing Commission establishments which do not exist and which were never built? If a subsidy was paid, where has the money gone? Is Mr Hall guilty of some diabolical criminal offence? Why would a senior public servant take it upon himself to falsify reports, particularly if they involved Federal funding?

The Queensland Opposition and the people of Queensland demand that the report be laid before the Parliament post haste. The Opposition is entitled to know the findings of the Public Service Board and what recommendations are contained in it.

Mrs Nelson: This is disgusting.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I will take the interjection from the "beast of Belsen". What is it?

Mrs Nelson: You are crucifying the man. Why don't you wait?

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I am not crucifying the man at all.

I want to know what is contained in those recommendations. It is time that the report was laid before the Parliament.

Unlike the fabrication presented by Mr Hall to this Parliament, the reports, figures and factual accounts that I will table today are official documents from the Queensland Housing Commission.

On behalf of the people of Queensland, I demand that action be taken. I table the documents.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the documents on the table.

Industrial Relations

Mr COOPER (Roma) (11.30 a.m.): I would like to elaborate on some matters concerning changes to the industrial relations scene, with particular reference to deregulation of the labour market. The Opposition may not agree with me when I say that I believe that deregulation of the labour market, like the deregulation of the financial market, is absolutely vital to Australia's economic revival and survival.

The task of deregulation will be severely hindered, as it has been in the past, whilst compulsory unionism and compulsory arbitration remain in existence.

One or two members on the other side of the Chamber have a fair degree of intelligence. They recognise that changes will be needed.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr COOPER: Because of the productivity factor, I refer to the productivity of the workers, not the union-leaders. That is the matter that I want to address. It is not union-bashing; it is a matter of co-operation between employers and employees. Instead of trying to wreck this country, as Opposition members have done in the past, they should put their minds to it so that co-operation can be achieved.

The two commodities—if I can put it that way—that Australia can no longer afford are compulsory unionism and compulsory arbitration. Since their inception, those two commodities have held Australia back from realising its true potential.

If honourable members have done their history, they will know that, as far back as 1909, the first President of the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, Mr Justice Higgins, in one of his first and famous statements, said that it would be better for an employer to go out of business rather than pay his employees less than the fixed rate. That is supposed to be conciliatory and productive. There is no common sense in that, because when a businessman goes out of business his employees are out of a job.

That same learned gentleman also believed that conflict is the natural state of relationships between employers and employees. Is that conciliatory and productive? It

is an example of the shocking start that the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission received. It has never recovered, and it is time that it was abolished.

Some of Mr Justice Higgins' philosophy prevails today amongst the illustrious members of the industrial relations club. I can cite only three cases during the last 80 years in which consideration was given to industry's capacity to pay. That consideration should be given in every case.

In 1931, during the Great Depression, the basic wage was reduced by 10 per cent. In 1953, a Judge Kelly brought down a majority judgment that abolished quarterly cost of living adjustments and ruled against any increase in the basic wage. In 1965, the commission ruled that there should be no increase in the basic wage. In doing so, it stressed the importance of the capacity of the economy to pay.

Anyone with sound economic knowledge would agree that those decisions in 1931, 1953 and 1965 made sound economic sense. However, instead of being heralded as such, they were treated with absolute disdain by members of the industrial relations club.

Following Judge Kelly's decision in 1953, Bob Hawke described him as an Irish pig-farmer. That was well before Mr Hawke's pre-reconciliation days. However, Justices Sweeney and Nimmo, who were the key figures in the 1965 majority decision, were simply bushed; they were sent to Coventry and neither of them sat on a full bench of the commission again.

In 1982 a judge of the commission suggested that the 1931 decision to reduce the basic wage by 10 per cent constituted a leap in the dark. Anyone with any common sense would realise that, in 1931, Australia was in the grip of a depression, which had a devastating effect on those people without jobs and not as much effect on those who had to accept a 10 per cent wages cut. At least those people were still earning something, which is better than nothing.

It has been said also that members of the industrial relations club have a desire to help the underdog. If it can be proved that Australia's powerful and monopolistic unions are underdogs, I will hop to Bourke. The ailing economy and the unemployed are the underdogs who are in desperate need of assistance. However, they will remain in that state while the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission formulates wage decisions without any regard to economic conditions. How on earth can this nation return to an economic footing where it can compete favourably with other nations when it has such self-imposed handicaps? The loss of 100 000 metal-workers' jobs is a shocking example of the commission and unions working together for so-called industrial harmony.

Honourable members will recall that, in 1981, the Australian Metal Workers Union staged a campaign for more pay for less work. That is a shocking indictment of the union. The campaign was certainly a howling success! The employees received more pay for less work, businesses closed down and 100 000 metal workers lost their jobs.

I cite another case from the Northern Territory pastoral award hearings. The respondent graziers actually proved their case on a work-value basis. The commission accepted that the application of comparative wage justice principles would result in unemployment for many persons employed under the proposed award. Yet, incredibly, the commission proceeded with its decision and, as it knew would happen, unemployment occurred again.

I will read from an article about the latest national wage case in which the commission finds it almost impossible to come to grips with the productivity issue. The article in the *News Weekly*, which is probably anathema to the Labor Party but is factual, states—

> "In handing down the National Wage decision last week, the Arbitration Commission acceded to the federal government's demand that in the interest of industrial peace, wages should rise immediately.
>
> . . .
>
> The Commission at several points made clear that its decision was an exercise in tightrope-walking, between the current economic emergency and the expectations of the ACTU and its members.

It said, 'A strong case can be argued that the economy should not be asked at this time to absorb increased labour costs.'

But it added 'We do not think that such an outcome is feasible, given the immediate needs and expectations of wage and salary earners.' "

What the commission has said is, "To hell with productivity."

The article continues—

"In other words, as the government had promised a significant wage rise, and unions expected it, the commission would not frustrate those expectations."

The nation has no hope of getting back on an economic footing when decisions along those lines are made.

The system has failed and it is long overdue to be replaced. It should be obvious to all honourable members that the principles of decision-making that the commission has adopted over the years have destroyed Australia's growth and prosperity. The commission's founders hoped that industrial conflict would be replaced by law and order. That objective has not been met.

Over the years, Australia has had a dreadful record in relation to industrial disputes. Because of their unpredictability, the disputes have a particularly harmful effect on the international scene.

The established system of conciliation and arbitration required the sacrifice of traditional liberties and rights. Employees lost their right to freely establish their own unions or associations once a union had been registered, as they say, "to which they might conveniently belong". Under that system, they cannot form their own association or union, because it would never be recognised by the arbitration commission. As I have mentioned previously, the commission, by its actions, has created a mighty monopolistic union movement with the power to coerce employees. It also has created union officials who are completely preoccupied with their status and privileges.

Time expired.

South East Queensland Electricity Board's 1985-86 Annual Report

Mr VAUGHAN (Nudgee) (11.40 a.m.): I want to speak about the South East Queensland Electricity Board's 1985-86 annual report, which was recently released and which contains some interesting statements and information in which I am sure the board's electricity-consumers will be interested.

Under the heading "The Year in Brief" on page two, the report refers to the significant features of the year's operations.

Firstly, there was the launch of SEQEB's "Customer Care Campaign" with the mottos "Service is our business" and "If it weren't for the customer we wouldn't be here". I am sure that all SEQEB's consumers will be pleased that "service" by SEQEB is a high priority and that they are so highly regarded.

The second significant feature in 1985-86 was that SEQEB had productivity gains of 30 per cent, or $37m, in real money terms through—

- a decrease in staff following the 1984-85 private contract dispute;
- the use of contractors;
- improved attitudes to work;
- no strikes;
- no output limiting arrangements;
- the sale of surplus properties; and
- the elimination of non-essential activities.

A productivity gain of 30 per cent, or $37m, is significant, so let us see how this was achieved. According to the report, receipts increased by 16.1 per cent, or $98.1m,

while disbursements increased by 15.5 per cent, or $94.1m, resulting in a surplus of only $4m. Because of an 8.21 per cent increase in the amount of electricity sold and an approximate 3.59 per cent increase in average retail prices—a 9.6 per cent increase for domestic consumers— sales revenue increased by 14.8 per cent, or $86.9m. However, the cost of distributing electricity increased by only 0.95 per cent, or $575,000. The cost of repairs and maintenance increased by only 2.6 per cent, or $854,000, but the cost of installation inspections dropped by 11.3 per cent, or $588,000, meaning that fewer installations were inspected. Management costs also dropped by 4 per cent, or $1.3m.

Meter-reading costs dropped by 10.2 per cent, or $319,000, which is probably the reason that there is a high incidence of estimated accounts and why there were 3.57 meter-reading errors per 1 000 premises, whereas the target was one per 1 000 premises.

The sale of assets, which would include surplus properties that contributed to the 30 per cent productivity gain, accounted for $9.5m—$5.4m more than the previous year.

For the record—the number of permanent employees employed by SEQEB at 30 June 1986, was 3 417. That was 143 fewer than the previous year and 850 fewer than in 1984.

The number of consumers supplied by SEQEB is 640 152. That is an increase of 3.6 per cent over the previous year and 7.4 per cent more than in 1984.

Another interesting snippet under the heading "The Year in Brief" is the statement that there had been a distinct improvement in reliability of supply with system minutes lost totalling 175 compared to 10 586 in 1984-85—the year of the SEQEB dispute. Unfortunately, the report for 1983-84—the year previous to the dispute—does not contain figures for system minutes lost, but it does state that for metropolitan consumers, minutes lost totalled 96, which clearly shows that reliability of supply before the dispute was as good as, if not better than, it was after the dispute.

Under the heading "The Customer" on page 12, it is interesting to note that whereas the 1985-86 target for disconnections for non-payment of bills was 250 per 10 000 consumers, the actual number was 276.3.

Although the report goes on to state that to reduce the number of customers being disconnected for debt, SEQEB's advance payment system will be widely publicised in 1986-87, a recent check with SEQEB reveals that to date virtually nothing has been done. With only three months of this financial year left, maybe the publicity campaign has been rescheduled for next year.

Under the heading "Productivity" on page 17, the report spells out that the 30 per cent, or $37m, productivity gain was achieved as follows—

- $15.7m from a reduction in staff;
- $3.6m from the use of contractors;
- $11.7m from improved attitudes to work,
  no output limiting arrangements,
  no strikes, and
  no demarcation; and
- $6m from the sale of surplus properties and elimination of non-essential activities.

Yet, with all these savings, profit was only $4.6m compared with $7.5m in 1983-84, $7.03m in 1982-83 and $6.13m in 1981-82.

On page 18 of the report a subheading titled "New Alternatives for Developers" states—

> "A 'smorgasbord of choices' for installation of electricity in new estates was offered to developers in 1985-86. Developers were no longer obliged to use board labour in the design and installation of supply and could involve private contractors for all or part of the process."

On page 30 of the report, it states—

> "Negotiations between the developers of the Sanctuary Cove tourist and residential complex at Hope Island and SEQEB during the year, resulted in the board taking over responsibility for electrical reticulation within the development."

As we are all aware, the Minister for Mines and Energy made a ministerial statement on this matter on Tuesday, 17 March, in which he pointed out that SEQEB would share the cost of electrical reticulation throughout the Sanctuary Cove complex.

Although the Minister stated this was in return for Sanctuary Cove becoming an all-electric development, according to information that I received in September last year, SEQEB, which usually requires money up front when it contracts for such work, had not been paid for work performed. I hope that situation has now been corrected.

On page 22 of the report in the section headed "Market", reference is made to the "most aggresive multi-media advertising campaign" to encourage domestic consumers to change over to the night-rate off-peak hot-water tariff. The report states that by the end of June 1986, betwen 40 and 70 applications were being made each day to transfer to the night-rate tariff, but no mention is made of how many had actually changed over.

On 19 August last year, in a question, I asked the then Minister for Mines and Energy for details about the cost, etc., of the advertising campaign and the number of consumers who had changed over to the night-rate tariff. The Minister would not give me the answers to my question. Perhaps details of the number who changed over to the night-rate tariff will be given in this year's report. After all, on page 25, the report states that 50 000 consumers converted to the controlled hot-water tariff. So why the secrecy about the night-rate figures?

On page 32, under the heading "People at Work", the report states that only 6 per cent of SEQEB's work-force—approximately 205 employees—had entered into the personal contracts offered by SEQEB in November 1985.

Ten per cent of the work-force are members of the Queensland Power Workers Association, which last year received substantial financial assistance from the Government and SEQEB, and 25 per cent are not members of any union.

On page 33, under the subheading "Safety and Occupational Health", the report states—

> "Safe working practices are given the highest priority within SEQEB and during 1985-86 the board's safety performance reached record levels—almost 96% of the workforce completed the year without sustaining lost time injury."

The report goes on to refer to the lost time injury frequency rate, direct employee participation in safety through employee involvement groups and quality circles and the insistence on safe working practices in the field and offices, but there is not one word, not one reference to the fact that two unfortunate employees were electrocuted on the job last year. That is indicative of the whole report. A lot of flowery words, hype and snow have been used to paint a rosy picture to conceal the true situation that exists within the SEQEB organisation.

As a final comment on the report, I want to refer to the great Brisbane street light competition that has been publicised in the press. The advertisement states—

> "It's easy: just help us find the street lights in Brisbane that are not working—all it takes is a phone call to Terry Smith and we will have a crew out to repair the street light as soon as we can."

According to a table on page 14 of the report, in 95 per cent of cases inoperative street lights are repaired within three working days. That claim is not in accordance with information that I have received. One only has to drive around the streets at night-time to see how many street lights are out.

I have received numerous complaints about street lights being out for weeks. Recently, I was advised that street lights in Nundah had been out since 10 February.

Of course, as the report says on page 18, street light maintenance is now carried out by contractors. However, I understand relations between SEQEB and contractors have deteriorated and contractors are not as co-operative and enthusiastic as they were initially.

As I have indicated, I am not happy with the contents of SEQEB's 1985-86 annual report. I cannot help but get the impression that the powers that be in SEQEB are not giving the true picture of the situation within the board. However, time will tell. I certainly will continue to monitor the situation closely.

Federal Election

Mr ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (11.48 a.m.): The issue that I wish to raise is the spectre that is hanging over the whole of this nation in the form of a threatened early Federal election. I would urge everyone in this place to think about that and to look at what is going on. At the moment, the Prime Minister is hedging his bets, playing games and saying, "We are not going to have an early election." Then he is making a few comments that suggest that perhaps there will be an early election. He is using the situation in the Senate in regard to the Australia Card legislation as a trigger for a double dissolution and then an election.

If the Prime Minister does not do something about that speculation and quell the rumours that are running rife in this country today, he will be responsible for the consequences that follow. If one looks at the instability that has been caused by previous early elections, or speculation about early elections, one realises the tremendous damage that will be caused in this nation if the present speculation is allowed to continue. It is absolutely essential that that speculation be stopped.

Mr Vaughan: What are you worried about?

Mr ELLIOTT: What am I worried about? That inane comment from the honourable member who has just resumed his seat suggests that talk of an early election is not a problem for this country. A lack of business confidence will follow from that.

Mr Vaughan: That is not true.

Mr ELLIOTT: I challenge the member for Nudgee to look at the graph that I have here, which illustrates the history of what has happened following speculation about early elections.

The graph shows three things: the value of the Australian dollar, the all ordinaries index and the Consumer Price Index. I will now consider particularly what has happened to the value of the Australian dollar in the past following speculation about early elections. Prior to 5 March 1983 when, against much advice, Mr Fraser decided to go to the people early, the speculation that was rife in the community caused the dollar to drop markedly, as anyone who looks at this graph can see. The same thing happened prior to the December 1984 election that was called by Mr Hawke. Before all of that rumour-mongering that occurred at that time, the value of the dollar had commenced to stabilise slightly, but with the rumour and speculation about an early election, the value of the dollar dropped. As soon as there is such speculation, business people in the community become absolutely terrified.

One thing that terrifies business more than anything else is instability in government. Business people want to know which Government will be in power and what the guide-lines and ground rules will be. In business it is impossible to plan any future strategies when an early election may mean a different Government and different guide-lines. Today I challenge the Prime Minister to come out and tell the nation that there will be no early election. In my opinion, no-one has the right to call an early election unless the nation is confronting calamitous circumstances. It is nothing short of economic suicide to suggest that the rejection of the Australia Card legislation is a sufficient trigger to call an early election. It is absolute madness. If those who are interested in what I

am saying do not think that it is valid, I ask them to have a look at the graph, because it spells out in great detail what has happened in the past.

Some people might say that the graph shows what has happened only in Australia, so I will now turn to the present world scene and ask honourable members to have a look at the tremendous fall in share prices on stock exchanges in England that has taken place in the last few days when there has been speculation about an early election. Immediately following that speculation, the stock market in London recorded one of its biggest ever plunges. That is the sort of thing that Australia could do without.

At the moment, the Australian share market is running in a fairly buoyant manner. In fact, perhaps in some cases the high share prices cannot be justified; but, be that as it may, people in the market-place decide where they place their money. Australia should be taking advantage of its current situation. The stock market in the United States of America is going down in value and there is much speculation about what is happening. That is causing what might be termed a false feeding-in of money to Australia from overseas and it is boosting the value of the Australian dollar. This nation should take advantage of that. It is a good opportunity for the Prime Minister and Federal Treasurer to get together and change the disastrous interest-rate policy that they have perpetrated upon the nation. Those high interest rates are absolutely killing this country. I suggest to the House that an opportunity has now presented itself for something tangible and practical to be done. The most practical thing that anyone could do right now is lower the high interest rates that are killing this nation.

High interest rates are killing small business. They may not be killing big business. In fact some big businesses are presently showing good returns. However, those good returns are being achieved mainly through speculation on the share market, not through activities that are bringing export earnings to this country, such as those undertaken by many people in the mining fields and in rural industries.

If the Federal Government does not do something to stop the tide of speculation about an early Federal election, it will drive the final nail into the coffin of small businesses and farmers. That speculation will definitely cause a tremendous lack of confidence in the business sector.

The value of the Australian dollar is the highest it has been for nine months. The Federal Government should capitalise on that and lower interest rates. Of course, that would do more than any other single factor to ensure that those people in the small-business sector, who employ more people than any other sector in this country, and the farmers in this country have a chance to get back on their feet again.

Most Government members, who have many farming communities in their electorates, would realise that Australia is faced with potential disaster. The small-business and farming sectors have a higher rate of bankruptcy now than possibly ever before. If that is not enough, surely to goodness the Federal Government realises what happened to the economy of this country when Fraser and Hawke called early elections. This country cannot afford a repeat performance.

I urge the Federal Government once and for all to dampen down any suggestion of an early election and to make an unequivocal statement that there will be no early election.

VAGRANTS, GAMING, AND OTHER OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 10 March (see p. 521).

Mr BURNS (Lytton—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11.58 a.m.): The Opposition reluctantly agrees to support this amending Bill. It is reluctant to do so for two main reasons. The first reason is that the amending Bill is a piece of shoddily drafted

legislation. The second reason is that the principal Act would hardly bear further amendment, for reasons which I will detail shortly.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister for Police said that the Act will prohibit, amongst other things, the climbing of tall office blocks by means of suction caps. However, when one examines the amendment one sees that no such restrictions are attached to the offence. It is simply climbing a building or structure.

Mr Vaughan: There will be no Spiderman.

Mr BURNS: After the passing of this legislation, there will be no Spiderman or Superman in Queensland.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr BURNS: I can look that way and address the Chair——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! No, the honourable member cannot do that. I will not allow it.

Mr BURNS: I have to look at the person occupying the chair?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Yes, that is correct.

Mr BURNS: That is a new ruling. Every year a new ruling is given in this Parliament. I will look at you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I will talk to those fellows at the back of the Chamber.

Superman will be outlawed under the Act. There will be no Spiderman or any other comic-book characters in Queensland, because they will not be allowed.

It is quite sensible to stop fellows from climbing buildings and jumping off them with parachutes, hang-gliders and so on. However, a reading of the Bill reveals that it can mean people climbing onto a shop awning to watch a Warana or Labour Day parade would be caught up by this Bill, because it talks about climbing on a building or structure. It does not mention the height of the building or structure. It is left to the policeman to determine whether the act is lawful.

Admittedly, the Bill provides for a defence of lawful, reasonable or sufficient excuse. However, the statutory interpretation rules insist that "lawful", "reasonable" and "sufficient" each mean a different thing, so that what is not necessarily a lawful excuse may nevertheless be a sufficient one.

This Bill is yet another example of badly drafted legislation that is processed by this House in a sausage-machine style. No-one can deny that because legislation regularly comes before the Parliament and honourable members have to amend, amend and amend it. In the 14 or 15 years that I have been a member of this Parliament, some Acts come back for amendment every year, and on many occasions it is the same clause that has to be amended.

As I have said, I can understand the problem with people diving off the Gateway Bridge. I think that that is the cause of the original amendment. However, I am a bit concerned that when legislation is drafted to stop someone diving off the Gateway Bridge or climbing a 20-storey building with suction caps or whatever, it should be drafted properly. I am concerned that the Parliament legislate correctly and professionally; that the legislation enacted by the Parliament really reflects what honourable members are trying to do. It should not be left to policemen to interpret. The biggest problem with the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act is that a policeman has the right to put his own interpretation on the Act and to enforce the Act in many ways that I feel are stupid.

The members of this Parliament are the people's representatives. We are also legislators and have a responsibility to ensure that the legislation is professionally drafted. It is a sad reflection on this House that poor-quality drafting, as evidenced by this

amendment, has become the norm, rather than the exception. It should not be the intent of legislation to proscribe a wide net of persons and behaviour while leaving it to the discretion of police officers to sensitively carry out their duties. Rather it is the function of this House to ensure that only in the most necessary and limited cases should people be thrown onto the wrong side of the law.

Subsection 2 of the proposed new section 4B provides for the court to order a defendant to pay expenses shown to be incurred by a rescuer of the defendant. This concerns me. There are no machinery provisions for qualifying the amount. Honourable members will remember the headlines about the fellow who dived off the Gateway Bridge and landed in the mud. It took many hours and many people to dig him out and save his life. I have not heard what happened to him after he was carried away. It seems to me, as a boating man, that someone could have gone down the river, pulled him quickly out of the mud, put him into one of those cages that are put under bodies, lifted him onto a boat and taken him away with only half the expense and trauma that actually occurred. If people are to be charged with the expense of their rescue, the rescue ought to be professionally and economically performed in the best possible way. In addition to that, the person rescued ought to have the right to challenge the costs and charges levied against him. At the very least, the subsection should specify that the defendant may be heard on the issue of expenses and may cross-examine the rescuer as to those expenses. The assessment should be based on the normal criminal standard—beyond reasonable doubt.

It is not clear why such provisions are not specified in the amendment. The Labor Party suggests that they should be. It is an indictment of the Minister that he should bring into the House an amendment in this form accompanied by a speech which bears little correlation to the amendment itself. The old Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act should be scrapped and a good look should be taken at today's life-styles and today's way of doing things. This Government should bring in a new Act that would cover the necessary section. Half of the provisions could be thrown away. The basis of the Act is that, if people are poor or have an unusual or irregular life-style, they should be arrested before they commit any crime. It may be that they would never commit a crime and that they simply prefer to live an alternative life-style. That in itself seems to be a crime. In the days when this Act was first implemented, it was a crime. A person ought not to be arrested and put on the wrong side of the law simply because he might be the type of person who might one day, somewhere, commit a crime.

This legislation was born in the days when and in a country where people could be sentenced to seven years' transportation for stealing food and minor trinkets. It evinces the same kind of anti-Christian and antilibertarian philosophies as were common in England in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The Vagrant Acts were based on the English poor laws of the time. The present Act passed in 1931 repealed the Vagrant Act 1851, the Indecent Advertisements Act 1892 and the Police Act 1855. The Act denies to citizens even the most basic and lack-lustre of freedoms, the freedom to be poor.

Today the offence of vagrancy is a total anachronism and should be abolished. It is bizarre that poverty should be criminal; it is contrary to the whole philosophy behind Australia's social security system. Most of the provisions of the Act are outdated, unjustifiably broad and unduly onerous. The Act places an enormous amount of power with the members of the police force and virtually places ordinary citizens at the whim of any member of the force. It fails to properly protect the citizens of this State—the sunshine State—which everyone is told is a stronger State that has a better life. It fails to protect members of the police force from public disrepute and completely discredits this Parliament as the supreme legislative body.

I refer now to a few matters in the old Act that should have been amended. I have spent a bit of time going through the Act. Section 7 prohibits the use of indecent or obscene language in public places. The penalty for that offence is imprisonment for six months. The common feature in those cases is that police pick up someone and say to

him, "You have been driving over the double line" or, "Your tail-light is not on." The bloke gets out of the car. In doing so, he argues with the policemen. They grab him round the neck and he utters a few swear words. The policemen do not find the driver guilty of any offence for which he was pulled up. However, he is charged with using indecent language. The person is then brought before the court. It is not a matter of a great deviation from community standards of behaviour.

Recently a child came to my house and brought with him a video with a family rating. I think that the video contained more swear words than any other words. If all the swear words had been deleted from the video, the actors would have been deaf mutes, or at least dumb.

When two people are angry and are fighting, it does little or no harm for the arresting officer to call a person a so-and-so. I am sorry that I cannot say the words that would be used. There are children in the gallery. When both the policeman and the civilian use swear words when speaking to each other—it is crazy for the policeman to say that his pink ears are offended by the swear words and that he has never heard them before—the policeman is incensed and arrests the bloke, drags him down to the watchhouse, throws him in the clink and says, "Under the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act, this is offensive behaviour." It does the policemen no good at all. Everyone knows that policemen swear that they are like any other citizen in the community. They live by the same standards and in the same community as we do. They have all heard the words before. When the driver of the motor vehicle to whom I referred goes back to his mates and says that he was booked for swearing, his mates will laugh.

Mr Davis: They do it in demonstrations all the time.

Mr BURNS: The honourable member is right. The police pick up the demonstrators, take them to the watchhouse and charge them with resisting arrest and using obscene language.

As I say, members of the police force are not shrinking violets in their own choice of language and they should not be particularly sensitive to the language used by other people when they themselves are on the receiving end.

My colleague the member for Caboolture will refer to fortune-tellers who get a guernsey under the Act. Let us hope that the *Courier-Mail* does not pay Kisha for her astrology services, or the paper could be liable as a party to this absurd offence under the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act. However, I will leave that matter to the honourable member for Caboolture.

The Act retains the consorting provisions abolished in most jurisdictions. The effect of that retention is that a person who has served a sentence imposed in court is not entitled to have friends. It is a crime by association, a very repressive concept, and it is still on the statute-book. A person cannot knock around with a known criminal; that is consorting.

Many of the current criticisms of the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act arose in 1981 when a Police Department submission to Cabinet was leaked to civil liberties groups and to the press. Mr Hinze, the then Minister for Police, stated that the present Act was introduced in 1931 and obviously the Act could not have envisaged the changes that have occurred in our society. I agree completely with that statement. That Act was introduced in 1931, which was the year in which I was born. What happened in 1931 does not relate to what is happening now in 1987—56 years later. Unfortunately, the then Minister, Mr Hinze, and the Police Department proposed draft legislation that was even more restrictive and draconian than the Act that was already in existence. That draft, the Summary Offences Bill, was never passed by this Parliament. However, my information is that another draft is in the final stages of preparation and is likely to be reintroduced soon. I call on the Minister today to state whether that is so and I ask the Justice Minister to undertake a complete redrafting of all the provisions of the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act.

It should not be a matter for the Police Department to redraft legislation such as this. Queensland has a Law Reform Commission whose clear responsibility it is to redraft such legislation. Because of the serious repercussions for civil liberty groups and for the protection of the rights of ordinary citizens, no new legislation should proceed without prolonged discussion with the Bar Association, the Law Society, the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties and other interested groups. Too many arguments are advanced for the decriminalisation of certain victimless crimes, such as vagrancy and public drunkenness, for the Government to simply legislate in its usual sausage-machine style, such as honourable members are witnessing today.

The Police Department annual report contains interesting statistics on drunkenness. The figures for drunkenness in Cairns are alarming. Last year, about 10 000 convictions for drunkenness were reported in Cairns. However, in Townsville the figure was only 2 000. That says one of two things: either Cairns has more drunks, or a lot more drunks are not apprehended by the police in Townsville, which has a substantially larger population than that of Cairns. The northern people, who like a drink on a hot day—as most of us do—would find it hard to justify the difference in those figures.

Last year, the numbers of arrests for drunkenness were: Brisbane, 7 000; Cairns, 10 358; Townsville, 2 255 and Rockhampton, 2 277. The number of arrests in Cairns is substantial.

Police have had to return to the beat. Many drunks are now being placed in gaol. I am not sure whether the drunkenness provisions of the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act are the correct way to handle the problem. There must be a better way, and in 1987 the Government should be looking for a better way.

I refer to an article that appeared some years ago in the *National Times*. I kept that article because it seemed to represent the real problems that are faced because of certain senseless sections of the Act. That article, headed "Jailed pensioner succeeds with appeal", told the story of a war pensioner, Mr Jim Lucas, who had been arrested 18 times by the Queensland police and served 40 months' imprisonment for not having sufficient means of support. In fact, Mr Lucas was the recipient of a war service pension. Because of his war service record, he suffered severe memory loss. In spite of representations by legal aid lawyers to police that made it clear that Mr Lucas had sufficient means of support, the police persisted in locking him up under the Vagrants Act. The police response was that sufficient evidence was available. In fact, in a letter, the police said—

> "Your representations concerning the particular personal circumstances of your client have been noted. However, as you will appreciate, police officers are duty bound to ensure that the statute laws of this State are not contravened and in instances where sufficient evidence is available to substantiate an offence, prosecution action is instituted."

Even though the police were told that Mr Lucas had sufficient means of support, that he was not really a vagrant without lawful means of support and that he suffers a memory loss from his war service, the police threw him in gaol. They arrested him on 18 occasions and he served a total of 40 months' imprisonment. In spite of those representations, the police kept locking Mr Lucas up. Finally, he won an appeal in the courts. He has since disappeared into limbo, and I hope that the police have left him alone.

The point is that, because the police claimed that there was sufficient evidence available to implement the provisions of this Act, that man was thrown in gaol for a total of 40 months during a period in which he had sufficient and lawful means of support. It is the sensitivity of the police response that I question; the legality is right. The legality cannot be questioned, but the sensitivity can most certainly be questioned.

It is the duty of this Parliament to ensure that such weaknesses are once and for all removed from the statutes. I ask the Minister to once again look carefully at this particular Act. It is not good enough that eighteenth century English ideals are still the law in Queensland.

During the last month or two statements were made by the Minister in relation to prostitution and such reports as that of the Lucas commission. The Minister is on record in the newspapers as saying that there was no evidence of prostitution in Queensland.

Mr GUNN: I rise to a point of order. I ask for a withdrawal of that statement. It is not correct.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The Minister has raised a point of order.

Mr BURNS: I will withdraw that comment.

That newspaper article to which I referred was headed "No evidence of prostitutes, says Minister", and stated—

> "There was no evidence that prostitutes were working in Queensland massage parlours, the Police Minister, Mr Gunn, said yesterday.
>
> Mr Gunn said there were 13 or 14 massage parlours operating in Queensland compared with 200 in Victoria.
>
> If someone had evidence to prove prostitution was being practised in Queensland's massage parlours, the police would investigate and lay charges . . ."

A famous massage parlor named Bubbles Bath House was knocked down, not by the police but by the owners of the building. They knocked it down and the site was redeveloped. If the Minister needs evidence of prostitution, I will read the menu from Bubbles Bath House. I waited until the children left the gallery. Bubbles Bath House was at 142 Wickham Street, Fortitude Valley. I repeat: it was not closed by the police; it was knocked down by the owners. The menu reads—

"PRICE LIST

Amount	Bookings	Time
$40	OR { 1. Straight Sex 2. Straight Massage 3. Hand Relief	15 Minutes
$50	Part French & Sex	15 Minutes
$60	69 & Sex	20 Minutes
$70	Full French (oral sex)	20 Minutes
$80	French & Sex with Bubble Bath	½ Hour
$120	All Inclusive with Spa	1 Hour

10% Surcharge on all Credit Cards

IF THERE ARE ANY EXTRAS NOT MENTIONED IN OUR PRICE RANGE,

PLEASE DO NOT HESITATE TO ENQUIRE:

SIMPLY ASK YOUR HOSTESS"

Mr Gunn: Did you enjoy it?

Mr BURNS: The Minister gave me the book. They said to me that Mr Gunn was no good, because there was nothing that took three minutes. He could not last the

minimum time. The book dropped out of the Minister's pocket as he was coming to Parliament. I asked him for it and he said that I could keep it.

The Minister said that the police could not catch the prostitutes unless they sent young policemen to those establishments to have sex with them. The Police Department annual report states that over 700 prostitutes were caught last year. The Minister said that he did not want to keep sending the policemen down to have sex with the prostitutes in order to obtain convictions. He did not want to put them in that position. That was a rather interesting remark from the Minister. Is that the reason that so few police are out on the job? To obtain convictions, 700 of them have been there sleeping with the ladies of the night!

Mr Gunn interjected.

Mr BURNS: That is the Minister's statement. He did not deny it.

Mr GUNN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I deny that and I ask for a total withdrawal. That is not correct.

Mr BURNS: "Sex with police only way: Gunn"—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The honourable member will resume his seat while I am on my feet. This exchange across the Chamber between the Honourable Minister for Police and the member of Lytton has gone far enough. I suggest that the member for Lytton proceed no further with any provocative personal remarks about the Minister.

Mr BURNS: I am quoting the paper. Standing Orders allow members to quote from newspapers.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am suggesting that the member for Lytton is colouring his quotations.

Mr BURNS: I will not colour them; I will read them out.

"SEX WITH POLICE ONLY WAY: GUNN

The only way to close massage parlors was to send young policemen in to have sex, the Police Minister, Mr Gunn, said today.

Mr Gunn said the police force was loath to force officers into massage parlours and 'lower their standards' to ensure convictions.

While maintaining that he did not know if prostitutes worked in Brisbane massage parlours, Mr Gunn virtually admitted it was impossible to close them down.

'It's a very, very difficult situation,' Mr Gunn said. 'It's very difficult to close them down.'

'To get evidence we've got to get a person to go in and actually have intercourse.'

'We don't want to put our police in that position.' "

Isn't that what I said Mr Gunn had said?

Mr Gately interjected.

Mr BURNS: That is a quote from Mr Gunn. Mr Gunn has never denied that in the papers. Make no bones about it, the Queensland Government is soft on massage parlours and prostitution, which have been allowed to flourish in Queensland.

Mr Gately interjected.

Mr BURNS: Honourable members only have to pick up the newspapers on the Gold Coast, which is in the electorate of that loud-mouthed member who is singing out. The advertisements for escort agencies proclaim that people can have sex Greek-style, French-style and all sorts of other styles. On the week-end, the *Gold Coast Bulletin*

contained many pages of advertisements; yet the Minister says that it does not happen in Queensland. At the same time, the police pick up a few old drunks and they charge a lad with abusive language if he swears when a policeman grabs him by the scruff of the neck. That is justice, Queensland style. That is Bill Gunn's justice—justice by the Minister for Police. He does not even understand that massage parlours exist in Queensland.

Mr Gunn: When they pinched your suits, you said it was a National Party plot. It was an old wino down under the bridge.

Mr BURNS: I accept that interjection. The police have never found the person who stole my suits. I ask the Minister why that person was not charged with the theft of my suits. The Minister sits there and makes up stories. That is a lie and he knows that it is a lie. I ask him to put his money where his mouth is. He has gone on record in *Hansard* as saying that an old wino stole my suits. The police force was never able to find who did it. The Minister knows who did it. I want to see some charges laid.

I will be writing to the Minister for Police. He has put his foot in it and I will be writing to him, asking him to substantiate what he has said here today. If the Minister has misled the House, he will have to come back and tell the truth. The Minister has misled the House. He is turning white and his mouth is going dry because he knows that he has been caught. As usual, the Minister does not know what he is talking about.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I insist that the exchange in the Chamber between the Minister for Police and the honourable member for Lytton cease forthwith. The honourable member should continue with his speech.

Mr BURNS: Right.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr BURNS: The honourable member knows the rules: Ministers are entitled to interject. The rules are that the Ministers can go for their lives and Opposition members have to do as they are told. Those are the rules. You know that, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will determine what goes on in the Chamber.

Mr BURNS: I know. You have, and honourable members just saw that.

Let me turn to examine the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act. The Act contains 25 paragraphs that provide 25 ways in which a person can be regarded as a vagrant. For example, a person can habitually consort with reputed criminals.

What is the name of the bloke who owns the high-rise developments in Surfers Paradise? Let's take Abe Saffron, for a start. Then there is Kornhauser. Under a provision of the Act, Russ Hinze should be run in and so should all of those who occupy the ministerial benches. The Act states "habitually consorts with reputed criminals". The criminals do not have to be convicted; they only have to be reputed criminals.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow the statement to be made in this Parliament that Ministers are consorting with reputed criminals. I ask the honourable member to withdraw the statement.

Mr BURNS: Well, I think that the Ministers are supposed to have——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is against Standing Orders. I am asking the honourable member to withdraw the statement.

Mr BURNS: Against Standing Orders? I will withdraw it. I will be asking to see the particular Standing Order, Mr Deputy Speaker. If you rule that way, you have to stick by your ruling.

In addition to the section I quoted previously, the Act contains a provision that prevents people from taking bottles into a stadium. Moreover, kids are not allowed to

sit in a movie theatre in the same area as that occupied by adults. The classic provision is that one that relates to the protection of children. Section 37B provides—

> "It shall be a condition of the license that the licensee shall provide and maintain seating accommodation separate and distinct from adult persons for all children, under or apparently under the age of fourteen years attending the picture theatre where any such child or children is or are unaccompanied by a parent, adult relative, guardian, or person over or apparently over the age of fourteen years;".

That is the law at present.

The Act also states that the term "Picture Theatre" is to be interpreted as follows—

> "... any building or any part of a building or any enclosure, ground, place, or premises whatsoever wherein or whereon any film is exhibited ..."

Even drive-in picture theatres are covered by that definition. That is crazy. Although separate seating is no longer provided, it is still the law in this State.

Under the provisions of section 31 (2), a person cannot bring a bottle into a stadium. Under the definition of "bottle", the Act could be read to apply to a baby's bottle. A person could get into trouble for bringing a baby's bottle into a stadium under the provision of the Act if its provisions are taken to the nth degree.

Another crazy situation arises when the Literature Board of Review allows certain books to be available to be sold in newsagencies but, under the provisions of this Act, a police officer is empowered to find those publications objectionable and can charge the newsagent with an offence. That can happen, in spite of the fact that the Literature Board of Review has classified the material as okay. Such an incident has occurred in this State.

Under the provisions of the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act that relate to gaming, lesser penalties apply than those provided under the Gaming Act. If a charge is brought under the provisions of the Gaming Act, all the gambling equipment, including roulette tables, can be confiscated, whereas under the Act presently being debated only the fruit machines can be confiscated. In simple terms, a police officer is given a discretion.

The honourable member for Stafford raised an issue involving people at a place at Sunshine Beach from which all the gambling equipment was taken. The police—quite correctly, I believe—charged them under the relevant Act. The instruments used for gaming were taken away and became the property of the Crown. Later, the equipment was sold. I think that the original owners bought it back and used it again. Under the provisions of that Act, that is the way it goes. Because the police do not charge offenders under the Gaming Act, the equipment remains on the premises. After the police officers leave, the premises are opened up again, and the same tables are used in the same room on the same premises. That can happen because the Act under which the charge was brought was the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act.

A number of provisions of the Act are not relevant. Can I say that, in 1987, they are not only out of date but they are also rather stupid? It is time that some of the other sections of the Act were looked at. Section 5 is about prostitutes. Under the Act, pimps, thieves, terrorists, illegal casino-operators, flashers, unlicensed collectors, impostors and fortune-tellers are all regarded as vagrants. They are all lumped in together. There may be good reason for covering each and every one of them. However, what I am saying is that it is time that somebody had a good look at the Act and that it was brought up to date. Really, a new Act is needed. Instead of all the amendments which have been introduced over the years——

Mr FitzGerald: What would you legalise?

Mr BURNS: As an example, it is not a matter of legalising drunkenness; it is a matter of taking some of the stupid provisions out of the Act. I do not know that it should any longer be an offence to take a bottle of beer into a football ground. On any Sunday any policeman could go down to Lang Park, Kougari Oval or Ballymore Park

and book most of the people drinking stubbies. That provision of the Act is outdated. It is not a matter of legalising it; it is a matter of bringing it up to date with 1987 standards. In 1931 portable Eskies and ice boxes did not exist. The ice box was a big ice box that stood in the back yard with a big hunk of ice in the back of it. People did not have light-weight refrigerated gear in which they could cart drinks all around the State. So today those sorts of provisions just do not apply. They are 56 years out of date. That is what I am saying about this Act.

The Government has to stop continually amending the Act. We have to have a look at the whole Act and say to ourselves, "Look, there are things here that we have to get rid of." The simple answer is that they be got rid of. There may be new provisions that can be changed in relation to some of those things. Maybe the Act should be altered so that it relates to the throwing of cans of beer at the footy and not just bottles. Perhaps other articles should be included. What I am saying is that in its present form the Act is a relic of the past. In many ways, it puts policemen in an invidious position. It allows them to use sections of the Act in a manner that people see as wrong. The Minister cannot tell me that, under the provisions of this Act, prostitution and similar sorts of offences have been able to be controlled. That has just not been done.

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (12.28 p.m.): In rising to speak to the Bill, I will leave the more colourful aspects of the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act and its undoubted shortcomings for a moment to deal with the specifics of the amendment that is currently before the House. I do not think that there can be too many objections to the proposal that has been put forward to us, or at least the principle of the proposal that is put forward to us, wherein it has been said that people taking parachute jumps off the Gateway Bridge or irresponsibly climbing on the outsides of buildings or elsewhere merely for thrills are placing the public in danger, are placing a strain upon our emergency services and that that is an undesirable activity that should be curbed.

What is in question, of course, is the wording that has been used to do this and the fact that it is being inserted through yet another amendment to create yet another offence under the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act.

I would take up the points made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr Burns, and talk about the drafting of the Act. There can be no doubt that this Act is sloppily drafted. One must conjecture whether it is a product of the Crown law office or of the police force. In recent years in this State a very unfortunate precedent has arisen in that, because a few people in the police force have qualified as barristers, the police have taken over the drafting of their own Acts. I and other members of the Liberal Party believe that that is a dangerous precedent.

A parliamentary draftsman, under the control of the Premier's Department, has the responsibility of introducing consistency of principles and appropriate wording into all of the Acts of the State of Queensland. We cannot afford a situation to arise in which each department starts its own little drafting section to put in the words that it feels are the most appropriate. I will return to that subject in a moment.

