

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 19 OCTOBER 1989**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**THURSDAY, 19 OCTOBER 1989**

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

**PETITIONS**

The Deputy Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

**Police Manning Strength; Police Station, Sunnybank**

From Mr Gygar (160 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take urgent steps to increase the number of police and establish a police station in the Sunnybank area.

**Compulsory Pre-registration Period, Medical Students and Practitioners**

From Mr Beanland (290 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will reject changes to the Medical Act which extend the compulsory pre-registration period for medical students and practitioners to two years.

**Jet-ski Areas, Tallebudgera Creek-Snapper Rocks**

From Mr Gately (537 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will legislate to provide separate areas for the use of motorised jet skis from Tallebudgera Creek to Snapper Rocks.

Petitions received.

**PAPERS**

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

**Reports—**

Commissioner of Main Roads for the year ended 30 June 1989 and companion document

Department of Employment, Vocational Education and Training for the year ended 30 June 1989

Queensland Employment, Vocational Education and Training Board for the year ended 30 June 1989

Department of Community Services and Ethnic Affairs for the year ended 30 June 1989.

The following paper was laid on the table—

Order in Council under the Electricity Act 1976-1988.

**STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE****Adoption of Report**

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Leader of the House) (10.03 a.m.): I move—

- “(1) That the Report of the proposed amendments to Standing Orders concerning the Election of Speaker, from the meeting of October 4, 1989, be adopted, and
- (2) That the amendments be presented to His Excellency the Governor by Mr Speaker for His Excellency’s approval.”

Motion agreed to.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### Road-funding

**Hon. G. ALISON** (Maryborough—Minister for Main Roads and Racing) (10.04 a.m.), by leave: I am making this statement to inform members of my concern about the inadequacy of funding for roads. Over recent months a great deal of media attention has been given to the need to increase road-funding, arising from the deep concern expressed by the RACQ and the strong calls for action from the Local Government Association of Queensland.

Since becoming Minister for Main Roads, I have received a number of representations from councils, community groups and individuals pressing for greater efforts to improve roads and to make them safer. I have also had an opportunity to look closely at the basis for our road-funding.

I am sure all members appreciate the importance of a good road system to people and communities right throughout this State. Road transport is vital to the economic and social life of Queenslanders, and often provides the means of access to essential services such as health and education. The cost of road transport gets factored into almost everything we buy.

This Government recognises the importance of roads, and has reflected this in its priorities, as have various Queensland Governments since 1957. No-one can deny the great achievements since that time, when many of our major highways still had significant lengths unsealed.

However, there is presently a crisis with roads, and it is simply a problem of inadequate funding. The cause is clear. Since 1983-84, the level of road-funding from the Federal Government has declined by 30 per cent in real terms—or \$120m per annum. The decline occurred because Federal road-funding was not indexed during intervening years. It is indexed now, but it is indexed at a level which is just too low.

During that time, for example, Federal expenditure on administrative services increased by 13 per cent in real terms, and on culture and recreation by 11 per cent. The Federal Government's priorities are hitting at the very life-line of this State and nation. The Federal Government collects some 30c from every litre of fuel sold, but returns to roads only about 5.4c per litre.

For its part, the Queensland Government has increased its road-funding effort in real terms in an endeavour to compensate for the Federal decline. For example, it has increased motor vehicle registration in real terms, and dedicated all of those funds, some \$300m in 1989-90, to roads. In 1983-84, Queensland Government road-funding represented 65c for every \$1 of Federal road-funding to Queensland. In 1989-90, to maintain at least a modicum of progress, the Queensland Government has to provide \$1.62 for every \$1 of Federal road-funding.

In addition, to assist local government with its road problems, the Queensland Government has recently announced a special matching grant scheme, involving a further \$40m over two financial years. This scheme has received the overwhelming acceptance of local authorities. I expect to be able to approve the grants to individual councils by the middle of November.

This inadequacy of funding means narrow pavements are not being widened where necessary, ageing pavements are not being rehabilitated soon enough, not enough additional passing lanes are being provided and heavily used highways are overdue for duplication. All of these things could be tackled more effectively with a proper level of road-funding from Canberra. The result is higher costs for freight hauliers and motorists, a higher than necessary road-toll—with all that implies for human tragedy—and a higher life-cycle cost of providing roads.

There have been many independent studies on the economics of investing in roads that show the community benefits exceed the investment, but we do need to make the

investment to gain those benefits; we need to increase road-funding. That extra funding could be achieved just by the Federal Government's returning at least 7c per litre to roads instead of approximately 5.4c per litre as at present. It seems illogical to underinvest in roads when the outcome is bad roads, high accident rates and high freight costs.

Mr Speaker, the situation is grim. I urge all members of this House to contemplate this important issue, and to lend their voices to the call for an adequate level of road-funding. For my part, I will be meeting soon with my Federal counterpart to discuss with him at first hand some of Queensland's road problems. I hope to be able to persuade him and, through him, the Federal Government——

Mr Tenni: Put the whole lot back into roads.

Mr ALISON: That would be very useful. Through the Federal Minister, I hope to be able to persuade the Federal Government to restore the level of Federal commitment to building a good roads system.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### Comments by Member for Rockhampton on Teachers' Salary and Career Restructuring

Hon. B. G. LITTLEPROUD (Condamine—Minister for Education, Youth, Sport and Recreation) (10.09 a.m.), by leave: Mr Speaker, it is a matter of concern to me as Minister for Education and as a parent that, on Tuesday, the Opposition spokesman on Education, the member for Rockhampton, misled this House. In a scaremongering, alarmist statement on proposed salary and career restructuring for teachers, Mr Braddy claimed that the Queensland Government had refused to supplement salary increases. He is obviously more concerned with trying to score political points than with achieving something positive for education in Queensland.

I reiterate what I told non-Government school representatives recently. The State Government has made a commitment to meet its share of any additional costs that flow on to the non-Government sector as a result of any approved award increases for teachers. That was also stated at a meeting with non-Government school employers' representatives on 18 September and reaffirmed by the Honourable the Premier at a subsequent meeting on 26 September.

On 26 September I also wrote to my Commonwealth counterpart, Mr Dawkins, seeking an assurance that the Commonwealth also would meet its share of any award increase for non-Government teachers. I have not received a reply.

Mr Speaker, I seek leave to table the letter and have it incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

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

26 September 1989

The Honourable J.S. Dawkins, MP  
Minister for Employment, Education  
and Training  
Parliament House  
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Mr Dawkins

You would be aware that, as part of its recent State Budget, the Queensland Government announced a major initiative in the area of teacher salaries and benefits. The details of a major component of that initiative are contained in the attached document "A New and Improved Career Structure for Teachers in Queensland State Schools".

It is intended that the Government's proposed career structure be central to the restructuring of the Teachers' Award—State. To this end, the document provides a basis for negotiations between the Department of Education and the Queensland Teachers Union. I am advised that these negotiations are proceeding satisfactorily.

It is intended to present a submission to the State Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission as soon as possible after agreement has been reached between the parties, particularly in respect of productivity and efficiency issues which are subject of as yet "private" discussions between the Department and the Union. It is the Department's firm intention that any submission to the Commission will be within the guidelines set by the Federal and State Commissions as part of the National and State wage decisions. Perhaps more importantly, it is expected that any decision of the State Commission in respect of teachers' salaries and conditions will similarly be "within guidelines".

This brings me to the central reason for my writing to you.

There were recent statements in the media which related to the Commonwealth's position on cost supplementation for salary increases that are awarded by established arbitration tribunals. I am aware of the statement subsequently made by the Acting Minister for Employment, Education and Training which clarified the Commonwealth's position. In particular, I was pleased to see the statement that

"the Federal Government would support teacher pay rises as part of award restructuring if such rises were within the wage fixing guidelines and were ratified by the relevant industrial commissions."

I have had approaches from groups of employers in the non-government school sector who have expressed grave concerns about their capacity to pay for the flow-on effects of a restructured Teachers' Award—State if they do not receive supplementation from the Commonwealth Government. For our part, the Queensland Government has assured these employers that we will meet our share of any additional costs that flow to the non-government sector as a result of any approved award increases for teachers.

I would appreciate it if you would reassure the non-government employers of your intention to do likewise.

The opportunity is there not only for a restructuring of the teachers' salary and career structures but also for the enhancement of the attractiveness of teaching as a profession. I would not wish to see those initiatives lost because one group of employers feel that they are not going to be supported by Governments in assisting them in meeting the costs involved.

I await your response.

Yours sincerely

BRIAN LITTLEPROUD, M.L.A.  
Minister for Education,  
Youth, Sport and Recreation  
and Member for Condamine

**Mr LITTLEPROUD:** It should be pointed out that, on average, salaries for non-Government teachers are paid roughly 60 per cent by the Commonwealth, 30 per cent by the State Government and the remainder by school fees.

I wonder if the honourable member for Rockhampton has heard today from his union advisers, the President of the Queensland Teachers Union, Mary Kelly, and the General Secretary of the Queensland Association of Teachers in Independent Schools, Peter O'Brien. I believe that they are not very happy with comments made by Labor's spokesman on Education and with attempts at trying to undermine the Queensland Government's initiative aimed at giving teachers improved salaries and career paths. At least Mr O'Brien put the blame where it should be put in a recent edition of the *Independent Teacher*, which refers to a submission that was supposed to have been put by Mr Dawkins to Cabinet last week. Mr O'Brien states—

"There still is a chance that Dawkins may get rolled. If this happens the (Commonwealth) Government will have a state aid election on its hands . . . Let us hope sense prevails."

The journal also states—

"It would be ironical if a Federal Labor Government, whose rhetoric over the last eight years has been towards education reskilling and improvements in the quality of our workforce, was to give less to that process than a right wing National Party Government."

I am still waiting to receive a reply from Mr Dawkins, who I believe was rolled in Cabinet but previously had changed his mind several times on this issue.

Allow me to trace the history of his commitment. Following our State Budget, Mr Dawkins made an implied threat that the Commonwealth may not provide any funding. Subsequently his junior Minister said the Commonwealth would contribute if increases were within national wage-fixing guide-lines. Reportedly the position again changed to that of the Commonwealth's funding only its share of a 6 per cent increase. The latest rumour is that Mr Dawkins believes the Commonwealth should meet its full share.