The drafting of this Act is simply not appropriate. I will speak about the section that deals with the manner of payment for rescue operations which have been mounted. Because it is not the Liberal Party's proposal to debate the clauses of this Bill—and I do not think that that is the Opposition's proposal either, because it is a minor Bill——it is best to raise these matters at the second-reading stage.

The honourable member for Lytton is quite correct when he says that in this Act there is absolutely no control over the manner in which any rescue is carried out. Nobody, I think, would reasonably argue that, if a person acts irresponsibly by leaping off a bridge with a parachute or by climbing a building, that person should not be forced to pay the reasonable costs of rescue, replacement and restoration works carried out by emergency services. However, the operative word is "reasonable". This proposal contains no element of reasonableness. The Bill proposes that, as long as the incurring of some costs has been proven, the person will be liable for them.

The Minister may tell the House that magistrates will take this into account. However, if someone gets carried away and does crazy things when carrying out a rescue operation, the costs can become quite horrendous. For example, the current cost of running a helicopter is approximately $1,200 an hour. If some do-gooder—that is probably the best word that one can use—decides that he needs a helicopter in certain circumstances for a rescue operation, all he has to do is pick up the phone and $1,200 has gone, because that is what it will cost to hire one for the first hour.

If it was reasonable to hire a helicopter, okay, I have no argument; the person who created the incident should pay. However, if this was just some—one hesitates to use the word—Rambo-style operation, that has to be taken into account. If someone goes a little beyond what he should do, lets the whole situation go to his head and takes measures and steps that under the circumstances are not reasonable, why should some person, who goes on what is probably a mere, innocent frolic that endangers nobody other than his stupid self, suddenly finds himself facing a bill of what could be astronomical proportions that was unreasonably run up by a person who let matters run away from him? I have no argument at all that the person who created the incident should pay the costs—the reasonable costs—incurred by his activity.

I hope that in his reply the Minister will be able to tell the House of some measure that can be taken or give some assurances that directives will be given about the presentation of accounts under these circumstances. As I said, it is not a matter on which one would proceed to the stage of proposing amendments and dividing the House, but it is one of concern and one that I hope the Minister will address.

In speaking generally to the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act, I must agree with the sentiments, if not perhaps with the detail, presented to the House by the honourable member for Lytton. There is no doubt that the Act is an anachronism. It is out of date; it has had its day. The time has come for a review, but that is no news to the people of Queensland because to my knowledge the proposed Summary Offences Act has been coming and going for at least the last four years. It has been talked about. The House has heard that drafts have been prepared, returned to the department and reconsidered. But where is the Summary Offences Bill?

The Government has acknowledged that the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act is not adequate in this modern age. That is so. This legislation started out as a catch-all Bill in a different era where what was proposed to be done—frankly, I believe this is a police Bill—was to provide a mechanism whereby, if police could not catch a person for another matter, he could be caught under the provisions of this Act. The Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act has become just that Act. I defy any member of this House to live for even 24 hours in the State of Queensland and not do something for which he could not be booked under this Act. Under this Act a person can be caught for just about anything.

It is a discretionary Act. Certainly there are arguments that the police need some discretion to act against matters arising when they cannot obtain conviction under other legislation. The honourable member for Lytton was quite correct when he spoke about the consorting provisions. They are ridiculous. I make no accusations of impropriety or otherwise against the Premier when I raise this point. Frankly, the Premier is liable for arrest under this Act for attending a party hosted by Brian Maher to celebrate his acquittal of some criminal charges. Maher has convictions. Maher is not simply a reputed criminal under the terms of the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act; he is a convicted criminal. By associating with him the Premier rendered himself liable to arrest under this Act. That is ludicrous. It should not occur. This is the twentieth century; it is the 1980s. Very many provisions of this Act just do not sit right with the modern, current perceptions of the rights of the individual in a modern society.

If the police seek to use, and continue to use, the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act pending the introduction of the much-vaunted, but still to appear, Summary Offences Act, some safeguards should be built into it. I suggest that no prosecution should be mounted under this Act without the consent of some higher authority first

having been sought and received. I do not suggest that it should go as high as the Attorney-General; that would hamstring the police far too much.

It would not be unreasonable to require that a commissioned officer of police should give a certificate consenting to a prosecution under the "Vag" Act before it is proceeded with. This Act should be acknowledged for what it was designed to be—an Act of last resort; an Act under which proceedings are taken only if there is no option under any other Act.

Again I must defer to the research that has been carried out by the honourable member for Lytton. He is quite correct when he talks about gaming offences. People should be charged under a specific Act. If this State has a Gaming Act, people should not be charged under this catch-all Act, the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act. It should be an Act of last resort. That is what it was allegedly designed to be.

Why have things changed? If it is an Act of last resort, an Act to which people look for prosecutions when no other reasonable legislative or common law measure will prevail, why should there not be a proviso that a certificate of consent, by a commissioned officer of police or someone else in authority, should be obtained first so that there is a guarantee that appropriate legal proceedings are taken against offenders?

The Liberal Party is not saying that proceedings should not be taken. If people have committed crimes, proceedings certainly should be initiated. However, they should be appropriate and correct proceedings. It should not simply be said, "Let's do it under the 'Vag' Act" because that is the quickest and easiest way to get a conviction.

If the Parliament has gone out of its way to consider and pass specific legislation about certain acts which are deemed to be crimes or offences under our laws, at the least the Parliament's view should be respected sufficiently by the police and the others responsible for enforcement to cause them to rely on those specific Acts.

I would welcome the Minister's telling honourable members in his reply a little bit about what would happen in the future with the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act. Perhaps the Minister might think that this is a suitable occasion to resurrect in this House the long story of the proposed Summary Offences Act.

I support this Bill with reluctance. The matters I object to are not of such moment that they require taking up the time of the House or dividing on. However, I invite the Minister to tell honourable members where the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act is going. When will honourable members witness the introduction of the proposed Summary Offences Act so that the matters that have been raised today in this House will be put to bed once and for all?

Mr HAYWARD (Caboolture) (12.38 p.m.): In rising to speak to the Bill, I express my disappointment not with the amendment as such but with the fact that the opportunity was not taken to thoroughly consider all the provisions of the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act with a view to modernising it to conform to practices in the latter part of the 1980s. An opportunity should have been taken to bring the Act into line with contemporary society and attitudes.

Vagrancy is an outdated concept, a concept which traditionally meant someone with no accommodation, money or work. All of the offenders outlined in sections 4 and 5 of the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offencers Act are deemed to be vagrants. Offenders under section 4A are deemed to be disorderly persons.

I will examine what constitutes a vagrant within the terms of this Act. Some of the definitions have been very well covered by the member for Lytton and the member for Stafford. However, I want to concentrate on a couple of those definitions. Firstly I will deal with the concept of having no visible means of support. It is actually a criminal offence to have no visible or insufficent lawful means of support. To make matters worse, under this Act the principle of being innocent until proven guilty is reversed, the onus being on the person charged to prove his or her innocence.

That offends one of the corner-stones of our criminal justice system, that is, that a person is innocent until proven guilty. Under this Act, even if a person possesses money or property, he or she must prove that it was obtained lawfully.

I believe that this offence—in reality, that of being poor—is a total anachronism and should be abolished. It demonstrates a lack of compassion and, as the member for Lytton said, it is contrary to the philosophy behind the whole social security system that exists in this country. It creates what could only be described as the classic victimless crime.

Secondly, I will deal with the concepts of begging and fourtune-telling. No-one is permitted to beg or solicit contributions in a public place. Apparently, the origin of this law was in the aftermath of the Battle of Trafalgar when mutiliated British seamen, who were apparently being discharged without compensation by the British navy, went into the streets of London begging for money. They caused embarassment to public officials. It is also an offence under this Act to tell fortunes for gain or payment of any kind. I am attempting to illustrate the definition of "vagrant" under the existing Act.

The proposed new section 4B states—

"(1) Any person who—

(a) makes or attempts to make a descent from or onto a building or structure by parachuting, abseiling or other means;

or

(b) climbs or attempts to climb a building or structure,—

is guilty of an offence, unless the building or structure exists for that purpose or that person has a lawful, reasonable and sufficient excuse for so doing."

Section 4B (2) states—

" . . . the court may order that person to pay another person, specified by the court, a sum assessed by the court on account of expenses shown to it to have been incurred by that other person in connexion with the rescue or attempted rescue . . . "

The desperate irrelevance of the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act is illustrated by an incident that occurred recently in my electorate. A constituent of mine was found to be a vagrant within the meaning of this Act because she "professed to tell fortunes for gain or payment of any kind". Lynette Margaret Zabielo was a vagrant within the meaning of this Act. She was charged that on 13 October 1986 at Narangba she professed to tell fortunes, to wit the fortune of one Deborah Kay Froud, for payment, namely $30. According to evidence given in the court, Deborah Kay Froud was a police officer attached to the sexual offences squad of the Queensland Police Department. It is an absolute disgrace that this policewoman was taken away from vital work to listen to Ms Zabielo. This matter then went to the Magistrates Court. What a waste of valuable police resources and public moneys! The matter was heard all day and there are 42 pages of transcript from the court. A magistrate was tied up and the whole court process was held up for a day whilst this matter was decided. Ms Zabielo was not a long-cloaked lady with a crystal ball in a back lane telling people to put all their jewellery in a coloured box whilst her associate sneaked around the corner, grabbed the money and took off. Ms Zabielo is a mother and a wife. She is a family woman residing in her own home at Narangba. She lodges a taxation return in her occupation as a psychic counsellor and pays tax on her net income derived. Her business is registered with the Queensland Commissioner of Corporate Affairs and she advertises regularly in available newspapers. There are no big garish signs advertising what she does or her place of work. People answering the newspaper advertisements go to a suburban house. They sit down and she consults with them and tells them about their lives or whatever they wish to know. In my opinion Ms Zabielo is no more a vagrant in the real sense of the word than anyone in this House.

What has happened is that this Act, as has been clearly pointed out by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr Burns, has not moved with the times. Vagrancy is an

outdated concept. In the matter involving Ms Zabielo, police resources have been tied up, the court's time has been wasted and there has been an enormous amount of public expenditure. Ms Zabielo was fined $80.

An article on 6 February 1983 in the *Courier-Mail* under the heading "Soothsayers palmed off" states—

> "The future for Queensland's fortunetellers remains a mystery, despite government predictions that their stars are on the rise.
>
> Fortune tellers, sick and tired of section four of the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act which bars card, tea leaf, and palm reading, last year appealed to State Parliament for a change.
>
> Transport Minister Don Lane tabled a petition with nearly 400 signatures before the House in April last year.
>
> At the time, the then Police Minister, Mr Russ Hinze, said amendments to the Act would go before Parliament later in the year.
>
> But nearly 10 months later no one seems to know what's happened to the amendments.
>
> Mr Lane said as far as he knew they had not gone before Parliament, but he would be taking the matter up with the new Police Minister Bill Glasson.
>
> A spokesman for Mr Glasson said he would be examining the legislation this year."

Mr Lane recognised that the amendment was due when he tabled the petition in June 1982. Mr Hinze said that the changes would occur that year. Mr Lane said that he would take the matter up with Mr Glasson. In 1983, Mr Glasson said that he would be examining the legislation. It is now 1987 and Queensland has a different Minister for Police. The amendments have still not been produced.

In the past, as times and social attitudes have changed, the Act has been amended. Prior to 1972, section 4 (1) (ii) contained an absolutely disgraceful provision. A vagrant was defined as—

> "Any person who—
>
> . . .
>
> Not being an aboriginal native or the child of an aboriginal native, lodges or wanders in company with any aboriginal native, and does not, on being charged before a court, give to its satisfaction a good account that he has a lawful fixed place of residence and lawful means of support, and that he so lodged or wandered for some temporary and lawful occasion only, and did not continue so to do beyond some occasion . . ."

The Act has been amended previously. I have referred to the 1972 amendment. As all speakers in this debate have said, it is time that the Act was examined and further amended.

The crucial point to understand in the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act is that most of the offences are offences only if they occur in a public place. "Public place" is very widely defined to include any place where free access is permitted to the public, including private property where the owner has given "express or tacit consent" to free access, and also places where the public are permitted upon payment of an entry fee. In other words, "public place" can mean virtually anywhere except within the walls of a person's home, and may even include his home if he allows in people who pay a charge or people who attend a public function, or if the interior of his property is open to public view or hearing.

Proposed section 4B does not take away the distinction between a public place and a private place, but it now becomes a question of whether "the building or structure exists for that purpose or that person has a lawful, reasonable and sufficient excuse for

so doing". That "purpose", which seems so fundamental to proposed section 4B(1), gives the authorities a very wide interpretation.

As I said, proposed section 4B(2) gives the court power to make an order that the person deemed to be a disorderly person pay any expense connected with his rescue or attempted rescue. Personally, I think that that provision has appeal in the community generally because in many ways people are sick and tired of the cost of rescues being borne by the public purse. Honourable members have read in newspapers about many acts that appear to be very foolhardy. It is debatable how effective the amendments will be.

Proposed section 4B(3) deems an order for payment of money to have been made under the Magistrates Courts Act. Although a judgment is made, the problem with the Magistrates Courts Act is that it does not guarantee payment. The onus to collect from the rescued person will revert to the claimer—in this case, the rescuer—to collect the money. That is unsatisfactory. It places an intolerable burden on the rescuing party or parties. The provision should be examined.

In conclusion—basically, I agree with the points made by the member for Lytton and the member for Stafford. All honourable members agree that the opportunity should be taken now to redraft all the provisions of the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act with a view to modernising it to the 1980s. People such as Lynette Zabielo should not have the stigma of being charged as vagrants, especially when they are considered to be normal people who are living in our community and who are doing everything that is normal in our community.

I ask the Minister whether he can clear up my concern about proposed new section 4B(3) that relates to the enforcement of judgments.

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police) (12.51 p.m.), in reply: The amendments deal with the unlawful practices that were listed as (a), (b) and (c) in my second-reading speech. Those unlawful practices are becoming more prevalent, and I have instanced them.

The Opposition spokesman, Mr Burns, rambled on about the Act and expressed his point of view. There is nothing wrong with that. However, the honourable member has continued with his usual diatribe.

These amendments are reasonable and are now very necessary. Mr Gygar mentioned the hiring of helicopters and the guide-lines that are set for the calling in of helicopters where police rescue resources cannot cope with a particular situation. That is fair and reasonable.

The proposed Summary Offences Bill is presently in the hands of Mr Sturgess and Sergeant Doug Smith. The Government looks forward to Mr Gygar's support when that Bill comes before this House.

Gaming offences are included in the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act. Both this Act and the Gaming Act are used where applicable.

The honourable member for Caboolture rambled on and on about fortune-telling and a particular lady who tells fortunes. Fortune-telling is about as reliable as horoscopes.

Mr Hayward: And the waste of police resources.

Mr GUNN: That lady is telling fortunes for financial gain. I have no faith in people who tell fortunes, and I advise all honourable members not to become involved with those sorts of people.

It is all right for people to claim that fortune-tellers have been correct on occasions, but even a broken clock is correct twice a day.

When the Summary Offences Bill was proposed, the majority of Ministers requested that fortune-telling be kept simply as an offence of telling fortunes for gain or benefit. I

believe that that is extremely important. The summary offences legislation was held up in 1985 by the Justice Department.

Motion agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 6, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

Sitting suspended from 12.56 to 2.30 p.m.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY (STATE PROVISIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 10 March (see p. 519).

Mr GOSS (Logan) (2.30 p.m.): My concern with the legislation is primarily that the effectiveness of the National Crime Authority in investigating organised crime in Queensland will be limited and diminished by the Government's removal of the Attorney-General from the Inter-Governmental Committee of the National Crime Authority. My concern and suspicion about this Government move arises from the fact that in replacing the Attorney-General with the Police Minister on the Inter-Governmental Committee, the Government has not given any reason for the change. No reason was provided in the Minister's very brief second-reading speech—perhaps one of the briefest speeches that I have ever heard by a Minister to justify such an important change to a body that is gaining increasing importance and credibility in this country in combating organised crime.

The person who would take this position on the national Inter-Governmental Committee is the Queensland Police Minister who has introduced the amendment; yet the Minister has already shown his lack of commitment to fighting organised crime by his refusal just this year either to act on the findings of the Sturgess report or to even acknowledge the validity of those findings. I refer in particular to the findings of the Sturgess report that two organised criminal groups control prostitution in Brisbane in Queensland. Even more serious is the finding by Mr Sturgess that the main offenders have for years enjoyed immunity from prosecution.

That is not a comment or allegation made by the Opposition. The Government's own Director of Prosecutions undertook an inquiry for over a year, during the course of which he spoke to victims, to a wide range of police officers and other people with a contribution to make. He found that two organised criminal groups are operating organised prostitution in Brisbane. The names of the relevant people are published on the front page of the *Courier-Mail* of 12 January this year; yet no action and no acknowledgement comes from the Minister. I will go into that in more detail later.

The finding by Mr Sturgess, the Government's Director of Prosecutions, that the main offenders have enjoyed immunity from prosecution is nothing less than an official finding of corruption against the Queensland police force. However, Mr Gunn, the Police Minister, dismissed his own Government's report and the report of his Director of Prosecutions without any hesitation as "only the opinion of one man". Given his attitude this morning, perhaps it may be yet another one of those numerous cases in which the Minister subsequently conveniently claims to have been misrepresented.

I ask honourable members: how can such a Minister be given responsibility for assisting the National Crime Authority in investigating organised crime anywhere, much less in Queensland? What would happen if the Minister who seeks to replace the

Attorney-General on the Inter-Governmental Committee of the National Crime Authority wanted to investigate organised prostitution and corruption in Queensland and the authority said, "We have received certain confidential information from Queensland. We have seen that this has been confirmed by the State Government's own Sturgess report about organised prostitution and official corruption. We want to investigate it. It may link up with some people in Sydney or some other place."? The decision on whether or not to co-operate with the National Crime Authority to start to put an end to the organised criminal activity and corruption will be made by this Minister on the advice of the police force. One would not need to be a Rhodes scholar to work out the Minister's decision when it came to co-operating with the National Crime Authority.

I am told by some sources that the move has come about because of a problem with the previous Attorney-General, not the current Attorney-General. The previous Attorney-General, on being asked to co-operate on a particular matter, declined the request but was subsequently persuaded that a need did exist for the National Crime Authority to come into Queensland on a particular matter. The quite proper decision to co-operate, made by the previous Attorney-General, upset certain senior sections of the Queensland police force and they are determined to see that it does not happen again.

I believe that the attitude of the Government is exposed by its refusal to allow the Commissioner of Police to co-operate with, or to brief, a joint committee of the National Crime Authority. The recently published second report of the committee, dated November 1986, reveals that when the Queensland Premier was approached personally over the decision made by the Government, he rejected a request that was agreed to by all other States, that is, for each State's Commissioner of Police to address the joint committee on organised crime. Perhaps, along with the Minister for Police, the Premier believes that there is no such thing as organised crime in Queensland; perhaps, like the Minister for Police, the Premier believes that there is no such thing as prostitution.

Mr Davis: We haven't got any massage parlours down the Valley now; Billy told me.

Mr GOSS: The point made by the honourable member for Brisbane Central is an interesting one, because, on a particular day in January, the Minister said something to that effect. However, by the end of that week, he had made three or four different statements as he tried to refine and twist——

Mr Gunn: Which faction are you in now?

Mr GOSS: As the Minister has raised that point, I inform him that I am not in any faction. I know what faction the Minister is in: the Minister is in the Gunn faction, which is bitterly opposed to the faction of the Minister's colleague now sitting alongside him on the front bench. It is fascinating to watch the back-stabbing and the contortions that are going on. The other day, one of my colleagues said that things are becoming so confused among Government Ministers that people are getting stabbed in the chest. That is how confused Government Ministers are becoming.

Mr Speaker, I know that you want me to return to debate on the Bill, and that is what I want to do, too. I was side-tracked by the interjection. When interjections come up again, I will deal with them if the Minister wishes, but I think honourable members should try to maintain some relevance and a serious attitude to organised crime in Queensland and the need to combat it. The frivolous and irrelevant interjection made by the Minister is typical of his attitude in trying to ignore these problems and of his trying to pretend that they do not exist.

Although the Parliament was dealing at the second-reading stage with important changes to the structure and operation of the National Crime Authority, the Minister's second-reading speech contained only three paragraphs. In effect, the Minister said that recently responsibility had been assigned by the Premier to the Minister. He went on to say that an amendment was required to replace the Attorney-General with himself and

that, consequently, the amendment was being made to section 3. That was all the Minister said. Where is the explanation? Where is the reason? Where is the statement of the attitude adopted by the Queensland Government to this body? Where does the Minister explain why the Government refused to allow the Commissioner of Police to brief the joint committee? Why does this State stand out from other States in its attempts to frustrate that particular request of the committee? No adequate reason has been given. It seems to me that if there were reasons, they would have been advanced by now.

It is interesting to note that in the *Sunday Mail* on 8 December 1985, the Commissioner of Police, Mr Lewis, was quoted at page 14 as stating the following—

> "He said the state Minister for Justice, Mr Harper, was on the inter-governmental committee which was in direct liaison with the NCA.
>
> 'There is a very effective channel of communication between the authority, governments and their respective police forces,' Mr Lewis said.
>
> 'It could not be bettered in my opinion'."

Yet, if one can believe the Minister, the situation is being bettered.

Does that tend to suggest that rumours and reports that are circulating in the force and in southern sectors are correct in that the purpose of this legislation is to remove potential problems in relation to a Queensland Attorney-General's being a bit more independent when it comes to such matters than the Minister for Police might be? Does it tend to suggest the ability of certain senior sections of the police force to overcome or to frustrate particular inquiries that are being conducted by the NCA and that they might not be happy with?

The position relating to the Premier is a serious one. The joint committee of the NCA makes specific reference in its second report on page 18 to "all States" in Australia "except Queensland" co-operating in having each Commissioner of Police address the committee on organised criminal activity in their jurisdictions. As I said before, the Queensland Government refused. A subsequent request was made by the committee that the Queensland Premier give further consideration to this matter, and that was also rejected. Why won't the Queensland Government allow the Commissioner of Police to talk to the committee about organised criminal activity in this State? What harm could there be in that, unless the concern was that certain people would be embarrassed?

I refer also to further excerpts from pages 18 to 20 of the second report of the joint committee. At paragraph 30 the committee says that it has had briefings from the Commissioners and senior officers of South Australia, Victoria, Tasmania, New South Wales, the Northern Territory and Western Australia. It had also received a briefing from the Australian Federal Police, the Australian Customs Service and the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence. The briefings dealt with a wide range of matters including the extent of organised criminal activity within their areas of responsibilities; the strategies undertaken to deal with the problem of organised crime; possible future trends in criminal activities; difficulties being experienced in the fight against organised crime and co-ordination and liaison between the various State and Federal agencies, especially in relation to the work of the National Crime Authority. Obviously those briefings are not only important, they are also quite detailed and quite important to the future of Australia when it comes to combating the spread of organised crime. Yet no explanation has been forthcoming from the Premier or from this Government in relation to the Government's failure on that particular score.

At paragraph 31 the committee goes on to say—

> "... the Committee was disappointed that it was unable to receive a briefing from the Queensland Commissioner of Police. As Queensland is an important link, such a meeting would have been valuable in completing the Committee's overview of matters relating to the fight against organised crime throughout Australia."

Indeed, Queensland is an important link. I think it was about two years ago that I raised in this place allegations in relation to substantial and organised criminal activities in

the drug scene, particularly in the Sunshine Coast area. Those allegations were pooh-poohed; they were rejected out of hand by the relevant Ministers in this Government. Yet it was subsequently discovered, when reports of the Costigan commission came out and various other prosecutions were undertaken, that there were some very high level figures in the drug trade operating out of the Sunshine Coast, and some of those people have been the subject of high level publicity in relation to their exploits and in their capture and recapture.

At paragraph 33 the committee says—

> "One theme which has been stressed by many of the representatives of the law enforcement agencies who have appeared before the Committee is the crucial need for a high level of coordination and cooperation between all agencies involved in the fight against organised crime."

Yet this Government refuses to allow its Police Commissioner to appear and to assist in that process to the same extent as all other States are undertaking that co-operative process. That is a shame and a disgrace. This Government has something to answer for on that particular score. That committee's work will continue, but it seems to me that it could continue more profitably and efficiently with co-operation from this Government.

The point that that raises for the consideration of all members and people concerned in this area is: have there been any particular requests from the NCA that have been rejected by this Government? That is what I would like to know. The Minister may say, if he is minded to answer the question, that the subject-matter is confidential or whatever. I would still be interested to hear whether there have been any requests from the NCA and, if so, how many have been rejected and the reasons why that has been done—without transgressing the confidentiality of any particular investigation being conducted by the Queensland police or any other police agency.

The thing that concerns me and a lot of people about this Government is its high-minded, high-flying rhetoric when it comes to being tough on criminal activity and on drug activity and when one compares it with the Government's performance, whether it is in relation to the National Crime Authority or whether it is in relation to the fact that, when one looks at the Commonwealth Grants Commission report, one sees that the Government spends the lowest or the second-lowest of all Australian States on law enforcement. The points simply are not on the board. Certainly the rhetoric and cliches are on the board. Legislation such as the Drugs Misuse Act is on the board. But where are the facts relating to the performance as opposed to the rhetoric and the public relations that are extensively carried on?

The role of the police and, for that matter, that of the Police Minister have become highly politicised. Especially in recent years in this State they have been unfortunately politicised. This is an important factor in my objection and that of the Opposition to this particular amendment. We think that this particular responsibility should stay with the State's first law officer. There are other States where the particular ministerial responsibility falls to Ministers other than the Attorney-General, but in Queensland it has been the Attorney-General, and no good reason has been advanced for a change in that. The Opposition believes that, because of the peculiarities of Queensland in this particular area, the State's first law officer—the Attorney-General, Mr Clauson—is the appropriate person to continue this responsibility and to continue the work carried out and undertaken by the previous Attorney-General. No reason has been given for the change.

Surely the change is not as a result of any concern about the Attorney-General's ability to handle this responsibility. He has, after all, been plucked from the obscurity of the National Party back bench after a very short period to become Attorney-General. In interviews at the time of his promotion I think he said that it was partly or largely due to the fact that the Premier must have observed his performance in the House. No doubt it is performance and ability that are the bases for promotion to the front bench. That is why those who are on the Government back bench remain there and why others have been appointed to the front bench. Surely there has been a clear expression of

confidence in the ability of the Attorney-General, so that could not be the reason for this change. What is the reason? It would be interesting to hear it.

As honourable members know, the National Crime Authority deals with the problems of organised crime. Therefore, it is illustrative, and also informative, to refer again in a little more detail to the most recent involvement of the Minister for Police in this issue, his most recent incursion into the area of organised crime. I have already referred to the report of the Sturgess inquiry, which this Government established in late 1984. That inquiry lasted for more than a year and involved interviews with a wide range of people from all fields and from many places—Brisbane, north Queensland, the Gold Coast and Sydney. As a result of that inquiry, in Brisbane two organised crime groups have been identified as having for years enjoyed immunity and as running organised prostitution and all that goes with it. Honourable members must remember that with prostitution come other varieties of organised crime, including illegal gambling and a high degree of involvement in drugs.

Yet these findings are ignored by this Minister. He is quoted in the *Courier-Mail* of 13 January and by other media outlets as saying—I put it that way because he has now denied all the inconvenient or embarrassing quotations—that there is no evidence of prostitutes working in Queensland massage parlours. On 14 January in an article in the *Telegraph* written by Mr Lane Calcutt, the Minister is quoted as saying that the only way to close massage parlours was to send young policemen in to have sex. That has already been dealt with in some detail in an earlier debate today, so I will not again go into it.

Those ludicrous—perhaps "silly" is the best word for them—statements simply underscore the point that I am making: the last person in this Government who should be dealing with responsibility for organised criminal activity is the kind of Minister who would make those statements which so lightly and perfunctorily dismiss the findings of his own Director of Prosecutions as "only the opinion of one man". I cannot stress that point too much. The findings of immunity are most serious, yet there has been no action of which we are aware and of which the public has been informed in relation to them.

Until some good reason is advanced and until the Government and this Minister can claim a better track record, the Opposition will continue to be suspicious of the reasons for this move. In the absence of any explanation, it is entitled to be. The Opposition will continue to oppose this particular amendment to the Act on that basis. Until honourable members get some assurance that this Minister and this Government are serious about these matters, they do not deserve the support of the House on this particular legislative provision.

Mr JENNINGS (Southport) (2.50 p.m.): The National Crime Authority and its efficient and proper operation are vital for the future of this country.

I desire to draw attention to a matter that vitally concerns every Queensland citizen and, indeed, every Australian as it relates to crime interstate and Australiawide.

In 1985 the Federal Labor Government established a Constitutional Commission, which was given duties of the utmost importance which very much affect the State of Queensland, every Queensland citizen, and indeed every Australian. This commission was to consider ways in which the Constitution might be changed "to recognize an appropriate division between the Commonwealth and the States", but it was no secret that those who set up the commission hoped that the appropriate division would be a transfer of many of the powers of this State to the Federal Government in Canberra. The commission was also intended to ensure that democratic rights were guaranteed to every Australian.

If such a commision was established—and many Australians did not want such a commission—it was vital that the persons appointed to it should be persons of great ability, but above all persons of the utmost integrity. If there were to be changes in the rights of the State of Queensland and of its citizens, the Queensland Government would

want an assurance that the men who recommended such changes would be men of honour who had the best interests of all Australians close to their hearts.

It is with deep regret that I point out that one member of that commission, Sir Rupert Hamer, not only has a long record which more than demonstrates his complete lack of integrity but also that recent investigations in the State of Queensland have now demonstrated that at the very least he has been closely associated with men who have been guilty of blatant fraud and that he is personally untruthful.

If Sir Rupert had any integrity at all, he would have already stepped down from the Constitutional Commission until his reputation was cleared. Sir Rupert has not done so, and I now believe that the people of Queensland and the Queensland Government have the right to demand that such a man should not be associated in any way with this important commission, which so vitally affects us all.

Sir Rupert Hamer was appointed to the Constitutional Commission by the Federal Labor Government. No doubt it was desirable that as a former Labor leader, Mr Gough Whitlam, had been appointed, there should be at least one member who could be identified with the Opposition parties. However, having regard to the deep suspicion which had long surrounded Sir Rupert Hamer's personal integrity, he is a most unfortunate choice.

As early as 1972 Sir Rupert Hamer's personal integrity had been seriously questioned in a private report into "Dealings concerning the Keilor Estate", which was sent to members of the Victorian State Cabinet. As in that year Sir Rupert Hamer became Premier of Victoria, it is perhaps not surprising that the important questions raised in this report were never raised.

The essence of some of the allegations then raised in this report were that Hamer, as the then Minister of Local Government, had wrongly allowed land in the flight path of Tullamarine Airport to be rezoned Residential C, and that at a later date when the land had to be rezoned the Federal and State Governments had been thereby forced to pay far greater compensation than they should have paid. Hamer himself was also alleged to have interfered with the valuation process, increasing the profit to the owners by a further $1m. It would appear from this report that Hamer played an active part in helping to provide an unjust profit of approximately $2m to unidentified persons.

It is now a matter of history that in September 1977 the then member for Caulfield in Victoria, Mr Charles Francis, QC, and I were expelled from the Victorian parliamentary Liberal Party at the direct instigation of Sir Rupert Hamer, who personally signed the notices calling for our expulsion. He did this because neither of us was prepared to indicate our confidence in the land transactions conducted by his Government's Housing Commission. It was of course no secret at the time that I personally had striven for an investigation of these fraudulant transactions and had been supported in this by the member for Caulfield. It is also now a matter of history that at a later date an inquiry, and then later a royal commission, found that many of the transactions of the Victorian Housing Commission were tainted with either corruption or incompetence or both.

It is most curious that a Federal Labor Government should have appointed Sir Rupert to this position when the Victorian parliamentary Labor Party had on 13 September 1978 moved a motion of want of confidence in Sir Rupert, who was then Premier of Victoria. In that debate many Labor members made grave attacks on the personal character and qualities of Hamer. However, perhaps even more important were the criticisms made of him by the honourable member for Caulfield, an Independent Liberal. It should also be pointed out that at that time the member for Caulfield was already a senior Queen's Counsel.

Of Rupert Hamer the member for Caulfield said, "I have found the Premier to be a man who is completely untrustworthy. One cannot believe his word, whether he is answering a question in the House, speaking to the public or giving evidence under oath . . . " He said that Hamer was corrupt in the sense of being "tainted, ungenuine, and having the quality of corrupting and debasing those around him." Mr Francis then went

on to say of Sir Rupert that he was untruthful, that he had no respect for the law and that he frequently misstated the law for his own purposes. He said that Hamer was a very learned lawyer, that his capacity as a lawyer was well recognised in Melbourne and that, when he misled the public as to what the law was, he did so deliberately.

After many other criticisms of Sir Rupert, Mr Francis pointed out that the Premier was also a character assassin and that he did this either personally or more frequently through his immediate henchmen. I refer to Victorian *Hansard* of 13 September 1978 pages 3722 to 3728. All these matters, of course, may have the utmost relevance to present investigations in the State of Queensland.

The member for Caulfield then went on to analyse instances in which Rupert Hamer had lied in Parliament and, indeed, other instances when, being on oath before parliamentary inquiries, he had committed perjury. By reference to documents Mr Francis showed how it could be plainly demonstrated that this had occurred. He said further that the Leader of the Opposition knew that Hamer had committed perjury before a parliamentary privileges committee earlier that year, and he specifically referred to the documentation from which this could be established. It should also be pointed out that earlier that year, on 10 May 1978, a Victorian National Party member, Mr Bruce Evans, MLA, had raised in the Victorian Parliament another instance of possible perjury by Hamer before the same committee. I refer to Victorian *Hansard* at pages 2761 to 2762.

The member for Caulfield also detailed a further instance in which, under parliamentary privilege, Mr Hamer had issued a spurious report well knowing that the contents were false. Of that report Mr Frank Rees, a Melbourne journalist, had written some three months previously, "It is highly improbable that R. J. Hamer will ever repeat this grotesque absurdity outside the safe confines of Parliamentary privilege" and added that "the deceptions of the Hamer Government commit it to repeated wiles and shams in defence of a squalid fraud". The member for Caulfield pointed out that the Premier had never sued on that journalist's report because in truth Hamer had participated in what was a squalid fraud.

The speech of the honourable member for Caulfield was far too well documented to be answered and was indeed unanswerable. It remained unanswered. The Premier did not seek to exercise any right of reply nor did he seek at a later date to make some personal explanation, a further right which, as every member of this Parliament would know, was plainly available to him.

Having dealt with Hamer's lying and perjury, the member for Caulfield then commenced to analyse some of Hamer's connections with corruption in Victoria. He proposed to analyse the connections of the Hamer Government with corrupt members of the Victorian Police Force and how, for example, an assistant chief commissioner, who was later found to have lied repeatedly before the Beach inquiry, was used to help cover up corrupt Housing Commission land dealings. The honourable member intended to demonstrate that at that time there was a quite elaborate network in the State of Victoria to prevent the detection of corruption, that Hamer was well aware of the network and from time to time made use of it. However, he was prevented from completing this analysis when the Liberal Party voted to prevent the continuation of the honourable member's speech.

As a matter of record it should be pointed out that the member for Caulfield, who in 1978 made this attack on Hamer, was in 1981 appointed to be Deputy Judge Advocate General of the RAAF by Sir James Killen, a Federal Liberal Minister. At that very time some of the many matters of corruption with which Hamer was associated were well known to me personally. A few days previously I had already set out in written record much of what I had seen and heard in the period between 1976 and 1978. That document was tabled in the Victorian State Parliament in September 1978. Not surprisingly Hamer opposed and prevented any investigation of the many matters which I had then raised.

In that document entitled "Personal Explanation", I set out, amongst other matters, some of the many facts and circumstances surrounding corrupt land transactions in Victoria, and the personal involvement of Hamer and some members of his Cabinet

with some of the persons who had corruptly made money from those transactions or had been granted special deals by the Hamer Government. Included in that document was a description of the Albury/Wodonga fiasco which was probably one of the biggest swindles of them all. That report, which I then made, remains on record and will assist anyone who reads it to determine the real nature and character of Sir Rupert Hamer.

In May 1979 the member for Caulfield and I were defeated at the election for the Victorian Parliament, but the credibility crises of Mr Hamer continued with monotonous regularity. In April 1979 Hamer had assured the Victorian people that the land deals were entirely behind them, but within weeks of the return of his Government in May that year—with a now very slender majority of one—a great many more improper land dealings were disclosed which led to the necessity for the setting up of the Frost commission.

In 1980, further answers given to the State Parliament by Hamer in relation to the Southgate syndicate's attempts to obtain land of the Lutheran Church for a casino in South Melbourne were demonstrated to be false by the Reverend Jordan of the Lutheran Church, as stated in the Melbourne *Age* dated 29 March 1980 at page 14.

Finally on 28 May 1981 Hamer resigned as Premier of Victoria, but statements made that day by his wife made it very clear he had been forced to resign by his own party, and it was no secret that his own party had finally got rid of Hamer because they had found him to be—as the member for Caulfield had said in September 1978—"totally untrustworthy".

Upon his retirement from State politics, Mr Hamer became actively involved in a variety of business activities and, in particular, in the Melbourne Underground restaurant night-club, of which he became a director. Unfortunately for this State, Hamer's activities began to extend beyond Victoria and in 1982 he became chairman of Jojoba International Ltd (Queensland). The other main proponents of that company were Brian Goldsmith, with whom Hamer was associated in the Melbourne Underground, and Fritz Mader.

Subsequently, Sir Rupert, together with Goldsmith and Mader, became a director in an entirely different Queensland project, Land Bank Estate. In August 1984 I was approached by some of the many share-holders who were defrauded in that disgraceful scheme. Hamer and his associates attempted to stifle my public disclosure of what had occurred by the issue of a writ, which a few days later they had to withdraw. Shortly afterwards, in this Parliament I uncovered some of many fraudulent and illegal activities of Hamer and his associates.

The Honourable the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General at that time, Mr Harper, then told the Parliament that Sir Rupert was one of the heads of a misleading and devious scheme to cheat potential investors. The Honourable the Minister also detailed in the Parliament numerous breaches of the Companies (Queensland) Code. I now point out that, in Melbourne, Sir Rupert had for many years been a partner in the leading law firm of Smith and Emerton, that Hamer was well recognised as an expert in company and commercial law, and that he had been a director in and adviser to a number of major companies such as Gas Supply Co. Ltd, General Foods Corp. Ltd, Moulded Products (Australasia) Ltd and Nylex Corporation Limited.

Even on 3 September 1984 Sir Rupert Hamer continued to maintain that the land sale scheme was a perfectly good investment opportunity. That was reported in the Melbourne *Age* on 4 September 1984. By that time he must have known that the statement was blatantly false, but within a matter of days, no doubt in the hope of avoiding prosecution, he and his fellow directors undertook to repay the 364 people who had invested in the scheme. At that time the estimated repayment amounted to $910,000. As much of this money had now gone, the question that arises is: from where was the shortfall to come?

Before I answer that question, however, I want to analyse a little further the obvious falsity of Sir Rupert Hamer's statement that Land Bank Estate was a perfectly good investment opportunity.

First of all, the advertisements that appeared under Sir Rupert's name were grossly misleading. They referred to an investment land sale of Gold Coast land and invited share-holders to buy a piece of the Gold Coast. It was also referred to as an exciting new land buying concept and a safe investment for the family. Any investor would be likely to conclude that for his $2,500 he was acquiring an interest in valuable land.

The land that formed the basis of the so-called bank in fact had changed hands in June 1984. Thereafter, from it was excised more than 20 of the most valuable acres on which stood valuable buildings, thus reducing the value of what was left to approximately $400,000. In August 1984 in the House, I traced the details of this part of the fraud and I will not repeat what I said then.

However, from evidence given on 18 March 1987 to the Jo Jo Ba investigation by Melbourne solicitor James Renton in the Brisbane District Court, it now appears that the contract of sale by which Land Bank Estate was acquiring its interest in the land, by a deed of assignment dated 29 June 1984, had been assigned to unnamed mortgagees. The deed purports to be personally signed by Hamer and Goldsmith. So by 4 September 1984 Sir Rupert already must have known that Land Bank Estate had divested itself of the equitable estate in the land and, consequently, that at that time Land Bank Estate had nothing to sell.

Even if the deed of assignment had not been executed, nothing had been done since to enhance in any way the value of the land itself, and the realisable value of each share for which $2,500 had been paid would then probably have been no more than $600. However, the assignment of the contract of sale having taken place more than two months before meant that any share must have become well nigh worthless as being unsaleable.

It is also interesting to note that, according to page 3 of the Melbourne *Herald* of 4 September 1984, Sir Rupert Hamer said that day that he played no role in the purchase of land and came into it after the land was purchased. Yet the contract of sale dated 29 June 1984 and tendered to the inquiry shows Hamer's signature, and his signing on behalf of the purchaser. Unless Sir Rupert can establish that his signature was a forgery, this would appear to be just one more matter on which he has publicly lied. Furthermore, if Sir Rupert signed the contract, he must also have known that the sale of a share in the scheme for $2,500 was on any view the grossest of overcharges, because the contract price alone would indicate to him that on any view the shares must at that time have been worth considerably less than $1,000. That is why I say without reservation that when Sir Rupert Hamer said on 3 September 1984 that the land sale scheme was a perfectly good investment opportunity, his statement was false as he well knew, and that he was by that statement continuing to participate in what was a blatant fraud.

Now let me turn to the shortfall and how it was to be met if the share-holders in Land Bank Estate were to be repaid. In a written statement purporting to be signed by Brian Goldsmith and dated 5 October 1984, it was said that "the total indebtedness may be something like $450,000 shortfall over and above what was in the two bank accounts, but that the money actually required for repayment of the investors"—in contradistinction to other debts—"could be around $300,000 or $350,000 mark".

Now, Sir Rupert Hamer may not have known the precise amount of the shortfall in September 1984, but any man in his position would have been well aware that the expensive promotional campaign of Land Bank Estate must inevitably have resulted in a substantial shortfall in the event, as had then occurred, that all share-holders had to be repaid.

There appears to be a strong probability that Hamer, Goldsmith and Mader repaid the Land Bank Estate share-holders by a fraudulent misappropriation of moneys invested in a quite different group of companies. Perhaps fortuitously for them, more than $400,000 of share-holders' funds was then being held by Bangalow Farm Management Pty Ltd. These moneys were provided on the express understanding that they would be applied to a Ba Ba Co plantation, another Hamer/Goldsmith/Mader project. Between 11 September 1984 and 11 January 1985 most of these moneys disappeared. As no

proper accounting records were ever kept, it may not be possible to trace precisely where these moneys went; but what is known is that approximately $400,000 went to Gonzales Nurseries during this period. At that stage Gonzales Nurseries appears to have been used as a device for transferring funds from Bangalow Farm Management to the Land Bank Estate. As I understand it, there is no evidence which suggests that moneys of this amount would at this time have been paid to Gonzales Nurseries for legitimate business reasons, and the bank account of Gonzales Nurseries was in fact then being operated by Mader in the fictitious name of Paul Brown. Thereafter, ultimately the Land Bank Estate share-holders were apparently repaid and the shortfall of an approximately corresponding amount was covered.