Although the details of the State Government's proposal were first announced in the State Budget, the subject of salary and career restructuring for teachers has been the subject of discussion for much of this year. Discussions at a national and State level involved even Mr Dawkins as well as union and other representatives. When representatives of the non-Government sector met recently with the Honourable Premier and myself they were reassured they could be confident of the support of the Queensland Government, as stated in the Budget Speech. It now remains for Mr Braddy and Mr Dawkins to show the colour of their money so that the non-Government sector can resolve its uncertainty.

Mr Speaker, while the non-Government sector of education has every reason to doubt Labor's sudden interest in it, there is certainly nothing to fear from this National Party Government's policies, which guarantee independence and fair funding assistance, and have done for many years.

#### LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr GOSS (Logan—Leader of the Opposition) (10.13 a.m.): I seek leave to move a motion of censure without notice in respect of matters referred to—

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

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

#### AYES, 36

Ardill	Prest
Beanland	Santoro
Beard	Schuntner
Braddy	Scott
Campbell	Sherlock
Casey	Smyth
Comben	Vaughan
D'Arcy	Warburton
De Lacy	Warner
Eaton	Wells
Gibbs, R. J.	White
Goss	
Hamill	
Hayward	
Innes	
Knox	
Lee	
Lickiss	
McElligott	
Mackenroth	
McLean	<i>Tellers:</i>
Milliner	Davis
Palaszcuk	Gygar

#### NOES, 44

Ahern	Hobbs
Alison	Katter
Austin	Lester
Berghofer	Littleproud
Booth	McCauley
Borbridge	McKechnie
Burreket	McPhie
Chapman	Menzel
Clauson	Neal
Cooper	Nelson
Elliott	Newton
FitzGerald	Perrett
Fraser	Randell
Gamin	Sherrin
Gately	Simpson
Gibbs, I. J.	Slack
Gilmore	Stoneman
Glasson	Tenni
Gunn	Veivers
Harper	
Harvey	<i>Tellers:</i>
Henderson	Stephan
Hinton	Hynd

PAIR:

Underwood

Row

Resolved in the negative.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr BRADDY (Rockhampton) (10.21 a.m.), by leave: This morning the Minister for Education made an attack on me on the subject of support for non-Government schools.

**Government members interjected.**

**Mr BRADDY:** I will be a long time if Government members do not keep quiet.

The Minister has misled the House. In fact I was contacted by the Catholic education authorities and the independent school authorities, who told me that there has been a retreat from the Government's position. The former Premier, Mr Ahern, made a promise in his Budget Speech which Mr Littleproud is trying to suggest the Government is still adhering to.

The reality is that the incoming Premier, Mr Cooper, and the Treasury have informed the non-Government school authorities that they are not certain to back the undertaking given by the previous Premier.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member must make his personal explanation and not debate the question. I ask him to make his personal explanation.

**Mr BRADDY:** In these circumstances it was proper for me, as shadow Minister, to place on the public record the position of the Labor Party and demand that the Government come clean as to its position.

## PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC WORKS

### Report

**Mr McPHIE** (Toowoomba North) (10.23 a.m.): I lay upon the table of the House the report of the Parliamentary Committee of Public Works for the period 1 July to 19 October 1989, and seek leave for the report to be printed.

Leave granted.

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

**Mr McPHIE:** As Chairman of the Public Works Committee I place on record my appreciation of the dedication and commitment of all members to committee deliberations during the Forty-fifth Parliament.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**Mr GATELY** (Currumbin) (10.24 a.m.), by leave: Last night in this House another member of the National Party and I raised the fact that we disagreed with the appointment of a certain police officer to the rank of superintendent. This morning on the Rod Henshaw program my colleague and I were maligned by Mr Tom Burns, who stated that we were at odds with our Premier. That is totally untrue and false; he has misled the public. What happened proves conclusively that Government members are entitled to exercise their democratic rights in this House and say what they believe. Mr Burns has made scurrilous attacks for purely political purposes. My colleague and I have been maligned; that is not what we said.

### QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

#### 1. School Capital Works, Nerang Electorate

**Mr HYND** asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

“With reference to the Nerang electorate—

What is the cost, commencement time and estimated completion time of (a) the construction of the new Southport State School at the old Harness Race Club at Queen Street, Southport, (b) the construction and modification to the Musgrave Hill State School administration block, (c) the increasing of the perimeter fencing at Musgrave Hill Special School, (d) the covered way to the toilet blocks at

Labrador State School and (e) Nerang State School soundproofing against the high traffic noise?"

**Mr RANDELL:** I thank the honourable member for his question.

- (a) The project cost is estimated to be \$4m and design development will be completed early in February 1990, with completion of construction expected in the fourth term of 1990.
- (b) Upgrading to the administration block at Musgrave Hill State School is expected to cost about \$150,000. It is expected to begin in the middle of December this year and to be completed in March/April 1990.
- (c) Increasing the perimeter fencing at Musgrave Hill Special School is expected to cost in the vicinity of \$11,350. The work is expected to begin in November this year and be completed within one month.
- (d) The covered way from Block C to the toilet blocks at Labrador State School is expected to cost about \$26,700. Work is expected to begin in December this year and to be completed in January/February next year.
- (e) Technical officers are to reassess traffic noise levels prior to the school vacation to establish whether readings meet design criteria requiring mechanical ventilation in school buildings to alleviate the problem.