I have demonstrated that Sir Rupert Hamer has a long history of lies and perjury, has participated in squalid frauds and has frequently been associated with other people who have unjustly enriched themselves from the public purse or have received favoured deals. I do not want to say much more at this stage because some of these matters are now under investigation but, unfortunately, the operations of Land Bank Estate itself are not yet being investigated. The suspicion that Sir Rupert and his associates participated in a fraudulent misappropriation of approximately $400,000 to Land Bank Estate is obvious. How can such a man continue to act on our Australian Constitutional Commission?

When large sums of money are lost in financial enterprises, not infrequently a last ditch defence is raised by those accused of losing or misappropriating the share-holders' moneys. The accused directors may say by way of defence, "We were not dishonest, but we admit we were foolish and incompetent." Will such a defence be raised hereafter and, if so, will it be true? I point out that it hardly behoves the person who undertook to be Premier of Victoria for nine years to assert that he was incompetent to be a director of Land Bank Estate. Let us look just a little further.

Early in 1986, in Victoria, a number of interviews were conducted with share-holders in the various Jo Jo Ba and Ba Ba Co companies. Amongst other documents, computer print-outs were made of these interviews with a view to assisting in some investigation. Some of those share-holders told how they had been inveigled into investing in the Jo Jo Ba and Ba Ba Co companies when they had attended meetings or seminars in Victoria at which Sir Rupert Hamer actively participated by personally delivering speeches and answering questions on the projects and telling all present what a wonderful investment opportunity the projects represented. Most of those share-holders asserted that they invested primarily on the basis of Hamer's personal representations. I will table a letter about that later.

Other share-holders told how salesmen who visited them had personally communicated by telephone with Sir Rupert Hamer in their presence and that, as the result of such phone conversations, they were persuaded to invest in the projects. It is obvious that the person who would most want to know the contents of those computer print-outs would be Sir Rupert Hamer. Those print-outs were evidence against him of a very active participation in obtaining the share-holders' moneys. If he sought to assert that he was a mere figure-head chairman and that he knew little of what was going on, those statements would give the lie to that suggestion. Sir Rupert had the strongest of motives to find out what was in those statements for the purpose of preparing his defence.

Then a curious incident occurred. According to the written statement of a witness before the present inquiry on or shortly before 11 March 1986, much of this material was stolen by a man named Russell Lindsay Moffit, who then departed by air for Queensland. Thereafter an order was obtained from the Victorian Supreme Court requiring Moffit to produce the materials stolen. Not long after, many of these computer print-outs of the records of interview were returned; but when they were returned, they were returned by a Queensland solicitor, Pat Cowen, who was acting for Hamer, Mader and Goldsmith, who had long been associated with their projects and who then had the documents in his possession. The obvious inference is that either they were stolen for Hamer's benefit or that Moffit believed that Hamer might be prepared to pay to get the

material. The circumstances in which this material came into the possession of Cowen thus becomes a very important question.

It may be a mere matter of coincidence, but I am reminded of an incident which happened in Victora almost 10 years ago. On 8 September 1977, Hamer, as Premier of Victoria, asked the member for Caulfield to go and see him. At the interview, which occurred that day, the member for Caulfield was asked to give to the Premier such information as he had relating to the Victorian Housing Commission land deals. As there was at that time an inquiry into this very matter already being conducted by Mr Justice Gowans, it was an improper request. The member for Caulfield indicated that he was not prepared to make this material available to Premier Hamer, but would take appropriate steps to place the material before the inquiry. He was pressed to make the material available to the Premier but refused to do so.

Not long afterwards the honourable member's electorate office was broken into and entered during a week-end. All his files were gone through and a locked drawer in his desk was opened with a hack-saw. The whole surrounding circumstances would suggest that the person concerned wanted to get his hands on the honourable member's information relating to the Housing Commission land deals. The Premier, of course, was one of relatively few people who knew that the member for Caulfield had this information. Of course, it may all be mere coincidence. I used to keep my information in a special safe.

One other matter should, perhaps, also be mentioned at this stage. Mader has, of course, gone overseas and cannot be questioned. There can be little doubt that he misappropriated monies. His disappearance is very convenient for Hamer and Goldsmith, who can now ascribe all the blame to Mader. No doubt in relation to every fraudulent act established against Mader hereafter, Sir Rupert will say "I knew nothing of it", as he has so often falsely said before in other matters unrelated to the present inquiries.

It is not without relevance that some of the monies which went from the Jo Jo Ba and Ba Ba Co companies did go not to Mader or his interests or to the Land Bank Estate, but to the Melbourne Underground restaurant night-club in which Hamer and Goldsmith were directors and share-holders. One witness has already told the present inquiry that Hamer himself ordered the diversion of $150,000 out of Jo Jo Ba Management Limited into Redchamp Research Station Limited, whence it went to Goldsmith's company Potier Pty Ltd. If this was simply a legitimate loan, why the circuitous route? There appears to be little doubt as to the ultimate destination of this money. It has also now been established that Hamer himself received monies, but for what he cannot remember.

I make no comment on Hamer's evidence before the present inquiry. The public will form its own view on that. We shall await the findings of the present inquiry. Nor would one seek to influence that inquiry in any way.

However, I do make these comments. By 1981, Hamer was already tainted. He was made a Knight Commander of the Order of St Michael and St George. He is a disgrace to that Order, to the State of Victoria, to the Liberal Party, and to the Commonwealth of Australia. We, the people of Queensland, have the right to demand that he be now stood down from the Constitutional Commission.

Furthermore, Hamer's activities and those of his fellow directors have deprived many innocent Australians of their monies, of their hard-won savings and, in some instances, of virtually their entire assets. Those people have the right to demand that even though Hamer is a former Premier of Victoria he should be treated no differently from anyone else; no better and no worse. If he has committed criminal offences, Sir Rupert should be prosecuted with the full rigor of the law.

We have a fine judicial tradition in this State. I hope that Queensland will never become like Hamer's Victoria was between 1972 and 1981. We have a duty to protect the many Australian citizens who have suffered at his hands, and I can only ask that we, as a State, exercise the greatest vigilance in relation to this man and his close

associates, one of whom by his very flight from this country provides corroboration of criminality. That is why Sir Rupert Hamer should be made to forfeit his passport immediately to prevent a similar act of treachery.

I table a contract between Mader and Land Bank signed by R. J. Hamer; deed of assignment dated the same day and signed by R. J. Hamer; a press cutting dated 4 September in which Hamer said, "I was not involved in land purchase."; a statement by Brian Goldsmith; a precis of the Keilor Estate report; and a copy of a letter from Mrs Wilson, in which she states—

> "Sir Rupert assured investors he was not only Chairman of the company but would be taking an active part in its development.
>
> I categorically state I would not have invested in any such scheme had it not been for the personal promotion of Sir Rupert Hamer."

Whereupon the honourable member laid the documents on the table.

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (3.14 p.m.): The Liberal Party supports the legislation. It does not find the arguments raised by the Opposition substantial. It might be a matter of personal inclination as to whether a person prefers one Minister or another Minister. The realities are that the body involved has largely an inquisitorial role. Although it uses its legal knowledge to assist with the preparation of cases for court, the body has very much a sophisticated police-type function.

I turn now to examine the ordering of Cabinet responsibilities in the other States of Australia. In New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia and Tasmania, the Ministers for Police and Emergency Services are the Ministers responsible. In the Northern Territory, the Chief Minister is the Minister responsible. Only in South Australia, in common with Queensland, does the responsibility remain with the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General. Across the board, the situation reflects acceptance of the usual order of things, that is, that Cabinet can decide which Minister will bear the responsibility. It is clear that in various States, a police-type function seems to be the appropriate slot. Members of the Liberal Party will take no part in an analysis of a particular Minister of this Parliament who bears such a responsibility for the time being. It is clear that if the argument is based on preference for one Minister over another, that preference can change with the exigencies of politics.

I note that under the proposed amendments, the Premier will have the right to nominate which of his colleagues will be given the responsibility. I note also that the Special Minister of State and not the Attorney-General has the responsibility at the Federal level. Members of the Liberal Party will not engage in a qualitative analysis of the various incumbents in this House. It is the right of the Government of the day to order and allocate these responsibilities. That is certainly the position in other States.

I wish to speak to the provisions of the Bill and to the broad principles of the National Crime Authority. It is instructive to note a very substantial article that appeared this morning in the *Sydney Morning Herald.* The article is based upon a report by an organised crime group that was submitted to the Police Commissioner in New South Wales. Apparently, in New South Wales there exists that time-honoured tradition that we have in Queensland of leaking very substantial reports in total to the press. Nevertheless, there seems to be little in the report that does not deserve public perusal and should not excite a good deal of intelligent debate in response to what is an urgent problem. As is so often the case with leaked documents, although very little appears to be of anything other than momentary political sensitivity to Governments of the day, in fact the document deals with some of the very important issues in substantial ways.

The document evidences something which, from my experience, would be mirrored throughout Australia. It points to the development of crime in Australia from a stage in the 1960s when the prince of thieves and criminals was a safe-breaker. I can certainly vouch for the Northern Territory in that respect. The safe-breaker was seen to be not only a criminal but a man who had some expertise and some sophisticated skill in the

use of explosives because he could break a safe without damaging or destroying the contents. In my personal experience, I have seen both the successful and the unsuccessful. The report points out that the safe-breaker was at the pinnacle of criminal activity.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr INNES: I thought that the honourable member for Brisbane Central would be able to give the House the inside story. I was not actually present at the time of the break-in; I just looked at the consequences.

The report describes a progression in New South Wales from a stage at which safe-breaking was the pinnacle of criminal success and activity to a stage when organised warehouse-looting, in association with certain waterfront activities, had emerged. The report points out the increasing sophistication in planning crimes. It looks at robberies in which, say, a former safe-breaker or house-breaker became part of an organised group and planned sophisticated hold-ups such as wages-packet hold-ups and transit mail-van hold-ups. These robberies clearly require both the use of people with inside knowledge to case the operation and the development of a conspiratorial plan, as well as an appreciation of timing, the use often of substantial numbers of people and the planning of a get-away. Finally, there is the planning to deal with the proceeds.

The report also pointed out that systematic motor vehicle thefts became evident in those times. The stealing of motor vehicles, transporting them signficant distances within the State or interstate, the breaking-down of the motor vehicles and the selling of the parts are all matters that involved not just one or two people, such as in the classic safe-breaking situation in which there were perhaps the safe-cracker and a cockatoo or somebody who helped carry or wheel the safe out. That criminal activity involved planning and a network or chain of participants.

In the late seventies, in New South Wales, the drug menace first manifested itself. It also surfaced in the rest of Australia. The drug menace had a twofold consequence. First of all, there had to be a degree of organisation and a network of people for the distribution of the drugs, even marijuana. From the point of view of addiction, that led to an upsurge in crime generally. People who were hooked on the drug broke into premises to get the wherewithal to purchase the drug to satisfy their habit. That created a cause and effect situation, which generally led to an upsurge in the drug market.

The report points to the use of vice, of gaming—both illegal casinos and SP book-making—and, in New South Wales in particular, the use of amusement machines and drug-trafficking as areas in which, throughout the latter part of the seventies and the early eighties, crime has clearly flourished. Gaming, gambling generally and drug activities have always been targets for American-based organised crime. The Mafia go in for, and have always been involved in, the control of gambling, vice as a cash-flow enterprise, and, of course, drug-trafficking, which has a big cash flow and is a very high profitability criminal pursuit.

The proposals that are set out and have been the subject of debate involve a number of legal and administrative reforms. The first major problem is the life of the commission itself. At the moment, it is limited to five years. Almost anybody who thinks about the problem of organised crime and is prepared to accept that organised crime is here in Australia, as it clearly is—I do no think that any intelligent, reasonably informed person could come to any conclusion other than that organised crime exists today throughout Australia—realises that there has to be organised crime to provide a network for the importation and distribution of drugs.

There clearly is organised crime, and it has its tentacles in prostitution and in the massage parlours. As the member for Logan mentioned, a feature by an investigative reporter, which appeared in the *Courier-Mail* and which I believe was well-based, drew links that have never been refuted. The newspaper was brave enough to publish the names involved, the links and the tentacles of an organisation involved in massage parlours in Brisbane. Everyone knows that there was a debate about legalising versus not legalising massage parlours. Perhaps I take a more conservative view. I would act

to close them down. The fact that they continue to exist, I believe, is unfortunately an indictment of the police. The police can close down massage parlours whenever they decide to turn up the heat. Unfortunately, in this State, as in other States, licensing, vice and gambling are areas in which the police frequently get into trouble because not only do such activities provide cash flow for crime, but they also provide cash flow for those police—and there are always bad apples in every barrel—who are prepared to succumb to the quick quid and to corruption.

In this State if one wants to see the consequences of the evils of maintaining massage parlours, which are brothels—there is no other expression for them—one could do no better than to turn to what has happened in the last month in connection with the Cosmo massage parlour at South Brisbane. Was not the Cosmo the place where a woman who had lived on a yacht in the Brisbane River and who it is believed was murdered had previously worked, and was not that the place that was held up last night? Within the last two weeks another woman hit the headlines as being on the fringe of organised crime; she had been working at the Cosmo massage parlour.

The link between illegal money, which is gained from the illegal activities that are carried on at massage parlours, and protection, pimps and the luring of teenagers into prostitution through heroin addiction is clear. That woman who it is alleged was likely to have been murdered and who had lived on the yacht had got involved with prostitution at a young age because of her heroin addiction. That is precisely what the Director of Prosecutions in this State said in his report.

One might argue about the intensity with which Mr Sturgess pursued the thesis that he developed, but his concern was dominantly about young people. Clearly he believes that very strong steps can and should be taken to protect the young. Exactly the thesis put forward by Mr Sturgess about the relationship between youthful addiction to hard drugs, to being lured into prostitution to provide the cash to feed the drug habit, was demonstrated in that incident. Through heroin, that woman had left her normal life behind, gone into prostitution to service that addiction and found her death amongst those sorts of people who are attracted to that traditional criminal area of activity.

Some people say that even if a massage parlour is closed down it will find its way somewhere else. Certainly some level of prostitution activities will always take place. There might well be an upsurge in escort agency activity, but it is a darned sight harder for organised crime to get its tentacles into a diffused, small-business situation than it is to get its hooks into identifiable premises such as massage parlours.

Some people believe that it is impossible to get rid of massage parlours, but I became involved in the removal of one from this city. Somebody complained to me about the development of a massage parlour adjacent to a place where young people had been taught music for a long period of time. Parents were disturbed about the development. They saw a premises being fitted out with numerous spas and baths and formed the intelligent and obvious conclusion. They were disturbed for the well-being of the young people who went to that area. Certainly I was one of the people who were contacted. I do not mind saying that my action involved speaking to local government authorities, who can turn them over to see whether the premises are in the correct zone and whether the necessary approvals have been granted. I also spoke to the police and asked them to do what they could, that is, turn them over. They simply go to the people developing those facilities and say, "Every morning, every afternoon and every evening we will be in here to ask your clients for their names and addresses." Boy oh boy! With those actions any such operation can be closed down in a week.

Everyone knows that "massage parlour" equals "brothel", that these premises exist from week to week and from month to month and the pattern of criminal activity that is associated with them. Why are they allowed to continue? It is a foul and filthy game for the police to have to be involved in. I think it is a terrible thing that the police have to be involved in gaining the evidence, but they do not have to go as far as gaining that evidence. They should turn them over. Anybody who has been involved in police work

knows that these sorts of premises just need to be turned over until the patrons are deterred.

As I say, the total activity must not be stopped, but if it is diffused into one-woman operations, that will achieve something in breaking down the tentacles, the control and the involvement of organised crime itself, which in turn by offering money to allow its illegal activity to continue, targets the police as a way of getting an umbrella of protection.

That is a simple little illustration of the proof of the warnings given in this city by Mr Sturgess and anybody who knows anything about this level of activity.

Mr Davis: Some of the operators of the massage parlours don't even have any qualifications.

Mr INNES: The honourable member for Brisbane Central points out that some of the operators have no qualifications. I suspect that one would be hard put to it to find any operator in any massage parlour in Brisbane who has a diploma or degree in physiotherapy or, indeed, any qualification in massage at all.

That is a little illustration of what happens in this State. Honourable members have witnessed the Fine Cotton affair, which was one of the types of operation that the secret New South Wales police report demonstrates is part of organised crime. The rigging of races and the bringing under its influence of jockeys, trainers and owners is part of the tradition of organised crime nationwide and internationally.

I turn to the drug scene. Surely the drug scene causes fear for our young people and for our nation. There is an urgency about the fight against organised crime. This country has not gone through prohibition. Australia did not have the tradition of the Mafia gangs or the Triads or the other endemic or traditional groups of organised crime. However, the drug scene has brought with it the tentacles of international crime. The prospect of extremely high profits, sometimes from activity which can be of very short duration, has brought with it a totally new threat. It is a threat which has to be met, because we do not want our youngsters to be sucked into the lower end of crime and dragged through the vortex of hard crime. We do not want to see young Australians suffering from heroin addiction or, for that matter, any sort of drug addiction. No parent wants his or her child to have a criminal conviction of any sort, because of the effect that it has on that child's life.

The fight against organised crime is a fight that has to be fought. It is a fight that is worth fighting because of the dangers that it avoids and the benefits that it brings to our society. There is no doubt that organised crime is nationwide, and there is no doubt that a nationwide authority is needed.

For once in our history, and particularly in this State, there are needed people whose eyes and horizons are broader than their own little dunghills and whose horizons are wider than petty politics.

The Queensland Government will not co-operate with the New South Wales or Federal authorities because they are Labor-controlled. As long as the Queensland Government hangs onto control it is not likely to be politically embarrassed, because it can suppress politically harmful, politically embarrassing or politically damaging things. Unfortuately, that seems to be the reason why this Government appears so frequently to blindly refuse to co-operate with other authorities.

There has to be a National Crime Authority. Nowadays the call is for a task force or multidisciplinary approach. There has to be a commitment to go beyond five years. No effective crime organisation can operate on a five-year basis.

The use of databank information, the collation of information and the development of the sorts of links that Mr Bob Bottom has demonstrated exist in New South Wales—the same names bob up here and there—are the ways in which modern crime is fought.

As I have said before in this Chamber, in the United States some of the great figures of the Mafia were not first brought to task over murder and things of that

sophistication; very often they were brought to task for offences against the internal revenue or taxation department, or immigration regulations. They were fought in the same way as I say things such as massage parlours can be fought, by just moving in, turning them over and asking them for troublesome names. In my view this is a legitimate device and in that way it is possible to target organised crime.

There is a need for a totally co-operative approach between the States of Australia and the Commonwealth and for task forces that involve people with police, investigative and accountancy training, people experienced in the racing industry, and in club administration; in other words people with a full battery of experiences necessary in order to come to grips with the tentacles and outlets of modern organised crime.

I strongly support the call that is made in this New South Wales report and has been made frequently when referring to the functions and the task ahead of the National Crimes Commission, for the setting-up of a special task force. It will require expensive funding and total co-operation and support. This special task-force will be empowered to fight this very important war.

There are calls for fairly radical legislative co-operative exercises such as the use of legislation similar to that which exists in the United States of America for the disclosure of cash transactions placed into financial institutions. In the United States any cash financial transaction above $10,000 has to be recorded on a register, so that if at a later time investigators wish to follow up particular individuals' dealings, those transactions can provide links in a chain which might lead to detection. The laundering of cash money is traditionally a problem of major crime and the creation of large amounts of money illegally poses the problem of putting it lawfully into the system. It has to be put somewhere, and that in itself leads to other consequences. I understand that in the United States it has led to the use of people called "Smurfs", who front up at the banks with $9,999 in cash in an attempt to hide or resist the legal obligation to reveal the total amount of money in question.

Some amendment to the law is required—similar to the phone-tapping powers—to permit in special circumstances the tracing of financial transactions. Special legislation has been used in the United States called the Ricio legislation, which is an organised crime prevention technique in regard to racketeering. Under this legislation special powers of punishment and seizing of property are given where a person has been convicted a number of times of certain types of offences, provided there is clear evidence that those offences were committed in concert with other people. Those are the devices. Bank secrecy and special anti-racketeering legislation are others. There has been a call in Australia by a number of royal commissions for uniform drug-trafficking legislation. Queensland has gone down a separate track in this regard, but if that track is found not to be effective, Queensland has to look at co-operative possibilities.

I have already referred to intelligence-gathering and the money to back that up. Because of Australia's traditions in the law and its federation, there are special problems in regard to the protection of witnesses who are required for special prosecutions. That requires a national scheme to cover, for example, a Queensland-based witness who is required in some other part of Australia. That requires co-operation. In regard to the provision of indemnity to people who are informers, traditionally Australia has been very reluctant under its common law system to implement the kinds of indemnities such as are well known and used by the Americans. To get at the authors or the real masterminds behind even greater crimes the provisions of indemnities to people who might themselves have committed significant crimes is one of the armoury of weapons that organised crime demands that legislators think of in law enforcement.

The consorting squad concept has existed at an informal level in this country. One usually finds that the hard-core squads in a criminal investigation bureau exercise that type of technique informally. That gets some detectives into a little bit of trouble. They have a small crime that they know someone has committed and they hold it over his head so that they can obtain constant and better information. Sometimes that leads to the accusation that the police have covered up a particular matter and that they must

have received money because they did not prosecute someone over a petty crime that they knew about. In the battle that has traditionally been fought by police, that is one technique that has been used. A police officer may have something over somebody so that he can obtain more information to get at bigger criminals and prosecute them for worse crimes.

Mr Mackenroth: Did you use that when you were a police officer?

Mr INNES: I certainly knew that it was used.

Mr Mackenroth: I asked you: did you use that?

Mr INNES: No. I think that I discharged my responsibilitites to the best of my ability.

It is a fact that that is a technique that has been used throughout Australia and in other parts of the world. The use of an indemnity is an extension of that type of system, but it makes it legitimate. It is far better if it is done legitimately, where it is above and under control. A whole range of techniques need to be addressed. The primary issue that must be addressed is the need for this State to assume its participation in and commitment to an effective national body. There is a need for a national body and total co-operation between the States.

One problem is that police forces are jealous of each other. Some jealousies occur within police forces. The New South Wales police force has been racked by mutual accusation that exists between people in its own senior detective ranks. Such accusations have been made in Queensland. People do not know to whom they should give their information, because they do not know whom they should trust and with whom the information will be safe. What needs to be established within the police force or within a group of police forces is a group that achieves a reputation for total probity, total security, and from whom the smell, touch or suggestion of corruption is removed totally, who can be predictable, reliable repositories of what can be very dangerous information to informants—particularly if one is dealing with organised crime—and who can take the fight to the real enemy.

The members of the Liberal Party support the amendment and welcome the opportunity to say something about a massive national problem in the solution to which we think Queensland can play a bigger part.

Mr WELLS (Murrumba) (3.44 p.m.): Mr Deputy Speaker, as this is the first time that you have been in the chair when I have spoken, may I take the opportunity to congratulate you on your elevation to your position. I hope that you will maintain the reputation that you have for even-handedness and continue to dispense justice with a fair hand.

Honourable members have just listened to practically an hour of keynote speeches from the honourable member for Sherwood and the honourable member for Southport on subjects that presumably would have been relevant to the Bill if they had drawn up the Bill themselves. I would like to address the Bill, which has not been mentioned since the honourable member for Logan, the shadow Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, spoke to the Bill. As the honourable member for Logan pointed out, the Bill is very brief—"suspiciously brief" I think was the phrase that he used. The Deputy Premier says that because responsibility for the National Crime Authority (State Provisions) Act 1985 has been transferred to him, an amendment is therefore required to transfer membership of the Inter-Governmental Committee of the National Crime Authority from the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General to the Deputy Premier. In other words, the Deputy Premier is suggesting that in order to bring the Queensland legislation into line with the Commonwealth legislation, it is necessary to introduce the amendment so that he rather than the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice can go to Canberra for the Inter-Governmental Committee. No such amendment is required.

I would be grateful to hear the opinion of the honourable member for Sherwood, who is a lawyer, in relation to my argument that this amendment is not required. The fact that no amendment is required to send the Deputy Premier instead of the Attorney-General to Canberra, raises suspicion.

The section to be amended states that the term " 'Minister' means the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General or other Minister of the Crown for the time being charged with the administration of this Act . . ."

The Deputy Premier is the Minister for the time being charged with the administration of the Act. He has told us so, and it is a matter of public knowledge. An amendment to the Act is not required to legitimate such an arrangement. The wording of the amendment is " 'Minister' means the Minister of the Crown for the time being nominated by the Premier of the State of Queensland. . ."

Honourable members can see what a very fine legalistic line is being drawn throughout the paraphernalia of these half-hour keynote speeches together with the publication of the Bill and everything else that has gone into the preparation of the amendment. It all relates to the changing of a few words. What is new is that the Premier is brought into the Act. The amendment states "nominated by the Premier of the State of Queensland" whereas the Act states that it is the "Minister of the Crown for the time being charged with the administration of this Act". This is a bit unusual. The Premier does not usually get a guernsey, especially when those words are superfluous. In any Government that operates under the Westminster system, portfolios are allocated by the Premier or the Prime Minister. An Act is not needed to spell that out; so what is going on?

In his second-reading speech, the Deputy Premier said that it is necessary to spell this out in order to transfer membership of the Inter-Governmental Committee from the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General to him. However, other Governments in Australia have not found it necessary to do that. They are sending their appropriate Ministers without amending their Acts, which are as general as this Act.

Section 8 (1) of the National Crime Authority Act, which the Deputy Premier claims that it is necessary for Queensland to be brought into line with, states that the Inter-Governmental Committee will consist of a Commonwealth Minister and a member to represent each participating State, being a Minister of the Crown nominated by the Premier of that State. An amendment to the Act is not required to effect that either. The Premier can nominate whoever he likes; so, why is an amendment proposed? Perhaps the intention is to remove from the minds of members of Cabinet any thought that it might be appropriate for the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General to go to Canberra.

The clause that is proposed to be amended states that the Minister is the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General or another Minister of the Crown for the time being charged with the administration of the Act.

Why would it be necessary to make it legislatively inappropriate for the Minister for Justice to go to Canberra? Perhaps it is because he is a lawyer. Steeped as he is in the traditions of British justice, the Minister might be offended by the stand that Queensland has taken at previous meetings of the Inter-Governmental Committee.

I turn now to a speech that was made in Federal Parliament on 27 November 1986 by Mr Alan Griffiths, the chairman of the Committee of the National Crime Authority. When he was introducing the report of that committee, Mr Griffiths stated—

> "In this context the Committee was disappointed that it was unable to receive a briefing from the Queensland Commissioner of Police. As mentioned in the Committee's first report, all States except Queensland agreed to the Committee's request for a briefing by their Commissioner of Police on organised criminal activities within their jurisdiction. A subsequent request this year to the Queensland Premier to reconsider this matter was also rejected by the Queensland Government."

Honourable members are aware that the Inter-Governmental Committee of the National Crime Authority contains members from all parties. It unanimously expressed regret that Queensland had failed to allow the Commissioner of Police to appear and testify before that committee. Honourable members are aware also that Queensland takes more than its fair share of time in the discussions of the Inter-Governmental Committee while providing less of the evidence.

The Bill is suspiciously short and conspicuously unnecessary. I would be quite happy if the Minister could explain why he is introducing amending legislation that enables the Government to do nothing that it cannot do already. I ask him seriously why amendments have been drafted, speeches and Bills have been printed and the House is now meeting to consider changes that are pointless, since he could have continued to administer the Act and could have gone to the next meeting of the Inter-Governmental Committee without them. If he cannot answer that genuine question, it is not surprising that members of the House such as the honourable member for Logan wonder what on earth he is up to.

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police) (3.51 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate. As the honourable member for Sherwood said, the Police Minister in every State, with the exception of South Australia—and I believe that that is being altered also—is a representative on the National Crime Authority. Under section 8 (1) (b) of the Commonwealth Act, the Premier appoints the Minister of the Crown responsible. The Premier has appointed me to that position and I have attended some of the meetings of the authority.

I do not intend to go into any detail about what transpires at the meetings, but I indicate that Queensland has co-operated in every way and I am satisfied with the important role that the Queensland Government is playing. I am also satisfied that there is a need for co-operation between the States. That co-operation exists at present. The Commonwealth was represented not by the Attorney-General but by the then Special Minister of State, Mr Young. I believe that Senator Tate now carries out that function.

Sufficient funding by the Commonwealth is important. The success of the NCA will depend on the continuation of that funding. I am pleased to say that the NCA has been very successful, and will continue to be so, provided that the States continue to co-operate and the authority is not starved of funds. Funding of the authority is important and at present a question mark is hanging over it.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 54		NOES, 30	
Ahern	Katter	Ardill	
Alison	Knox	Braddy	
Austin	Lane	Burns	
Beanland	Lee	Campbell	
Beard	Lester	Casey	
Berghofer	Lickiss	Comben	
Borbidge	McCauley	D'Arcy	
Burreket	McKechnie	De Lacy	
Chapman	McPhie	Eaton	
Clauson	Menzel	Gibbs, R. J.	
Cooper	Muntz	Goss	
Elliott	Neal	Hamill	
Fraser	Nelson	Hayward	
Gately	Newton	McElligott	
Gibbs, I. J.	Powell	Mackenroth	
Gilmore	Randell	McLean	
Glasson	Schuntner	Milliner	
Gunn	Sherlock	Palaszczuk	
Gygar	Sherrin	Prest	
Harper	Simpson	Scott	
Harvey	Slack	Shaw	
Henderson	Stephan	Smith	
Hinton	Stoneman	Smyth	
Hinze	Tenni	Underwood	
Hobbs		Vaughan	
Hynd	*Tellers:*	Warburton	*Tellers:*
Innes	Littleproud	Wells	Davis
Jennings	FitzGerald	Yewdale	Warner

In division—

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I warn the honourable member for Wolston under Standing Order 123A for disturbing the Chamber.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 19 March (see p. 948).

Mr BURNS (Lytton—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (4.02 p.m.): The Opposition has no great quarrel with most of the amendments before us in this Bill. However, it does have strong reservations about the National Party Government's general administration and funding of the Queensland police force.

Although the Opposition will not be opposing the amendment to section 7 of the Police Act, which increases the number of assistant commissioners, it believes that it reflects the basic faults in the State Government's attitude to the police force. I will say more on that in a little while. Firstly, I will deal with the specific amendments contained in the Bill. The amendments to section 69B of the Police Act are only common sense changes. We all appreciate the great stress under which police officers operate. They have a job in which most of them face more emergencies in one year than most people face in a life-time.

In emergencies there is not always time for the luxury of lengthy contemplation of the effects of a person's actions, even if he has very best of intentions. It is only in hindsight that some may say police action at the scene of an emergency should have been different; but on the job there is no room, nor time, for the luxury of doubt. It is for this reason that the Opposition supports changes to section 69B removing police from liability when rendering assistance to injured people in emergencies. I believe that no-one should be placed under the threat of legal action simply for doing his or her job honestly and sincerely.

I would make the point also that the Minister should look at what happens to other volunteers. In his second-reading speech, he said—

> "However, once a person, police officer or otherwise, goes to the assistance of a person in distress, that volunteer then puts himself under a duty and may be held civilly liable for his actions."

I know that the average citizen would rush in and help. The more that a person is aware of the fact that he might be found civilly liable in some way, the more chance there is people saying, "Look, don't go in and help." I have been involved in circumstances myself where, if later on someone said to me, "You could have got into trouble", I might have thought twice about it. So I think that, if the Bill is being amended——

Mr Gunn: It is in another Bill.

Mr BURNS: Very well.

Certainly no police officer should face such a threat when his or her only "crime" is to try to help someone under the pressure of an emergency.

Clause 3 of the Bill, which amends section 68 of the Police Act, also contains some commonsense provisions, and the Opposition does not take exception to it. That

amendment sets out that the Commissioner will no longer have to make those sorts of declarations.

However, I would like to address my remarks to clause 2 of the Bill and its implications. This amendment allows for an increase in the number of assistant police commissioners. It is obvious that the Government or the current Police Commissioner has one or two people in mind for promotion to these extra posts. I would put money on the Commissioner's right-hand man, Inspector Greg Early, being rewarded with one of the assistant commissioner's jobs. This increase in numbers at the top end of the police force reflects just how badly this Government's priorities are twisted. What we need in our police force are more Indians, not more chiefs!

According to the last annual report of the Police Department, Queensland still has the worst police-to-population ratio of any State in Australia.

In this State there is one police officer for every 525 people. Other States have, on average, a ratio of one officer for every 450 people. South Australia has one officer for every 418 people.

To make matters worse, Queensland spends the least of any State on its police force. The latest available figures from the independent Commonwealth Grants Commission show that the National Party Government spends only $67.62 per capita on its police force, compared to figures such as $77.24 in South Australia and $76.27 in Western Australia, a State with similar population and geographic characteristics.

The result of the State Government's deliberate policy of starving the police force of funds and staff is that the force has not been able to keep pace with rising crime rates. While most categories of crime recorded increases in offences during 1985-86, clear-up rates in most cases did not keep pace. In addition, owing to a lack of police to effectively patrol the State's roads, Queensland's road toll continues to climb. The shortage of police is a major reason for the National Party Government's continual rejection of a system of genuine random breath-testing.

To increase the effectiveness of the Queensland police force and to provide greater security to Queensland families, I believe that we should consider a wide-ranging inquiry into the Queensland police force, along the lines of the Neesham committee of inquiry into the Victorian police force. The inquiry should review the structure, procedures, personnel and equipment needed by the force to achieve the force's objectives, respond to the needs of the community and maintain a high standard of efficiency.

Each time the Government brings legislation before the House to amend the Act, it is simply to amend a few sections—in this case, to provide for more assistant commissioners—but in reality it ought to have a good look at the entire management and staffing of the police force. The problems lie in staffing and in managing the force in such a way as to provide the control and protection that people in the community really need.

In addition, any inquiry should, of necessity, examine and make recommendations on such things as the tasks that are carried out by the force. Only recently I was in Cairns, where once or twice a week two policemen have to take prisoners to the gaol in Townsville. Once a person has been convicted, it should be a prison officer's job to convey him to the gaol; it should not be the job of policemen. As it is, Queensland does not have sufficient policemen. A similar thing occurs in Townsville, where the judges have demanded that two policemen be assigned as court orderlies to each of the five courts five days a week. That means that 10 policemen are taken out of the quota for that city. At the time that I was in Townsville, out of the 142 police officers stationed in the city, only about 42 were available for roster. Another difficulty is created by the number of classes that are conducted for policemen. They have to attend the various courses that are conducted round the State. Leave entitlements also result in the absence of police officers. There are also the problems of jobs that should be the responsibility of other than police officers.

Any inquiry should also examine the police and public servant staffing levels and the adequacy of selection, training and physical facilities; budgeting arrangements; regional deployment; the responsibilities of the public to the police; and the effects of policing on the welfare of policemen and women.

Pending the results of any inquiry, which should be chaired by a senior police officer, the Government should immediately increase police force staffing to ensure that by 1989 the population-to-police ratio is reduced to 500 to one and to ensure that the majority of additional officers are provided before the start of Expo 88 in Brisbane. Although much has been said about the mismanagement of Expo 88, I have seen no major drive for an increased number of police to handle the problems that will be created by Expo. Many policemen will be needed on the Expo site. It seems to me that the current planning of the police force is to take the officers required for Expo from somewhere else, as happened during the Commonwealth Games.

What is really needed is a substantial increase in the numbers of police. The Police Commissioner has said that it takes about 17 months from the time a person is recruited to the force until he can be effectively used. When I travelled in the north of the State I found that the force depends very, very much on a thin line of trainees. The police in Cairns, Townsville and Rockhampton depend on trainees to keep the force going in their areas. They all say that, if they did not have the trainees, they would not be able to cover the district and cope with problems in the area. Police force staffing should be immediately increased and, as I say, the majority of the additional officers should be provided before the start of Expo 88.

The Government should ensure that clerical public service staff fulfil as many routine administrative roles as possible within the Police Department, thereby leaving police officers free to fight crime. Many policemen are now retiring when in their fifties. Many police women are leaving the force after seven or eight years. They have been trained in police matters; they have skills and the knowledge of how to work as policemen in the field. After those people have been out of the force for a while and, in the case of the women, after they have had their babies and have things settled down, they may want to come back into the work-force. The Government should be trying to bring them back into the police force, maybe as civilians.

One of the arguments against using civilians in the police force is that they do not have those police skills and knowledge. In the case of the court orderlies, why not have one retired senior police officer, who has had years of experience, working with a trainee. Some policemen have to be sent to the courts to learn court procedure. That is the way it is done. They sit and watch all day and learn. Really, two well-trained officers are not needed. In reality, no major problems have been experienced in the courts, where police have been rostered for some time. I suppose there is always a danger that a problem will arise. However, it seems to me that, when this State is short of policemen out on the beat, in cars, in the suburbs and in country towns, there might be a better way of utilising them. That is why I suggest that the Government should ensure that clerical public service staff fulfil as many routine administrative roles as possible within the Police Department, to leave police officers free to fight crime.

The Government should boost the strength of the drug squad and provide sufficient resources to combat the drug trade. Anyone who reads the annual report will see that the Queensland Government is not providing additional police staff and facilities for the drug squad. The Police Union has said that Queensland is becoming the drug State.

The Government should—

- provide extra officers for other squads of regions at a level to be determined by a working group consisting of representatives of the Police Commissioner, the Police Minister and the Queensland Police Union;
- ensure that women have equal opportunities for entry, training and promotion within the police force; and

- require police officers to undergo regular in-service training to keep abreast of legal, technical and social changes.

There is a problem in the police force over the need for training today. Many of the older officers do not like it. Many of the older officers are saying that it is a waste of time; that the skills which they have built up over the years on the beat—on the job—are in many ways wasted while they spend much of their time in training. I do not know. It seems to me that, in a modern police force in a modern world with modern technology, training is necessary. But surely their views should be considered. That is why an inquiry is needed.

There are two schools of thought within the police force. Obviously the Commissioner is a very strong believer in training and university skills. However, there are others who say that the old university of hard knocks—the job that is learnt out on the road—is still an important part of the career, and the degrees or the number of letters that a policeman has after his name should not be the only criteria.

The Government should also—

- ensure that criteria for transfers within the police force are fair and equitable by establishing a fair dinkum transfers appeal board; and
- provide sufficient police throughout the State to enable the introduction and proper implementation of random breath-testing.

I support random breath-testing. Some years ago I chaired an inquiry conducted by the Labor Party into random breath-testing. During the course of that inquiry I travelled to Victoria and New South Wales. It seems to me that the brewery lobby and the liquor lobby have too much influence in this State's liquor laws.

In Victoria, a driver who has been drinking and is not one of the eight who are pulled in by police to the large, well-lit area along the side of the road but is lucky enough to go past, does a bit of finger-crossing and says, "I won't do that again." It has to be very public. Police have to be seen on the road so that people get the impression that something fair dinkum is being done about it. I have witnessed the RID campaign in operation. It does not seem to me to have anything like the same impact as random breath-testing. It is fairly obvious that it does not have the same impact.

If a person wants to be a drink-driver, he should go outside Cairns in north Queensland, because there are no traffic squads in those areas. The ordinary policemen have to do the job. I cannot remember the exact number, but Cairns has a very small traffic squad of, I think, seven policemen. That traffic squad has something like two motor cycles and a car. In any event, there are insufficient vehicles to go round, especially when the police have to do a considerable amount of work such as escorting heavy vehicles and wide loads around the area in the vicinity of the town itself. If the Government is to have fair dinkum random breath-testing or driver-licensing laws, it really has to have police out on the road. It has to do better than it is doing now.

There are abvious regional imbalances in the police-to-population ratio between different areas of the State, and there is a close correlation between urbanisation and crime. A strong case can be made for the Police Department to alter its staffing formula if one considers the growth in the Beenleigh/Woodridge/Kingston area. The figures that the Police Department supply for that area reveal that there is an increase in urbanisation growth and that the problems associated with that increase bring greater pressure to bear on the police force to do its job and, of course, in many cases can mean an increase in the crime rate.

As I said, a strong case can be made for the Police Department to alter its staffing formula by placing more emphasis on allocating police according to urbanisation levels. In other words, places such as Logan City and Beenleigh would get more police and new police stations. Some decisions seem to be made for political reasons rather than police staffing needs and crime statistics.

Police Department statistics clearly show that regions such as Beenleigh and the Sunshine Coast have much worse population-to-police ratios than other areas. This problem needs to be addressed urgently, because, quite frankly, police staffing and conditions in some regional areas of this State are absolutely abysmal, despite the Premier's repeated statements about his support for the force. The truth is that the police in this State are getting a raw deal from the very Government that claims to be the policeman's friend.

When I took on the shadow Police portfolio, I was told that the National Party had turned the police into a uniformed party branch, with large numbers of police joining or supporting the Nationals. With National Party members of Parliament skiting that the police force was in their pockets, I thought police working conditions would be No. 1. I thank the Minister for giving me the opportunity to visit police stations a few weeks ago. I undertook a tour of police facilities to see how the department would handle an increase of 1 200 police proposed by the Police Union. I did not think I would see some of the worst working and living conditions that I have seen in many years in politics and that was in the major police centres in the State, not the little ones. When I have talked to policemen about it, they have said to me, "Why don't you get out to St George? Why don't you get out to Indooroopilly? Why don't you get here or there?" Everyone has another place where I should look. I was prepared for finding, as I did, that many major police districts depend on trainees to provide a "thin blue line" between criminals and citizens, but I was not prepared, for example, for the so-called barracks in Rockhampton Police Station or the overcrowding in the old Mackay Police Station in the heart of that town. No wonder one National Party Minister visiting the Mackay Police Station only went onto the verandah! Even though he had old police mates inside, he did not venture into the station.

I drove from Cairns to Brisbane, but I only scratched the surface of my plans to visit Queensland police stations. Whilst I was returning, I read a *Courier-Mail* report of an inspection of watchhouse facilities by Police Union officials. That report reminded me of the Mackay watchhouse, which is a terribly primitive workplace for the police officer on duty.

Today I make the point that there is a Bill before this House to increase the number of assistant commissioners here in Brisbane from five, whereas, in reality, what is needed is more Indians out there in the country areas. I will tell this House of the problems faced by the single policeman who runs the watchhouse in Mackay. Police officers know of the difficulties in handling drunks. In Mackay a drunk has to be carried up 20 narrow stairs to be charged and then placed in a cell. Up to four policemen have to carry a struggling drunk. It is not only unnecessary, but it is also a waste of police resources. A simple Works Department job of converting a downstairs car-parking bay into a drunk cell has been suggested on more than one occasion, but nothing has happened and the policemen have to go through that struggle up the stairs day in and day out. There are no toilet facilities for the policeman on duty at the Mackay watchhouse. He has to go next door to the police station, which is far from satisfactory from a personal hygiene and security point of view.

The honourable member for Mackay, Mr Casey, was with me at the Mackay Police Station. A fellow who had been arrested was in the watchhouse at that particular time. The honourable member for Mackay made the point that, after I had read the man's sheet and heard of his activities, I swung about 8 or 12 feet away from the cell when the man looked out of the door. Just having a look at the man was enough to suggest to me that the small sergeant or officer in charge at the Mackay watchhouse deserved the next police medal. Not only did he have to look after the man, but also because there was no mirror or shower in the cell, the man had to be brought out into the kitchen, which is a small room not as big as the table at which the clerks sit, and was given a razor to shave at the mirror, which was behind the policeman, who went about his duties booking people in and out. I might say that I would not have given that bloke a razor even if he was in the next room, let alone in the same room standing behind

me. Those kinds of things are happening, and are happening regularly, to policemen in those circumstances. I suppose that, when the policeman gets a chance to go to the toilet next door, he has to leave them to bash each other up. He had just settled a fight between the prisoners when the honourable member for Mackay and I walked in the door that morning. He is probably pleased to get out of the place for a while.

With the upstairs/downstairs construction of the watchhouse, the officer on duty, when the main entrance door downstairs is closed, must go down the 20 stairs to permit entry, thereby again reducing watchhouse security upstairs. He does not know what the prisoners are up to whilst he is downstairs. It creates a potential for escapes. A simple closed-circuit TV monitoring system, such as is installed in this House, and electronic opening and closing mechanisms, such as those used for garage doors, should be installed immediately. Over the years they have been asked for, but nothing has been done.

Talking of electronics—the sole policeman on duty at the Mackay watchhouse depends on an obsolete emergency button that more often than not does not work. It requires constant attention from technical officers. When he is in trouble, he is supposed to press the emergency button to get the policeman to come from the station across the road, but the button often does not work.

These are the "good" conditions that policemen are given. Is it any wonder that the wastage rate is as high as it is in the service? Is it any wonder that people talk of stress and the other problems in the service itself? A simple intercom system such as the one at Parliament House would eliminate phone calls between the watchhouse and the police station and provide a greater security for police than an obsolete emergency button. I suppose that it would cost $50 to install the system if the Police Department's own technical experts set it up.

I could go on about the poor conditions for police. The same circumstances apply to persons who have been charged and who must sleep on floors. Recently in Mackay, a number of new mattresses were bought. They were placed on the cement floor. Every time they were picked up, the vinyl on the bottom of the mattresses was ripped. Already the new mattresses are beginning to be knocked about and are starting to fall apart. They are not worth two bob. What common sense is involved in spending money on mattresses when no bunks are provided? Only recently a wooden stool was provided in the area at the back where prisoners could sit. Before that, they sat on the floor, and again they dragged out the mattresses along the concrete.

Mr Casey: Many of those people, too, are subsequently found not guilty.

Mr BURNS: The honourable member is right. At that stage the persons have only been charged; they have not been convicted. Of course, once they are convicted, the Mackay police then face the problem of transporting them to Rockhampton and using up valuable police resources.

I found the Mackay watchhouse the most depressing environment in which one could work. Even a good coat of paint would have done wonders for both the inside and the outside of the building and for the morale of the policemen.

When I went next door to the Mackay Police Station, I found a rabbit-warren of overcrowded rooms and locker-filled corridors that were similar to a number of other stations that I visited. One thing that is standard for police stations in Queensland is the filling of the corridors with staff lockers. A visit by the fire brigade to many Queensland police stations would result in their being condemned as fire-traps. The so-called upstairs barracks in Rockhampton would not have been acceptable to Queensland shearers a decade ago or even 20 years ago when I was knocking around as an organiser in the west.

My very short tour of police stations opened my eyes and made me wonder how the department would cope if large numbers of trainees were placed in existing stations to meet the demands of the union for an extra 1 200 police. The Police Union has quite correctly pointed out that, while population rates and crime rates have escalated, effective

police presence has been dwindling. Little opportunity exists for crime prevention and control measures, because all available personnel are committed full time.

There is no doubt that the beat patrols in Cairns have been very successful. The police officers must be given credit for that. Although the beat patrols have worked, police had to be taken from other duties. It is good to see that in Townsville and Rockhampton the policeman on the beat is returning. Things have changed. When the casino is open until 4 o'clock or 5 o'clock in the morning, the night-clubs want to open until the same time. A city that once at 4 o'clock or 5 o'clock in the morning had only the milkman running through it now has a whole team of people who are leaving the casino and the night-clubs at that hour of the morning. That puts new pressures on the Police Department to provide more beat patrols at that time. Police beats are coming back along the coast.

When I stood as a candidate in 1972, Jack Houston promised that a Labor Party Government would put police on the beat. When I came along the coast in 1987 I was pleased to see that the Government was starting to move to implement Labor's policy. The Government took a little while, but it got there.

Crime car patrols that reduced breaking and entering and motor vehicle stealing offences from seven or eight every 24 hours to two in the same period had to be withdrawn because of insufficient staff. The Government's answer is the appointment of a couple of extra assistant commissioners. Every police officer could tell of positive steps that could be taken to aggressively attack crime in our streets and suburbs. All those steps are rejected because of a lack of police officers.

What is the Government doing to help police fight drug-runners? The police union is on record as stating—

> "Queensland is becoming the drug capital of Australia... Queensland's large uninhabited coastline and massive tracts and bushland make detection a major difficulty."

Only two water police are stationed in Cairns to handle the far-north Queensland coast from Innisfail to Thursday Island. A single water policeman at Thursday Island gives a total of three to handle the gulf area and the east coast to Innisfail. Some years ago, when I was up at a little place called Hope Island, which is out from Bloomfield, a magnificent 80-foot yacht pulled in. About half an hour later, down came a little single-engined, pusher-type amphibian aircraft and landed beside it. Dinghies were taken backwards and forwards. The plane took off. Away it went. I do not know what the people were up to. I thought to myself, "Two policemen in a shark cat in Cairns and one policeman with a boat on Thursday Island is an ineffective way to control the drug-trafficking or any other trafficking that might be going on along those miles and miles of unprotected coastline." It is no wonder that the drug trade flourishes. It is a scandal. Queensland must be the easiest place in Australia to ship in illegal drugs.

Mr Elliott: They take it straight through the customs in Sydney.

Mr BURNS: I am talking about Queensland. The Government is always transferring the problem somewhere else. I am referring to the Queensland Parliament. The drug trade is a Queensland problem. A spokesman from the Queensland Police Union said that Queensland is becoming the drug capital of Australia. I agree with that statement.

Police shortages in this State are reaching a chronic stage. Police stations and watchhouses are overcrowded. There is also a shortage of equipment. There are insufficient numbers of patrol cars to run efficient mobile patrols. To supply cars for highway patrols, cars must be taken from some other section.

It was a real education for me to visit Queensland's police stations and watchhouses. I was told that I have not seen anything yet. I have already been told of several surburban police stations that I should visit; of the plight of police who have been transferred to high-rent areas; and of the shortages that exist in specialist squads such as the highway patrol, drug squad, fraud squad, armed hold-up squad, stock squad, fauna squad,

prosecution corps and the crime prevention squad. The list is never-ending. All of those squads are requesting additional staff and, in most cases, more equipment and other assistance. However, the Bill provides for an expansion in the ranks of the top echelon of police administrators, while the lower ranks are crying out for more staff, resources and funds.

The Government argues that those additional assistant commissioners are needed to improve efficiency. Who can argue against extra efficiency? What is the use of additional senior positions in Makerston Street headquarters when those people are required to oversee a police force that is terribly thin on the ground throughout Queensland? It is like having an army top heavy with generals but with no privates in the field.

As I said earlier, this move is typical of the National Party's twisted priorities in the provision of essential community services. There is always enough public money to spend on the Premier's personal political crusades, but never enough to spend on protecting the public.

Mr GATELY (Currumbin) (4.27 p.m.): I wish to raise a number of issues. Comments were made that additional assistant commissioners are not required. However, there is no doubt in my mind that it is right, proper and correct that the Government should be looking at making the task of the Queensland police less onerous so that they are more capable of being efficient and effective for those people whom all honourable members represent.

I am concerned that the honourable member for Lytton has castigated the National Party for its operation of the Queensland police force. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is missing the mark, because the rapport between this Government and the police force in Queensland is above reproach. Unlike Queensland, New South Wales with its Labor Government has a total lack of trust and morale between its Government and police force. I have never seen a State with lower morale in its police force than New South Wales has. I have some past experience in that regard.

Mr Gygar: You lived there until a couple of days before the last election.

Mr GATELY: The honourable member neither knows nor cares, because he did not bother to read my maiden speech. I had five years' experience in the police service.

I assure the House that the rapport between the New South Wales Government and its police force is at an all-time low. Nothing but distrust exists between the police and that Government. That has occurred because the New South Wales Government has not taken the necessary steps towards ensuring that police in New South Wales are given every opportunity to fight crime in an effective manner. That Government has not lived up to its responsibilities. It has not taken adequate steps towards ensuring a free flow of policework that will ensure that criminals and those people involved in crime are brought to justice.

Because of his association with people who are involved in criminal activities, one of the Ministers of the New South Wales Parliament has resigned in order that he can fight his own legal battles regarding his superannuation. That is a sad situation.

The honourable member talked about the inadequacy of the RID scheme. I remind him that in New South Wales a vast number of people who are pulled up under the random breath-testing system are inconvenienced severely; yet compared with the large number of people who are inconvenienced by the scheme only a very small number of people are convicted.

Mr Burns: What's that got to do with it?

Mr GATELY: The honourable member is the one who brought it up, not me. I am just answering his comment.

The honourable member referred to the use of electronic devices. He suggested that such a system should be installed. In his next breath, he turned around and said that

an electric device to warn another person that somebody was in trouble did not work. He cannot have it both ways. Honourable members know that electronic systems fail. If they suggest that they do not fail, I remind them of the fatalities on 28 January 1986 during a NASA space launch. I also suggest that the same members would be the first people to castigate the Government and the Police Department if a person escaped from a lock-up when such a device was being used. They would not take into account that it was an electrical failure; it would be the Government's fault. Let us put those items to rest.

Mr Burns: You're setting the world on fire here with this speech.

Mr Gygar: I think he's just about finished.

Mr Prest: Wait till he gets to Seagulls.

Mr GATELY: These fellows waste a lot of time, don't they, Mr Speaker? When one of the members suggested that I had only been here two minutes, I reminded him that somebody else made that comment and he no longer runs something.

The point that I wish to bring up is in relation——

Mr Prest: We'll all bring up in a minute if he keeps this up.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Port Curtis will withdraw the words.

Mr PREST: I will withdraw them.

Mr GATELY: I turn to the clause dealing with people rendering assistance to persons who may be injured. Nine times out of 10, when people are in trouble, the police are the first persons on the scene. It is important that protection be offered to police, doctors and nurses who attend injured persons.

I refer to a motor vehicle accident in which a person had his leg trapped by metal and the vehicle was on fire. In an attempt to save his life a person cut the injured person's foot off at the ankle and was later charged with assault.

In 1982-83, in Chicago in the United States a drug-pusher on the streets was seen by a police officer to swallow a large number of pills that he was peddling. The police officer used a metal badge from his coat to prise open the person's mouth in an attempt to save him from choking. He was later sued successfully by that person for damages. Some two years later, in the same locality the same person was seen by the same police officer to do the same thing again. On that occasion the police officer did absolutely nothing. The person died. That is an instance of why it is necessary to give protection to the police in Queensland to ensure that they do not find themselves in the same predicament.

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (4.35 p.m.): I rise to join in the debate on amendments to the Police Act that are presently before the Parliament. It is not a surprise to find that one of the main aspects of the amending legislation is supposedly about streamlining administration at the top. Recently, I looked through some of the notes that are contained in my file on police matters. On the last occasion when amendments to the Police Act were before the Parliament, the purpose was to streamline administration at the top. As the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition mentioned, none of the amendments has solved the real problem facing the police force. The notes on my file indicate that in 1970, the then Minister for Police promised that he would upgrade the numbers of recruits to the Queensland police force and help to make the police force a far more efficient unit so that the police would be able to carry out their role fully in this State, namely, to protect the life and property of the people of the State and solve crimes that are committed.

It is no wonder that members of the Opposition are hesitant about accepting that the real problem confronting the police force is being faced up to. The Minister said when he introduced the Bill that much of the legislation is about streamlining. I accept

that a need exists for proper structures within the police force so that matters can be taken right to the top; so that decisions can be made by good men at the top who have gained a great deal of experience and can have instructions carried out rapidly by officers at the lower levels. Such a system would not be of much use if the police force did not have those officers at the lower levels to carry out those instructions.

When I speak about having good men at the top, I take the opportunity of offering my congratulations to Mr Ron Redmond, who was recently promoted to the rank of deputy commissioner. He is one of the finest police officers I have known throughout my time as a member of Parliament and in my service to the community. I was also very very pleased to see Terry McMahon appointed as an assistant commissioner. Only a matter of 15 months ago he was the officer-in-charge of the Mackay police district, where he showed himself to be a very competent and very efficient police officer and a very efficient administrator as well. I believe that he will add a great deal to the good efforts that are made at the top levels of administration in the police force.

As I mentioned previously, it is the streamlining at the bottom levels of the police force that is really needed at the moment. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr Burns, recently completed a visit to the coastal areas of the State and the main provincial cities and witnessed personally the very real problems that exist. He cited problems associated with the Mackay district that are being confronted by officers at the Mackay Police Station. I was very pleased that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition could visit Mackay so that he could see what has been occurring. Over the years, quite a deal of correspondence has been engaged in and representations have been made by myself and others in the Mackay district to have some of the problems addressed. All those efforts have proved unsuccessful.

A typical example of the kinds of problems that occur these days was reported to me as recently as last week-end by a constituent. A young fellow was married on Saturday afternoon. Along with families, relatives and friends, that evening he celebrated. When the couple returned to the home of his mother-in-law to collect their goods and chattels so that they could head off on their honeymoon, it was found that while they had been away, criminals had broken into the house and had stolen all the money that had been set aside for the honeymoon, many of the gifts that were offered as wedding presents, as well as many other things that were in the house. The police were notified immediately.

Two uniformed officers came round to the house in a patrol car merely to call in and acknowledge the call that had been made. They said that they would arrange for someone to call on Monday and have a look round the place to ascertain what had happened. I remind honourable members that this was Saturday evening. Naturally the young couple protested and said, "We're about to go on our honeymoon"—which is generally the thing that people do when they get married! One of the police officers said, "I am sorry, but we cannot get anybody out before Monday, because we can't pay overtime for somebody to come on Sunday and have a look for fingerprints—somebody from the CIB who can conduct a proper and thorough investigation into the breaking and entering." Is it any wonder that Queensland does not have a very good clean-up rate for breaking and entering offences?

Criminals do not worry very much about overtime or about when they should or should not commit felonies. They simply move straight in at the time that is most suitable for them. In this case, that time was when the family was away at the wedding. This is a classic example of what is happening within the police force at the moment. The payment of overtime is being allowed to dictate the policy that will be put into effect to solve crimes and apprehend criminals. The crims went off. In fact, by some time on the Sunday they were spending the honeymoon money somewhere, whereas the young married couple had to wait until Monday before proper interviews could be conducted with officers from the CIB in order to try to locate those responsible and some of their goods that had been stolen.

It is no wonder that members of the police force themselves get very discouraged when this type of thing happens, and much more so the public at large. Everyone knows

and realises that one of the greatest assets that a police force can have is public support and public co-operation. Indeed, in addition to that police officers have to have the confidence of the public as well. However, in circumstances such as those I have just related, they have none of those three assets.

Mr Burns touched very briefly on the working conditions of police in Mackay. I extend a public invitation to the Minister for Police, Mr Gunn, to visit Mackay and see for himself the type of working conditions faced by members of the police force there.

As the member for Lytton mentioned, if a person is walking down the passageways in the police station he is ducking and diving to avoid lockers. If a policeman has had to open up his locker to get something out of it, a person has to stand in the passageway and wait until the locker door is closed again before he can proceed further down the passageway. That must create some sort of a fire hazard, or even a hazard for getting people in and out of those areas. There is absolutely no proper or decent place that could be called a public area. Members of the general public who come into the police station to make a general inquiry have to mix with people who are being held there awaiting interviews, maybe on criminal charges. People are being interviewed right in front of other members of the general public, or very close to where members of the general public may be sitting waiting to be interviewed in relation to a traffic matter, or making a query, with the officers of the traffic branch.

One of the rooms in the police station would be no bigger than the table here in this Chamber, yet it is expected that 17 police officers must work out of that particular room with their own typewriters, their own files and all their own gear and equipment. They do that throughout the different shifts each day. Either they do that or they share tables, consequently disrupting one another's work and working conditions. That is just not good enough. The public cannot expect to have an efficient police force unless the police have sufficient working conditions at their police station or in their place of work. So I invite the Minister to visit the Mackay Police Station at the earliest opportunity. In addition to having one of the worst police stations in Queensland, the Mackay police district is one of the worst staffed. I have taken out figures in relation to police strengths.

I know that the present Commissioner likes to brag about how he is reducing the ratio of police to population in Queensland. At the moment the State average is one police officer for every 576 persons. Some alarming figures are found when one looks at a number of the regional districts of Queensland. Mackay is by far the worst affected. Mackay has 728 persons per police officer. That is almost 50 per cent—it is well over 40 per cent—above the State average. That covers a major district. Police officers are required to travel long distances from some of the outlying police stations to carry out their investigations. The district covers the major new mining towns such as Moranbah, Glenden and Middlemount. The main station at Mackay is required to provide relief staff to those areas. Consequently, at any given point in time the inspector in charge of the Mackay police district finds that he has to supply something like up to 10 relieving staff from his own resources to man some of the other police stations because the officers at those stations may have to escort persons into Mackay for court appearances. In other cases people have to be taken under escort to gaol at Etna Creek or even, if necessary, up to Townsville, and if it is a female prisoner, the officers will have to escort her down to Boggo Road.

The other alarming aspect is that a policeman's work is not finished when he apprehends an offender. The major task remains for him to produce the evidence to a court so that the whole episode can culminate in the offender's being sentenced by the court. A recent headline in the Mackay *Daily Mercury* showed that in the last few years police have had a 250 per cent increase in court appearances. That has meant 250 per cent more of the time of police officers has been involved in going to court to give evidence to ensure that the offender is properly dealt with. I have given just a few examples of the problems of police operations that are there for anybody to see if he cares to walk in off the street and have a look at the Mackay Police Station.

Upstairs in the Mackay Police Station is the clerical section, where five or six girls work in such a small alcove that they are nearly sitting on one another's lap while trying to do the typing work that relieves police officers from doing this work. That is not conducive to efficient working. All these facts are well documented. They are contained in proper submissions that have been made to the Minister and his office. In my 18 years in this place I have never been a person who has set out to bag the police force. I have great respect for the job and for those who do it. Sure enough, the force contains some bad apples, but there are bad apples in every job. The Queensland police force must be backed by the community and by its parliamentarians, but it also must be backed by the Government, which has to provide the proper working conditions for these men and women to operate in to help them carry out the very difficult job that they have undertaken.

I now make an appeal on behalf of an enormous number of police officers who are very, very disappointed that the Commissioner will not allow police in the Brisbane metropolitan area to wear the felt hat with which police officers in country areas of the State are issued. It is archaic that officers in Brisbane are told to wear the cap. Traditionally many members of the force are of Irish descent, as I am, or of Scottish descent and have fair skin that is particularly susceptible to sunburn in this climate. They also suffer the problems of skin cancer. If they are stationed in the country areas of the State they can wear the felt hat with its big brim, but in Brisbane they are forced to wear the cap, which in no way is properly effective in protection from the rays of the sun. As an alternative they can wear the old pith helmet—even trying to pronounce it makes it sound a bit dirty. The helmet is archaic. It is a relic of the old colonial days. It is hot, hard and heavy. The proof of what I am saying is in the fact that police officers will not wear it as an alternative to the cap. How often is a police officer in the Brisbane metropolitan area seen wearing a pith helmet? I guarantee that none of them wear the helmet. However, the requirement is that police officers in Brisbane must wear either the cap or the pith helmet; they are not permitted to wear the felt hat.

Another old regulation forced police officers in Brisbane to wear the heavy jacket, even in the summer months. That requirement was done away with long, long ago. Now officers are allowed to wear shorts and long socks, which is in keeping with the State's tropical and semitropical climate. I believe that they ought to be allowed to wear the felt hat. After all, Greg Norman and even Ronald Reagan are now promoting the Australian bush felt hat, yet the State Government will not allow its own police officers to wear them under certain conditions.

At a time when the department of the Minister for Health is spending a great deal of money on advertising its "Slip! Slop! Slap!" campaign against sun cancer, the Government should introduce a measure that would assist members of one of its own very fine bodies to ensure that they do not suffer from sun cancer. The felt hat is the best one for our climate.

I make an appeal to the Minister, and also to the Minister for Health, who is present in the Chamber. It is like a preliminary bout, the No. 1 and No. 2 contenders, so to speak. If both of those Ministers really want to do something for the police force in Queensland, they ought to ensure that police in all parts of the State are allowed to wear the felt hat as part of their uniform.

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (4.51 p.m.): The Bill contains three major measures, all of which I believe should have the support of the Parliament, with some reservation. The provision deleting the requirement that there be a numerical statement of how many shall or shall not be assistant commissioners is a sensible one.

It is not appropriate that legislation should have to be amended day by day or even year by year to take into account changing circumstances and rational reorganisation of the police force or any other Government department.

It is not a habit of this Parliament to legislate for the intricate internal workings and positions that should be available to the people in the Department of Primary

Industries or other departments. I do not believe that it is appropriate at the second level for it to be contained in the Police Act Amendment Bill. Therefore the Liberal Party supports that measure.

However, a note of caution should be sounded, that is, that this is a measure which is obviously designed—and it is admitted by the Minister to be designed—to allow an increase in the number of high-ranking policemen in this State.

I think that there is a broad public recognition at the moment that although more policemen are needed, they are not really needed at the top; more are needed at the bottom. More police are needed who are out policing, not more police who are driving desks. I would hate to see the police force of Queensland go the way of some banana republic's army where the soldiers have to be shared out every day so that each general gets a chance to command at least one every now and again.

The effectiveness of the police force is determined by those policemen who are out in the field, face to face with the public, handling crime hands-on. With that note of caution, the Liberal Party supports the Bill. However, I urge the Government to take on board the fact that one does not make more effective police work, the same as one does not make more effective armies, by increasing the number of generals.

The second major provision relates to the status of the ownership of police goods and whether certificates and so on by the Commissioner should be necessary. The measure is one which I think would be quite unexceptional to any person and, again, one that appeals to common sense and is perhaps overdue. It is one of those tidying-up measures that should have been effected some time ago. The fact that it is now being effected is welcomed.

As the Minister pointed out in his second-reading speech, the evidentiary provisions contained in the present Act are not in line with reality and, therefore, the appropriate changes are now being made.

The third major measure in the Bill relates to the liability for torts committed in emergencies when police go to the aid of citizens. Again, as the Minister has correctly pointed out, policemen have a high duty of care to the public. Although a member of the public may be able to stand aloof from an emergency situation, the people rightly expect that the police will be the first to render aid; the first to come to their assistance. Therefore, it is equally essential that the police be perhaps the first to be given protection for reasonable acts carried out under circumstances of emergency.

The Liberal Party believes that there was a minor error made in the drafting of the Bill in that the requirement was not made that the opinion of the policeman that an emergency exists be reasonable. I would like to pay the Minister a compliment in this regard. When this was drawn to his attention earlier today and he was forewarned of a proposed Liberal Party amendment, the Minister quite properly and appropriately took the amendment on board, redrafted it in terms which he felt were more acceptable to the legislation, and will now be proposing that amendment himself.

I congratulate the Minister on that. Incidents such as these occur too rarely in our political system. However, I believe that that is the way it ought to be done. Although this Parliament often devolves into an adversary system, and even lower to a mud-slinging system, overall honourable members are trying to put forward the best legislation for the people of Queensland.

I compliment the Minister for being prepared to take on board amendments which will, in the opinion of the Liberal Party, and in the Minister's own opinion, improve the legislation that is being offered to the people of Queensland.

The Liberal Party will be delighted to support the Minister's amendment when he proposes it in Committee.

Whilst discussing the Bill, I wish to say a few other words about the police, because rarely, except in Estimates debates, does this House have the opportunity to canvass broader issues. I express the view to the Minister and to the Government that Queensland

is currently facing a bit of a crisis in regard to crime. In fact it is more than a bit of a crisis; it is a large crisis. It is one that the Government should take on board and act decisively against. It is a fair warning to any Government that things are not right when the Commissioner for Police apears in the newspapers pleading for increased manpower in order to bring crime under control in this State.

The police on the ground are doing a magnificent job, far better than could be expected. If one goes to certain areas and looks at the rise in the crime rate and the maintenance of a steady clear-up rate, one cannot help but be taken aback in admiration for the job that the men and women on the ground are doing. A few months back I had the opportunity to examine at some length the crime statistics on the Gold Coast, where the crime rate is increasing to dramatic proportions. The number of police available to combat that increase and to detect it was not being increased by anything like the same dramatic proportions, yet the police were still delivering the goods and were able to maintain quite exceptional clear-up rates. This cannot go on for ever.

Mr De Lacy: Maybe if the Minister is not doing the job, the Commissioner has to do the job.

Mr GYGAR: I do not think there is any need to descend to that level in an attempt to score points. What this House has to do during this debate is to use the opportunity to try and urge appropriate changes in public policy.

The first step is to recognise and acknowledge the role that the police are playing. They are paying a price. Recently much has been said about police retiring due to ill health and stress, and there may be points that could be raised in regard to individual cases. When one looks at the overall figures, it is quite apparent that the strain placed on members of the police force is taking its toll, especially on young policemen.I would say a young policeman is any policeman under the age of 45 years. Police are being forced to retire on the grounds of ill health for stress-related reasons.

Queensland is losing irreplaceable experience and knowledge and that is causing the median age of police to decline. These are the men who are out there face to face with the public. When the median age declines, it is inevitable that the standard of policing will decline with it. Law enforcement and police activity is one of those areas where there is absolutely no substitute for experience. The brightest, most alert and intelligent young person can be put through all the training that can be mustered, but only experience will make that person into a good policeman. For years and years the strength of the police force in Queensland has been the crusty old sergeants who man the stations; the men who have been there and seen it all before, who knew what needed to be done and how to do it, and who were there to guide the younger members. This is most important: they were there to guide the young policemen along the paths that needed to be taken.

Yet these are the ranks of men and women—as women rise higher in the ranks of the police force—who are suffering from stress. The capacities of Queensland's police force are not elastic and unlimited. A point is reached where something has got to give and it would appear, from recent publicity and from statements that have been made at the recent Police Union conference which was held in this State, that this limit has now been reached. There is only one way to solve it. If experienced men are to be retained and kept in positions where they can hand on this great store of knowledge and experience to the upcoming generation of young policemen, the strain has to be relieved. This will only occur through increases in police manpower.

Despite what is being done, Queensland is still in the grip of a veritable crime wave. If proof is required of that, one only has to look at two of the most publicised residential developments on the Gold Coast; Mr Gore's infamous Sanctuary Cove development and the other one that was opened by one of the Ministers of the Crown only a few months ago. The great boast of these resorts is that there is absolute security—locked doors, bars, and nobody will be let in unless he has a pass or a permit or is vouched for.

Our society has reached a pretty sick state when people must buy fortresses for homes. There would not be too many members of this Assembly who cannot remember a time, maybe when they were children, when people in this State did not even bother to lock their doors when they went out and certainly did not bother to lock them before they went to bed. In the urban areas of Queensland, I do not think that anybody today would be stupid enough to even consider walking away from his house without checking that it was locked and barred and that all the windows were closed. Indeed, the Queensland police force runs a very extensive advertising campaign to encourage people to do just that.

All honourable members can remember the days when nobody cared about locking up his home. It just did not happen. The blame must be sheeted home eventually to activity or inactivity on the part of the Government. I do not necessarily single out the party presently in Government in Queensland for being responsible for that situation. Changes in society have occurred. However, the role and responsibility of Government is to respond appropriately to changes in society. One of the appropriate responses that must be recognised is that a greater proportion of public resources must be devoted to the police force to ensure that in these troubled times people can at least have a measure of security.

I do not think that it is inappropriate that people should be urged to lock their houses when they go out, but surely the Government must acknowledge that it has gone beyond an acceptable standard when a promotional feature of new housing estates is that the occupants will live in a fortress, that private guards will patrol the grounds 24 hours a day and that the gates will be locked to keep unwanted people out of the estates. That is just too much. People have a right to expect that the streets in which they live will at least be safe for them and that they do not need to provide private security guards to ensure that they have what they regard to be a basic measure of personal safety and security of their property.

From the studies that have been undertaken and from what honourable members have been told, it is obvious that the first dramatic step that must be taken is to increase significantly the police manpower in this State. The Commissioner has even been reported on the front pages of the newspapers as saying that. What more must be done before that fact will be acknowledged, recognised and acted upon? The Commissioner has called for more police. He has said that the shortage of police officers is chronic. The number of retirements of police officers owing to stress-related illnesses is climbing. The median age of policemen is falling because of early retirements or because of stress-related illnesses. It all points clearly and irrevocably in one direction—greater emphasis needs to be placed on providing the resources that the community needs and demands by its actions of constructing fortresses in which to live. More police are needed to meet the public's reasonable expectations of safety and security. That will not happen unless the Government acknowledges the problem and comes forward with a plan to solve it.

The Government has a Budget coming up. I would hope that within that Budget that recognition will be shown. There are very few areas in which Governments can be said to have prime, basic responsibilities. All honourable members have heard arguments about Governments doing too much or too little. We have heard arguments about the Federal Government's having too many departments. The bottom-line departments for a Federal Government are the Department of Foreign Affairs and the Department of Defence, because they are charged with looking after the overseas relationships of the country and the defence of the realm.

The most basic department of a State Government is that of police, because at the bottom line, if people get nothing else from a Government, they demand and have a right to expect security. That is part of the social contract under which we live. A person is told that if someone comes around and gives him a hard time, he cannot hit him; he must call the police or take legal action against that person. A social contract exists between the citizen and the Government. The citizen gives up the right to act on his own behalf in favour of a Government that assures him that it will do it for him. The

Government fails in that duty, and it cannot complain if citizens become upset. When a Government falls down badly enough, all sorts of outrages occur. People demand the right to shoot burglars. They say, "If anyone raped a member of my family, he would be dead, because I would take the law into my own hands." People take the law into their own hands when the Government that is administering the law is not keeping its side of the bargain and is not fulfilling its side of the social contract.

The police force has often been called the thin blue line between civilisation and anarchy. It has gained that title not only because it enforces the law and keeps criminals under control, but also because it is the force that fulfils the social contract that this and every other Government has accepted from its citizens.

If this Government will not construct its police force in a way that will fulfil that contract and provide people with what is deemed to be a basic level of safety and security, it will break its contract, and that is when the trouble will begin.

All honourable members should be greatly concerned not because of Mike Gore's financial arrangements but because he is actually advertising that, "This is private property. We will lock the public out." Other estates, which will guarantee private security guards 24 hours a day, are being developed. This Government should be concerned that people feel that they must go to those lengths because of the inadequacy of the police force and law enforcement in Queensland. It is not the fault of the police. They are doing their best, to the extent that their health is starting to fail and other reactions are beginning to set in.

The police force must operate not only with the acquiescence but also the enthusiastic support of the population at large. If 2 per cent of the population of Queensland decided to ignore the law, there would be anarchy. The law operates because people support it and want to obey it. There is an extraordinary level of compliance with our law. A diminutive proportion of 1 per cent of people do not comply with the law.

People will comply with the law as long as they have confidence in the police force and feel that the police are doing a good job. That is one of the reasons why bodies such as the Police Complaints Tribunal have been set up; so that people will have that confidence.

When police are pushed too far under constant tension, they start snapping at motorists and abusing citizens instead of adopting a far more cool-headed approach. Nothing detracts more from the image of the police in the community than a short-tempered policeman under stress who ignores the fact—or perhaps is unaware of the fact—that the citizen to whom he is speaking will have a lasting impression of the police force by the attitude of that policeman who comes to his car window to inform him that he has been speeding, that his brake light is not functioning, or to ask him to breathe onto the crystals.

Police who operate under constant stress and tension are definitely bad advertisements for the police force and the rule of law. The enforcement of the law in this and every other State rests upon that public confidence.

The manpower shortage is chronic and must be addressed. I also urge the Government to do a couple of simple things. For example, patrol cars should be air-conditioned. How could anyone believe that a policeman who works an eight-hour shift in January in Queensland and who drives around in a non-air-conditioned car will be in anything but the foulest possible mood at the end of that eight-hour shift? If I do not have an air-conditioned vehicle, I end up in the foulest possible mood after attempting to drive through traffic for 30 minutes to attend this Parliament.

How can anyone reasonably expect policemen to perform their duties at the level upon which we insist if we do not provide them with the adequate mechanisms and tools? Perhaps it is a pinprick, but it is one of the many things that lead to high or low morale in the police force. Those are the matters that the Government should be taking on board. The police force should be taken more seriously. More resources and attention should be devoted to it.

The Minister who is responsible for the Bill is the Deputy Premier of the State—the second man in the State. If he cannot do it, the police have a right to say, "Well, who's going to do it for us?", and to really drop their bundles. As Police Minister, the Deputy Premier is in a unique position of power to ensure that appropriate resources are allocated to the police force in the enforcement of law and order in this State. I hope that when the Budget is drafted, he will use that power to make sure that this critical area is addressed.

The Bill is unexceptionable and has the support of the Liberal Party. I repeat my congratulations to the Minister on his attitude in bringing the Bill before the House today.

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (5.11 p.m.): I wish to raise a couple of brief matters and to ask a question of the Minister. Last week, in one of the newspapers circulating in my area, the officer in charge of the Oxley police district was asked about the spate of criminal activity in the area. In his response he indicated that the problem of house-breakings, robberies and thefts could be overcome with additional manpower.

The southern Brisbane police district is still the most undermanned in the State. The Commissioner's report this year showed that that district has the lowest number of police per head of population in Australia. Queensland is supposed to be a law-and-order State, but the statistics and support for the police force do little to support that contention. In many significant areas, the statistics reveal that criminal activity in the State is increasing at a faster rate than that anywhere else in Australia.

I have reason to contemplate those statistics not only because the Commissioner referred to an acute manpower shortage in an area of very large population, that is, the Oxley police district, but also because last Thursday my own house in the greater area of the South Brisbane police district was broken into. Six months ago, it was my neighbour's house on one side; 12 months ago it was my neighbour's house on the other side. Six months ago, the house of the honourable member for Yeronga was broken into. Three months ago an employee of the honourable member for Redcliffe or his wife was murdered. This comes right home. I am not talking about something that does not impact on our lives; I am talking about something that is happening to our lives and to the lives of our neighbours.

On Thursday, I am having an interview with a squad from police headquarters with regard to a review of police strength in my area. I know what it is about. It is about the possibility of closing down the Sherwood Police Station, despite the fact that, in the last 18 months, almost all my neighbours have had their houses broken into. It is the rationalisation. As the floors at Makerston Street grow one by one and as the new site is developed floor by floor, there is a diminishing presence of police on the ground, where crime happens in the community. The force is getting top heavy. There is no question about that. People in the suburbs and in parts of Queensland where the Commissioner's own statistics show the least police protection in Australia find themselves having to meet the Commissioner's representatives, who are desperately involved in a juggling act, balancing the impossible with a diminishing number of policemen responsible for an area with a growing population. It is an impossible task.

As the honourable member for Stafford and others who have spoken today pointed out, the protection of our house and our property is fundamental. It is one of the fundamental obligations of Government. I support increased numbers of policemen on the ground. Queensland demonstrably has fewer police officers and demonstrably has a crime rate that is rising faster than that in any other State in Australia. Members of the Liberal Party demand an answer, which is not the answer of passing special legislation for special enclaves of Queensland where people who are wealthy enough to provide themselves with private armies or private security guards get peace of mind and security of property.

This is an urgent and acute matter. I can point to a dozen areas of Government in which I would willingly support the Government's reduction in expenditure in favour not only of an overall reduction but also of a reallocation of resources to an area of primary need. I do not know about the domestic circumstances of other honourable members in this House, but half the members of the Liberal Party have had property stolen or know of neighbours whose homes have been broken into. I guarantee that our situation is typical in that, during the last 12 months, many other people have felt the touch of the criminal hand upon their lives. Either that is the case or it is the case that the Government is prepared to sacrifice the peace of mind and security of other people in favour of distorted numbers elsewhere.

Mr Sherrin interjected.

Mr INNES: I have heard the honourable member for Mansfield groaning away, suggesting that what I am saying is fantasy. I am telling the honourable member that what I am saying is absolutely accurate. The honourable member for Mansfield is sniffing and snorting and laughing, suggesting that this is distortion. My daughter had to sleep in my bedroom for two nights last week.

Mr SHERRIN: I rise to a point of order. I find those remarks personally offensive and I ask the honourable member to withdraw them.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I was occupied at the time, so I have to take the honourable member's word——

Mr INNES: Is the honourable member suggesting that he did not do what I have suggested?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Sherwood will withdraw the remark. It has offended the honourable member for Mansfield.

Mr INNES: I withdraw that, Mr Deputy Speaker—in deference to you, not to him.

Crime does affect people's lives. When women—young women or older women—go into a house that has been broken into, it is disturbing and remains disturbing for a number of days or a number of weeks. It affects people. What I am talking about is not fantasy; it is reality, and it is touching the lives of thousands of people in this State.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr INNES: I am sensitive about this matter. I only have to look at what is recorded in my local newspaper, at the crime rate and at the complaints made by police who are trying to grapple with the problem.

I will certainly be meeting with staff from police headquarters to say that I do not want the Sherwood Police Station to become any further undermanned. About five years ago, it had four officers, and at times it is down to one sergeant and one new recruit. As it is, the area is struggling to keep the police station. What is needed is an extra police station built on the site of the Centenary Estate to increase police presence on the ground in suburban Brisbane.

Although, from a professional point of view, I have not always seen eye to eye with Superintendent Kevin Dorries, I do support his response to lawlessness in the streets of Cairns by putting policemen back on the beat and in preventing the outbreak of problem situations by police officers going into pubs and places where the trouble starts. Today, the honourable member for Lytton agreed that a dramatic reversal in criminal activity has taken place in Cairns by use of the oldest, simplest and most straightforward police tactic in the book, that is, men on the ground walking a beat. That is what I want to see more of in Queensland and not police officers emerging from police fortresses in crisis cars, tangling with the problems associated with going from a break-in here or to a fight there. That kind of activity leads to complaints and it leads to police officers'

becoming too taut and reacting in a way that is not always calculated to improve public relations.

I support totally the call for reallocating the State's resources to provide greater numbers of police officers. The last time the size of the police force was increased it was done not to fight crime, despite the statistics showing an increase in crime. It was done for the purposes of Expo, to create a tourist-guide police force. Last time, that was the reason given for the increase in the number of police officers. That is a spurious reason compared with the urgent reason of needing to control crime in this State, in the suburbs, towns and homes of Queensland.

I will ask a question in response to a phone call that I received last week-end from an outraged citizen. It relates to the public image of the police force. Recently, the Commissioner's daughter was the beneficiary of a superannuation entitlement. Many people in the community who do not have superannuation—even those who do—discovered what appeared to be extraordinary indulgence for someone who appeared to have a particular relationship with the most important person in the police network in this State. The extraordinary circumstance was her lump-sum benefit received at the age of 26 or 27, although there appeared to be some evidence that she can go out and get another job.

The more recent event—and I promised that I would raise it in Parliament at an appropriate time—was in relation to the superintendent of police who at the moment is on remand for some offences. An announcement was made that the superintendent, who was involved in an incident at the Aspley hypermarket, was allowed to resign or was going on sick leave and taking his lump-sum superannuation before the matter of the charges against him had been concluded. The person who spoke to me—a person without superannuation, I understand—was outraged. He was saying, "What would happen to me or any other employee? Wouldn't the matter of discipline be decided first, and the person's situation with regard to retirement benefits and superannuation benefits be consequent on that?" I am not trying to pre-judge the situation, but would the Minister mind clarifying what are the circumstances in which that officer is terminating his services and under which he will recieve a lump-sum superannuation payment, and how does it relate to any opportunity to leave the service, shall we say, without charge or blemish and before the determination of that matter?

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police) (5.22 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their support of the Bill. Most people would agree with the proposed amendments.

The Queensland police force has an excellent clear-up rate in crime. That is shown by the ABS figures, which I have. The clear-up rate is 51 per cent, and that is the best rate of all Australian police forces. So that speaks for itself.

The amendment of section 69B is absolutely essential to protect police officers. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition mentioned that protection. He also mentioned other people going to the aid of people who are hurt. That aspect will be dealt with in another Bill at another time.

Mention was made of the police relying on the co-operation of the public. That is very, very important indeed. As a matter of fact, I believe that in most instances the police do receive that co-operation, for which I am very grateful.

Owing to the increase in the population of this State, the increase in the number of assistant commissioners is essential.

Modern equipment has been supplied to the force. A new headquarters is about to be constructed at a cost of $60m. In addition to the normal capital works program there is a $10m program. I was instrumental in having it approved. I invite those people who have never been out to the academy to go out there and have a look at the most modern academy in this nation.

In the 12 months that I have been Minister for Police I have opened new stations at Edward River, Cairns, Kuranda, Dalby, Daisy Hill, Lockhart River and Goodna. A large number of stations are still under construction. I can assure honourable members that I will be doing my utmost to see that police continue to get their fair share of the Budget.

At the same time, I am very disturbed at the Federal Government's intention to cut back on funds for the States while not cutting back on its own expenditure. That is very important.

Breaking and entering——

Mr De Lacy: What is going to happen when Joh knocks $16 billion off the national expenditure?

Mr GUNN: The honourable member is not proud of that, is he? Is he proud of the fact that the Federal Government is not cutting back on its own expenditure but is cutting back on the States'? I can assure him that in that regard the Federal Government is not popular, even with the Labor States.