## 2. Land Tenure, Punsand Bay, Cape York Peninsula

**Mr INNES** asked the Minister for Land Management—

“With reference to an area of Cape York known as Punsand Bay—

- (1) Has a special lease been granted by his department for land in this area?
- (2) If so, (a) what is the number and date of grant of the lease, (b) what is the area of land involved in the lease, (c) to whom was the lease granted, (d) is the lessee the owner of the Punsand Bay Private Reserve and (e) what is the lease payment?”

**Mr HARPER:** It is disappointing to me that the Leader of the Liberal Party in this House should be succumbing to the Goss/Richardson syndrome. Of course, he is being helped along the way—

**Mr Randell:** A Labor/Liberal coalition.

**Mr HARPER:** Perhaps, as the honourable member for Mirani said, it is a Labor/Liberal coalition, but I do not believe that for one minute. The fact is that some sections of the media, such as the ABC, are acting very irresponsibly in these matters.

I was interested to receive quite recently a letter from a person who felt quite strongly about the type of weighted media coverage that is encouraging people such as the Leader of the Liberal Party to ask this question. I table the letter and seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

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

4 October 1989

The Hon. N. J. Harper  
Minister for Land Management  
Land Administration Building  
George Street  
BRISBANE Qld 4000

Dear Sir

During the screening of the “7.30 Report” programme on the ABC Channel 2 on Tuesday night, the 3 October 1989, I telephoned the ABC and asked to speak to the producer of the “7.30 Report” programme.



I was connected to a gentleman whom I asked why Quentin Dempster was presenting such a blatantly biased report against the Queensland Government on Cape York.

I was told the report was not biased at all and that "your type always think anything you do not agree with is biased".

When I replied that I objected to taxpayers' money being used once again to obviously support the Labour Party cause, the ABC employee to whom I was speaking told me to "stick your head up a dead bears bum!" and hung up in my ear.

Such arrogance by a public servant surely typifies the current ABC philosophy.

The Australian Taxpayer can no longer afford to pay for such a self indulgent organisation.

It is time the ABC was scrapped or sold to private enterprise.

Yours faithfully

Brian Hall  
Director

**Mr HARPER:** The fact is that the Queensland Government has a very proud record on Cape York Peninsula, and anyone who really knows the area, as some honourable members do, knows that a good deal of it——

**Mr Scott:** You don't know where Cape York is.

**Mr HARPER:** The honourable member would appreciate that what is involved is not the rainforest and the lush green pastures that the *7.30 Report* and *Countrywide* fellows tend to illustrate.

When the Leader of the Liberal Party has had an opportunity to evaluate what has been done on Cape York Peninsula, its potential and the type of country there he, like us, will understand that the Government does have a very proud record. The fact that we have taken initiatives to develop policies for the structured and responsible development of that area must weigh very heavily in our favour.

The answers to the questions are——

(1) Peak Hill holding on Punsand Bay comprising 1424.5 hectares was surrendered on 18 May 1988 for the purpose of issuing, to the present lessees, two priority special leases and an occupation licence over the area.

(2) (a and b) A special lease over an area of about 80 hectares has been offered under section 203 (a) of the Land Act for tourist facilities. Let me make it clear that this is not—I repeat "not"—a freeholding lease. The lease has not yet been issued. Survey and boundary adjustment matters are being considered.

A further special lease over an area of about 5 hectares—a little over 10 acres—has also been offered for a fishing lodge and caretakers residence under section 203(a) of the Land Act. Again the lease has not yet been issued.

(c) The lease offers have been made to the former lessee of Peak Hill holding, being Nottingham Enterprises Pty Ltd and Halinta Pty Ltd.

(d) A parking and recreation reserve is proposed in the locality, but its boundaries have yet to be defined and the land has not yet been set aside. The Torres Strait council is to be the trustee.

(e) Rent is to be \$7,500 per annum for the first period of five years on the larger lease. Rent is to be \$3,000 per annum for the first period of five years on the smaller lease.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### Legal Advice on Use of Ministerial Expenses

**Mr GOSS:** I ask the Premier: will he justify to the House his action in obtaining legal advice from the Queensland Government's senior legal counsel, Mr Callinan, QC, on the viability of legislation seeking to validate the past use of ministerial expenses

and cash advances when even the suggestion of such a proposal should have been instantly rejected?

**Mr COOPER:** Any suggestion of such a proposal was instantly rejected. National Party members have every right to raise in the party room matters pertaining to Mr Drummond's investigations. No doubt, members of the Labor Party have a right to raise in their party room any matters that they wish. Certainly, any matters raised in our party room are not for public discussion or for discussion in this House. I have no doubt that the Labor Party has a similar policy.

I give an unequivocal assurance to the people of Queensland that there is no way that this Government would take any action, legislative or otherwise, that would interfere in the normal processes of investigation by the Special Prosecutor, Mr Drummond. I have said that ever since that office was set up, and that is the way it will be.

However, I am concerned about the allegation that a staffer of Mr Drummond has been having contact with a prominent ALP member.

**Mr Mackenroth:** Who? Name him.

**Mr COOPER:** His name will come out in time.

While the Leader of the Opposition whinges, whines and complains about people stealing letters from fax machines—falsely or otherwise—this other character is doing his dirty work and spreading his filth from the Strangers Bar.

The Government has always maintained an at-arms-length approach to maintain the independence of the Special Prosecutor. The prominent ALP member was responsible for spreading false rumours about a former Premier of this place, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, and other National Party identities. That is scurrilous. He is using the Strangers Bar as his base of operations to vent his bitterness. He could express his views in this Chamber, but he chooses to do it from another direction.

Yesterday, I was disturbed to hear yet again that that member was in the company of a person who, it is alleged, is a Drummond staffer. That occurred just before we saw headlines in the paper making sensational allegations against Sir Joh.

**Mr Goss:** Who is the Drummond staffer?

**Mr COOPER:** I am having the matter checked out. I have already drafted a letter to Mr Drummond bringing that matter to his attention. It has serious implications for the Labor Party's role in the matter.

The Labor Party will stop at nothing in attempting to gain Government. The Leader of the Opposition, who is a lawyer, constantly abuses the normal processes of proper investigations. He constantly abuses the normal presumption of innocence, which Government members hold very dear. The member for Murrumba has also stuck his beak into these affairs. Because of their tactics of misinformation, smear, disinformation and innuendo, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Murrumba are not fit to hold office in any Government.

Opposition members are just a bunch of failed leaders and trade union lackeys. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition on one matter: when we return to Parliament next year, he will not be sitting where he now is. He will not be sitting there at all.

**Mr R. J. Gibbs:** He will be sitting over there.

**Mr COOPER:** I know who will be sitting here; but the Leader of the Opposition will not be sitting in his present seat, because Mr Peter Beattie will be in that seat. The Leader of the Opposition knows that. Peter Beattie will be the umpteenth Leader of the Opposition in this State. Wayne Goss will join people such as Ed Casey, Tommy Burns—who is absent again today—Nev Warburton, Jack Houston, Keith Wright—

**Mr Gunn:** Percy Tucker.

**Mr COOPER:** Yes, Percy Tucker. Correct me if I miss any. I do not know how many more there are, but it is a growing club. Of course, a membership requirement is to be a defeated Leader of the Opposition.

My talking about Peter Beattie sticks in the craw of the Leader of the Opposition, because they do not get along. Peter Beattie is looking for an assurance that he will get a Cabinet post if ever the Labor Party comes into Government, which it never will. Wayne Goss will not give him that assurance. Peter Beattie wants an assurance from the Leader of the Opposition that he will be placed on the front bench. The Leader of the Opposition will not give him that assurance. I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to give Peter Beattie an assurance that he will get a front-bench spot. Why will the Leader of the Opposition not give him a position on the front bench when he gets in? I also want the Leader of the Opposition to tell me who he is going to kick out so that he can let Peter Beattie in.

**Mr GOSS:** I am happy to answer the question from the next Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr COOPER:** I issue that challenge. I know how concerned Peter Beattie gets and I know how upset the Leader of the Opposition gets. But, of course, the Leader of the Opposition will have to ask Errol Hodder's permission, because everybody knows that he is Errol Hodder's little boy. He has to get permission from him for whatever he does.

#### **Legislation Validating Use of Ministerial Expenses and Cash Advances**

**Mr GOSS:** The Premier will have to do better than that if he wants to be a decent Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr GOSS:** I refer the Premier to the legislation that seeks to validate the past use of ministerial expenses and cash advances, which was discussed at the Premier's party room meeting yesterday. Irrespective of the discussions that were held at that meeting, I simply ask: which Minister was responsible for the preparation of the legislation; on whose instructions was it drafted; and who drafted the legislation?

**Mr COOPER:** No legislation was drafted.

#### **Use of Voluntary Employment Agreements to Resolve Airline Pilots Dispute**

**Mr STEPHAN:** I again refer the Premier to the airline pilots strike, and I ask: is the Premier aware of reports that striking airline pilots are seeking voluntary employment agreements as a means of settling the dispute? If this is so, will the Premier take action to make available to the pilots Queensland's unique VEA system?

**An Opposition member:** What a deep question.

**Mr COOPER:** A member of the Opposition says, "What a dead question.", or something like that. That is typical of the attitude of members of the Opposition. Heavens above, they do not give a hoot about the tourist industry, which is losing about \$3m a day in Queensland. Members of the Opposition could not give a hoot about it; they do not give a damn. They have never done a thing to help any of the people who are involved. I am not necessarily talking only about the industry; I am talking about the people who are involved in the tourist industry. Members of the Opposition are supposed to be concerned about people. They could not give a hoot about anyone but themselves. That is all they care about.

The former Premier, Mr Ahern, made the suggestion many weeks ago—which I certainly support—that the Hawke Government and the pilots consider the use of VEAs as a means of settling the dispute. This Government copped an immediate bucket from the ALP at both State and Federal levels.