As I was saying, breaking and entering is a universal problem, despite the number of police. There could not be a police officer on every street corner. However, they do rely on public co-operation in that regard.

A neighbourhood watch program is being tested down on the Isle of Capri. I believe it is working well at this time. It is something to watch.

The Police Department places a very high priority on breaking and entering offences. The crime prevention bureau and the public relations branch are very active in that particular area. To prevent offences, care on the part of the house-holder is very, very important. The matter of stolen cars takes up a lot of police time. However, it is amazing to walk down the street and find the number of people who still leave their keys in their cars. I have seen it in my own town. The people do not even take the keys out of the car.

Mr Casey: They are all honest people out there, aren't they?

Mr GUNN: It is not the people who are there, it is the people who come to the town, possibly from other areas, who cause the problems. Not all people are as honest as those in Mackay and Laidley, are they?

Staffing levels are assessed by the management services branch, from which I receive reports.

The air-conditioning of police cars used in the country is now under way. Most of them are now air-conditioned. A problem did exist, but I have given instructions that all patrol cars that are on the road 24 hours a day will be air-conditioned. That is presently under way.

If the member for Sherwood gives me details of all his local problems, I will be only too pleased to handle them at any time. I am not familiar with the fact that the Sherwood Police Station will be closed. I do not know anything about that. I rely on honourable members to let me know about police matters in their electorates.

Mr Innes: I said I thought that would be the anticipated result of the meeting that was held.

Mr GUNN: The honourable member can contact me on that matter at any time he chooses.

One thing that the department has not received much credit for from the public—it has from police—is the appointment of 834 clerical staff to assist at police stations. That releases many police from the office.

Mr Burns: That is not as many as last year.

Mr GUNN: There are 834 out there and that is a great help to police. It releases them from typewriters, counter work, etc.

Mr Innes: It is excellent.

Mr GUNN: Yes, it is excellent. I will look at that again when the next Budget is being framed. That is an area that must be given a high priority. If a top girl can be brought in, she does an excellent job. I have appointed them to country areas throughout the State.

Mr Casey: What about court orderlies? That would save a lot of time if police involved in courts could be released and you had a system of court orderlies?

Mr GUNN: What has been happening is that some of the clerical staff from schools have been helping out in courts during school vacations. Instead of putting them off, the Government is using them in that sort of court work. However, I would rather see more young people get involved in clerical police work so that a policeman is not tied to his desk for long periods of time doing his paperwork.

Mr Casey: But they also get tied into the courts for a lot of time organising witnesses. That could be done by an orderly.

Mr GUNN: Those are the sorts of things that are being considered. I can assure the honourable member that recommendation will be made to me by the planning branch.

Motion agreed to.

Committee

Hon. W. A. M. Gunn (Somerset—Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3, as read, agreed to.

Clause 4—

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

"At page 3, line 1, omit—

'opinion of the member'

and substitute—

'member's opinion (formed on reasonable grounds)'."

Mr GYGAR: I briefly reiterate what I expressed at the second-reading stage and congratulate the Minister on taking on board this amendment, the effect of which is merely to require an objective test to be placed upon whether or not an emergency exists. It merely says that if a policeman forms an opinion that an emergency exists, it must be a reasonable opinion. It detracts in no way whatsoever from the level of protection provided to the police, because in the past the courts have shown that they take a very, very broad view of what is reasonable, particularly in circumstances of an emergency, and are quite willing to take on board the fact that decisions must be made quickly in these circumstances.

Without such an amendment the result would have been that the policeman's statement that he had formed an opinion would have been conclusive proof of the fact in the statement. An example is that if a policeman put in his statement on a case of a person jaywalking that he had formed the opinion that that constituted an emergency, the courts would have had no choice other than to deem it as an emergency because, without this amendment, that is the way the legislation would have read.

I congratulate the Minister again on taking on board the suggestions that were made to him by the Liberal Party and on moving this very appropriate amendment, which, in my view, improves the legislation not only for the people of Queensland but also for the police involved.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, with an amendment.

Third Reading

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

SUGAR ACQUISITION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 17 March (see p. 765).

Mr De LACY (Cairns) (5.33 p.m.): These amendments to the Sugar Acquisition Act have been debated on three separate occasions. On two of those occasions I was a member of this Parliament.

In 1982, the amendments to the Sugar Acquisition Act were moved and passed. However, those amendments were passed only because of the insertion of a sunset clause, which meant in effect that the amendments would be in force for two years only.

In 1984, amending legislation was once again passed to extend the sunset clause. I do not know what it was called in that instance; perhaps the twilight clause. So, it was extended for a further three years.

Now, in 1987, further amendments are before the House to extend the sunset clause for another three years. I do not know where it will finish. However, let me say this: the ALP opposed the legislation in 1982; it opposed the extension of the sunset clause in 1984; and it proposes to oppose the further extension of the sunset clause tonight, in 1987. That means that the ALP is consistent, if nobody else in this Chamber is consistent. It is certainly more than can be said for the Government.

I will give honourable members a bit of the history of the matter. In 1982, when these amendments to the Sugar Acquisition Act were first introduced, the legislation caused such a row and outcry in the sugar industry that the Government had to back off. It was opposed by the Queensland Cane Growers Council; it was certainly opposed by the Australian Sugar Producers Association; and it was opposed by most of those National Party members who represented sugar-growing areas.

The only way in which the Government could get the legislation through the House was to insert the sunset clause. The Government said, "Let us put the legislation into place and we will give you an undertaking that in two years the legislation will die and it will revert back to the status quo." In actual fact, what the Government was saying to the people and to the cane-growers—I might add that the cane-growers did not accept the legislation; they opposed it vigorously—was, "Trust us. This legislation is not going in with any ulterior motives. We are introducing it because it is important and because it is necessary." I will come to that part in a minute, because the Government has never convinced me that it was necessary. The Government said, "Trust us." Obviously the cane-growers would not do that and the Government had to insert the sunset clause into the legislation.

It is a bit like the Queensland Government Development Authority. When the authority was established, the Government said that it was quite obviously there for the purpose of funding or raising finance for statutory authorities and public bodies. Any reading of the legislation and the debate and any interpretation of the Minister's second-reading speeches and comments made at that time led everbody to believe that the authority could not be used for any other purpose whatsoever. However, there was an out clause. If, at that stage, someone had charged the Government with using the authority for ulterior motives, the Government would have said, "That is not true. You are just making it up. Trust us." As it has come to pass, the Government has used that out clause to lend $10m to a private person.

This legislation is similar to the legislation that the Government now proposes to introduce to allow the freeholding of the Barrier Reef Islands. I heard the Minister for Lands saying, "That is not the reason. We are not going to sell off all the islands. We are not going to allow subdivisions. That is not the purpose. We are not going to prevent the ordinary public from coming out to the islands. Trust us. That is not the purpose." History shows that this Government cannot be trusted.

That is what happened with this legislation. If ever evidence was needed to prove that the Government could not be trusted, this House is being given that evidence tonight. Twice the sunset clause has been extended. The extension of the sunset clause in 1984 proved that those Government back-benchers who supported it on the basis on which it was inserted were made to look ridiculous.

If those who supported the legislation in 1984 because it was a sunset clause extension for three years, support this legislation tonight, once again they will look ridiculous.

At this juncture I should say that tonight one member of the Government does not look ridiculous on the basis of his performance in 1984. That is the honourable member for Mulgrave, Mr Menzel. On that night he made his celebrated decision at least to abstain from voting. He opposed the legislation on the floor of the House and then walked out when the House divided. He was right then, and I will be interested to see what he does tonight.

On this occasion I understand that the Queensland Cane Growers Council does not specifically oppose another extension of the sunset clause, but has mixed feelings about it. The council certainly opposed the legislation when it was introduced and I am certain that virtually to a person the council still opposes it. It is frustrated with the Government and the legislation and it is not quite certain where things are going. If ever these people wanted confirmation of the fact that the Government cannot be trusted, they got it last week when legislation was introduced that overturned something which was very, very sacred in the sugar industry, that is, the powers of the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board.

It really makes a joke of the whole legislation and the consistency and direction that the State Government is providing to the sugar industry. Now it is perfectly obvious that that legislation in 1982 was legislation by deception. The Government said, "We will introduce it, but it will only be there for two years." Five years later this House is debating legislation which will extend it for a further three years, until 1990.

However, a more fundamental reason why we as an Opposition oppose the extension of the sunset clause is that, once again, the Government is tinkering with something that is fundamental to the industry. I know that the growers, the Queensland Cane Growers Council, the Opposition and certain members of the Government keep saying that the sugar industry has a certain legislative structure that has served the industry well for a long period.

Because of the nice balance that exists between the Sugar Acquisition Act and the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act, for the best part of 70 years the growers have been protected in their dealings with the millers. I do not think that the Minister was completely honest—I think he may have been partially deceptive in his second-reading speech—when he said—

> "The Sugar Acquisition Act is the legislation under which the Queensland sugar crop has been acquired and marketed since 1915."

That is right. However, the Minister went on to say—

> "Sections 4 and 4B of the Act empower the Sugar Board to conduct research into the quality of raw sugar, to pay mills transport allowances for special shipping arrangements, to make interim payments to mills and bonus payments to growers and to enter into agreement that will facilitate the disposal of sugar."

That is not what the Sugar Acquisition Act is all about and it is not what it has been all about for the last 70 years. In fact, those amendments were the amendments

that were introduced in 1982. A quick reading of the Minister's second-reading speech would lead one to believe that the amendments are an integral part of the Sugar Acquisition Act. They are not an integral part of the Sugar Acquisition Act; they were inserted in 1982 for a two-year period. Tonight, honourable members will vote on whether or not to extend that period for a further three years. I have never heard a good reason for the introduction of the amendments to the Sugar Acquisition Act.

Mr Harper: Doesn't an amendment become part of the Act?

Mr De LACY: It certainly does. It becomes part of the Act. When the Minister referred to 1915 and the Sugar Acquisition Act, one could be led to believe that he was saying that the Act has existed in that form since 1915. However, it certainly has not.

Mr Harper: There was never any intention of suggesting anything of that sort.

Mr De LACY: I will accept the Minister's word on that. A reading of his second-reading speech led me to that belief.

The Sugar Board's powers have been defined under the Sugar Board Act. Although they were important powers, they were quite simple powers. They are simply to acquire the sugar on behalf of the Government, to sell it, to recieve the money, to divide it into the No. 1 pool and the No. 2 pool and to distribute those funds back to the industry. At that point, the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act takes over. Those funds that are received from the Sugar Board are allocated by formula to the growers and millers.

The big concern with the legislation that was introduced in 1982 was that the powers of the board were being strengthened and enlarged, giving it control over the distribution of sugar moneys. That fundamental change to the arrangement has served the sugar industry for many years. I do not believe that there was ever a good and fundamental reason to make those changes. At the time, it was said that there was a need to carry out research into the quality of raw sugar. The fact is that the sugar industry has a research arm that has existed for many years.

The Sugar Research Institute and the Bureau of Sugar Experiment Stations are the research arm of the sugar industry. They have a funding arrangement. I believe that the BSES is more accountable to the sugar industry than the Sugar Board ever was. I say that because the growers' representative on the BSES is appointed by the Queensland Cane Growers Council. The growers' representative on the Sugar Board is appointed by the Government. That is a fundamental difference. I am not criticising the cane-growers' representative on the Sugar Board. I believe that he reports back to the growers, and I do not think that the growers are upset.

The basic principle that remains is that that representative is not elected by those growers to whom he is accountable. The growers' representative on the BSES is selected by the Queensland Cane Growers Council, which is the body that represents and is elected by the cane-growers of Queensland.

Another fairly important point is that the BSES would have a greater chance than the Sugar Board of picking up Federal Government research grants.

Secondly, I do not believe that a good and justifiable reason exists for the introduction of these amendments because, if money is required for specific research into, say, floc in sugar cane, or for whatever purpose, the Minister can obtain funds by proclamation. The need to introduce specific legislation in that regard has never existed. The growers were justifiably suspicious that an ulterior motive or alternative reason, which was not obvious at the time, may have existed.

The Government may claim that nothing untoward has happened. I must admit that that is the case. During the last three or four years, the sugar industry has experienced most traumatic times. During that period, the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act has largely remained intact, certainly in so far as it relates to the distribution of sugar moneys. Last year, that Act was substantially amended to introduce some deregulation into the sugar industry. However, the growers and the Labor Party believed that those

changes were unnecessary. I turn now to a paper that was prepared by the Cairns Cane Growers Executive when the amendment was introduced in 1982. I believe that previously I have referred to that paper. It succinctly sums up the concerns of the growers and the ALP about the proposed amendments. It states—

> "The recent amendments of the Sugar Acquisition Act have now made what was a simple piece of very direct legislation into one that has a prior authority over the Cane Prices Act in the distribution of sugar sales proceeds. The Sugar Acquisition Act now has first say in the directing of industry income and, unlike the Cane Prices Act, its distribution of money is not controlled by formula. Its authority is completely discretionary to bless or to blight wherever it chooses.
>
> The Cane Prices Act was specifically brought in to protect growers from millers and to see that the Big and the mighty could no longer exploit the sugar industry in a manner tantamount to a royal prerogative."

When the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act was introduced in 1915, which was approximately the same time as the Sugar Acquisition Act was initially introduced, it was vigorously opposed by the CSR.The CSR regarded that Act as disadvantaging it in its relationship with the sugar industry.

The growers are justified in opposing the proposed amendments. One may well ask what might happen if agreement to extend the sunset clause is not reached. Obviously, if the sunset clause is not extended, the amendments that were introduced in 1982 will no longer apply. Where will the sugar industry be then? As far as I am aware, the research that is carried out within the sugar industry will be back where it belongs, namely, with the sugar industry research arm, the BSES.

It is nonsense for any honourable members to suggest that the BSES could not carry out that type of research. The bulk of that research is probably already being undertaken by it in consultation with the Sugar Board.

Tonight, the Queensland Cane Growers Council has given modified approval—probably exasperated approval—to the amendment. It is nice to see that the council has been consulted, which is more than can be said about the Sugar Milling Rationalization (Far Northern Region) Act, which was pushed through the House last week without any consultation with the industry, with the Queensland Cane Growers Council—the body that represents the cane-growers of Queensland—and certainly with the growers who supply the Goondi mill and will be vitally and directly affected by the legislation.

Mr Casey: There does not appear to be too much Government back-bench interest in the sugar industry at the moment.

Mr De LACY: I am amazed at the lack of interest in the legislation that is being displayed by the Government and by Government back-benchers. The member for Mulgrave, Mr Menzel, is the only Government back-bencher representing a sugar seat in the House at the moment. Perhaps he is the only Government back-bencher who could hold his head up when the amendments to the Sugar Acquisition Act are discussed.

Mr McKechnie: What about the Chairman of Committees?

Mr De LACY: I am sorry, I did not take the Deputy Speaker into consideration.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The Chair will remain neutral.

Mr De LACY: Of course. I would not have liked it to appear in *Hansard* that the Deputy Speaker was not in the Chamber.

Mr Eaton: He was in the chair when the other Bill went through, otherwise he would have voted against it.

Mr De LACY: I thank the honourable member for Mourilyan. I will allow that to go into *Hansard.*

As a consequence of the legislation that was introduced last week, some members of the Government back bench might not be game to face the Chamber tonight or to go back to their electorates and face the cane-growers. They supported the legislation that went through the House last week. That legislation was absolutely disastrous because, for the first time in the history of the sugar industry in Queensland, it overrode the powers of the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board.

Mr Harper: On the suggestion of the board chairman.

Mr De LACY: No, I cannot accept that. It was not on the suggestion of the board chairman. The board chairman said, "If you want to introduce politics into it, you do it in the Chamber. But if you want to operate on the legislation and the principles on which the industry has existed for the last 70 years, then it ought to remain where it should remain, and that is with the central board." The legislation certainly was not introduced on the advice of the Queensland Cane Growers Council.

In the fortnight or so since the legislation passed through the House, all hell has broken loose in the sugar-growing areas. It does not surprise me that the Government back-benchers have gone to water. It is not only back-benchers; members of Cabinet represent sugar-growing areas and they are now completely out of step with their constituents, the sugar-growers of Queensland, whom they presume to represent directly as members of the National Party or the old Country Party. It amazes me that members of Parliament who sprang from the Country Party are introducing legislation that so fundamentally changes the principles under which the sugar industry has been structured.

The legislation was passed through the House almost clandestinely the week before last. It was a bit like the way in which the Minister passed through Innisfail the other day. I am still trying to find out whether the Minister passed through Innisfail, was in Innisfail, passed over Innisfail or tunnelled through Innisfail.

Mr Eaton: They were all out at the aerodrome at 12 o'clock when I went past going to that funeral.

Mr De LACY: On Saturday, the *Cairns Post* quoted a press release from the State Minister for Primary Industries, although I have not been able to verify it. First of all, the Minister accused some Innisfail cane-growers of being concerned with their own interests. I wonder whose interests the Minister would expect them to be concerned about—CSR's interest, the National Party's interest, the State Government's interest or whoever's interest?

Mr Harper: Would it help you if I told you that I gave that press release to the ABC reporter at the Innisfail airport on Friday and that he was the only person who welcomed me. I was so disappointed.

Mr De LACY: My advice is that the Innisfail growers were organised to meet the Minister. They were determined to meet him. They had a telephone link-up so that anybody who found the Minister was to get on the phone. They had a system in place to make sure that he was met by hundreds of growers. I know it is not true, but rumours have been circulating that they had eggs. There were rumours that they also had a bucket of tar. Although I do not believe those rumours, I do believe that they were very keen indeed to meet the Minister.

Mr Casey: I'll bet you that they had plenty of white feathers.

Mr De LACY: That is right, feathers.

Mr Innes: The sugar Pimpernel.

Mr De LACY: That is right, yes.

The *Cairns Post* reported as follows—

> "He made the accusation in Innisfail yesterday, while addressing cane growers upset at legislation closing the Goondi mill and splitting its normal intake between the Babinda and Mourilyan mills."

That article was published by reference to a press release that stated that the Minister was in Innisfail, but the *Townsville Bulletin* conveys a different impression. I might need my glasses to read this because it is not very clear.

Mr Harper: You will need more than glasses. You will need imagination, too.

Mr De LACY: No. I will quote directly from the article. Never let it be said that I was making this up. The article states—

> "Primary Industries Minister Neville Harper deliberately threw a 'smoke screen' around his visit to North Queensland yesterday, according to Innisfail cane growers.
>
> Industry spokesman George Taifalos said 1000 people had planned a rowdy demonstration to greet Mr Harper on his arrival in Innisfail, but the Minister had intentionally withheld details of his visit and avoided landing in the town."

The Minister tells me that he actually landed in the town.

Mr Harper: What is more, I took off from Innisfail, too.

Mr De LACY: Apparently he took off, all right.

The article continues—

> "It was believed Mr Harper flew directly to Tully to open a new COD . . . depot at 4 p.m."

I do not know about that.

A little bit of history is behind this matter. A fortnight ago, on 17 March, when legislation relating to the sugar industry was rushed through the House, I saw the Minister on television. He was asked why he did not go to Innisfail, because the Federal Minister had gone there to put forward the position of the Federal Government. He responded by saying that he could not go because the matter was before the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board, a quasi-judicial body, and he would not wish to contravene the sub judice rule. It is passing strange that the sub judice rule did not stop him introducing legislation to overturn what the sugar board was doing or from pre-empting what the sugar board was doing.

On the same television program, the Minister said that he would be willing to go to Innisfail. As soon as I got back to my electorate, which is adjacent to Innisfail, I saw the trouble that was brewing and the very real, deep and abiding concern that existed in the Innisfail area about this legislation. I sent a telegram to the Minister, inviting him to come up and to talk to the Innisfail people. It was hoped that the Minister would come up to Innisfail and that he would allow growers who live in the Innisfail area to put their point of view to him.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr De LACY: As I was saying before the dinner recess, the Sugar Milling Rationalization (Far North Region) Bill, which was introduced just a fortnight ago and pushed through this House in the still of the night, is having, and will continue to have, a substantial political fall-out for the Government in the coastal areas of Queensland. I do not mean only in the Innisfail area or amongst the Goondi growers who supply the Goondi mill. I understand that many of those people are long-term members of the National Party and they are resigning their membership.

Mr Harper: You don't want to count on it.

Mr De LACY: If I were the Minister, I would not take this too lightly, because there is a reaction up and down the Queensland coastline.

Virtually every day in the past fortnight, the general manager of the Queensland Cane Growers Council, Mr Bolton, has issued a press release. In that which stated that the Minister was dodging Innisfail, the president of the council, Mr Soper, said that at "a meeting of the Queensland Cane Growers Council on Thursday" they condemned

the Government for the passing of the legislation without first consulting the industry. Mr Soper said that the Government had made such a mess of the Sugar Milling Rationalization Act that it should be repealed and renegotiated. I put it to the Minister that that is the opinion of the growers of Queensland. This is the first time——

Mr Harper: Of Mr Soper, are you saying?

Mr De LACY: That was a quotation from Mr Soper; that is right.

Mr Eaton: He knew three weeks before. They said to him, "You are going to cop the flak so you can stay on side with the department. You give us a bit of flak, too."

Mr De LACY: Sure. That may be Mr Soper's point of view; it is not his public point of view. The reason he is saying that is that he knows the point of view of the growers. The growers feel very strongly about the sanctity of the central board.

In closing, I would like to mention the information on the news tonight that CSR has made a bid for all of the shares in Pioneer Sugar that it does not currently hold—that is, the 70 per cent which it does not currently hold.

Mr Menzel: What has that got to do with it?

Mr De LACY: I will tell the honourable member. When I consider the Sugar Milling Rationalization Act as it affects the Innisfail area, I wonder why the State and Federal Governments should be involved in a rescue program wherein most of the money that they are putting up goes to CSR.

Mr Harper: Rescuing the growers.

Mr De LACY: But most of the money is going to CSR. I do not have the figures here, but something like half of the money is going to CSR for the purchase of its mill. What value does that mill have? What right does it have to sell it to people——

Mr Harper: Free enterprise.

Mr De LACY: Free enteprise—with the Government buying it, or with the Government providing the money to buy it.

Mr Harper: Where is the Government buying it?

Mr De LACY: The Government is providing the money by way of grants and loans.

Mr Harper: Haven't you read the Savage report?

Mr De LACY: Correct me if I am wrong, but the Government is providing money by way of grants and loans.

Mr Harper: Loans; they are repayable.

Mr De LACY: Repayable; but that is not free enterprise is it, if the Government is coming in and providing the money so that they can do it?

Mr Harper: What about the Commonwealth?

Mr De LACY: The Commonwealth, too. I am not saying one or the other. The chief beneficiary of the whole rationalisation program is CSR. CSR is getting out of Innisfail. It is expected that it will probably get out of Hambledon. It is concentrating its efforts in the Burdekin area. For the last six years my colleague the member for Mackay has been saying in this House that eventually CSR will locate and concentrate all of its efforts in the Burdekin basin.

Mr Casey: And the Herbert.

Mr De LACY: And the Herbert.

If CSR is to expand its production in the Burdekin area, it will need to take cane assignments from somewhere else. That fits in very nicely with the recent opening of the Burdekin Falls Dam. Most of the feasibility studies that were done on the Burdekin Falls Dam were on the basis of growing sugar-cane and rice. Nobody wants the rice any more and there is no market for sugar-cane. There is no question of expanding production, so the only way that production in the Burdekin area can be expanded is to take production from somewhere else. CSR is getting out of Innisfail. Does that mean that eventually it will take the assignments from Innisfail or the superwet belt down to the Burdekin? Does that mean that the Rocky Point mill and the mill at Caboolture will eventually lose their cane assignments?

Mr Ahern: Where is the mill in Caboolture?

Mr De LACY: I am sorry—Nambour.

I know that, because of what CSR intends to do, many of the cane-growers in Queensland are very apprehensive about their future. If ever they needed confirmation of the justification for that apprehension, they have it now.

As I said at the outset, the Labor Party opposed similar amendments to the Sugar Acquisition Act when they were proposed in 1982. In 1984 it consistently opposed the extension of the sunset clause, and it will oppose it again tonight.

Debate, on motion of Mr Powell, adjourned.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (QUEEN STREET MALL) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing) (7.37 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Local Government (Queen Street Mall) Act 1981-1983 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing) (7.38 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Honourable members will no doubt be aware that extensive works are already under way for the extension of the existing Queen Street Mall to cover the area between Albert Street and George Street and part of the area of Queen Street in front of the old Treasury Building. Because of the decision to extend the pedestrian mall into this area, it has been necessary for the Brisbane City Council to arrange a major relocation of the bus transport system operating in that area of the city. A decision has accordingly been taken to construct a tunnel under part of Queen Street and Albert Street and to create a major underground bus transport terminal in the Albert Street area. It is apparent, of course, that there are major commercial redevelopment works going on at the same time on private land in the vicinity of that area of Queen Street, and I understand that more works are planned in the area.

The provisions of this Bill provide the framework for the extension of the mall area as referred to, including the construction of the underground tunnel for the buses. Provision is also to be made for the mall to be extended in future, if considered necessary, by approval of the Governor in Council so that it will not be necessary to amend the Act each time a further extension of the mall is proposed.

In terms of the existing Local Government (Queen Street Mall) Act, a Queen Street Mall advisory committee has been constituted with representation including that from

the owners of rateable property in the vicinity of the mall. Suitable amendments are to be made to enable those property-owners affected by a mall extension to be also eligible for representation on the advisory committee.

The existing law provides for the Mayor of the city to be, ex-officio, a member of the committee referred to, and provision is also made for the ward alderman to be, ex-officio, a member of the committee. If the ward alderman is the Mayor, the vice-mayor is deemed to be a member of the committee.

These provisions were included at the time when the Mayor of the city was elected from amongst the aldermen. As this situation no longer applies, the Mayor now being elected at large, there is no necessity for the provisions in question, and they are accordingly to be deleted.

The question of compensation for those traders operating in the vicinity of the mall construction works who have had their businesses seriously affected by the carrying-out of such works is a matter of some contention.

In terms of the existing Local Government (Queen Street Mall) Act, no compensation is payable on account of injurious affection to any right or interest of a business, commercial or industrial nature by reason of the existence of the mall or anything done in the process of constructing the mall. This provision was included because of the nature of construction of the existing mall and the fact that it was considered, at that time, that it would have a minimal effect on the traders.

The current situation is, however, dramatically different to that which existed at the time of construction of the original mall. There is already clear evidence that there will be many traders whose business will, for a considerable period of time, be almost completely isolated from any sort of normal trading by works associated with the relocation of services, the construction of the bus tunnel under Queen and Albert Streets and the construction of the pedestrian mall on the surface area of Queen Street.

It is quite obvious to any person who wishes to examine the situation that what is occurring at this very moment in this section of Queen Steet, and what is to follow in the very near future, is something which this portion of the main thoroughfare in the capital city of this State has never before experienced. On this basis, there is obviously some need for special provision for those persons who are, and who will no doubt continue to be, seriously affected by this situation.

I have had discussions with the Lord Mayor on this aspect and it has been agreed that further discussions will be initiated with traders in the area with a view to settling some system of payment to assist them over their trading difficulties during the mall extension construction period. The Bill accordingly contains a provision empowering the council to make any payments it may agree to make as a result of these discussions.

If agreement cannot be reached on this matter then the Government will have to give further serious consideration to ways of providing for assistance for these traders.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Prest, adjourned.

RACING AND BETTING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing) (7.43 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Racing and Betting Act 1980-1985 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing) (7.44 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

This Bill makes a number of amendments to the Racing and Betting Act which are designed to provide improvements in the administration of racing in this State. There are also a number of machinery and consequential amendments and I do not propose to deal with each of these individually. I will, however, for the benefit of honourable members, explain the matters of major principle contained in the Bill.

Firstly, there is an amendment designed to strengthen certain provisions of the law relating to SP betting offences. The law, as it presently stands, provides for an offence of bringing into Queensland an instrument of betting in respect of any race meeting where possession of the instrument constitutes an offence under the law where the person had possession of the instrument.

The police have advised that this provision is unworkable in the case where the possession originated in New South Wales because there is no offence of possession of an instrument of betting in that State. In such circumstances it would, for example, be extremely difficult to obtain a conviction for an SP betting offence where a person is apprehended in, say, Coolangatta, for possession of betting instruments which originated in Tweed Heads. To assist in the elimination of this unsavoury aspect associated with racing, it is proposed to correct this situation.

There are within the Racing and Betting Act at the moment a number of provisions dealing with the days on which race meetings of the various codes may be held. There is also a provision which states that any form of racing is prohibited on Sunday, Good Friday or Christmas Day. It is proposed to retain this latter provision and omit the other provisions of the law, thereby giving greater flexibility in the allocation of race dates across the three codes of racing.

Whilst on this topic, it is also intended to empower the Minister, after consultation with the principal club, to allocate to a particular race club an additional race day in any one year over and above the number which has already been allocated. As honourable members would no doubt be aware, the Act presently empowers the Minister to approve the total number of race dates to be allocated to any particular club and it is considered to be only reasonable that he be also permitted to allocate an extra day where special circumstances exist.

In terms of the current Act, both the Harness Racing Board and the Greyhound Racing Control Board are constituted by seven members nominated by the Minister; three directly and four from panels submitted by the various groups within the particular code of racing. There is strong evidence that, within the administration of both boards, certain groups of clubs are placing pressure on their representatives to consider the interests of their group before the interests of the controlling board. It is therefore considered desirable to restructure the boards in an effort to avoid such a conflict of interest. It is accordingly proposed that the composition of each board be reduced from seven to four members with the members being nominated by the Minister. An amendment of this nature will also reduce the administration costs of the board particularly in relation to travelling expenses, meeting fees, etc.

Section 115 (o) of the Racing and Betting Act presently provides that any horse branded on or after August 1985 shall be branded by the method commonly referred to as freeze-branding. This provision was inserted at the time of the Fine Cotton affair when it was felt that there was a need for some clearer method of branding to be established. At that stage, action Australiawide in improving branding procedures was progressing rather slowly. The action taken in Queensland has, however, triggered action throughout Australia to the extent that the Australian Rules of Racing now provide that the keeper of the Australian Stud Book require that foals born after 1 August 1986 be

freeze-branded. In these circumstances, the provision in the Queensland law is no longer necessary.

Section 117 of the Racing and Betting Act deals with the purposes for which moneys from the Racing Development Fund may be advanced. The purposes generally relate directly to racing venues and racing facilities and there is power to advance money for a special purpose.

Section 118 of the Act, however, which provides the machinery for making application for an advance, can be interpreted as restricting the class of person who may apply for advances. It is accordingly proposed to clarify the situation so as to cover, in particular, all classes of applications for special purpose advances.

In terms of the Act as it currently stands, a book-maker may have approved a remote clerk, but he is not authorised to have more than one remote clerk at any time in respect of a racing venue. It is obvious that, if for some reason the authorised remote clerk is not available on a particular race day, then the book-maker is disadvantaged in his operations. It is accordingly proposed to amend the law to provide that a book-maker may have more than one remote clerk authorised, but only one will be permitted to operate at any one time.

One of the functions of the Totalisator Administration Board under its charter provided by the present Act is to distribute to such clubs and at such times and in such manner as are prescribed the net profit and other moneys of the board after allowing for reserves, etc. This is considered to be unduly restrictive in that it is considered there are good reasons to provide that some of the profits of the board be distributed to other sections of the racing industry and it is proposed to amend the Act accordingly.

It is the desire of the Totalisator Administration Board to introduce a system of all-up betting, but it is restricted from doing so by the terms of the present Act. An all-up bet is an accumulation type of bet where an investor can nominate selections in each race. The winnings are carried forward and reinvested in accordance with the investor's previous selection. There is evidence that there is a demand for this form of investment in Queensland, and appropriate provisions are to be included in the Act to enable the Totalisator Administration Board to implement its proposals in this area.

Finally, it is intended to include in the Act a provision empowering the making of regulations governing the conduct of barrier draws. At the moment, the manner of conducting such draws is entirely at the discretion of the race club concerned and there is no provision for any public participation. It is considered desirable that there be public participation in this very important aspect of racing activity and an appropriate regulation will be prepared in consultation with control bodies. As stated previously, I consider the amendments contained in this Bill will assist in a smoother administration of racing throughout Queensland, and I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Prest, adjourned.

SANCTUARY COVE RESORT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing) (7.51 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

> "That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act 1985-1986 in certain particulars, and that so much of the Standing Orders relating to private Bills be suspended so as to enable the said Bill to be presented and passed through all its stages as if it were a public Bill."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing) (7.52 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Honourable members will recall that when the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act was passed towards the end of 1985, there was general support for the provisions contained in that legislation. The Act was, of course, designed primarily to facilitate the development and ongoing management of a true integrated mixed land use resort which, when completed, will be a self-contained resort community of international standard.

It will also be recalled that, when the Bill was first introduced into the House, it was clearly stated that the residential zones within the site would be subdivided only in a manner permitted by the Building Units and Group Titles Act and that each stage of the development would in fact be a separate group titles plan requiring the establishment of its own body corporate.

Provision was also made for the private roads within each stage of the development to be transferred to a principal body corporate to ensure that the lands comprising such private roads are adequately maintained for the benefit of all residents.

Construction works on the site have been progressing rapidly and the group title plans subdividing parts of the residential zones are now at an advanced stage of preparation. The lots created by this subdivision are described as secondary lots and the private roads within these areas are referred to as secondary thoroughfares.

In preparing the aforementioned group title plans and the necessary documentation to establish the tier system of management bodies corporate to provide for the care and maintenance of works and services which are of benefit to the residents generally, it has become apparent that certain amendments are required to be made to the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act to ensure that development of the site proceeds in the manner in which it was originally intended. This Bill, therefore, deals with four principal amendments and also provides for a number of machinery amendments as a consequence of the principal amendments referred to.

Firstly, there is a need to clarify that the residential zones within the site may be subdivided into a maximum of 900 residential group title lots and building unit lots, notwithstanding that certain parts of such zones may be developed to a lesser density than was originally proposed. The present Act does not make this absolutely clear. There is no doubt, however, that this was the original intention and all parties involved in the project are in agreement in respect of this matter.

Secondly, there is a proposal to provide that a lot or common property shown on a group titles plan subdividing or resubdividing a secondary lot, or resubdividing a lot shown on a group titles plan as secondary thoroughfare, may be transferred to the principal body corporate and developed by the company as a secondary thoroughfare.

While this amendment will enable the company to adopt a more flexible approach in the creation and subsequent development of secondary thoroughfares within the residential zones, it does, however, create more difficulties for the Registrar of Titles in registering the plans of subdivision. For this reason these procedures will not be encouraged in future developments of this type. It has become necessary to amend the legislation in this way in respect of Sanctuary Cove because the company, in preparing the necessary plans for the staged subdivision of the residential zones, incorrectly interpreted the relevant provisions of the Act.

The third amendment relates to the application of the primary thoroughfare by-laws made by the primary thoroughfare body corporate and the secondary thoroughfare and development control by-laws made by the principal body corporate. At present, there is some doubt as to whether or not the provisions of those by-laws apply to individual owners of lots within the residential zones of the site. This was, of course, the original intention, and the amendment proposed clarifies that this is the case.

Finally, an amendment is proposed which will enable the principal body corporate to make by-laws for the control, management, administration, use or enjoyment of land and lots within the residential zones. The type of by-laws proposed to be made will be similar to those which can be made by a body corporate under the Building Units and Group Titles Act. This is considered desirable, as the principal body corporate is representative of all bodies corporate within the residential zones and is intended to take on a managerial role in relation to this part of the overall development.

I consider that the amendments proposed will lead to a more efficient development of the site and will more adequately cater for the ongoing maintenance of the development once established.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Shaw, adjourned.

INTEGRATED RESORT DEVELOPMENT BILL

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing) (7.57 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to provide for the approval of schemes of integrated resort development, to make provision to assist in the establishment, operation and management of approved integrated resort developments and for other purposes."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing) (7.58 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

It is with considerable pleasure and satisfaction that I introduce the Integrated Resort Development Bill to this Parliament. Honourable members will recall that, when introducing the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act in 1985, I foreshadowed that further legislation similar in concept to that Act would be required to allow other true destination resort complexes to lawfully establish.

It will also be recalled that at that time I stated that the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act was the first of its type not only in Queensland but also in Australia. I believe that there is still no similar legislation elsewhere in Australia, but it is known that both New South Wales and New Zealand are at present considering introducing similar legislation to adequately accommodate and deal with proposals before them to establish major resort developments of this type in their own areas.

There can be no doubt that in all of these areas a substantial demand exists within the tourism industry for true, fully serviced and self-contained destination resorts to be established, and that considerable economic and social benefits will flow from these developments. These benefits are not limited to the construction phase of such projects, but extend into continued high levels of employment for the ongoing servicing, maintenance and management of such facilities when they are operating.

Because positive career paths in the tourism industry will be established locally, the desire of many young people to leave our provincial cities in order to find jobs with a future will, I believe, diminish as a direct result of the establishment of these complexes.

If there are any doubts amongst honourable members about the demand for development of the type envisaged by this Bill, I would emphasise that, at this time, a conservative estimate of the value of projects either under construction or awaiting the

passing of this Bill is set at approximately $1.2 billion. This figure does not include the Sanctuary Cove development or the mooted major development on Noosa north shore.

The provisions contained in the Bill are conceptually derived from existing overseas condominium resort legislation but they are, in my view, more appropriate to Queensland's form of land tenure. They certainly provide a superior and more sensitive approach to the ongoing operation and maintenance of developments of this type than the provisions contained in the overseas models.

The Bill facilitates the establishment, development, and ongoing management of what can only be described as a new generation of complete resort destinations in the true sense. The Bill recognises that, of necessity, these resorts will contain a number of different but complementary land uses which collectively provide all of the facilities and services desired by the tourist. Recognition is also given to the need to maintain security and privacy in order to achieve this. Such developments include private roads and a mix of land tenure types within the total site of development.

The Bill establishes a management structure which is designed to ensure that all parties having an interest in any part of the site have their rights adequately protected and their obligations clearly defined.

This management structure is similar to that which is contained in the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act, and I will elaborate on this at a later stage.

Honourable members will recall that, when I introduced the Sanctuary Cove Resort Bill to this House, I indicated that I believed that legislation of this type needed to be site-specific in each instance so that the variables contained within each project could be adequately addressed.

Since that time a considerable number of proposals have been submitted to me for consideration.

After having regard to the details contained in those proposals which I considered could be held to be true destination resort developments, I am now satisfied that separate legislation for each proposal is not necessary.

The Bill, as drafted, therefore provides generally for an application to be made to the Government for a scheme of resort development to be considered by the Governor in Council.

Upon the granting of approval by the Governor in Council, the provisions of the Bill and those matters and things contained in the approved scheme will apply to the land which is the subject of the approval.

Because the zoning of land under a town-planning scheme in force in any local authority area in Queensland is not an appropriate mechanism to use within resort developments of the type envisaged, the Bill provides that the operation of a town-planning scheme ceases to apply to land which is the subject of an approval under the Bill. I would, however, draw attention to those provisions of the Bill which require that a land-use scheme similar to that provided for in the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act form part of an approved scheme of resort development.

In terms of the Bill, the local authority for the area is charged with the administration of this scheme.

I can assure honourable members that close liaison will occur with the local authorities in relation to the form and content of land-use schemes prepared as part of a scheme of resort development prior to any such scheme being submitted for consideration by the Governor in Council. It will also be apparent that a proposed scheme of resort development will very likely affect the interests of many Government departments, and in this respect it has been determined that all departments which may be affected by a particular proposal will be fully consulted in relation to that proposal.

The Bill requires that the approval of the relevant local authority be obtained in relation to matters which are normally the responsibility of a local authority, such as

the setting of road construction standards, the subdivision of land and the granting of building approvals. In addition, all lands within the site, including residential lots created pursuant to the Building Units and Group Titles Act, will be rateable lands, which is an important feature of this type of legislation.

The Bill also provides for an approval granted by the Governor in Council to be revoked prior to the registration of a plan of subdivision. Once a plan has been registered in the office of the Registrar of Titles, special legislative action will be necessary to revoke the approval so that the rights of lot-owners within the site are adequately protected. I should state, however, that I am confident that the matter of revocation will not arise in relation to developments of this nature because approval of projects under the provisions of the Bill will only be recommended after the suitability and capability of applicants to perform have been carefully assessed.

The Bill provides that its provisions only apply to lands which are held in freehold title or lands which are intended to be freeholded at the time of registration of a plan of survey. This is an obvious prerequisite, if regard is had to the types of subdivision proposed, and I wish it to be clearly understood that the provisions contained in the Bill may be applied to any freehold land whether it is proposed to be used for an inland rural resort, a coastal resort or a resort on an offshore island. I might add that all of the resort development proposals presently under consideration relate to mainland coastal areas.

I turn now, briefly, to the overall structure of the Bill. I should point out, firstly, that, in essence, the Bill provides a new code for the subdivision of land which recognises a mix of different forms of freehold title, including group titles and building unit titles, together with a management structure which properly provides for the ongoing maintenance of a private road system and other common areas for the benefit of all who reside within the development.

As a first step, the Bill requires that the site be subdivided into initial lots which approximate the boundaries of the land-use precincts in an approved scheme or resort development, which will include the creation of one or more primary thoroughfare precincts. These primary thoroughfares are the main accessways to all lots proposed to be created by the plan of survey, and upon registration of this plan the land comprising the primary thoroughfares is transferred automatically to a primary thoroughfare body corporate, which is charged with responsibility in perpetuity for maintaining these accessways to the initial lots.

Representation on the primary thoroughfare body corporate is to be determined by the approved scheme but will always include each lot-owner or his representative, either personally or by way of the principal body corporate or a nominee of that body corporate. The voting entitlement and obligation of the owner of each non-residential lot is to be as determined by the approved scheme. In respect of residential lots, the base entitlement will be one unit for each residential lot to be finally created.

The Bill provides for the residential precincts to be subdivided into secondary lots which, amongst other things, are to provide for the creation of lots which are to be designated as secondary thoroughfares. When a plan creating secondary lots is registered, the lots designated as being secondary thoroughfares are transferred immediately to a principal body corporate which is automatically established upon the registration of the first plan of survey which creates a secondary lot. The main purpose of the principal body corporate is to own and maintain all secondary thoroughfares in perpetuity for the ongoing benefit of all residential unit-holders only, irrespective of whether such units are registered on a building units plan or a group titles plan. In terms of the Bill, all residential units have to be established on lots created by a building units plan, a group titles plan, or both.

Each unit-owner will be represented on the principal body corporate by a representative of the body corporate which was created by the registration of the plan of survey which established his lot under the provisions of the Building Units and Group Titles Act. Voting entitlements and liabilities are to be assessed as being one unit per residential

lot created. Both the primary thoroughfare body corporate and the principal body corporate may establish executive committees to conduct the day-to-day administration of their affairs.