It is an absolute tragedy that, because of the obstinacy of Goss and Hawke, VEAs have not been able to be utilised. In the opinion of this Government, the use of VEAs is a very obvious method of overcoming a dispute such as this. If the use of VEAs had been adopted much earlier in the dispute, it would have certainly saved tens of millions of dollars and alleviated much hardship. People are going broke. Small-business people are going broke. It is an absolute tragedy.

This State and other States in Australia are suffering from the strike's effect on tourism. Queensland is more affected than other States. The Goss-led Opposition has effectively dumped on people involved in the tourist industry. That is an utter disgrace. These ghosts opposite, these faceless men whom we never see, cannot put together a shadow Cabinet, let alone anything else. They should be absolutely ashamed to show their faces in public, particularly on an issue such as this dispute, which could have been resolved long ago.

This Government wants to see the airlines use VEAs as a solution to the dispute and it believes that the Leader of the Opposition should use his offices to effect an end to the dispute by coming to grips with it instead of simply dumping on the tourist industry, which is of such tremendous value in many ways to the economy of this State and to the people of this State, who are so sorely affected.

#### **Police Raid on Illegal Gambling and Unlicensed Liquor Sale, Upper Mount Gravatt**

**Mr STEPHAN:** I refer the Premier to a recent police raid on an illegal gambling den and unlicensed liquor outlet in Upper Mount Gravatt after which the police laid numerous charges against two prominent ALP candidates, Mr Gary Gibson, the ALP candidate for the Federal seat of Moreton, and Ms Laurel Power, the ALP candidate for the State seat of Mansfield. I believe that Senator Margaret Reynolds was also seen speeding away from the scene in a Commonwealth car. I now ask: with what offences have those candidates been charged? Were any children involved? What does this reveal about the ALP and its commitment to recommendations of the Fitzgerald report that focus on illegal gambling and the illegal distribution of alcohol?

**Mr COOPER:** Every member of this House should be concerned that such charges have been laid, and I think that all honourable members would be extremely concerned and interested in the outcome, especially when two ALP candidates and a senator—a Queensland senator at that—were involved in the illegal activities.

Charges are pending and the matter is still under investigation. I have no doubt that the member for Gympie, along with other honourable members, is extremely interested in the outcome of this matter. I most certainly undertake to keep him informed. As this very serious matter unfolds, I will do so by letter.

#### **Legislation Validating Use of Ministerial Expenses and Cash Advances**

**Mr R. J. GIBBS:** I refer the Premier and Treasurer to the Sir Robert Sparkes/Don Lane conspiracy in relation to attempts by the Government to legalise the abuse of public money by past and present Ministers, and I ask——

**Mrs Chapman:** How many times do you have to be told?

**Mr R. J. GIBBS:** Will the honourable member please stop squeaking?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr R. J. GIBBS:** I ask the Premier: was the Government's consideration of such retrospective legislation part of the deal struck by Sir Robert Sparkes with Don Lane for his advice and support in the coup against Mike Ahern? Will he now give undertakings that the Government will not intervene in any way whatsoever in investigations by the Special Prosecutor in regard to ministerial expenses; that any Minister charged in relation to such matters will be stood aside; and that any Ministers or former Ministers found

to have avoided taxation in relation to expenses or other public funds will be named, along with details of the nature of the offence, the amount involved and any extra tax and penalties assessed?

**Mr COOPER:** The honourable member is just proving to us that he can read; he is obviously deaf. I have just answered the question. I suggest that tomorrow the honourable member refer to *Hansard*.

### **Fitzgerald Recommendations on Pornography**

**Mr R. J. GIBBS:** I direct a question to "Judge Roy Bean"—I am sorry, that was a Freudian slip. I direct a question to the Minister for Justice and refer to his statement in this House yesterday in which he attacked former corruption commissioner, Tony Fitzgerald, on the subject of pornography. I now ask: can the Minister identify for members any reference in the Fitzgerald report to recommendations for the admission of "all forms of pornography" into Queensland, as the Minister claimed yesterday?

**Mr HENDERSON:** I thank the honourable member for his question. It is now clear that he cannot read and that he does not listen. Had he listened to what I said, he would have heard that I alluded to the fact that in the section of the report relating to prostitution, pornography and so on, Mr Fitzgerald said that pornography ought not to be the concern of the Legislature except as it related to children.

Yesterday, I said that there is absolutely no way in the world that I personally would endorse that recommendation, and I do not think that my party would endorse it. I found interesting an article in today's *Sun*. When I read a headline "TV porn must go says MP" I thought that the newspaper was quoting me, because it is obviously a very strong statement about pornography. I thought that, if it was not me, it was probably a member of the Government or some other person who is at least prepared to stand up for decency. But guess what I found? It was a reference to none other than the Federal Labor member for Oxley, Mr Les Scott. It seems to me that he is in total disagreement with the honourable member for South Brisbane, who, during the debate on the Fitzgerald report, specifically endorsed that comment by Mr Fitzgerald. It is on the parliamentary record that the honourable member did that.