The Bill also provides authority for each of the bodies corporate to make by-laws to control activities for which they are particularly responsible. To protect the interests of individual residential lot-owners, the principal body corporate is also authorised to have development control by-laws which may limit the height or bulk of a particular residential building on a lot and also regulate the texture or finish materials of a particular building so as to prevent the creation of nuisance for others.

Provision is also made for thoroughfares to be deemed to be roads, notwithstanding that they are privately owned, and for the establishment of service easements for the benefit of occupants of the site. The normal authority of officers of statutory agencies, including members of the police force, is preserved.

As I indicated at the outset, this Bill represents pioneer legislation which effectively is a new code of subdivision for the development of integrated resorts. I believe it is the forerunner to a new era in development which will bring substantial benefits to Queensland.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Shaw, adjourned.

SUGAR ACQUISITION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Remaining Stages; Allocation of Time-limit Order

Hon. L. W. POWELL (Isis—Leader of the House) (8.10 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That so much of the Standing Orders and Sessional Orders be suspended as would enable the Sugar Acquisition Act Amendment Bill passing through all its remaining stages by 10 p.m. this day;

If the debate on any stage of the Bill be not concluded by the time so specified, Mr Speaker or the Chairman, as the case may be, shall forthwith put the remaining questions on the Bill without any further amendment or debate."

Question put; and the House divided—

AYES, 44	
Ahern	Lane
Austin	Lester
Berghofer	McCauley
Bjelke-Petersen	McKechnie
Borbidge	McPhie
Burreket	Menzel
Chapman	Muntz
Cooper	Neal
Elliott	Nelson
Fraser	Newton
Gately	Powell
Gibbs, I. J.	Randell
Gilmore	Row
Gunn	Sherrin
Harper	Simpson
Harvey	Slack
Henderson	Stephan
Hinton	Stoneman
Hinze	Tenni
Hobbs	
Hynd	*Tellers:*
Jennings	Littleproud
Katter	FitzGerald

NOES, 38	
Ardill	Prest
Beanland	Schuntner
Beard	Scott
Braddy	Shaw
Burns	Sherlock
Campbell	Smith
Casey	Smyth
Comben	Underwood
D'Arcy	Vaughan
De Lacy	Warburton
Eaton	Warner
Gibbs, R. J.	Wells
Goss	Yewdale
Hamill	
Hayward	
Innes	
Knox	
Lee	
Lickiss	
McElligott	
McLean	*Tellers:*
Milliner	Davis
Palaszczuk	Gygar

Resolved in the affirmative.

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah—Leader of the Liberal Party) (8.18 p.m.): This is about the fourth occasion in the last three years on which the Government has not been prepared to debate the sugar industry in this House. Members who represent sugar electorates have been absent all day. Honourable members allowed 35 minutes to be set aside so that the Minister for Local Government could introduce some Bills. That could have been done later this evening. That took up time that could have been used to debate this Bill. The number of members who wish to speak to the Bill is quite limited. The Bill would have passed through the House quite comfortably in 2½ hours. The Government deliberately filibustered and then gagged the debate because not one Government member is prepared to debate the sugar industry.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Alison): Order! The House will come to order.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: This is the fourth occasion on which the Government has failed to debate the sugar industry in general terms in this House. There is no reason why it should be ashamed to debate the sugar industry; it is being debated up and down the coast in every city and town, yet this Parliament is not allowed to debate what is a very simple Bill that extends the sunset clause provisions.

Mr Wells interjected.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Sugar was first grown in the Nundah electorate and it had the very first sugar-mill, so I know all about sugar.

This Bill, as simple as it might be, has of course great ramifications. The extension of the sunset clause allows the opportunity for the industry to talk with the Minister and to bring about the rationalisation which everyone is expecting. It has been delayed almost two years simply because of political posturing by two Governments. Nevertheless, the sugar industry leaders have worked very, very hard in that period to get unified voices from the various parts of the industry in order to be able to talk to the Government with one voice.

Mr Davis interjected.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Sugarmill Road, yes. Honourable members know all about it.

The sugar industry leaders have made great sacrifices to reach the compromises that are necessary in order to talk to the Federal and State Governments with one voice. Unfortunately, some of the politicians in this Chamber have not been able to accommodate the collective views of the leaders of the sugar industry because of their own particular parochial interests.

Mr Jennings: Name them.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The honourable member for Mulgrave, Mr Menzel, who is the $8m man, is one of those who have benefited from recent legislation—and good luck to him. He has led a long fight. Even though the rest of the industry will be sent to the wall and all sorts of difficulties will be created, the member for Mulgrave has had a dream run. However, a couple of years ago he was sent to Coventry. Nobody would eat with him; nobody would sleep with him; and nobody would be seen in the House with him.

Mr JENNINGS: I rise to a point of order.

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

Mr JENNINGS: I rise to a point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will state his point of order.

Mr JENNINGS: The member for Nundah has just said that no-one would eat with the member for Nundah—Mulgrave. I would eat with the member for Nundah.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The Chamber will come to order.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The honourable member for what's-its-name could not even remember the name of his own street when he first became a member of this Parliament.

The only person who can stand up tonight with some degree of pride is the honourable member for Babinda. All the others have gone into their funk-holes.

The 100-day committee, which was established and supported by the industry and the Federal and State Governments, did produce a document and recomendations, which have been largely accommodated by the industry.

The Governments should listen more closely to the leaders of the industry because they have sorted out some very difficult political problems, even though members on the Government side have not. It is vital that the industry leaders be able to be heard and to resolve the problems within the remaining three years.

At the height of the controversy I pointed out to the public at large that the Sugar Board acquired all the sugar of both New South Wales and Queensland. At the time the Premier said, "Oh, nothing of the sort. It is not a socialised industry." I will read from page 214 of the Auditor-General's report on the accounts of statutory bodies for the financial year ended 30 June 1986. It states—

> "The Commonwealth and Queensland Governments control and regulate the Australian sugar industry in terms of the Sugar Agreement 1984."

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Yeronga will kindly resume his seat.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The report continues—

> "The Queensland Government, by Proclamation issued under authority of the *Sugar Acquisition Act 1915-1985* acquires all sugar and cane invert manufactured from sugar-cane grown in Queensland and, by agreement with the millowner, purchases all raw sugar manufactured from sugar-cane grown in New South Wales."

In fact, the Queensland Government is the owner of every grain of sugar that is produced in Queensland and New South Wales. It is a very highly organised industry that is financed by the Queensland Government. In past years I have been involved in some of those negotiations.

I will quote from the report some of the items for which finance is provided by the Queensland Government. Last year the Queensland Government interest subsidy was $7m and the Queensland Government's payment of interest subsidy to the growers was the same amount, $7m. The Queensland Government Development Authority loans currently stand at $26.5m.

Mr Simpson: You are opposed to it?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: No, I am not. I am pointing out the arrangements that were made. The Premier denied that the Queensland Government owned every grain of sugar in this State and New South Wales.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber and in the gallery. I ask the gallery also to come to order. There must be absolute silence.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The purpose of this legislation is to allow enough time to complete the negotiations necessary to bring about the rationalisation of the industry. This is a very difficult process and I understand the predicament that a number of members of Parliament who represent the sugar areas find themselves in because of parochial interests that are contrary to the collective view of the leaders of the industry. Even so, the matter has to be resolved. The growers in this State have agreed that there should be a measure of deregulation and have announced very clearly that they will accept further deregulation as long as it can be proved and demonstrated to them that it will be to the advantage of their position in the industry. That is a very reasonable position for the growers to assume. Yet, in the dead of night, a very capricious decision was made in this House to overrule growers in certain areas of the State who had other wishes and who would not be accommodated.

One hopes that, as a result of the extension of time brought about by the extension of the sunset clause in this legislation the leaders of the industry will be listened to, their very sensible recommendations will be accommodated by both Governments and the people who have worked so hard in this industry during the last three years will be rewarded for their efforts. That is a sacrifice that they are prepared to make in order to reduce the number of farms, have a measure of deregulation and a prosperous industry which will be alive and well in this State for another 100 or 200 years. This is a very critical time in the history of the industry, and it is important that this legislation be sound and capable of being supported by the industry.

It is true that some people will have difficulties, and this has been recognised and admitted by the sugar industry. Both the Federal and State Governments have indicated very clearly that compensation and assistance will be provided during this difficult period. One takes heart from the fact that the price of sugar has risen on the world market, which will make the situation less difficult than it otherwise would have been. It is still a very difficult period and people are very apprehensive. Understandably, there is a loss of confidence and some degree of concern about their security and welfare.

The role of Parliament and the Government is to resolve these problems, and, to the credit of the Minister, he is attempting to do that and is doing it extremely well with a few difficulties here and there. Whilst he may be criticised for rushing the legislation through the House, nevertheless he is listening to the leaders of the industry and taking on board their views. This House is the place where ultimately the decisions are made. They are not made in secret or by Government edict. This industry is controlled by legislation which is produced in this Parliament.

The members of this Assembly, whether or not they represent sugar industry areas, are entitled to speak on behalf of their constituents to ensure that the legislation is sound and that it is in the best and long-term interests of the sugar industry of this State. My colleagues and I have no doubt that the sugar industry will continue to be a viable and strong industry in this State. I hope that this legislation will allow negotiations to proceed as quickly as possible to resolve the difficulties faced by the industry and that the legislation that will come to this House ultimately will in the long term guarantee the support and security of that industry.

Mr MENZEL (Mulgrave) (8.31 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to support the Minister and the legislation. The previous speaker paid some compliments to the Minister for Primary Industries, the Honourable Neville Harper. That was probably the best part of his speech. There is no doubt that in the short time that Neville Harper has been the Minister for Primary Industries, he has done what is right. The legislation has the support of the Queensland Cane Growers Council. The member for Cairns may have mentioned that briefly.

Although the sunset clause has been extended a number of times by legislation passed in this Chamber, it is true that when the legislation was first introduced I was not happy with it. Many things have happened since then. One concern expressed at the time the legislation was introduced was over the huge amount of money that was coming out of the No. 1 pool of sugar to shandy up, for want of a better word, ships

containing export sugar that were going into different ports. That cost a considerable amount of money. The cane-growers whom I represent were unhappy that they were subsidising research into floc. At the time, "floc" was a dirty word. That problem has been overcome.

Mr Jennings: If you're happy about it now, we're happy about it. You know all about the sugar industry, right?

Mr MENZEL: I will get back to that. I have probably forgotten a lot more than what some members who represent Brisbane electorates know about it. However, I will not be too tough on them.

When the Government first introduced the legislation, the Queensland Cane Growers Council and others in the sugar industry were divided. I believe that the sunset clause helped to overcome the problem that existed. It demonstrated to that section of the sugar industry that they had to get their house in order and that they did not have an open cheque book. Strong opposition was expressed from some quarters. I was one person who expressed a great deal of opposition at the time. I believe that the Government took on board those comments by introducing a sunset clause. The floc problem has now been overcome. It has also overcome the problem of financing. The Mackay mills are looking after their own problems, by and large. That is the way the industry wanted it in the first place.

The Minister in his second-reading speech stated—

> "Sections 4 and 4B of the Act empower the Sugar Board to conduct research . . ."

I have covered that matter. The Minister's speech further states—

> " . . . to make interim payments to mills and bonus payments to growers and to enter into agreement that will facilitate the disposal of sugar."

A previous speaker said that new legislation was introduced a few years ago. It is true that it was. For many years an established practice was taking place without any legal basis for it. It is extremely important that I say that. The Minister also will probably refer to that later. However, it is extremely important to put the record straight. A number of members have already spoken. I do not think that I heard one speaker who really knew what he was speaking about.

Mr Casey: I have not spoken yet.

Mr MENZEL: I think that the honourable member probably knows a fair bit more than the members who spoke before I began my speech.

The Leader of the Liberal Party can be pitied, because he was a little out of his depth. He did mention——

Mr Eaton: See what your little mate will tell us about the Federal Government.

Mr MENZEL: At least he wins the prize for representing the first electorate in which sugar was grown.

The honourable member went on to talk about the fact that the leaders within the sugar industry have been working towards its deregulation. That is true. However, I believe that there would be no industry more divided than the sugar industry. It has even more factions than the Labor Party.

Mr Randell: The Labor Party is completely divided.

Mr MENZEL: I said that there were more factions in the sugar industry than there are within the Labor Party; and there are quite a few.

The sugar industry has never reached agreement on deregulation. It is more divided than ever. After 12 months' discussion about rationalisation in the Innisfail and Mackay areas, no real agreement, as proposed by the Sugar Milling Adjustment Committee, has been reached.

Following comments that were made by a judge at a recent hearing in Innisfail, I believe that the Government had no choice but to act.

Mr De Lacy: Tell us what would happen if this legislation did not go through—if the sunset clause took effect.

Mr MENZEL: I ask the honourable member to let me finish speaking about the honourable member for Nundah. I wrote down a couple of the points that he made, but I am unable to find them. He mentioned my name, and there was a bit of confusion about the honourable member for Mulgrave or Babinda or whatever.

Mr Casey: He said that nobody was going to eat with you and nobody was going to sleep with you.

Mr MENZEL: The honourable member for Southport said that he always ate with me. I believe that almost anyone is prepared to eat with me. I do not believe that I am starving. If anything, I am probably trying to lose weight all the time. As far as the other part of the remark is concerned, I believe that I am a happily married man, and I will leave it at that. I do not believe that that has much to do with sugar, anyway.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The Chair insists upon some relevance in this debate.

Mr MENZEL: I could not agree with you more, Mr Deputy Speaker.

As I said earlier, the Cane Growers Council has approved of the legislation. It seems hypocritical that, only a week ago, the Opposition was saying, "We must oppose the legislation because the cane-growers would not be happy with it." Now, when the Cane Growers Council is happy with the legislation, the Opposition still opposes it.

Mr Campbell: They were not happy with it in 1982 and in 1984. Do you remember what they said then? You have been bought off for $8m.

Mr MENZEL: Mr Deputy Speaker, I ask that that comment be withdrawn. It is totally incorrect and irresponsible, and I take offence to it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not think that the remark was entirely in order. I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr CAMPBELL: I will withdraw the remark that the honourable member was bought off for $8m.

Mr MENZEL: That was just one of those ridiculous remarks. However, for the record, I regarded its withdrawal as very important.

Much was said recently about the Sugar Milling Rationalization (Far Northern Region) Bill. In my opinion, that Bill has nothing whatsoever to do with this legislation. I cannot see the relevance of it, but I believe that I have a right to reply to the comments that were made about it.

It was suggested that the Minister was afraid to address any Innisfail cane-growers. I have not been too scared to speak up. I have appeared on Channel 10 in north Queensland. The day after that appearance, last Saturday, I received many telephone calls of congratulations. Those callers said that it was about time somebody told the truth. The truth is that the growers from the Goondi area who will send their cane to the Mourilyan and Babinda mills, together with the existing growers, will probably receive the best deal of any growers in the sugar industry. No other mill besides the Babinda and Mourilyan mills have agreed to cutting the mill average c.c.s. off after 22 weeks and subsidising any deficiency or lowering of the mill average c.c.s.

The people in the Labor Party are being hypocritical in trying to get cheap politicial mileage——

Mr Eaton: How long are you going to do it for?

Mr MENZEL: An award lasts for one year; but once it is in the award, it is very hard to take out. That is an agreement that will probably last for five years. The honourable member for Mourilyan should remember that often the Goondi growers and the CSR mill at Goondi were crushing up till Christmas or longer. They had more than a 22-week season.

Honourable members should not be hypocritical about the facts. The growers will be far better off because they will have a shorter season with continuous crushing.

Mr Eaton: All it is going to do is suck them in, that's all.

Mr MENZEL: The fact is that they have got it and they will have money in their pockets as a result of it. They will be better off than if they remained at Goondi. If they remained under the control of CSR and Goondi remained open, they would have a longer season than 22 weeks. Just about every mill in north Queensland has shut down, except Hambledon and Goondi mills, which drag on till Christmas.

The suggestion that the season will be longer is nonsense. If the season is longer, the growers will have the guarantee of a subsidised mill average c.c.s.

It is a most ridiculous and untrue statement by so-called responsible people who wasted rate-payers' and tax-payers' money flying to Brisbane and Canberra last week to see Mr Kerin. They only wanted a free trip to Canberra. They knew that they could not change anything.

Mr Eaton: Who?

Mr MENZEL: Councillor Schue, Councillor Lacaze and all the ALP council. It is an absolute disgrace.

Mr Eaton: Who is down talking to Kerin today?

Mr MENZEL: That is a bigger disgrace. They know full well what is going on.

Mr Eaton: Babinda is down there today.

Mr MENZEL: Yes, but on a purely business basis. They are not trying to knock anything. They were ordered down to see Mr Kerin.

Mr Eaton: They were down on business last week.

Mr MENZEL: They only went down for self-interest on a propaganda stunt to waste tax-payers' and rate-payers' money. They knew that they could not change anything. They just wanted a trip to Canberra. I might add that I have never been to Canberra in my life. I have never had the opportunity of receiving a free trip. I do not intend to waste tax-payers' money by making a trip to Canberra. That is a disgrace.

Mr Randell interjected.

Mr MENZEL: As far as I know, he has issued a press release today which says, in effect, that he supports what has taken place. At least Mr Kerin is taking a responsible attitude on the matter and not listening to the Labor rabble in Innisfail. I have been told that Councillor Lacaze is chairman of the local Innisfail ALP.

Mr Eaton: He does a good job, too. He knows the sugar industry.

Mr MENZEL: All that he knows is to tell a few damned lies. It is about time that he told the truth.

Mr Eaton: He tells the truth. He didn't go down to Canberra.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The honourable member for Mulgrave had better withdraw those words.

Mr MENZEL: I will withdraw the "lie" part of it and say "a few untruths". I am sorry about that.

Suggestions have been made that the legislation was to help Max Menzel. How ridiculous can that be! The legislation was for the good of north Queensland and for the overall good of the sugar industry. It had nothing to do with the parochialism that is involved in much of the squabbling that is going on. It was for the overall good. As far as opinions are concerned, last week-end I heard one brilliant Liberal Party member suggest that the legislation was passed to save my seat. A few months ago, I won my seat and won it well, with an increased majority in Babinda and other Labor areas. It is ridiculous to suggest that I needed anything in order to win my seat. No legislation had been passed at that stage, and no suggestion had been made that there would be. At that stage, the Government had backed right away from doing anything.

Mr Casey: Swept under the carpet.

Mr MENZEL: There was no carpet around. I had to live with that. I had to live also with the uncertainty of whether or not Babinda would get any Goondi cane because the matter had to go to the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board, which had already rejected it.

It is utterly ridiculous to suggest that I needed that legislation. I might add that in practical terms, the Babinda mill will probably employ from about 32 to 35 sugar-mill employees from Goondi mill.

Mr Palaszczuk: Big deal!

Mr MENZEL: What I am saying is that, on balance, most mill employees vote Labor. In theory at least, the political implications of sending more cane to Babinda should be that I lose votes to the Labor Party—although I think the Babinda people might have seen the light from the Innisfail ALP.

Mr Palaszczuk: You will, too.

Mr MENZEL: No. I gained votes last time. The mill workers voted for me at the last election because they had faith in me and they had faith in the Premier. They knew that the Premier would help them, and they had faith in him. They will see to it that he ends up in Canberra, too.

Mr Casey: What about talking about the Sugar Acquisition Act?

Mr MENZEL: I reckon I have spoken more about the Sugar Acquisition Act than Labor's spokesman.

Mr De Lacy: That is not true. I did speak about it. I have not heard you speaking about it.

Mr MENZEL: It is about time the honourable member woke up. I thought that the honourable member was asleep.

The other point I must speak about regarding the amendment to the Sugar Acquisition Act is the importance of the legislation in the payment of bonuses and interim payments. Although it has been said that it is not important, I say this: if mills were not allowed to have interim payments made legally, somebody could challenge the practice and the growers could miss out. In that event, mills would not be obliged to make interim payments and carry-on finance would not be available during the season when money is needed most. Suggestions made by other people that this legislation is unnecessary are ridiculous and totally uninformed.

I have no hesitation in supporting the Bill.

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (8.48 p.m.): On the face of it, the legislation that is before the House this evening is supposedly a simple Bill that will merely extend amendments made to the Sugar Acquisition Act for a further three years by virtue of the sunset clause. Although the legislation does appear to be very minor, it is a further example of the way in which in this State this National Party Government has created a take-over of the sugar industry—our greatest primary industry.

The Government is continuing to dominate, dictate and rule the sugar industry. Since 1915, under the provisions of the original Sugar Acquisition Act, the sugar industry has enjoyed the greatest treasure of any primary industry in this nation, because, by virtue of its own structure set up by Government legislation, it has been able to control completely its own industry activity. It has done so in a very good manner, and it is a model for all other primary industries in this nation.

As I have said so often before in this House, it is a pity that a number of other organisations engaged in primary industry did not follow the example of the sugar industry and set up an industry structure under legislation similar to the Sugar Acquisition Act.

The Sugar Acquisition Act has stood the test of time from 1915 through till 1982 when amendments were introduced by the former Minister for Primary Industries, Mr Ahern. At that time, some amendments to that Act were a bit shady and a bit dodgy. Naturally, the industry reacted. On the very point of time-limits, which is the subject of the amendment presently before the House, one of the great conditions imposed by the sugar industry was set out in 1982. The industry said, "We want a sunset clause providing a time by which this will be completed." The Minister sought a few more years and the industry said no.

After all the protests from the growers, the then Minister for Primary Industries gave a guarantee that he would have a full investigation into the sugar industry and its legislation and would bring a comprehensive package back into this House to amend the entire sugar industry legislation, to modernise it and bring it up to date. In 1982, in this House that promise was made by the then Minister for Primary Industries, Mr Ahern.

Mr Eaton: His Government backed him up on that, and that was the biggest mistake they ever made.

Mr CASEY: The Government backed him up every inch of the way and the industry was fooled by him. I say quite frankly here tonight that people within the industry placed their own party politics before their sugar industry politics and went along with that situation on a promise and an undertaking from the Minister that, by 1984, after full consultation with every section of the industry, he would have that major package put into place. History shows and records that that did not happen. It did not happen because of the way in which he set about to try to do it.

So, in 1984, an amendment came before the House to extend the period to 1987. Now, in 1987, the sun is setting in the west and this legislation seeks to extend the period to 1990. That is an auspicious year for the sugar industry because, unless certain things start taking place very quickly in this industry, 1990 could see the sunset of the sugar industry itself. That will happen if the industry is not careful and if it continues to be dominated by the Government in the way in which it has been dominating the industry.

What has been the history since that promise was made by the then Minister for Primary Industries, Mr Ahern? Sure, as the member for Mulgrave said, the Minister started putting the industry organisations together in a loose-knit way, but they could not agree. They fought, they battled and they came out and publicly criticised one another. But why? Queensland finished up with four industry organisations. Only two organisations were supposed to be involved with the sugar industry—the cane-growers and the millers. Then the millers split and they finished up with proprietary millers as well as ASPA representatives, with millers' and growers' representatives meeting together. Further events occurred and the industry finished up with the co-operative millers.

As you would well know, Mr Deputy Speaker, although CSR dominates the industry, the growers are the most important part of the industry. That is typified by the sugar industry legislation itself. It virtually allocates a payment of the proceeds of the industry of two-thirds to cane-growers and only one-third to millers. Because of that determination of cane payments, the growers' interest in the industry is twice that of the miller's. But,

really, there are three miller organisations to one cane-growers' organisation. That is the first way in which this Government badly let down the cane-growers of Queensland, who are the very basis of the sugar industry. The Government disallowed them a proper voice and a voice on those councils equal to their proportionate investment within the industry. What happened from there on? An impasse was reached. The industry was in dire straits. To use a good Australian colloquialism, the backside was falling out of its pants.

The Federal Government was asked to come to the rescue, and it did. Anybody in this House who denies that the Hawke Labor Government made available one of the greatest rescue packages that any primary industry anywhere in Queensland—indeed, possibly anywhere in Australia—has ever seen, is just kidding himself. The Minister may laugh. He has been involved in the beef industry almost all of his life. What support did he get from Fraser and company in the 1970s for the beef industry, compared with the money that the Hawke Government has offered the Queensland sugar industry? As the old Australian saying goes—three-fifths of five-eighths of you know what. That is what the industry in which the Minister has been involved got from the Fraser/Anthony Government, the very coalition that the National Party is now talking about wanting to break away from. By comparison with what the Hawke Government has been prepared to do for the sugar industry, the beef industry got absolutely nothing.

The Hawke Government did one very sensible and sound thing in this regard. Because of the shenanigans that had been going on with the inquiries, it put together a package, appointed a 100-day committee and told the Queensland Government that it could appoint the chairman and have two representatives. The industry was granted two representatives and the Federal Government had its two representatives. The Savage committee very, very quickly investigated the industry and in those 100 days it reported back to both Governments and put together a package. That brought on bitter political in-fighting because the Queensland Government was determined to save its own hide over its failure to react to what the industry needed and required.

Nonetheless, the agreements staggered on, even though the then Minister for Primary Industries, Mr Turner, was not only handcuffed but also hobbled like an old pony out in the bush. In his negotiations on the deal he was completely hobbled by the Premier. He finished up working in a way that allowed the Federal Government to put into place rationalisation programs in certain areas within the industry. The Federal Government put its money where its mouth was.

What has happened since then, particularly with the rationalisation proposals, is history. Part of the deal was that the Queensland Government was to be always responsible for the legislation—I will come back to that shortly—but the only legislation that it has introduced to date dealt with the take-over of the Goondi mill. It could not be called anything other than a take-over. The only big winner from that was CSR. I know that the Babinda mill will make every effort to struggle its way out, but it is not out of the woods yet. I think the member for Mulgrave appreciates that. The Babinda mill has the battle ahead of it. It is holding the cart with both hands and pushing it uphill. Following upon the way in which the rationalisation has been undertaken, it has to contend with dissatisfaction amongst all the growers in the Innisfail area.

Now the sugar industry is faced with a further breach of promise by the Bjelke-Petersen Government. Somebody has suggested that, because the Queensland Cane Growers Council has accepted this, the House should accept it. I will reiterate the words that I spoke in this House on 27 October 1982. A few years later, the former Minister for Primary Industries, Mr Turner, quoted the words in reply to a question from the member for Mourilyan, Mr Eaton. At that time I said—

> "As I said, every member of the Australian Labor Party will keep the Minister honest in relation to the promises he has made today."

We will keep this Minister honest in relation to the promises he has made today, too. If, at the end of this three-year sunset period, those commitments have not been fulfilled,

we will continue to remind the cane-growers of this State who it was who sold them down the drain. That is what the Government is doing to them again.

Mr Menzel: What rot!

Mr CASEY: In reply to that interjection, I will have a look at some of the things said by the member for Mulgrave back in 1982. When speaking about the amendments to the Sugar Acquisition Act, he said that he could not support them and that they were wrong. He followed his principles; he walked out when the vote was taken. He claimed that many members of the Queensland Cane Growers Council were railroaded and that they had no choice but to water down the terrible sections of the Bill. That is the sort of thing that the member for Mulgrave said back in 1982. What is his position tonight? He is giving complete support to the legislation. I cannot see what part of the legislation has been changed to allow the member for Mulgrave, Mr Menzel, to change his mind as much as he has changed it. I cannot see what has changed in the activities of the sugar industry to force him to change his mind except that, as the honourable member for Bundaberg suggests, $8m has been made available to the mills in the Mulgrave electorate.

As I said earlier, no primary industry in this State or in Australia has ever received better Federal Government support than that received by the sugar industry from the Hawke Labor Government through John Kerin.

There has been an endeavour to suggest that Mr Kerin is 100 per cent behind what this Minister has been doing in recent weeks in regard to the sugar industry. In a press release on 19 March, Mr Kerin stated—

> "Sugar industry legislation . . . is entirely a Queensland prerogative."

The press release further states that in all discussions on rationalisation it was always subject to the provisos of industry agreement and satisfactory arrangements in the implementation phase, particularly for growers and workers. That is Mr Kerin's attitude. I have quoted from his press release.

I will outline some other reactions to what is happening in the sugar industry. The Queensland Cane Growers Council reacted strongly to "last night's blitzkreig solution", as it was called, to the sugar industry's restructure——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! With all due respect to his knowledge of the sugar industry, I remind the honourable member for Mackay that he is really talking about a Bill that was passed the week before last. The honourable member should concentrate on the amendment before the House at the moment, if he does not mind.

Mr CASEY: I thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I did not hear you make the same suggestion to the honourable member for Mulgrave. However, I point out to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that I am referring generally to sugar industry legislation.

There are two real pieces of legislation that completely control the sugar industry and which go hand in hand. I refer to the Sugar Acquisition Act and the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act. Those two pieces of legislation go hand in hand; they are complementary. No-one would know that better than you, Mr Deputy Speaker, as a cane-grower in this State.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I can make the point about repetition, of course. Everyone does not have to speak on the same subject.

Mr CASEY: Last week I was gagged, I have been gagged before that and maybe you want to gag me again tonight. However, I will keep talking about what I want to talk about in regard to the sugar industry.

I will deal with some of the comments of the cane-growers in the industry on what this Government is already doing today. A Queensland Canegrowers press release states—

> "Canegrowers are bitterly disappointed with the performance of their elected parliamentary representatives."

I assume that that also includes the honourable member for Hinchinbrook.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will remain anonymous in this debate. The honourable member has reflected on the Chair.

Mr CASEY: I doubt very much, Mr Deputy Speaker, that I have reflected on the Chair. I have referred to a member of this House as the member for Hinchinbrook—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am still on my feet. The honourable member should be seated. The honourable member will resume his seat. In a moment I will deal with the honourable member under Standing Order 123A. The matter that I raised was that the honourable member was not concentrating his remarks on the Bill being debated. I am entitled to do that. I ask the honourable member to proceed along those lines.

Mr CASEY: I am sorry, Mr Deputy Speaker. I thought that you rose to speak because I referred to the member for Hinchinbrook.

I have received letters about what this Government is doing from cane-growers' organisations all over the State, including the mill suppliers' committee for the area in which the member for Mirani is a supplier. I will not refer to the member for Hinchinbrook as being a supplier to a mill in this State. However, the member for Mirani certainly is.

The mill suppliers' committee of the Plane Creek mill—the mill that the member for Mirani supplies—has written to me protesting strongly at the way in which this Minister and this Government are treating the sugar industry. I have received letters from the Pleystowe Mill Suppliers Committee, the Mackay District Cane Growers Executive and others protesting at the way in which this Government is treating them.

Make no mistake about it: back in 1982 and 1984, I did forecast that any interference by this Government in the sugar industry would turn that industry against it. I believe that that is now starting to happen. The interference with the sugar industry will result in the demise of this Government. That is surely happening throughout Queensland today.

Queensland has not had a Minister for Primary Industries who has really been a person knowledgeable on the sugar industry in this State since the retirement of Sir John Row, a man whom both of us, Mr Deputy Speaker, hold in great respect. I held him in great respect when I first became a member of this Parliament and long before that when I knew him so well. He was the last Minister for Primary Industries in this Parliament who knew anything about the sugar industry. The present Minister is probably the worst. Mr Turner was pretty bad and did not know too much, but at least he tried. Now the present Minister is stumbling straight through with his hatchet in his hand and his bulldozer behind him bulldozing legislation through, including this legislation this evening. I give the Minister for Health and Environment, Mr Ahern, some credit because he at least allowed a full debate on the sugar industry when he introduced amendments to this Act in 1982. Since that time, this House has not been allowed a full debate on the sugar industry. The sugar industry is the most important agricultural industry in this State and the manufacturers of raw sugar are the biggest secondary industry employers in this State. But, what happens? Any time that sugar legislation comes before the Parliament, it gets pushed through. That is the way in which this Government acts.

Not only will this reflect on the Minister, the Premier and the Cabinet, but I and my colleagues will make sure that it reflects also on every National Party back-bencher who continues to sit in his place and put his hand up to vote in favour of this sugar legislation. My colleagues and I will travel to every sugar electorate in Queensland and will continue to tell all those associated with the industry how the National Party members have voted on this legislation in this Parliament. It is most important to note—it is hardly recognised—that the industry does not stop at cane-growers. This farm-gate philosophy has existed within the National Party for a long time. The party tries to put this "Don't rock the boat" policy on the people within the sugar industry.

This no longer counts, because people in the industry are starting to wake up to the way in which they are being treated.

The Brisbane members of the National Party will not escape from this, either. In their electorates are people who work in the insurance houses, on the wharves, and in the railways, refineries and various other places where sugar is handled. One could go into any of the big new buildings that are being constructed here in Brisbane and find insurance and commercial organisations that are connected in some way with the marketing of sugar in this State. They exist in almost every building. Brisbane itself is dependent upon the sugar industry and the successful marketing and handling of the sugar that is acquired under the Sugar Acquisition Act and sold through the Sugar Board.

A further point I raise is a matter that has been referred to in this House as tedious repetition. At this stage, I refer to CSR Limited. What is happening today, that is, the offer to take over Pioneer Sugar, is not new. Years ago in this House, and publicly throughout Queensland, I forecast that this was going to occur, and it was going to occur because CSR Limited wanted to make sure that it had a guaranteed crop and milling program for the entire Burdekin River area and Burdekin River irrigation area. For years and years, CSR Limited has been working on this Government through various avenues, such as industry organisations that it has undermined, in order to reach that situation. Through its efforts CSR will completely dominate the sugar industry in this State. It is unfortunate that many people within the sugar industry have short memories.

One of the things that are not recognised is that currently, prices are on the rise and an improved return is being received for the growing and milling of their cane. That will not last, that is for sure. Peaks and troughs in sugar prices have occurred, and they will occur again. The troughs or lower prices will occur more frequently, because the sugar industry no longer dominates the sweetener markets of the world. It is the sweetener market of the world that the Queensland sugar industry has to become a part of.

For a number of years, I have been saying in this Parliament and publicly throughout Queensland that the sugar industry should start to recognise that fact. Over the years, the industry may have been the world's best and most reliable exporter of a high-quality raw brown sugar crystal, but that is no longer the commodity that the world buyers are seeking. The reason is that it is an article that has to be further refined or treated before it can be placed into most of the manufacturing industries that use it.

It has been easy for the industry to blame the EEC and its dumping and subsidising of sugar on world markets for the drop in sugar prices and for the industry's problems. However, that is not the reason for them. The EEC captured the white sugar trade of the world and set out deliberately to do that. It was able to do it with its beet crop, which it could change and rotate very quickly and very simply. So it was not the EEC that caused the biggest problem for the sugar industry in this country.

Mr Harper: They will do it again.

Mr CASEY: The EEC has reached the stage at which it will do it again; but the EEC will do it again only if the industry sits back and remains complacent. The industry in Queensland has to change completely the commodity that it supplies.

Recently, I read a very interesting paper on a sweetener-users' group that was delivered late in February at an international sweetener colloquium at Palm Springs in California. I have some further details of what transpired at that conference. That conference accepted that there is a world sweetener market, not just a sugar market. At the moment, United States sugar-producers are being subsidised to such a great extent that the chemical companies are able to manufacture their artificial sweeteners—the high fructose corn syrups and others—at such a good price that it is far more profitable for them to do that. They are reaching a stage at which, within a few years, the US, which has virtually cut Australia out of its market, will become a world net exporter of sugar. How on earth will the Australian sugar industry be able to cope with the way in which the United States will be able to dump not only sugar sweeteners but also artificial

sweeteners on the world market? That stage will be reached by 1990. That is why I said earlier that if we are not careful and do not get the industry out of its complacency and moving in Queensland in the direction in which it should be heading with the marketing of its products, the sun will set on the entire industry.

The problem at the moment is very serious. The industry will need not only rationalisation but also major investment in the manufacturing sector in the industry so that Queensland is selling not only sugar but also jams, cordials and liquid sugar. It will need to return to the white sugar trade. The industry should be selling confectionery. Do honourable members know that a confectionery market worth $80m is available on the west coast of the United States alone? That was one of the points made at the conference at Palm Springs to which I referred. The point made was that, as far as the American industry is concerned, whilst Queensland could not export sugar and obtain a quota in that area, it could export confectionery. There is a sugar equivalent in that product.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I hope that the honourable member for Mackay is relating his remarks to research funding in the industry, because that is what this Bill is about.

Mr CASEY: I really do not like arguing with the Chair, but we are debating the Sugar Acquisition Act Amendment Bill and all things related to the Sugar Acquisition Act. The proposed amendments to the Act are vital to the marketing of sugar. Under the Sugar Acquisition Act, the Sugar Board not only acquires the sugar but also markets it throughout the world. The Minister is nodding his head in agreement. Everything I am saying is valid and is in keeping with what is contained in the Act. Honourable members do not want patchwork legislation or something to patch up the industry. More than anything, the sugar industry has been looking for leadership from the Government. It has been getting it from the Federal Government, with the rationalisation proposals, but it is not getting leadership from the State Government. Unfortunately, a major rationalisation endeavour in the Mackay area was going to cut back costs in the industry. Eventually, it would have meant more money in the pockets of cane-growers, millers and everyone else. It failed. I have no hesitation in saying that it failed because of the way in which the rationalisation campaign was conducted.

Mr Menzel: Are you blaming the cane-growers' organisation?

Mr CASEY: I am not blaming the cane-growers' organisation at all. In the long run, the cane-growers' organisation played a very important role in the rationalisation proposal. I sat down with the parties and pointed out where I felt that they had to throw their weight, and they threw their weight behind it.

Mr Menzel: That is why it failed.

Mr CASEY: That is not why it failed at all. It failed because the people who were conducting the rationalisation campaign acted a little bit like the National Party—don't rock the boat; let's keep it all wrapped up tight. They were not even prepared to tell the cane-growers what they were doing. It was not until very late in the piece that the growers were able to find out from the millers what the proposals were. Once they were told, they started to get unanimity. However, by that stage there had been so much opposition and so many opponents that the required 75 per cent vote was not obtained in order to achieve what they wanted. Seventy-five per cent of the vote is a difficult figure to achieve. The Premier does not even receive 75 per cent of the vote in his electorate of Barambah.

Mr Elliott: You are wrong. He gets 78 per cent.

Mr CASEY: I believe that it is the honouable member for Cunningham who receives 78 per cent of the vote. Nonetheless, it is a difficult figure to achieve. Consequently, the campaign for rationalisation of the sugar industry failed.

The Sugar Acquisition Act is the whole key to the sugar industry. It was introduced initially to ensure that the growers had a market for their crop; that their crop was going to be bought by somebody—in this case the Queensland Government. It was designed to ensure that they could sell their crop. At that stage, the growers were dominated by a number of companies, including CSR, which completely stood over the industry to get what they wanted for themselves, not to do what was good for cane-growers and the sugar industry.

This Government must ensure that the sugar industry remains under the control of those who work hardest within it, namely, the cane-growers of Queensland.

Mr STONEMAN (Burdekin) (9.16 p.m.): I support the Bill. There has been widespread discussion about the proposal, particularly from the previous speaker. Some of the points that he made need to be rebutted.

A perusal of the history of debate on this Act shows that many of the remarks of the honourable members of Mackay are far wide of the mark. Nevertheless, because they will be inserted into *Hansard*, they will become part of the history of this debate. Therefore, some of the statements made by the honourable member for Mackay should be corrected.

The Bill is self-explanatory. It is supported by all sections of the industry. Obviously, the amendments are necessary.

I have spoken tonight with the chairman of my local district executive in an endeavour to ascertain whether he or any of the other 800-odd growers in the Burdekin district have any reservations about the proposed amendments. He informed me that he could not drum up any interest. He said, "Naturally, of course, you have got to go ahead. This has got to be done. We want it."

As has been pointed out by other honourable members, there is no opposition to the proposed amendments. The honourable member for Mulgrave made that point when he referred to the note from the Cane Growers Council.

The Bill relates mainly to research related to raw sugar, and although it is not necessarily related to the principal Act, there is one facet of research that must be kept in mind. After all, raw sugar cannot be obtained without the production of sugar-cane. Over the years, I have been concerned that research on the production of cane in the Burdekin area has been held up, supposedly because it is so far ahead of other sugar-growing areas that it needs a lesser degree of support than other areas which produce a lower percentage of sugar per tonne of cane.

I remind the House that the growers in the Burdekin area face huge production costs to obtain their high tonnages. Four mills in the Burdekin area are involved. Two of those mills are already owned by CSR, and the remaining two are the subject of some interest by CSR. The growers in that area must irrigate their crops for a large proportion of the time, particularly during drought years.

It is interesting to fly over the Burdekin area—as I do quite often—and see the changes that have occurred and the reduction in the growth of the cane in many areas.

Because of the staff levels in organisations such as the BSES, over the years it has not been possible for them to undertake the extension services that are required to keep growers up to date with the technology, advice and so on that they need. It is sad to note the great variation in cane growth, particularly in areas of poor soil types.

The tendency within the sugar industry is for people to say, "Okay, the Burdekin's average tonnage is so far above everywhere else that we should not worry about that area. Let us try to build the rest up to that particular figure." It reminds me of the drover who is so intent on pushing the tail of his mob to the lead that very soon the lead becomes the tail. The Minister would well know the comparison that I draw. Support has to be maintained in research right across the industry so that the relativities of production are maintained.

The increase in production in that area of the State has not been as high as it should have been. However, the growers in the Burdekin have no problem with all the facets of the Bill.

At the moment, one of the problems being encountered with the production of the cane and, therefore, the raw sugar is caused by the drought, which is in its fifth year. The Burdekin Dam has been mentioned in the House many times, and so it should be. It is a magnificent structure and facility that should be the pride not only of the people of that area but also of the people of the State and the rest of our nation. Everyone has had an input into its construction.

As I mentioned in an earlier speech, it needs to be recognised that the Burdekin Dam is a facility for the future, not just for the present. Perhaps there is another matter that will have to be looked at. It may seem strange to suggest that, although plenty of water exists for the rest of the year, muddy water causes a problem. That water will not penetrate the soil, which is a problem in crop productivity. The water is being pumped round and round the recharge system and it will not penetrate the soil. That is affecting the production of the cane.

I refer briefly to and rebut some of the comments made by earlier speakers about the Goondi mill. In my speech a fortnight ago, I noted that in a very short time this rationalisation would be a seven-day wonder. In fact, it has proved to be less than that. The Innisfail growers, the ABC, the Opposition parties—yes, a couple of them are still in the Chamber—and the Liberal opposition, or the ALP/Liberal coalition, have not been able to stir up the trouble that they thought they could. Certainly, the ABC tried. That storm has not eventuated. In fact, there is a general acceptance of the reason why the Minister introduced the Bill and carried it forward. I cannot find a single grower to suggest honestly that it was other than in the best interests of the industry as a whole.

Mr Menzel: You can take it from me you were right.

Mr STONEMAN: I think the chickens are coming home to roost. The realisation is that resolute action had to be taken. The Minister has taken that action. The Government as a whole has supported it and now the industry is doing likewise.

The honourable member for Bundaberg made an interjection about the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board. I say to him that the central board certainly has a particular mandate, but I make the point that it has no mandate to represent the interests of the community. This House has that mandate, and the Government of the day has the particular mandate to make sure that the whole community is supported.

Over the years, the industry had been adamant about the need for the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board to have absolute powers. But when the dollars come—and that refers to dollars for research and all matters related to money that the industry receives for whatever reasons—Opposition members say that the central board should still have total say. When community money is going in, however, the community should also have a say.

Last night, I was at a meeting of a number of farmers at which the Bill was discussed. I did not realise then that it was coming on tonight, but it was discussed generally, as was what I refer to as the Goondi bull—I mean "Bill". In fact, there was a lot of bull spoken in that debate.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will withdraw that comment.

Mr STONEMAN: I withdraw that comment, Mr Speaker. It is an old colloquialism that slips out occasionally.

One of the messages that came forward very forcefully during the course of the evening's discussion—and, as I said, there were a number of small, medium and big farmers present—was the hope that under no circumstances would the Government consider changing that Bill. They said, "Don't give in to the rot that you are reading in

the press." This message has come from growers who are involved in the industry and understand what would happen if the Government does not provide support.

Mr De Lacy: Are you suggesting that the Queensland Cane Growers Council does not speak on behalf of the cane-growers?

Mr STONEMAN: I inform the honorable member for Cairns that one of the things that I am able to do with a fair degree of confidence is relate to the growers. Although I am not a cane-grower, I live among the growers; I virtually live in the cane-fields. I talk to the cane-growers all the time. I know what the growers are saying, and I know also that the Queensland Cane Growers Council has a particular policy that it must adhere to until the policy is changed. May I say, though, that the opposition has been somewhat less than vehement and has been dampened.

I wish to comment also on the offer by CSR to purchase the Pioneer sugar-mills. In the area of my electorate, that proposal does not frighten anyone. I remind honourable members that my electorate is one of the major areas that will be involved. Two mills in my area are owned by CSR, that is, the Invicta mill at Giru and the Kalamia mill at Ayr. The cane-growers in the area are saying that it is not a matter of if CSR will take over; it is a matter of when. That type of comment highlights the point that support is needed for the production of sugar in every facet, particularly in relation to research and related factors. It is not a problem at all when a company owns over 30 per cent. CSR has been buying shares for years, and that is well known.

I draw the attention of the House to comments made by the honourable member for Mackay. He said that the Hawke Government had given primary industry the greatest support it had ever received in the history of the nation. The "greatest support" given to the sugar industry was a lousy $54m. That amount was the maximum given by the Federal Government in cash, but the actual figure will probably be much less than that. The figure of $54m is expressed in terms of 1987 dollars. It may ultimately be paid in 1988 dollars. I hark back to when the wool industry received support from the Federal Government. I do not say that it was good support, but it was financial support in dollar terms. Back in the 1960s, the wool industry received $100m without any strings attached. Yet, the honourable member for Mackay says that the Federal Government support is the greatest thing ever in the history of Australia. What a lot of rot!

The beef industry received a similar amount of support. Again, I do not suggest that that was an example of a perfect support system, but again $100m was contributed. Yet the honourable member for Mackay cries from the roof-tops that Hawke is the greatest thing since sliced bread. No strings were attached to those earlier support schemes.

Mr Randell: All the Hawke Government ever gave the Queensland cane-growers was 50c a tonne for the 1986 crop.

Mr STONEMAN: That is exactly right. At the end of the two or three-year period, the growers will be able to add up just how great is the support referred to by the honourable member for Mackay.

In conclusion, I point out that the honourable member for Mackay in particular has used selectively the comments made by the Federal Government. I believe that the Minister was correct when he said, "What about yesterday's press statement?" I will quote Mr Kerin's media release of yesterday—

> "Mr Kerin said that the negotiations were part of the first mill rationalisation under the Commonwealth-Queensland sugar package."

Mr Kerin was referring to the Goondi legislation. The press release continues—

> " 'All parties knew it would be a difficult process,' he said. 'As people accept the reality of the need for change and discuss its implementation sensitively, I hope the fears will disappear.

'The Commonwealth has already recognised that the long term viability of the sugar industry depends on it achieving maximum efficiency.

'It is now crucial that the work begin on implementation so that the 1987 crush can be handled under the new arrangements'."

The Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry has endorsed the actions taken by this Government.

I reiterate my support for the Bill that is before the House. I suggest that growers are thanking God that this Government has been able to act so resolutely.

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Primary Industries) (9.30 p.m.), in reply: The arrangements under sections 4 and 4B of the Sugar Acquisition Act are necessary for the successful acquisition and marketing of and payment for each season's raw sugar by the Queensland Government. They have had legislative backing since 1982. They have worked smoothly and they have the confidence of the Government. They have been long-standing parts of industry practice operating without any opposition being voiced by the industry.

Of course, marketing includes, as well as actually selling the crop, quality and sales research and providing transport and handling facilities. I understand that the sunset provision was introduced at the request of the Queensland Cane Growers Council. Be that as it may; it is the philosophy of this Government to provide periodic reassessment of the need for regulation. This House should be afforded an opportunity for reassessment of the need for those board powers.

During the debate the honourable member for Cairns interjected. I say to him that perhaps the same result could be achieved in some other way, but the Government has chosen to give this House an opportunity to discuss the need for these powers. In the meantime, the successful role taken by the Sugar Board in that aspect will continue with confidence.

The honourable member who is the spokesman for the Opposition referred to my recent visit to Innisfail. Let me repeat what I said at that time. At the Innisfail airport, where I landed, I was met only by an ABC reporter. That was in daylight—perfect daylight. I might say that I was pleased to discuss with him matters relating to the issues at Innisfail and in the Innisfail district. I was pleased to give him quite a lengthy interview. No-one else turned up. Where was a representative of the *Townsville Bulletin*? Why did it not know that I would be there? The previous day I had actually asked the South Johnstone mill chairman and the mill suppliers' committee chairman to call on me. They met me and they knew very well of my movements. In fact, I was promised, particularly by the mill suppliers' committee chairman, a welcome when I arrived in Innisfail the next day. What was the welcome? One ABC reporter.

Yesterday the president of the Queensland Cane Growers Council and its general manager, Mr Bolton, who has been referred to particularly tonight, told me that they had called off any demonstration.

Where is the truth? Incidentally, for the benefit of the Opposition I say that I told Mr Bolton very clearly, because he is a new boy in his position and I want him to understand where I stand, that he need not interfere on my behalf. If his members want to put a point of view to me, I am prepared to listen to it when the opportunity is available, and I will make every effort to make the opportunity available. Despite the fact that it was known for two months that I was going into the area—the arrangements were made in February; the landing site and everything else was organised—no-one turned up except one ABC reporter. He was so interested. At Tully I did meet deputations from cane-growers, from mills and from mill suppliers' committees, but no mention was made. That is how important the issue is in that area.

The honourable member for Nundah made some very complimentary remarks about this Government's financial support for the sugar industry. Indeed, the sugar industry has been and is being favoured. The honourable member for Nundah is correct.

The Government is doing that to ensure the continued viability and the continued prosperity of the industry, to ensure that it will continue to contribute to the national economy for decades, and, as the honourable member said, perhaps for centuries ahead. It is just as important to ensure, of course, that cane-growers and their families do not lose the farms on which they have toiled to eke out a living in very, very difficult times.

The honourable member for Mulgrave, having a very close knowledge and understanding of the industry, particularly in that area, made some very pertinent points. He could well have quoted, as the honourable member for Burdekin did, from yesterday's media release of the Minister for Primary Industry in Canberra. I wish to add to the record the final paragraph of yesterday's release from Mr Kerin. It reads—

> "The Queensland Government's decision to legislate for change has brought the matter to a head and we must now act quickly in an endeavour to finalise the operational aspects of the rationalisation."

As a result of an interjection from a member of the Opposition, I should mention that I understand that the agreement by Mourilyan is to underwrite the c.c.s. indefinitely. As the honourable member for Mulgrave said, the guarantee of payment on a basis of a 22-week crushing period is almost unique.

The honourable member for Mackay took the opportunity to raise the issue of what he called lack of support to beef-producers by the National Party coalition Government in the days of Malcolm Fraser. I point out to the honourable member that grants of the order of $2,000 per producer were made with the object of starting a cash flow. That assistance was very much appreciated by the beef industry. I refer the honourable member to the Beef Industry Incentive Payments Scheme promulgated on 31 October 1977 for the purpose of enabling payments to be made to beef-producers provided they met certain conditions related to beef-husbandry procedures. The honourable member would do well to realise that the National Party coalition Government of Mr Anthony gave those grants to beef-producers.

The honourable member for Burdekin made his usual meaningful contribution to the debate. In a year when prices are recovering, it is unfortunate that seasonal conditions will reduce production. Primary producers know only too well, of course, that that is their occupational hazard.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 54		NOES, 30	
Ahern	Knox	Ardill	
Alison	Lane	Braddy	
Austin	Lee	Burns	
Beanland	Lester	Campbell	
Beard	Lickiss	Casey	
Berghofer	McCauley	Comben	
Bjelke-Petersen	McKechnie	D'Arcy	
Borbidge	McPhie	De Lacy	
Burreket	Menzel	Eaton	
Chapman	Muntz	Gibbs, R. J.	
Clauson	Neal	Goss	
Cooper	Nelson	Hamill	
Elliott	Newton	Hayward	
Fraser	Powell	McElligott	
Gately	Randell	Mackenroth	
Gibbs, I. J.	Row	McLean	
Gilmore	Schuntner	Milliner	
Gunn	Sherlock	Palaszczuk	
Gygar	Sherrin	Scott	
Harper	Simpson	Shaw	
Harvey	Slack	Smith	
Henderson	Stephan	Smyth	
Hinton	Stoneman	Underwood	
Hinze	Tenni	Vaughan	
Hobbs		Warburton	
Hynd	*Tellers:*	Warner	*Tellers:*
Innes	Littleproud	Wells	Davis
Katter	FitzGerald	Yewdale	Prest

Resolved in the affirmative.

Committee

Hon. N. J. Harper (Auburn—Minister for Primary Industries) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—

Mr CAMPBELL (9.46 p.m.): It is very important to make some comments on the Sugar Acquisition Act and the amendments to it, because it has been three years since the House debated this legislation. It is interesting to reflect on some of the comments that have been made by members of the National Party, or members of the Government, concerning——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chamber will come to order. There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber. I ask for perfect silence.

Mr CAMPBELL: When the amendment originally came before the House in 1982, what was said at that time was interesting, because an honourable member on the Government side of the House was prepared to say, "This is the greatest fraud that has ever occurred in any industry, especially the sugar industry. As far as I am concerned it is a damned fraud. It is an absolute disgrace."

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have to draw the attention of the honourable member for Bundaberg to the fact that he is debating the short title of the Bill. I believe that clause 2 is the appropriate clause. Would the honourable member for Bundaberg mind if the Committee agrees to the title and goes on to clause 2?

Mr CAMPBELL: If you would like me to debate this under clause 2, Mr Chairman, I will do so.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Do something about that rabble.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warned the honourable member for Wolston under Standing Order 123A this morning.

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—

Mr CAMPBELL (9.48 p.m.): It is important to note when looking at this Bill, that, when the amendment was originally moved in this House, it was found that members on the Government side did not agree with research funds being taken from cane-growers in the proportion in which sugar industry research funds are now being taken, that is, two-thirds from the cane-growers and one-third from the millers. For something like 50 years this has been a tradition, and the amendment refers to the extension of the sunset clause that has taken research funds from the industry. Funds have been taken from the cane-growers and effectively transferred to the industry and to millers.

When this amendment was originally moved, many members of the Government found it abhorrent that this should happen. I believe it is still abhorrent today. Why now, in 1987, is it okay for the research to be funded on the basis of two-thirds from the cane-growers and one-third from the millers, whereas before it was abhorrent to Government members that it should be funded on a basis other than fifty-fifty?

Mr Menzel: What has this got to do with clause 2?

Mr CAMPBELL: It is interesting, because the honourable member for Mulgrave found it obnoxious that money should be taken from cane-growers' pockets. Seeing that this has happened, it is interesting to note that not two years after the original Bill was brought in, or even three years, but five years later there is no time for the supposed judicial inquiry into the industry, and the sunset clause has to be prolonged.

It is important to refer to the division of sugar moneys and to show how it is now being reflected by the Sugar Board that it can decide how industry funds will be spent. One of the organisations that have a great deal of say in how the Sugar Board funds

will be spent is CSR. It is very important to reflect on the contract between CSR, the Goondi mill and the Babinda mill, and the way in which it is proposed to purchase the Goondi mill from CSR. The contract is being manipulated with the consent of the Government. The contract will be based on the price paid in the No. 1 pool. The contract contains what is known as a goodwill purchase price. That goodwill purchase price to be paid by Babinda under the contract will depend on the No. 1 pool price, which is being decided by CSR. Because of that, it reflects poorly on what is happening in this Chamber tonight.

A Government member: How do you work that out?

Mr CAMPBELL: Because, for the first time ever, it is a term of a contract that a mill will be paid for cane-growers to supply cane to another mill. That is what is happening through that contract. I would like to ask the Minister——

Mr Harper: Explain!

Mr CAMPBELL: I will explain it.

Under two different contracts Howard Smith and Babinda will pay a sum of money to CSR for capital investments, such as land and rolling-stock. In addition to that, the Goondi mill will be paid a special price. If he wishes, the Minister can deny that the contract price being paid by Babinda to CSR includes a goodwill purchase price. That goodwill price will be paid over three years. As the No. 1 pool price increases, the goodwill price paid by Babinda to CSR will also increase. That goes against all the traditions and the basis of the Sugar Acquisition Act and the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act.

Mr Eaton: CSR is selling on the value of the farmers' assignments.

Mr CAMPBELL: The honourable member is right.

If one takes the price used in the rationalisation study, the goodwill price that the Babinda growers will be paying to CSR will be $1.407m. That is the figure based on the price referred to in the rationalisation study.

Mr RANDELL: I rise to a point of order. As we are debating clause 2, the matters referred to by the honourable member are not relevant to the Bill at all. Mr Chairman, I ask you to bring the member back to the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have endeavoured to preserve some relevance in the debate on the Bill this evening. I also allowed a fair amount of elasticity. I intend to judge the relevance as the honourable member continues with his speech.

Mr CAMPBELL: The No. 1 pool price is decided by the Sugar Board, mainly on the recommendation of CSR. CSR can inflate the price by recommending to the Government and to the Sugar Board that money be borrowed. That will inflate the No. 1 pool price. If the price is inflated, which is possible on the direction of CSR, under the contracts that have been signed Babinda would pay up to $4.035m, depending on the No. 1 pool price. I ask the Minister: is it true that the Babinda Co-operative Sugar Company has signed contracts that include a goodwill purchase price under which, in effect, CSR can manipulate the No. 1 pool price—inflate it—so that it will receive a greater price for that mill? By inflating that price, the amount of money that is in the No. 1 pool will be reduced, and CSR will derive the benefit from that. That is why I asked that question. It is not in the interests of the Goondi growers to pay for their own contracts.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have allowed the question, but it does not relate to this Bill at all. It relates to another Bill, and I do not intend to allow honourable members to stray further from the subject under discussion, namely, the restitution of research funds.

Clause 2, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr Harper, read a third time.

RURAL MACHINERY SAFETY ACT AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment, Small Business and Industrial Affairs) (9.58 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Rural Machinery Safety Act 1976 and the Inspection of Machinery Act 1951-1985 each in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment, Small Business and Industrial Affairs) (9.59 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Under the provisions of the Rural Machinery Safety Act 1976, all wheeled tractors weighing between 560 kilograms and 3860 kilograms inclusive, except those specifically excluded under section 14 of the Act, are required to be fitted with a protective cab or frame. This requirement commenced on 1 January 1978, in respect of new tractors, and on 1 January 1987 for other tractors. Section 14 of the Act provides that the cab or frame shall, together with the attachments for fitting it to the tractor, be in accordance with the provisions of Australian Standard 1636-1984.

Numerous representations have been made to me by associations and persons involved in the rural industry expressing concern that there would be considerable difficulties in fitting roll-over protective structures to earlier model tractors to comply with Australian Standard 1636-1984, which is a test standard and not a design standard. In order to overcome the difficulties envisaged, owing to the stringent requirements of the standard, it is proposed to amend the Rural Machinery Safety Act to allow an owner of a tractor manufactured prior to 1 January 1978 to make and fit a roll-over protective structure to his or her own tractor. Honourable members will be aware that, today, on many farms there are machinery workshops which are quite capable of manufacturing equipment such as this to an exceedingly high standard.

The aim of the legislation is to have all tractors covered by the legislation fitted with roll-over protection frames to adequately protect any persons using them. Because of legal and practical problems, it is not proposed to use exemption provisions under the Act in respect of persons or organisations, except in extraordinary circumstances or where the machines are genuinely out of use.

The Bill also proposes that new provisions be inserted in both the Rural Machinery Safety Act and the Inspection of Machinery Act to safeguard the Chief Inspector of Machinery and inspectors of machinery generally, from civil or criminal liability arising out of the statutory performance of their functions and duties under the respective Acts. Both the Inspection of Machinery Act and the Rural Machinery Safety Act contain provisions for the Chief Inspector to use his discretion in making decisions, approving designs or granting exemptions regarding machinery, and inspectors have a discretion in regard to certain aspects of their inspectorial role.

Because of the increase in civil litigation in recent times, the legal liability of the Chief Inspector, and inspectors of machinery generally, has become a matter of concern. It is not desirable that these officers should be inhibited in the carrying out of their

duties and functions by any fear of civil or criminal litigation arising out of the due performance of those duties and functions.

Regarding section 19 of the Rural Machinery Safety Act, the opportunity has been taken to amend this general penalty provision to conform with the Penalty Units Act 1985.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr McLean, adjourned.

ADOPTION OF CHILDREN (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 17 March (see p. 775).

Mr HAMILL (Ipswich) (10.02 p.m.): The Bill before the House is fairly straightforward, yet the area of adoption is a very complex and sensitive subject. Unfortunately, it is another example of a Bill of missed opportunity. That will become quite clear as my speech progresses this evening.

At the outset, it is important to reassert that adoption is a service to the child and not, as some would have it, a service to the family wanting a child. That may seem a very harsh statement, but the whole tenor of this legislation is directed to looking towards the particular needs of the child—the child that is being sought to be placed with an adoptive family.

It is worth while noting also that the numbers of adoptions in recent years have fallen dramatically. Certainly, the Department of Children's Services report for 1985-86 illustrates that point very clearly. There are only 211 non-relative adoptions, that is, where adoptions were undertaken by people who were not the relatives of the adopted child. Even in the space of the last four years, that figure has represented only two-thirds of the figure that applied some four years ago. When we further break down the 211 adoptions mentioned, we find that 139 of those were for babies, usually with a four to five-year waiting period. There were some 25 adoptions of the special needs type, through the "Be My Parent" program, and 13 other special needs adoptions through the Special Needs Unit. Of course, the issue of the special needs adoption is a matter that goes to the heart of the Bill presently before the House.

The other facet that is becoming increasingly important has been overseas adoption orders. In 1985-86 there were 13 of those in Queensland. It is also interesting that in the same year there were 148 adoption orders made out in favour of relatives—a more dramatic figure, given that the issue of relatives adopting children has perhaps fallen a little from favour over recent times. There were some 306 applications to the Registrar-General for a change of surname. Of course, that is becoming an increasingly popular measure, particularly as the incidence of blended families increases in the community.

This evening, the legislation before the House has two focuses. The first one recognises the special considerations that pertain to the adoption of children with particular indigenous, ethnic and cultural backgrounds. The second is the establishment of a special needs register. I propose to deal with those two matters in order.

The principles of placement as espoused in this legislation have great relevance, particularly to this State's Aboriginal and Islander communities. Indeed, the Aboriginal communities of Australia have suffered greatly over many, many years through the operation of Australia's adoption laws. For decades, Australia's treatment of its Aboriginal people caused no greater sore than the measures which were taken to separate Aboriginal children from their families.

It is in that context that this legislation is particularly important; but, from the attitude expressed in the second-reading speech of the Minister, I do suggest that it is simply not good enough for the Minister to dismiss the genuine and real concerns of Aboriginal people in the cavalier manner shown in that speech.

The very special needs and special desires of Aboriginal and Islander communities with respect to adoption were addressed in what I can only say was an excellent report by the Australian Law Reform Commission titled *Recognition of Aboriginal Customary Laws*. This report draws attention to the very real cultural differences which exist between the Aboriginal community and European Australians with respect to both child care and, in particular, the notion of adoption. In 1976, at the first Australian conference on adoption, the notion of adoption, as it is understood by the Aboriginal community, was discussed. It was certainly the view of that conference that adoption, as understood by European Australians, is a concept which is quite alien to Aboriginal culture.

I propose to quote a rather informative and perceptive paragraph from the Law Reform Commission's report concerning Aboriginal customary practices in the context of the recognition of those factors for customary or de facto adoption.

Paragraph 383 of that report states—

> "As has been seen in Aboriginal communities the extended family plays a very important role in child care arrangements. It is common for a member of a child's extended family, often a grandmother, to look after a child or children for periods of time where the parents are unable to do so for one reason or another. Sometimes these arrangements may extend for longer periods of time, to the point where the child might be identified as permanently in the custody of the person(s) looking after him or her and thus regarded as having been adopted."

I give emphasis to the following passage—

> "But it would not usually be correct to describe such placements as 'adoption', since there is no severing of the parent-child relationship but rather a long term arrangement for substitute care. If an equivalent must be found in the State child welfare systems it would be fostering rather than adoption. In the Torres Strait Islands, on the other hand, there is a distinct practice of customary adoption, involving the permanent placement of children with members of the extended family. The new custodians of the child are thereafter regarded by the community as its parents."

From that paragraph, I believe it is quite clear that the Aboriginal custom of child placement is quite at odds with our understanding of the notion of adoption because, under Australian law, adoption means that the adopting parents are regarded at law as the parents of the child. That parent-child relationship with the relinquishing parent ceases to exist in law. That is quite distinct from the relationship that that passage described and is found in the Aboriginal community.

The Law Reform Commission concluded its discussions with a recommendation to legislate for an Aboriginal child placement principle which embodied the following prerequisites. Page 274 of that same Law Reform Commission report, under the title "Aboriginal Child Custody, Fostering and Adoption", states—

> " • There should be an Aboriginal child placement principle established by legislation, requiring preference to be given, in decisions affecting the care or custody of children, and in the absence of good cause to the contrary, to placements with:
>
> • a parent of the child;
>
> • a member of the child's extended family;
>
> • other members of the child's community (in particular, persons with responsibilities for the child under the customary laws of the community) . . . "

The report states further—

> " • Where such a placement is not possible, preference should be given to placement with families or in institutions for children approved by members of the relevant Aboriginal communities having special responsibility for the child, or by an Aboriginal child care organisation working in the area . . . "

The States have adopted those, or fairly similar, provisions as a policy in relation to Aboriginal adoptions and child placements—and rightly so. The amendment which is currently being discussed in this House falls broadly within that tradition. However, those issues of child placement were discussed in March 1984, which is before the present Minister took responsibility for the portfolio, by the Council of Social Welfare Ministers which endorsed the recommendations of the review of State and Territory principles, policies and practices in Aboriginal fostering and adoption. Recommendations 8 and 9 of that review relate to the placement by adoption of Aboriginal children. Recommendation 8 states—

"It is recommended that in the adoptive placement of an Aboriginal child a preference be given, in the absence of good cause to the contrary (and after considering the wishes of the consenting parent) to a placement with—

- other members of the child's Aboriginal community who have the correct relationship with the child in accordance with Aboriginal customary law;
- other approved Aboriginal couples."

That provision gives quite clear guidance in line with those customary practices outlined in the Australian Law Reform Commission report. Indeed, it is very much recognised in those provisions that in placing Aboriginal children, the relationship between the child and the parent should not be broken. Furthermore, it gives due recognition to the role of the Aboriginal community in the context of placing the child.

Recommendation 9 states—

"It is recommended that selection criteria for Aboriginal adopting parents be amended (by legislation if necessary) to:

(a) recognise Aboriginal couples married according to the customs of their community;

(b) recognise the prevailing social values and customs of the appropriate Aboriginal community;

(c) consider the appropriateness of recognising de facto marriages for adopting couples."

As the Minister had been a participant in that council meeting and agreed to those recommendations, it is somewhat strange therefore that, in introducing this legislation, she spurns the concepts set out in recommendation 9 concerning the recognition of relationships between Aboriginal adopting parents. In her second-reading speech the Minister made it quite clear that as far as she is concerned no special recognition will be given to any particular circumstances which might pertain to Aboriginal applicants for adoption. As I said, while the amendments that are being considered by the House this evening in the Adoption of Children Act Amendment Act are in spirit, if not in detail, in agreement with those recommendations, the legislation is deficient, I believe, for its lack of detail and its failure to give legislative effect to a further recommendation endorsed by that same ministerial council; that is, that it should recognise the role and the consultative process with Aboriginal agencies in the adoption process.

While the Queensland Department of Children's Services, in its draft statement of policy and procedures in relation to Aboriginal and Islander fostering and adoption, committed the department to active involvement with "relevant representatives from the Aboriginal and Islander community wherever possible", in both the draft Family and Community Development Bill of 1984 with respect to guardianship and this legislation, this Government has fallen short of such a legislative commitment, yet both the Northern Territory and the State of Victoria have taken this first step. In this context I cite section 50 of the Victorian Adoption Act of 1984, which reads as follows—

"Adoption of Aboriginal child.

50. (1) The provisions of this section are enacted in recognition of the principle of Aboriginal self-management and self-determination and that adoption is absent in customary Aboriginal child care arrangements.

(2) Where—

(a) consent is given to the adoption of a child by a parent—

(i) who is an Aborigine; or

(ii) who is not an Aborigine but, in the instrument of consent, states the belief that the other parent is an Aborigine—

and who, in the instrument of consent, expresses the wish that the child be adopted within the Aboriginal community; or

(b) the Court has dispensed with the consent of the parents and the Director-General or principal officer of an approved agency believes on reasonable grounds that the child has been accepted by an Aboriginal community as an Aborigine and so informs the Court—

the Court shall not make an order for the adoption of the child unless the Court is satisfied as to the matters referred to in section 15 and, where a parent has given consent, is satisfied that the parent has received, or has in writing expressed the wish not to receive, counselling from an Aboriginal agency and—

(c) that the proposed adoptive parents are members, or at least one of the proposed adoptive parents is a member, of the Aboriginal community to which a parent who gave consent belongs;

(d) that a person of a class referred to in paragraph (c) is not reasonably available as an adoptive parent and that the proposed adoptive parents, or at least one of the proposed adoptive parents, is a member of an Aboriginal community; or

(e) that a person of a class referred to in paragraph (c) or (d) is not reasonably available as an adoptive parent and that the proposed adoptive parents are persons approved or on behalf of the Director-General or the principal officer of an approved agency and by an Aboriginal agency as suitable persons to adopt an Aboriginal child.

(3) In this section, 'Aboriginal agency' means an organization declared by Order of the Governor in Council published in the *Government Gazette* to be an Aboriginal agency in accordance with sub-section (4).

(4) An organization shall not be declared under sub-section (3) to be an Aboriginal agency unless the Director-General is satisfied that the organization is managed by Aborigines, that its activities are carried on for the benefit of Aborigines and that it has experience in child and family welfare matters and the declaration includes a statement to that effect.

(5) The Governor in Council may, by Order published in the *Government Gazette,* revoke or vary an order made under sub-section (3)."

It is a very important provision because it embodies the principles as set out in that ministerial council decision to endorse the recommendations and it provides quite clearly within that legislative framework a true role for the Aboriginal communities in participating with the adopting authorities in the placement of Aboriginal children. One quite simply would not want to return to the circumstances, as I mentioned earlier, where the placement of Aboriginal children was a major source of anger, dismay and distrust between the black and the white communities in Australia. I submit that in this respect a provision such as that contained in the Victorian Adoption Act could be a worthy model for Queensland and other Australian jurisdictions.

In noting the inappropriateness of adoption orders to the cultural norms of Aboriginal Australians, the November 1986 report of the review committee entitled *Adoption Policy and Practice in South Australia* addressed the placement issue in the following terms. I quote from page 27 of that report as follows—

"If Aboriginal children are for some reason needing placement, it is essential for their sense of identity, their cultural awareness and their ability to grow up as part of the Aboriginal society, that their own kin be actively sought out as a first

preference. For this reason too, guardianship may be a preferred option for ensuring the care of Aboriginal children in need of permanent placement. Those groups consulted favoured guardianship as the preferred option."

Again I submit that Queensland could do far worse than enact a provision in Queensland law giving effect to that principle with respect to relatives who sought an adoption order in Queensland. I refer to the 1983 amendment to the Adoption of Children Act Amendment Act in which a new section 12 was inserted into the Act. Subsection 5 of section 12 related particularly to cases in which a relative—in this case a grandparent—sought to adopt his or her grandchild.

That amendment pointed out that in that case an adoption order should not be made in favour of a grandparent or grandparents unless the director is satisfied that there are exceptional circumstances that justify making the order.

Indeed, the issue of grandparents adopting their grandchildren is one which has generated considerable discussion over a number of years in the context of Queensland's adoption laws. As honourable members would appreciate, given the change of status which adoption would effect, the adoption of a grandchild by the grandparent would then result in the grandparent becoming the parent and the grandchild becoming the child and therefore the child's natural parent becoming its sibling. That would dramatically alter the generational relationships within that family.

Given that the department has taken—and quite rightly so—cognisance of these special circumstances in relation to adoption and certainly has sought to rely upon principles of guardianship when adoption in such cases might be deemed to be inappropriate, I believe that similar provisions could be made in relation to those particular problems that I have outlined in relation to the Aboriginal community.

As the notion of guardianship is certainly one which is familiar to the Aboriginal community, surely guardianship is a better way to go in making adequate, appropriate cultural arrangements for child care when dealing with Aboriginal children. Such an amendment to our laws would be easy to effect and, I am sure, would receive widespread community support.

As I have said, Aboriginals and Islanders have suffered greatly through the operation of insensitive laws in respect of adoption and fostering, and this area is long overdue for legal reform. However, the Opposition does welcome the amendment contained in this Bill and places those thoughts in relation to further legislative reform on record as, I trust, constructive suggestions for the Minister's consideration.

The Opposition also welcomes the amendments outlined in the Bill with respect to the recognition of special-needs children and, in particular, the acknowledgement of the difficulties that are encountered from time to time in the placing of such children.

As the number of new-borns available for adoption has declined in Australia there certainly has been a shift in adoption towards greater numbers of these older children, often with emotional or physical disabilities, being made available for adoption and being adopted by new parents. Again it is something that has generated considerable discussion because certainly the United States has had the experience of a number of single persons becoming adoptive parents.

The features of the American experience have been that generally adopted children have tended to be older children and their adoptive parent has tended to be an older professional female who believes that she can provided much greater input—particular emotional input—into the development of the child. Let us face it, the children who find themselves classed as special-needs children do require particular and very great input from their their adoptive parents. My congratulations go to those very special people who are prepared to give of their love and support for such a child.

As I said at the outset, I see this Bill as being one of a missed opportunity. I would be remiss if I did not mention the disappointment felt by thousands of Queenslanders with the fact that the Government has failed to take this opportunity to liberalise its

excessively restrictive provisions governing the operation of the adoption contact register that was established under legislation passed in August last year and, as I understand it, will come into operation on 11 May of this year.

The last few years have seen various States reform their adoption laws and in particular strip away the veils of secrecy which have shrouded adoption over that period. Sadly, while other States were recognising the rights of adults to know their biological origins, in establishing its contact register the Queensland Government fell far short of recognising this right. In the embryonic stages of development in the reform of Queensland's adoption laws it did seem that it was going to be present, but, as honourable members would know from when the Bill came before this House last year, the contact register requiries a tripartite presence, on the register, of the adopted child—or in this case under the legislation the adopted person has to be over the age of 18 years—the adopting parent and the natural parent.

In this context I believe it is incumbent upon the Opposition to reassert its view that adult adoptees do indeed have the right to know their origins and should not be unduly fettered in their quest to know their origins. The Opposition reasserts its acknowledgment that there are interests that are dear to both the natural and adopting parents, and that this is particularly the case where minors are involved. To that end the Opposition is disappointed that this Government continues to frustrate the endeavours of adult adoptees and their natural parents to obtain information about each other and perhaps effect a reunion. The Opposition believes that the Victorian Government, in its 1984 legislation, did indeed make adequate provision for the respective rights of adoptees, birth parents and adopting parents and the Opposition will continue to urge for the introduction of similar legislation in this State.

With these reservations and suggestions, the Labor Party supports this Bill and holds out the hope that the reform of the adoption laws in this State will not end here, but will progress towards a more open and responsible system for the benefit of all Queenslanders.

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Condamine) (10.28 p.m.): In rising to support the Adoption of Children (Amendment) Bill, I acknowledge the previous speaker's sincerity. It is quite obvious that the honourable member for Ipswich cares very much for people; however, there are some fundamental differences between the policies of this Government and the things that he has espoused.

I will begin by talking about contact registers. I was one of the members of the committee that thought for long hours about the formulation of the policies with regard to contact registers. I am very much aware of the point of view expressed by the honourable member for Ipswich and other people around Australia. A situation has arisen since this legislation was passed which reinforces my belief that this Government did the right thing. I refer to the case of a young person who is almost an adult and who, through the help of one of those unofficial organisations, was able to trace her relinquishing mother. Through this organisation that young person presented herself at the family home and created quite a furore. The first problem was that her mother's husband had never been told by her that in fact she had had a child and had adopted it out.

Mr Hamill: Was this case in Queensland?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I am not quite sure if it was in Queensland or not. I am just quoting the case and do not want to reveal the names.

The family had children in their teens. The family, and in particular the husband, had to come to terms with that situation. Not long after that, a revelation was made that the mother had in fact borne two children out of wedlock. It was bad enough for the husband and the other children of the family to come to terms with the first revelation, but the second revelation was shattering. As legislators, we have to come to terms with such matters. I know that some people have a great desire to know their origin. As far as possible, the Government is going down the track to meet that desire.

I point out to the member for Ipswich that some catastrophic circumstances arise in the process. As legislators, we have to come to terms with the problems as best we can.

I still hold the view that in its legislation the Government gave a guarantee of confidentiality to those people who relinquished children and to those who adopted children. I think that the legislation was passed in about 1976. The Government felt honour bound to continue that guarantee of confidentiality. The story that I related bears out the wisdom of the Government's actions.

One of the provisions in the Bill relates to indigenous and ethnic children. When the Bill was last amended, it was pointed out that the Government was not fully prepared to put this part of the legislation in place, hence the amending Bill that has been brought forward. When I listened to the speech made by the member for Ipswich, Mr Hamill, I could not help but notice that he highlighted the difference between the views of members of the ALP and those of Government members. The member for Ipswich said that adoption is a service to the child. It would be true to say that Government members believe that although it is very important to consider the child, it is also important to consider the relinquishing parent and the adoptive parents. That being the case, the Government and the Opposition have some differences of opinion.

Mr Hamill: I understood what I said was exactly in line with what the department says, adoption is there for the child—not for anyone else.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: The honourable member is being exclusive about the matter, whereas I am embellishing that by saying that we must also be very aware of the interests of the adoptive parents.

As to the honourable member's comments on indigenous and ethnic children for adoption—it would be true to say that most of his comments were based on Aboriginal people. I can understand the cultural differences there. The Government's legislation is very careful in its wording in that reference is not made to any one particular ethnic group. The Government has done that because there is a mood within the people of Australia—I am sure that it is not intended—that by legislating in socio-psychological and other matters exclusively for one ethnic group, a counter-productive move is achieved. There is something like a bit of an apartheid mood where people are being set apart. The common desire of all Australians is for the country to have a multicultural society in which a great deal of racial co-operation takes place. The honourable member would understand the wisdom of the Government's legislation in that it refers to indigenous and ethnic background children.

Mr Hamill: What about the guardianship idea, though?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I took that on board. I think that the Department of Children's Services would bear that in mind. The Government is very much aware that the other States of Australia, as well as Queensland, are trying to arrange adoption where at least one of the parents of an ethnic child who is up for adoption is of the same ethnic background. The Government supports that view, and I am sure that it is also supported by the honourable member for Ipswich.

I am aware also of the honourble member's comment that the perception of adoption is something that is alien to the Aboriginal culture. I am sure that the Government will go down the track as far as it can to accommodate that view. To a certain extent, I can perceive dangers in that if one tries to create too many laws that cater for too many cultural ideas and laws relating to those cultural ideas, one can end up with a hotchpotch that is very complicated. A compromise must be reached to get around the problem. Nevertheless, I am sure that we take on board the honourable member's comments about the problem of perception of adoption.

Mr Palaszczuk: Will the Minister take them on board?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I am sure that she has.

In some circumstances, it is impossible to put back into the same group the children with ethnic backgrounds who have been fostered out.

I am aware of a situation in my own electorate in which two Aboriginal children from a tribe in the northern part of the Northern Territory came to live with a family that is very active in the community and is involved with service clubs, school organisations and sports. The natural parents of those children expressed no desire for contact with their children until they reached puberty. That may be related to their cultural heritage. When the foster parents, as responsible parents, made that fact known, their foster children expressed a fear that they did not know what they were, in fact, going back to.

Through me, those foster parents contacted the Children's Services Department and a meeting was arranged. The foster parents were assured that their foster children would not be put into a situation in which their birthright had become alien to them.

I was most impressed by the sensitivity of the officers of that department. The process of adoption has reached a stage at which children who are reared from the age of two or three up to puberty and beyond are likely to be adopted by white foster parents. Once again, I point out the sensitivity of this legislation and of the officers of the Children's Services Department.

I turn now to special needs. I am very much in tune with the comments made by the previous speaker. The proposed amendments are very much in tune with the attitudes of modern society. It may be a simplistic idea that a new baby who is put up for adoption is healthy. That is not always the case. I will cite some examples of the types of children who may come up for adoption and who do not fit that description: an eight-year-old boy who is intellectually handicapped and has been physically abused; a four-year-old with a respiratory and cardiac condition, who has been in residential care since the age of two; a three-month-old baby with recently diagnosed cerebral palsy; a 14-year-old boy who has spent 10 years in foster care and whose natural parents have decided that he would be better off being adopted; and a four-week-old baby with Down's syndrome.

If those are the types of children with special needs who become available for adoption, a special situation arises. Those children suffer from physical and medical disabilities, psychological maltreatment, and perhaps a combination of all of those things.

I think it would be true to say that it is the opinion of the public at large, and certainly this Government, that every child—regardless of any special needs that he or she may have—is entitled to a family for life, if it is at all possible.

With those factors in mind, the Government has put together a couple of programs that are, in fact, paying dividends. The "Be My Parent" program caters for children from 12 months of age up to six years. All of the children under that program have disabilities of one form or another. They are all children with special needs. The program also caters for children with medical needs and children with fixed racial origins.

The second program that the Government has implemented is the establishment of a special-needs unit, which caters for children who are six years of age and over. Very often, those children have been institutionalised for some time and have become harder to place, because people prefer to have an association with their adopted child from birth or as close as possible to birth.

Nevertheless, those programs have been very successful. I am informed that between 1980 and 1986, the special-needs program placed 77 children. During the three years from 1983 to 1986, the "Be My Parent" program placed 76 children. Therefore, during the six-year period from 1980 to 1986, 143 children with special needs were placed with caring families.

The previous speaker paid tribute to those parents and people who find within their hearts the capability of taking on children with special needs and giving them a home for life. I pay tribute also to those people. A tribute should be paid also to the Department

of Children's Services which, with a great deal of finesse, has been able to bring those families and adoptive children together.

The number of healthy children available for adoption is declining. However, the number of children with special-needs care may well increase merely because medical science has improved to the extent that many of the medical conditions that some of the special-needs children have can now be treated in the home so long as support systems come forward from the Government in terms of psychological care and medical care being near at hand.

I cite another case in my area in which a couple who already have two children of their own decided that they had room in their hearts and their home for a special-needs child. Because their desires were not agreed to by the Department of Children's Services, they were rather frustrated. I was asked to find out why.

The "Be My Parent" program sends out a brochure with a picture of the child and the background of the child's disabilities. This couple thought that they had found a child that they could handle. It is important that people have an idea of a child's disabilities and that it is not like picking something off the shelf. They have to be aware of their own capabilities and what they can handle in the home situation. Because they had been turned down a couple of times, that very nice family were disappointed. I took the matter up on their behalf.

The problem boiled down to the fact that the Department of Children's Services saw that it had a need to make sure that a child in special need was never placed too far away from the medical treatment that it may need. I commend the department for that. Then it came down to a definition of how far was too far. Obviously, the parents whom I was trying to help thought that they lived close enough and the Department of Children's Services thought that that was not the case. We had to try to sort things out. I will not disclose the outcome, but it was a situation in which there was a chance to place a special-needs child who was hard to place. The Department of Children's Services was not prepared to allow the child to be adopted if it thought that a situation was not exactly right. I support that policy.

Mr Hamill: That is an example of what I was talking about—it is the emphasis on the child—the child's needs.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: In that regard, yes. I accept that.

Mr Hamill: In every regard in relation to adoption.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: In regard to the contact register, I would have to disagree with the honourable member. But in that regard, yes. In other aspects I would not always agree.

Mr Eaton: Agree to differ.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: That is a good comment from the member for Mourilyan.

Honourable members would be aware that many couples in Queensland are keen to adopt children from overseas, especially from south-east Asia, after all the conflict that has occurred there in the last 25 years or so. Some very successful adoptions have been carried out. It is true to say that the department is doing whatever it can to help the people who want to adopt those children by removing all the barriers it can and safeguarding the interests of the child and of the nation and trying to help the parents who want to adopt. It is also important that we impress on the minds of people in Queensland that they should not always look beyond the shores of Queensland. With the incidence of special-needs children increasing, people who have room in their hearts for adoption should be made aware of the children with special needs, be they only a few months old or the older children who have been a long time without a family life. After all, the policy was that every child should have a family life for ever.

I firmly support the Bill before the House.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (10.44 p.m.): I have much pleasure in speaking to the Adoption of Children (Amendment) Bill. I join with the Labor Party spokesman in supporting the Bill. The adoption of children is a very sensitive area. It is important that it is put into perspective in the overall operation of the Children's Services Department as to the problems that understaffing is having with the adoption of children in Queensland.

Because of the statutory requirements of the Department of Children's Services in areas such as child abuse, the adoption of children takes a lower priority. The adoptions are being neglected not by choice but work pressure. It is important that that area be examined, because it could be creating problems in ensuring that the children available for adoption are placed within the proper environment.