It seems that there are now more factions within the ALP: there is the pornography wing and the anti-pornography wing. In which wing is the honourable member for Wolston?

### **Criminal Justice Commission**

**Mr HYND:** In directing a question to the Premier about the Criminal Justice Bill, I remind him that it was Mr Fitzgerald's intention to have the CJC in operation within a minimum of nine months. I ask the Premier: has he set in place a timetable to fulfil the criteria to establish that commission?

**Mr COOPER:** It certainly is my view that the Government has moved with very commendable speed and thoroughness with the EARC and CJC legislation. To emphasise that fact, I point out that Mr Fitzgerald said—

"This Commission should continue to function until the investigation and information roles have been effectively transferred to an operative CJC. The time scale to achieve this goal is difficult to estimate but a minimum of nine months would be required to allow for introduction and implementation of legislation and completion of the necessary establishment processes.

In practice, somewhat longer may be required."

It is quite clear that this Government is very much on schedule. It is even more clear that this Government has treated this matter with the utmost seriousness and the utmost importance. This Government has backed off from playing politics with this most serious reform that is required for this State. This Government has moved with

much propriety and common sense in dealing with such a very difficult matter. It is something that has never been tried in any State before. That should be commended. Without doubt, it is a slap in the face for those members on the other side of the Chamber who have played politics with this whole reform process ever since it was instituted.

### **Legislation Banning Compulsory Membership of Student Unions; Commonwealth Threat**

**Mr HYND:** I ask the Minister for Education: has he received any advice from Mr Dawkins about his threat that the Commonwealth will withhold funds from States that introduce legislation banning compulsory membership of student unions?

**Mr LITTLEPROUD:** I have not received any formal advice whatsoever from Mr Dawkins. I would like to read to honourable members an article from this week's *National Affairs*, in which the comments of Mr Dawkins are reported. It is a classic example of double standards. The article states—

“The Federal Minister for Employment, Education and Training, Mr Dawkins, warned last night that the Commonwealth would withhold funds to States that introduced legislation banning compulsory membership of student unions.”

In other words, people would not have the right of individual choice. Mr Dawkins addressed a group of academics at Melbourne University on Wednesday, 18 October. The article further stated—

“Mr Dawkins also announced that the Government would introduce legislation which provided academics with a charter guaranteeing institutional autonomy and academic freedom.

The charter would be enshrined in law after consultations with academia and the legal profession to ensure that institutions and academics were ‘free from government interference’”—

strange, isn't it—

“in relation to the conduct of research, staff appointments and the free expression of views and opinions.”

The academics have the freedom, all right; but, when it comes to the students, the ALP is going to jump on them. That is a classic case of double standards. It is interesting also that in all the negotiations that resulted from the Green Paper and the White Paper on tertiary education, Mr Dawkins made the comment that there was a role for both State and Federal Governments. In his White Paper Mr Dawkins acknowledged that the State Governments were responsible for introducing the legislation to set up the various tertiary institutions when they changed from CAEs to university colleges or universities. I would have thought that the role of the State Government would be to include in its legislation what it thought was best. It is interesting that Mr Dawkins now wants to claim total responsibility for all tertiary education and that he wants to have a say about what happens to student organisations. I wish that Mr Dawkins would claim full responsibility for all funding, because he is trying to pass that responsibility onto the States and onto industry. It seems that he likes to exert his force when and where he can, but he slips away when things do not suit him.

### **Expense Entitlements for Ipswich and Townsville City Councillors**

**Mr INNES:** In directing a question to the Minister for Justice, I refer to the keen interest in the entitlements of public figures that has been displayed in this House by the Opposition. I ask: did the Minister hear the contribution last night of the honourable member for Toowong about the entitlements and expenses of local authority figures in Ipswich and Townsville? Because of the intransigence of those councils in their attempts to cover up and not account for their expenses, should their entitlements be a matter of proper investigation?

**Mr HENDERSON:** I noted with considerable interest the comments of the honourable member for Toowong. Immediately after he spoke in this House I inquired of senior counsel as to whether the Townsville City Council and the Ipswich City Council come within the definition of a "unit of public administration" within the Criminal Justice Commission legislation. I was assured that they do. I would have thought that the honourable member's accusations were such as to raise extremely serious charges of criminality on the part of both of those Labor councils.

I found it interesting—and I am sure the House found it interesting, too—that every allegation that Mr Goss has levelled at this Government has been levelled at both of those councils for doing exactly the same thing as this Government has been accused of. As well, members of the Opposition have accused Government members of having their snouts in the trough by using public funds for defamation actions. I remind honourable members of what is happening in the city of Townsville. Exactly the same thing is happening: defamation writs are being used to stop Liberal aldermen in the council from arriving at the truth about the misuse of public funds.

I give the Leader of the Liberal Party this undertaking: I personally will forward to Sir Max Bingham a copy of the speech of the honourable member for Toowong and I will ask that he acknowledges its receipt. I am not in a position to direct him to do anything, but I will make him aware of the criminal accusations that were raised in this House last night by the honourable member for Toowong, whom I thank for having done that. He has done the people of Queensland a great service.