I turn to the problems associated with the staffing of the Department of Children's Services in Bundaberg. In 1985, the staff consisted of one supervisor, four child-care officers, a part-time home-maker and two clerical staff. In 1987, the same staffing level applies in Bundaberg, that is, one supervisor, four child-care officers, one part-time home-maker and two clerical staff.

The problem arises because the same staff now has a greater workload brought about by the incidence of child abuse. Other aspects of the work of these departmental officers, such as the adoption of children, take second place and are given a lower priority. This is necessarily so because of the Acts under which the department operates. The department must fulfil its statutory requirements in relation to child abuse.

In Bundaberg only a few weeks ago, a seminar on child abuse outlined the problems that were being experienced in terms of child-abuse notifications. In Bundaberg, in 1984-85, 67 notifications were lodged with that office. In the following year, 1985-86, that number increased to 167, which is expressed as an increase of 150 per cent. In the six months between July 1986 and December 1986, the number of notified cases of child abuse was 136.

Mr Littleproud: We are talking about adoption.

Mr CAMPBELL: I know. I am trying to outline a situation that exists because of the increased workload that is being carried by the supervising officers who handle adoption. Because of that workload, the departmental officers cannot carry out that work.

Some of my constituents who wanted to adopt a child could not have their applications processed by the department. That is the point I am making, and that is why I am concerned about the contents of this Bill. I believe that the honourable member for Condamine should have waited until I made that point.

In Bundaberg, an increase of 150 per cent in cases of child abuse occurred in the period 1984-85. In a further period of six months, the incidence of child abuse has increased another 64 per cent.

The point I make is that those officers who handle not only cases of child abuse but also adoptions have not sufficient time to properly manage prospective parents who wish to undertake adoption. Moreover, those officers have not sufficient time to devote to the sensitive matter of holding discussions with relinquishing mothers. Because of the factors I have outlined, that kind of problem can happen.

I instance the case of a stepfather who wanted to adopt a child that he regarded as his son. The officers of the department in Bundaberg could not process that application for more than 12 months. Those officers did not have the time to process the application made by the stepfather for the adoption of his own son. That illustrates the kind of workload that is being imposed on the staff.

I do not blame the staff at Bundaberg, because this kind of thing is happening all the time. When workload relating to child abuse increases by 150 per cent and when the Act sets out that certain steps must be taken, the time taken for necessary procedures relating to adoption will be reduced. This is what is happening at present. I am sure

that other cases that relate to the same problem have been referred to other members of Parliament. When the Government talks about adoption, it should also look to increasing the number of child-care officers and staff in the Department of Children's Services to ensure that applications are processed much more quickly.

Another aspect that was raised by other honourable members is the adoption contact register. Last year when this matter was debated, I believe I put forward one proposition that would reduce the decline in the number of adoptions. I forecast that change might occur in some way and that more babies may be put up for adoption. One problem that affects relinquishing mothers who are unmarried mothers is that they feel they have to make a life-long decision. In other words, they feel that once they give up their baby, it will be for ever and they may never have another chance to come in contact with their baby. In many cases, because it is a life-long decision that they must make, they may be inclined to say, "Oh no, I won't do it. I prefer to keep the baby."

The aspects of the contact register could be broadened to allow for provisions whereby the relinquishing—the natural—mother could request that the adopting parents also put their names on a contact register at the time of adoption. With the consent of both the natural mother—the relinquishing mother—and the adoptive parents, at the time of adoption, they could together say, "Yes, we are prepared to put our names on the contact register." In that case a relinquishing mother may be prepared to make that decision, because she would know that at some time in the future, if ever that child wanted to meet or get to know its relinquishing mother, that factor could be taken into account.

I want to make two points. Firstly, the adoption of children in Queensland is being hampered somewhat because of the shortage of child-care staff in the department, and, secondly, the provisions of the contact register could be broadened to allow, at the time of adoption, with the consent of both the relinquishing mother and the adopting parents, for names to go on the contact register.

Mr BEARD (Mount Isa) (10.52 p.m.): I would like to support some comments made by all of the previous speakers tonight on the subject of adoption and also commend the Minister for further advancing Queensland's adoption laws by introducing a couple of very worthy amendments.

One of the greatest tragedies that I have struck over the last 15 years of my married life is the scarcity of children available for adoption. I guess that the introduction of more effective contraceptives, the freer availability of abortion and, in particular, the increased social welfare payments made to single supporting mothers for children born out of wedlock during the 1970s have all contributed to that. But for whatever reason, and the sum of all the reasons, the supply of children available for adoption has dried up.

I am an adoptive parent myself. I have two adopted children following two natural children. As recently as 1973 when my wife and I adopted our second child, we even had a choice. I can still remember the sister from the hospital ringing up and saying, "We do have a little boy available for you but he has red hair", as though that was going to make some difference—I could discard him because he had red hair. When we went to pick up that little baby the sister told us, "I can't really believe some people. Do you know that some people come in here with a full layette and dress a baby up and look at him for a while and then say, 'Oh, no thanks, I don't think so', and return it." That was as recently as 1973. Yet by the time 1980 came, people were waiting for four, five, six years or even longer to adopt babies. It is really a modern tragedy.

It is compounded by the fact—and I think that the member for Bundaberg made a good point here—that perhaps it is due to the shortage of staff. Probably single mothers who have childen out of wedlock are not given enough counselling and advice to help them make that heart-wrenching decision to give up their baby for adoption. Some young girls, most ill-advisedly, decide that they can handle this themselves and take the

baby away, with someone saying, "You will get a pension, honey. We'll help you for a little while", and that sort of talk.

I am aware of several cases of babies being returned at the age of 12 months, nine months, two years and three years because the girl just could not cope or because she later established a liaison with a young man who did not want to be reminded of her earlier liaison. So young children or babies were being returned to homes. That makes them very difficult to adopt. As Mr Hamill said, it takes a really special kind of person to accept into his home a child who is not a seven-day-old baby but who is older and who may well have some problems, physical, emotional, intellectual or whatever. That is another real tragedy involving children who are left in homes. From time to time one reads about them in the papers.

I am further aware that many people—acquaintances of mine from Mount Isa—have adopted overseas. Sri Lanka has become a fertile source from which Australian couples can adopt. I know at least one couple in my electorate who have adopted a Sri Lankan baby. Those people are desperate to have children of their own.

In a case when a relinquishing parent has not been properly counselled or does not know the rules, which happens particularly with members of Aboriginal communities—I have seen this happen in my electorate—it is often a tragedy when a child is given up but the relinquishing parent does not sign all the papers. She might go away, leave the child perhaps with somebody in the extended family and come back later to reclaim the child to the great distress and discomfort of all concerned. That causes many problems, but some of the amendments being proposed by the Minister will overcome them.

I support strongly the statement of the member for Ipswich that these amendments do not go far enough. I am a strong supporter of a contact register. I believe it is quite immoral that an adoptive set of parents can prevent an adult adoptee from seeking out and finding his own biological sources or roots or his parents. Far be it from me to suggest that an adoptive parent has a right to prevent that for ever. I do not think that a 31-year-old adult should be prevented by adoptive parents from seeking out his biological origins.

Mr Hamill: It is all about the rights of adults, isn't it?

Mr BEARD: Yes. I would prefer to say that it is the rights of human beings, David—Mr Hamill, I mean.

An Opposition member: That is very chummy.

Mr BEARD: Yes, very chummy. We are speaking about a subject on which we have a great deal of agreement.

Adoptive parents do have rights. If they do not wish their adopted child at age 18 to seek out his natural parents, they should have a right to say, "I am stalling you for three years." They may have the right to stall, to talk, to counsel, to advise and argue for three years, but when he reaches 21 they should lose any right to prevent that search.

I applaud the existence in Queensland of the Jigsaw organisation. My wife and I will give our two adopted children every assistance in seeking their own natural parents when they reach the age of 18—if they want to. If they want to, if the adoptive parents do finally agree to it and if the relinquishing parents have agreed to it, the case raised by the member for Condamine will not arise.

I am a believer in a multicultural Australia. I strongly believe that children of migrants should be aware of their parents' cultural origins, and that children of German migrants should learn the German language and be familiar with German culture and so on and so on. Similarly, I support strongly the contention that, if Aboriginal or other ethnic or indigenous children are available for adoption, as far as is possible, meeting all the requirements specified by the Minister, the adoptive parents, or at least one of them, should be of that race.

I fully support the amendments. In saying that I am sure I speak for the Liberal Party. In this case I just wish the Minister had gone a little further and provided for the establishment of a contact register.

Mr GOSS (Logan) (10.58 p.m.): I wish to speak briefly to the legislation. I obviously support the comments of my colleague the member for Ipswich and the suggestions that he has made.

I wish to deal with a couple of aspects but my primary concern is for a system that should be introduced in appropriate cases to provide a more efficient and speedier consideration of adoption. I understand that this scheme was adverted to in 1982 in a discussion paper during the time when the member for Redcliffe, Mr White, was the Minister. Tonight I seek to urge upon the Minister consideration for doing something about this particular situation. I wish to take one example that I came into contact with. A woman with a daughter in her early teenage years—in the range of 12 years or so—has formed a new relationship with a man; there is a further child or children of that relationship but they are anxious to adopt the older child into the family unit. Under the present system in these circumstances the adoption process takes some years to complete. In the case which was drawn to my attention, the child in question would have completed Year 12 and left school by the time the process had been completed. In that case that was quite inappropriate.

I made certain submissions to the former Minister, Mr Muntz, and to his credit he was good enough to make arrangements so that that particular adoption process could be expedited. That was certainly much appreciated by that family and I think it was certainly to the benefit and the welfare of that child and the family unit. That was an appropriate case.

I am aware of other cases in my electorate. In one case a woman who had a young child subsequently married; there are children of that relationship, and the family want to enter a formal adoption situation. That is not just because of the legalities of it, not just because of the question of the name of the child of the previous relationship, but more importantly having the child taken into the family completely formally and completely legally. It is important to people in an emotional sense.

In recent days some publicity has been given to people adopting the deed poll procedure to achieve certain results in relation to names. Obviously, this is a solution when it comes to effecting a change of name of a child from a previous relationship.

What I am saying is that I think there could be benefits in two areas from having what might be called, for example, a fast-track adoption process for certain children. I am sure that the Minister is aware of this particular suggestion. It is not new. However, I think it is something that does warrant consideration by the Minister, as it would have considerable benefits for people in that situation if it was introduced. Not only would it speed up the adoption process in that case, with consequent benefits to that family and to that child because it would happen more speedily, but also there would be a second benefit in that it would save the present scarce staff resources in the Minister's department in so many areas, particularly in relation to the adoption process.

Obviously, if some children's cases could be dealt with more quickly, that would mean that more staff and more resources would be available for the other more regular adoption cases. Hopefully, those cases could be speeded up by virtue of the fact that some cases have been taken out of the normal time-frame which, unfortunately, is quite lengthy.

I accept that quite a detailed process has to be undertaken to ensure that the best interests of the child are ensured and protected. I accept that the motivation in relation to that process is quite genuine. However, I think that if this measure was introduced, it would be of benefit to the family and to other cases because it would mean that more resources would be available. It would simply mean a more efficient use of resources. It would not really involve any substantial risk in relation to the welfare of the child in those cases in which there was some fast-track adoption process because in cases such

as the ones to which I have referred, the child in question is already living in that family situation anyway.

To a large extent it is simply a matter of recognising the reality of the situation of the family unit and enabling them to get on with their lives as a more formal and complete family unit in the way that they need, in an emotional as well as a legal sense. As I said, it has the important additional benefit of making the staff who work in this area freer to deal with the other more regular cases.

I urge the Minister to take on board my comments and to consider taking action at the earliest possible opportunity.

Hon. Y. A. CHAPMAN (Pine Rivers—Minister for Family Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs) (11.03 p.m.), in reply: The member for Ipswich appeared to speak in support of the provision which seeks to give preference to the adoption of children with persons who share the child's cultural background. However, there is no basis for his statement that the Bill seeks to deal with this sensitive issue in a cavalier manner.

Unfortunately, the member for Ipswich misinterpreted the scope of the Bill by referring to the fostering of Aboriginal and Islander children. As indicated in my second-reading speech, the fostering of such children is outside the ambit of this Act and will be dealt with in another Bill which I anticipate introducing later.

I see no merit in the suggestion that Aboriginal and Islander children should be specifically named in the Act. The same principles that apply in respect of these children should also apply to the placement of children from various ethnic and cultural backgrounds.

My department may consult with a number of Aboriginal and Islander agencies in the process of finding suitable community placements for children in its care and in working to reunite children with their parents. I would like to acknowledge the very valuable assistance that is provided by the agencies involved. However, I see no reason why it is necessary for these very satisfactory consultative arrangements to be embodied in legislation. It is my department and me as the responsible Minister who are accountable to the Queensland public for the placement of children for adoption and there can be circumstances where consultations with relevant agencies may not be necessary.

I am aware that the wide-ranging recommendations of the Australian Law Reform Commission will affect a number of departments, and these are currently being examined by an interdepartmental committee. However, I can assure all honourable members that the Queensland Government will oppose any suggested intrusion by the Commonwealth Government into the area of adoption, which has traditionally been regarded as the responsibility of the State.

The honourable member mentioned the reduction in the number of adoptions in recent years. I am sure he is aware that I have spoken on this matter on a number of occasions. It is a most unfortunate situation where hundreds of people who desperately want children cannot be satisfied. In the last financial year there were fewer than 150 babies available for adoption compared with a waiting-list of more than 1 200. The fact cannot be overlooked that this position has been forced upon Queensland in the main by the legacies of the disastrous easy hand-out policies of the Whitlam era.

The honourable member referred to the guardianship provisions of the 1983 Act that relate to grandparents. This section was amended in 1986 to apply to all relatives. He appears to support the existing provision and there is no suggestion that children will be adopted under this Bill when fostering or guardianship arrangements could be more desirable for the child.

I thank the honourable member for Condamine for his positive contribution to the debate. His experience with particular cases supports the balanced approach contained in the Bill to the adoption of children with indigenous or ethnic backgrounds. I agree with his sentiments that whilst preference should be given to adopting children to applicants who share the child's indigenous, ethnic or cultural background, adequate

provision should be made to ensure that any such rule can be departed from where the welfare and interests of the child are concerned. Adoption is an area where an individual's entire future is being dealt with. Therefore there can never be rigid inflexible rules for the placement of children.

I thank the honourable member for his acknowledgement of the role that my department plays in the placement of children with special needs. His words of encouragement are appreciated. It seems that in the future there will be an increasing number of children with special needs who will be available for adoption. It is my hope that as this occurs, more and more Queensland families will become aware of the needs of these children and will open their hearts to them so that they can enjoy being adopted into a family situation.

I appreciate the honourable member's support in regard to the compassionate stance taken on the contact register. My own impression is that there has been wide community support since the legislation went through Parliament for the Government's preference for a register which recognises all three parties to the adoption process. Since introducing the legislation, I have seen a great deal of evidence to support this Government's approach and its desire to protect the interests of all parties. As I have said in this House many times before, no one in this House is capable of legislating for people's emotions. I have been amazed at the lengths to which some organisations such as Jigsaw will go to find out information by underhanded means. I have had brought to my attention many instances of the heart-break and anxiety caused by these organisations trying to subvert the law. This has convinced me that this Government took the right direction.

I thank the honourable member for Bundaberg for his support of the general principles, but in relation to his remarks concerning the need for more children being made available for adoption, I refer him to the figures that I quoted earlier. He spent a great deal of his time criticising the department's inability to process applications from prospective parents. He does not seem to understand that even if the department's entire staff was put onto adoption assessments next week and cleaned them up, there would still be a huge number of disappointed people. There are just not enough children available to satisfy the demand. I point out that during 1986-87 about $120,000 was allocated for fees for adoption assessments in addition to those undertaken by my officers.

The honourable member for Mount Isa also showed some sensitivity for the problems being addressed, but I am sure that his comments about the inadequacy of the contact register provisions would be tempered if he saw some of the heartbreak to which I referred earlier.

I have noted the suggestions of the honourable member for Logan. They will be considered by my department. The current arrangements will be assisted when the four separate lists come into force later this year.

Motion agreed to.

Committee

Hon. Y. A. Chapman (Pine Rivers—Minister for Family Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3, as read, agreed to.

Clause 4—

Mr HAMILL (11.12 p.m.): Clause 4 contains the substantive amendment to the Act. It relates to the placement of children with indigenous or ethnic backgrounds. That is the way in which the proposed section is headed. It is important that the Committee receive a little further elucidation from the Minister on that matter. I know that in her reply the Minister stated that there was no merit to name Aboriginal children as such.

Maybe the Minister could explain further the clause and its operation. I would have thought that for the most part the operation of the proposed section will have greatest

application in the placement of indigenous children. By virtue of the drawing areas from which Queensland takes its overseas adoptions, obviously most overseas adoptions will not be adoptions where children will be placed with adopting parents of that particular ethnic or cultural background. The honourable member for Mount Isa mentioned Sri Lanka. I know that the Philippines and Korea are other countries in that category. Most of the adopting parents, of course, are not Sri Lankan, Filipino or Korean. Presumably the insertion of this provision relates particularly to the placement of indigenous children from this State. My understanding of "indigenous" is that it would refer to children from the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. If the Minister has the information at her disposal, she might like to tell the Committee the number of placements of Aboriginal and Islander children that have been effected over the last year—or during 1985-86, if the current year's figures have not been fully tabulated. The Minister might inform the Committee whether those children have gone to Aboriginal and Islander homes, to mixed-race homes or to European-Australian homes. That is a matter of greater significance. As I said, the Minister's attitude to the special adoption needs of those communities seemed somewhat cavalier.

It has already been recognised that special needs exist with children who are up for adoption. Why do we not also recognise the special needs of particular communities? This provision goes some little way towards doing that. However, there are special needs of Aboriginal and Islander communities. Evidence was presented that, to Aboriginal communities, adoption was alien, yet the Minister persists in requiring prospective Aboriginal parents to meet exactly the same criteria as those established for other prospective adopting parents. That unbending attitude is not in the best interest of the children.

I return now to one of the initial points that I made, namely, that the interests of adopted children are absolutely paramount. Although I believe that I share the sympathy of the Minister for those prospective parents who seek to adopt children, I do not agree with her statement that somehow or other, because not as many children are available for adoption as there were in the past, that is of itself a bad thing. After all, the interests of the child are paramount. If it means that a child will stay with its mother, surely the mother/child relationship is a very worthy relationship which should be supported by this Government.

I do not believe that moral judgments should be made as to who should adopt the mothering role. However, I believe that, if a natural parent wants to nurture his or her child, that parent has the right to do so. If a natural parent determines that his or her child should be relinquished and put up for adoption, it is the right of the parent to do so. The onus is then placed upon the Department of Children's Services to place that child in an adoptive situation in which his or her needs remain paramount.

I return to the subject of the adoption of Aboriginal children, and I invite the Minister to comment on my suggestion about the use of guardianship provisions to cater for the particular needs of the Aboriginal community in relation to adoption.

Mrs CHAPMAN: The proposed amendment is not restricted solely to Aboriginals and Islanders. It is worded generally to reflect this Government's policy that the law should apply equally to all residents.

In answer to the honourable member's question relating to the number of Aboriginal children that were adopted during 1985-86—I believe that the figure was 14.

Mr HAMILL: I also ask the Minister two further questions in relation to the placement of Aboriginal children. The Australian Law Reform Commission was concerned with the placement code. It was the intention of that commission that this Government should legislate within the purview of its constitutional powers of adoption.

Can the Minister provide the Committee with further details about the nature of the families into which those 14 Aboriginal children were adopted? The whole point of the insertion of this amendment into the legislation is to provide a legislative framework

whereby the cultural traditions of children who are available for adoption are recognised and nurtured in their adoptive families.

Can the Minister provide further information about those families and, perhaps, comment on the notion of guardianship of Aboriginal children?

Mrs CHAPMAN: In relation to the question of the eligibility criteria—indigenous background is only one factor that is considered.

In relation to the honourable member's query about those particular families—that information would not be available until the particular adoption cases are considered by the Department of Children's Services.

In respect of the question of guardianship—I refer the honourable member to section 20 of the 1986 Act.

Clause 4, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 7, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mrs Chapman, by leave, read a third time.

LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT AND SPIRIT MERCHANT'S LICENSES (VALIDATION OF TRANSFERS) BILL

Hon. P. J. CLAUSON (Redlands—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (11.21 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to validate determinations and orders made by the Licensing Court in relation to applications made to it for the transfer of spirit merchant's licenses and to amend the Liquor Act 1912-1985 in certain particulars and for other purposes."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. P. J. CLAUSON (Redlands—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (11.22 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Under the Liquor Act, the Licensing Court may grant spirit merchants' licences which entitle licence-holders to sell quantities of at least 9 litres of liquor wholly or principally to persons licensed to sell liquor by retail. It has been the practice of the Licensing Court, when granting or transferring a spirit merchant's licence, to impose certain conditions on the licence relating to the type of liquor that may be sold and the persons to whom it may be sold. These conditions have been imposed to ensure the orderly wholesale marketing of liquor and to prevent unfair competition with other licence-holders.

However, in a recent decision, the Full Court found that, as a result of an error in the 1973 amendments to section 27 of the Act, the Licensing Court did not have the power to transfer spirit merchants' licences; nor did it have the power to impose conditions on such licences when they were transferred. The effect of this decision was to raise doubts as to the validity of all transfers purportedly made by the Licensing Court since the 1973 amendments came into operation. The decision has also meant that there is now no effective mechanism in the Act for transferring spirit merchants' licences.

The purpose of the Bill is to correct that situation by providing, firstly, that transfers of spirit merchants' licences approved by the Licensing Court prior to the Full Court's decision are valid and, secondly, that all conditions imposed on such transferred licences by the Licensing Court are also valid. In addition, the Bill gives the Licensing Court both the power to transfer spirit merchants' licences and the power to impose and vary conditions when transferring those licences.

The Bill restores the legal position with respect to the transfer of spirit merchants' licences under the Liquor Act to what it was believed to be prior to the Full Court's judgment and it ensures that the rights and obligations of the parties to previously transferred licences are not disturbed.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Prest, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. W. POWELL (Isis—Leader of the House) (11.24 p.m.): I move—

"That the House do now adjourn."

Air Services in Queensland

Mr PREST (Port Curtis) (11.25 p.m.): Tonight I would like to talk about air services to certain parts of Queensland. I spoke about this matter in October 1981 and on 26 November 1981. At that time, I was concerned about Brisbane-Gladstone air services and those to the central-western area.

Of course, with the passing of time, the wheel has turned full circle and the situation about which I spoke again presents itself. Whereas in 1981 both TAA and Ansett wished to pull out of these runs, today Air Queensland wishes to pull out because the State's airline considers its after-operations loss of $4.2m over the last financial year to be unacceptable. Only Sunstate is now willing to do this run after 30 April. Ansett cannot be considered because both the deputy manager and the manager, Mr Entsch, made contradictory statements in relation to the Ansett deal that would be put to the Government so that it could obtain the Brisbane-Gladstone run. Unfortunately, because of those conflicting statements, Ansett should not be considered at all. After all, Ansett wants only the Gladstone run. An article published on 28 March 1987 reads as follows—

"Ansett Airlines wants to operate out of Gladstone but is not prepared to take on any of the 'unprofitable' western runs."

That means that Ansett is willing to forsake the people who live in the west—the people that this Government is supposed to represent. The silence from National Party members who represent these people is deafening.

Mr Powell: Is it true that Ansett promised a jet service to Gladstone when in fact jets are not allowed into Gladstone?

Mr PREST: That is true. One airline promised an F28 jet aircraft that requires a manned control tower that would have cost $1.5m. In addition, the airstrip would have had to be widened. Because of those factors, it was not possible for those aircraft to fly to Gladstone. That is why I say that the statements made by the deputy manager and the manager of Ansett were contradictory.

In Queensland, it is fortunate that Sunstate is willing to take on not only the profitable run to Gladstone but also the runs to western areas. On 22 March 1987, the following statement was made—

"Air Queensland will cease operating on south-east and central Queensland routes by the end of April.

The Air Queensland general manager, Paul Boyce, said yesterday the decision had been taken with 'deep regret for economic reasons'.

The south-eastern routes took in Brisbane, Gladstone and Bundaberg while the Central Highlands routes included Biloela, Blackwater and Emerald.

Australian Airlines, parent company of Air Queensland, will cease operations on its western routes at the same time."

The western routes referred to are those out to Longreach and Mount Isa. The article goes on to state—

"The future of air services to western Queensland will be decided this week when State Cabinet considers a number of proposals."

That decision was to be made on 22 March 1987, but again it was postponed. Among the proposals was a submission from Sunstate Airlines. I give great credit to the work that has been done by Sunstate Airlines since the service was taken over in either 1981 or 1982. Sunstate Airlines is now willing to provide a service that will double the number of services in and out of Gladstone, particularly to Brisbane. In addition, Sunstate Airlines will take on the unprofitable run into western areas. Sunstate Airlines also enjoys the support of the Chairman of the Barcaldine Shire, who said—

"Western Queenslanders would be disappointed to lose a service which is fast, frequent and very good. But if Sunstate are to take over we would find that acceptable."

The only opposition to the western route being taken over is raised by Mr Magoffin of the United Graziers Association because he wants a pressurised service. It is, of course, impossible to get such a service.

I am very pleased to note that Sunstate has revealed that it is negotiating with a Brazilian company known as Brazilia in relation to an EMB120 30-seat pressurised turbo-prop aircraft that is worth $8m. It hoped to bring that service on stream in two years but if Brazilia were granted the monopoly of these runs, it would be willing to bring them into service within 12 months. That would be a wonderful service that would be provided by a Queensland-owned company.

Time expired.

Federal Government Support for African National Congress President

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise) (11.30 p.m.): Tonight, I rise to object in the strongest possible terms to the Federal Government-sponsored visit to Australia by the president of the African National Congress, Oliver Tambo. It is an outrage and an insult that a man who advocates violence, death, murder and bombings is being touted around Australia by the Federal Government as a legitimate spokesman for black South Africans.

The ANC's contacts with the Communist Party and with Moscow are a matter of public record. At least 19 members of Mr Tambo's executive of 30 are committed communists. It is a damning indictment on the Labor Party that similar invitations to visit Australia have not been extended to people of the ilk of Chief Buthelezi, the elected leader of the Zulus, the largest black tribe in South Africa.

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: As the Minister for Education says, it is quite true that Bishop Tutu supports Mr Tambo.

Australians are being presented with a minority communist assessment of the South African situation with no-one else being permitted to put his views forward. By embracing Mr Tambo and failing to extend a similiar welcome to moderate pro-western anti-disinvestment black leaders and, for that matter, representatives of all parties in the South African Parliament, the Hawke Government's foreign affairs morality must be highly suspect.

The ANC ranks with the PLO and the IRA as a terrorist organisation committed to revolution through violence. Mr Tambo should be exposed for the fraud that he is. However, it is the Federal Government that stands condemned——

Mr De Lacy interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I inform the member for Cairns that he may not interject from other than his usual seat.

Mr BORBIDGE: As I was saying, it is the Federal Government that stands condemned for feting a murderer. It is very interesting to hear the interjections of honourable members opposite.

Let us examine the recent history of the ANC. I will quote the words of Mr Tim Ngubane. He said—

> "We want to make the death of a collaborator so grotesque that people will never think of it."

Let me quote the words of Mrs Nelson Mandela, the wife of the gaoled ANC leader. She said—

" . . . with our boxes of matches and our necklaces, we shall liberate this country"—

referring to South Africa.

Mobs of African National Congress (ANC) militants burn blacks alive by giving them "the necklace": dropping gasoline-soaked tyres over their shoulders and feet. The tyres are then set alight so the burning gases destroy the lungs while the flaming rubber burns into the skin. The victim's hands are either tied behind the back or chopped off with machetes to keep him from removing the burning necklace. It takes from 30 to 40 minutes for the victim to die. Some ANC mobs prefer diesel fuel to gasoline because it burns slower and prolongs the torture.

On 9 September 1986, in an interview with *Newsweek*, Tambo remarked—and I challenge Opposition members to prove this wrong—

> "The ANC will no longer try to prevent death or injury to white civilians in South Africa and expects a bloodbath there . . . from now on whether civilians are likely to die will not be a consideration."

They are the words of a guest of the Labor Party—a house guest of Opposition members—who is being funded by the Australian tax-payers.

From 13 June 1977 to 23 December 1985 there were no fewer than 22 documented ANC terrorist attacks against black and white civilians in South Africa—22 attacks! That is the man who is being feted around Australia by Mr Hayden and by the Labor Party—a murderer.

On 4 February 1985, in an interview with the *Zimbabwe Herald*, Mr Tambo said that he wanted to correct an impression created by speculation about talks between Pretoria and the ANC and the possibility of the ANC abandoning armed struggle. He stated—

> "In any case, even if there were any talks and if we thought the time had come for talks with the Pretoria regime, we would not abandon the armed struggle, we would simply carry on."

Mr Powell: Is it true that the member for Ipswich got his masters degree out of funds from Africa?

Mr Hamill interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: I notice that the honourable member who is interjecting is a former Rhodes Scholar. It makes one wonder.

Time expired.

Shelburne Bay Silica-mining

Mr VAUGHAN (Nudgee) (11.35 p.m.): In view of all the huffing and puffing that the Government has been going on with over Shelburne Bay silica-mining, I want to take this opportunity to place some facts on the record. Firstly, according to the answer to a question that I asked the then Minister for Mines and Energy, Mr Gibbs, on 11

September 1986, the amount of silica produced in the State in 1985-86 totalled 828 811 tonnes; the amount sold or used was 808 611 tonnes; and the value was $7,718,265, or $9.31 a tonne. 619 253 tonnes of silica worth $6,134,006, or $9.90 a tonne, was exported. Total royalty received by the State from silica production was $205,057, or 25c a tonne. Further, the proposed production from the Shelburne Bay silica project is 250 000 tonnes per annum initially, increasing to 400 000 tonnes in five years' time.

At last year's price of $9.90 a tonne, the value of silica to be mined initially at Shelburne Bay would be only $2,475,000. When production increases to 400 000 tonnes per annum in five years' time, the value will be only $3,960,000. The project could therefore hardly be described as a high income earner providing major economic benefit to the State. After all, State royalty will amount to only $62,500, increasing to $100,000 at full production.

In addition, the present Cape Flattery silica-mining project south of Shelburne Bay, which has more than 100 years' worth of reserves and which currently supplies about 70 per cent of Japan's silica imports, could be adversely affected by a second silica export facility at Shelburne Bay. The Cape Flattery silica sand export facility on which, according to this year's State Capital Works Program, the Government is spending $15m this financial year and on which Cape Flattery Silica Mines Pty Ltd is spending $30m, can easily handle the tonnage of silica the Japanese companies want from Shelburne Bay. Just because some Japanese company wants to set up its own silica mine instead of buying from the established Cape Flattery mine is no reason to jeopardise the State's silica industry.

Quite frankly, I cannot but question the motives behind the recent visit of a top-level Japanese investment delegation of Japanese Government and business-leaders who tried to pressure the Federal Government into letting the Shelburne Bay project go ahead. As I have said previously, the value of proposed production from Shelburne Bay is peanuts, yet the Japanese were trying to say to us that, if the Federal Government gives the project the go ahead, that would be real evidence of the Government's commitment to encourage foreign investment.

I personally think the Japanese were trying to con us. After all, the Minister for Northern Development, Mr Katter, said in March last year that Shelburne Bay silica was of higher quality and the earning power of the product by the turn of the century could be $1,000m a year. It makes me wonder if perhaps the Japanese want to get their hands on the silica now at such bargain-basement prices to stockpile for the future.

Although Japan is the State's major export market, the Japanese are very shrewd businessmen, as our coal-producers well know from their experience in renegotiating coal contracts. There are times when I feel that we may appear to be an easy mark for Japanese businessmen. I get particularly concerned at some of the statements made by the Premier when he goes to Japan.

For these reasons I am concerned about the extent to which the Government has gone and appears to be going to allow the export of silica from Shelburne Bay to go ahead. I am sure that the Japanese must wonder what we are all about when they hear the Queensland Government saying that the Federal Government had no right to interfere in a Queensland project and that mining will go ahead despite a Federal move to stop it. I am also sure that a similar situation would not be tolerated in Japan.

While the Queensland Government has reportedly met with representatives of the companies wanting to mine silica at Shelburne Bay—Shelburne Silica Pty Ltd and ASP Resources Qld Pty Ltd, which is a subsidiary of Toyo Menka Kaisha Ltd and Nippon Sheet Glass—to discuss ways of circumventing the Federal Government's decision not to allow mining. I would very much doubt that Japanese businessmen would be party to such a move or that the Japanese Government would allow them to be. It would be a sad day for Australia-Japanese relations if that were to happen. I think the Japanese are more astute than that.

Qantas Services to North Queensland

Mr BURREKET (Townsville) (11.40 p.m.): I wish to speak about the future of tourism in north Queensland and in particular the effect that Qantas, Australia's international carrier, has on it. Since its inception, Qantas has done a very good job for Australia, especially in taking Australians overseas and, in post-war years, in returning Australians with mixed cultural backgrounds to their homelands. However, in the last eight years there has been a dramatic change in the use of the Australian carrier.

In fact, what has happened is that there has been somewhat of a revolution in the tourism industry in Australia, particularly in north Queensland, and there has been a somewhat spasmodic response from the Australian carrier.

What is really a handicap to tourism in north Queensland is the one-for-one policy that Qantas has. That policy is very restrictive because the tourist areas of north Queensland such as Cairns and Townsville simply do not have the ability to obtain overseas carriers, who very much want to come into Australia and service our tourism.

Last week I attended a meeting with Qantas, the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation and the Townsville Chamber of Commerce, at which the chamber put to Qantas a case for getting the next North American flight direct to Townsville. The end result was that Qantas was unable to give any guarantee (a) that there was a flight to come and (b) if it did come, that it would come to Townsville.

The whole crux of the problem is that Qantas really cannot service the requirements of the tourist industry in north Queensland. I urge the State Government to follow the lead that I have taken in Townsville. Three things should be done. Firstly, the State Government should urge the Federal Government to extend the Townsville runway and, secondly, it should get the Federal Government to ask Qantas to scrap its one-for-one policy and introduce an open-sky policy. That would enable Townsville and the other tourist destinations in north Queensland to pursue their own direction in attracting tourists.

Undoubtedly, the big revolution and the big industry in Australia right now is tourism. It will result in billions of dollars that will help the recovery of the Australian economy. Queensland and Australia desperately need those dollars. The tourists are out there. They want to come here. However, we cannot get them.

I think that this is something that has to be considered. The delegation from the development bureau spoke in terms of one flight. I suggested to them that we have to lift our thinking. We are not talking about one flight; we are talking about 10 flights and more than that a week. Already Cairns has six Qantas flights per week; Townsville has two. Honourable members can understand the dilemma that is being faced in north Queensland, particularly in Townsville, of trying to get tourists in to service our tourist industries.

Tourist projects in north Queensland are on the drawing-board and some have been completed now to the tune of about $447m. If north Queensland has the ability to produce those sorts of developments, surely it must have the right to negotiate with international carriers to service those tourist developments. That is very important. I am talking about north Queensland in particular. However, the policy must really apply right across Australia.

If there is a market out there for tourism and if Qantas is unable to service that market, its one-for-one policy must be dropped as quickly as possible. It really is a political policy. Qantas has the ability to continue in the direction that it is going. However, there is a market out there that is more extensive than that which Qantas is able to service.

I urge this Parliament to do what it can to ensure that north Queensland and Queensland receive as much benefit as possible from the international tourist market.

AIDS; Sex Education in Schools

Mr SHERLOCK (Ashgrove) (11.44 p.m.): In 1985—just two years ago—during International Youth Year, Queensland's co-ordinating committee identified seven issues of concern to young people. Those issues were recreation, education, health, accommodation, income security and law. There also emerged the very real fear that young people had of nuclear war and proliferation of nuclear power in all its forms.

Just two years ago, no mention was made of AIDS. Today one cannot pick up a daily newspaper without seeing reference to acquired immune deficiency syndrome, which is increasingly occupying the minds of young people. A report in the *Courier-Mail* of Monday, 9 March, dealt with 45 students who were interviewed in a survey about AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases and ways to prevent them.

I will read some of the statements made by these young people who show a maturity far in excess of those people some 40 years their senior who are elected to public office. One student said, "It's everybody's problem now." A young lady at a Brisbane high school was adamant about the need for sex education classes and said, "We need to know every detail, no matter how gross it gets." Her deputy principal agreed and indicated that sex education courses in Queensland schools are about a century overdue. Many of the students interviewed knew little about sexually transmitted diseases and their prevention, but one student summed it up with the feeling, "We're the ones growing up into adults. We're the ones who should be consulted." Another student had a word of advice for politicians, and stated—

> "They should consider doing something. It's not right for them to sit in Parliament and discuss the ideas of sex education programs. It's up to the schools to teach it to us."

All this comes from Brisbane teenagers.

I call upon the Government not to politicise the issue of sex education and diseases transmitted by sexual means. It is too important an issue for that. It is an issue that will affect our children and our children's children. Teachers and educationalists in all political parties have been calling for sex education and AIDS awareness campaigns for some time.

The Australian Labor Party in this Parliament has called for an all-party committee of inquiry into the issue of AIDS. This is a good idea. Not all of the good ideas are in one party. The National Party in Queensland has often relied upon the Liberal Party to be its watch-dog, to be in touch with public perception of issues and to be in touch with the feelings and needs of people. When issues are identified, Ministers in the Government are quick to latch on to them to dress up their own policies for public expediency. The Nationals have demonstrated that they are good at political point-scoring.

Many honourable members have been calling for greater awareness and sex education for some time and also the acceptance of the problem of AIDS as the public health issue that it is. Suddenly, the National Party, at its State conference, has woken up to the fact that something needs to be done about sex education and AIDS awareness. In its high moral stance, one hopes that it is not side-tracked by issues such as the registration of brothels and ignores the real issue of educating families and young people.

This country has already seen the "ostrich in the sand" approach to the drug issue in the community. For decades, we stood aloof in Australia, and more especially in Queensland, and ignored the fact that not enough was done early to educate about the problem. Parents were not made aware of the basic elements of the drug problem and how to detect it in their own families. Many parents would still be unaware about the drug problem and drug abuse.

Let us educate now about sex and about sexually transmitted diseases so that all in the community know what we are up against. Just as misuse of drugs will affect all of society, the AIDS issues will cut across all portfolios, oblivious to ministerial or any other responsibility.

The Government can no longer ignore its responsibility in the area of AIDS care. It has largely abrogated that responsibility to community groups. The churches, and the Catholic Church in particular in Queensland, have taken up the battle, quietly and in the background. They offer succour and support to AIDS victims. Many church schools have accepted responsibility for sex education and have already implemented these programs, clearly showing the way to State Government schools.

Sex education is not about morals. It is about social awareness and personal relationships. It is essential for personal development and for creating greater awareness about healthy family living. More broadly, it is central to the promotion of public health. AIDS has the potential of plague proportions and that fact has been expounded in this House before. There is a need to isolate and protect its sufferers whilst protecting the rest of the community against the disease. Most enlightened and informed public health workers agree that the greatest challenge and the most effective way——

Time expired.

Queensland Government's Commitment to Technology

Mr SHERRIN (Mansfield) (11.50 p.m.): This evening I wish to speak on the Queensland Government's commitment to technology as a means of further improving the performance of the Queensland economy. The Queensland Government clearly recognises that science and technology have a central role to play in Queensland's and Australia's economy by revitalising Queensland's existing industries and encouraging the growth of new industries. The Queensland Government's commitment to technology is evident in five major areas.

The first area is one that is very close to my own interest, that is, the responsibility of the Queensland Government in raising not only Queensland's but also Australia's skills base. Our future development depends on knowledge-intensive industries. The number of students completing secondary education and entering tertiary education is very low when compared with figures for many OECD countries and has fallen far behind the numbers for major nations in our region, such as Japan and Korea.

In the recent report on the national technology strategy put forward by the Commonwealth Government, the Science Minister, Barry Jones, set a goal that, by 1995, 50 per cent of students in Australia should complete secondary school. It is easy to see that once again Queensland leads Australia, because for the period from 1971 to 1985, the retention rates from Year 8 to Year 12 in Queensland Government schools increased from 23.2 per cent to 49.1 per cent, which is only 0.9 per cent below the target that the Commonwealth Government set itself for 1995. That is another area in which the leadership of the Queensland Government shows through when compared with the rest of Australia.

For the same period from 1971 to 1985, the Australian retention rate from the first year of secondary school to Year 12 in Government schools increased from only 29.5 per cent to 39.9 per cent. In other words, they had over 10 per cent to go to gain that. The tremendous job undertaken in Queensland schools in encouraging the large number of students to remain for a full 12 years reflects great credit not only on the Queensland Government but also on the teachers and on the curriculums that are studied in Queensland schools.

In that same report, it can be seen that the Federal Government has set a most incredible target of 20 per cent of school-leavers entering tertiary education by 1995. What an incredible statement of hypocrisy! As I have said in this Chamber before, the participation rates in university education in Queensland in 1971 led all the other States and the Commonwealth. Under Commonwealth Government funding, by 1983 the position was reversed totally. Participation rates had fallen to 14 per cent. The Commonwealth Government has the hypocrisy to set itself a goal of trying to raise the skills base of the Australian population. It has set itself a target of 20 per cent, yet it cannot even adequately fund Queensland's tertiary education, which has a participation rate of only 14 per cent. That is incredible hypocrisy.

The Queensland Government is doing its job. It has increased the retention rate to 50 per cent, which is the target set for the whole nation by 1995. The Commonwealth Government, in its area of responsibility, is lagging. The percentage participation rate in Queensland schools is falling all the time.

One other area of credit to the Queensland Government is the attempt to bridge the gap between research and industry. So often in the past, research has been undertaken in universities and colleges in isolation. Industry needs that research desperately to develop new products and new processes, and never the twain shall meet. I believe that the Queensland University and the QIT, through Q Search and Uniquest, which are independent companies of both of those tertiary institutions, have forged very strong links with industry to enable the basic research undertaken in Queensland universities, which is of world standard, to be transferred to industries.

As a whole, I believe that the Australian and the Queensland economy has to move away from high-bulk, low-value-added exports that have dominated the economy in the past towards high-value-added goods and services with high unit value that requires an application of brainpower and intelligence to develop those goods in Australia so that the raw resources are not shipped overseas, thereby allowing somebody else's brainpower to turn them into processes that can be used by others.

Queensland needs to create stronger and more appropriate economic structures that are capable of identifying market niches, producing goods that can be placed on a world market. A recent initiative by the Education Department to market its goods and services to ASEAN countries is a clear indication of that.

Time expired.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.