The tragedy of it all is that, if any of the allegations that were raised by the honourable member had involved a Liberal or National Party alderman in either of those councils, they would have appeared on the front page of the *Courier-Mail*. But where are they? Nowhere!

### **Airline Pilots Dispute**

**Mr INNES:** I ask the Minister for Tourism: is he aware of reports that are circulating in the Australian Federation of Air Pilots and associated bodies of support from an unlikely source? Apparently a conversation took place in Rockhampton between an Opposition shadow Minister, Mr Gibbs, and people within the pilots' organisations, during which he expressed his disgust, the disgust of the Left Wing of the Labor Party and the disgust of the union movement generally in Queensland at the handling of the airline pilots dispute by Bob Hawke, Crean and Kelty. Mr Gibbs said that the concern about the support for voluntary employment agreements was shared by Mr Bannon in South Australia. He said also that the Queensland Labor Party would not have a bar of Hawke because of his anti-union statements, which were all part of a plot associated with deregulation.

I ask: does that demonstrate real opposition to the Federal Labor Government's handling of the dispute by the Labor movement in this State? Does it demonstrate the chasm between the different parts of the Labor movement in this State? Does the Minister believe that he can capitalise on the apparent support in some parts of the Labor movement to resolve the airline pilots dispute?

### **PRIVILEGE**

#### **Allegation by Member for Sherwood Against Member for Wolston**

**Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (10.58 a.m.):** I rise to a point of privilege. The member for Sherwood is telling absolutely incredible untruths in this House. He is asking the Minister to comment on a figment of his own imagination.

The truth of the matter is that last Thursday evening at the Ambassador Motel in Rockhampton I was physically threatened by an airline pilot in a bar.

**Mr Elliott:** Male or female?

**Mr R. J. GIBBS:** I do not mind the honourable member's interjection. Had it been a female, perhaps I might have become a member of the mile-high club, of which the honourable member is a member. He is notorious for it. Every time he goes on an aircraft the air hostesses do not want to know him.

The situation in Rockhampton was so appalling and so disgusting that three other airline pilots who were in the bar had to restrain that one fool because of the violence that he demonstrated towards me just because I am a Labor politician, and I defended the trade union movement.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members, it is disturbing to see the member hurt so much. I will allow the question.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### Airline Pilots Dispute

**Mr BORBIDGE:** Prior to the point of privilege, or apology, by the honourable member for Wolston, I was not aware of the incident. But I thank him for acquainting the House with it.

In reply to the honourable member for Sherwood—every thinking Australian should be appalled at the attitude and the ongoing policy of the Federal Government in respect of the domestic pilots dispute. It is a dispute that has taken this country's economy to the brink of collapse and that has involved innocent third parties right throughout Australia.

**An Opposition member interjected.**

**Mr BORBIDGE:** Again I make the comment that the member for Cairns, because of his complete and total indifference, has done nothing at all to assist the 1 000 workers in his electorate who are out of a job today as a result of the Federal Government's attitude. I remind the House that just a few days ago the member for Townsville rose in this place and brought to the Parliament's attention the plight of the tourism industry in Cairns because of the total indifference of the shabby member who represents—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BORBIDGE:** The member who represents the people in that electorate in this Parliament has shown total indifference to their plight.

In further reply to the honourable member for Sherwood, I make the point that to date the pilots strike has cost the tourism industry in Queensland something like \$360m. People who have been some of the most successful entrepreneurs in the history of Australia are on the brink of bankruptcy. Where has the Labor Party in the State of Queensland been throughout this sad and sorry mess? What has it suggested? What has Mr Goss, the man who would be Premier—the pretender—had to say?

**Opposition members:** Who will be Premier.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** Where have honourable members opposite been while the strike that has had the greatest detrimental effect on the economy of Queensland has continued unabated?

The fact of the matter is that, of all the Governments throughout Australia, this Government alone has taken positive action to try to alleviate the plight of the tourism industry.

**Mr De Lacy:** Never criticised the pilots once.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** The honourable member for Cairns continues to interject. He has no credibility in this place. He has betrayed his electorate. He has betrayed the greatest single employer in his electorate and, significantly for a member of the Labor Party, he has betrayed the workers in his electorate. He is a man totally without credibility.



**Mr De LACY:** I rise to a point of order. I reject the allegations that have been made by the Minister. I would like to put on record the fact that I have always supported the tourist industry. I would like to say also that Mr Borbidge and members of the Government have never once criticised the pilots, who have created this dispute.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** I can understand the sensitivity of the member for Cairns.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! There is no need for the Minister to comment.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** I am sure his electors will be having something to say about it shortly.

**Mr Cooper:** They are nervous, too.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** That is right. As the Premier said, they are nervous, too.

This is the only Government in Australia that has been able to provide relief in respect of pay-roll tax and liquor licence fees. I bring to the attention of the House that at the Tourism Ministers Council meeting in Melbourne two weeks ago, the Federal Government was asked to do the same as Queensland in respect of its taxes and charges, but it refused. It refused outright. The credibility of the Labor Party is at an all-time low.

In respect of the deferral of pay-roll tax and liquor licence fees, this Government has gone further than any other Government in Australia. Now we see the spectacle of the Prime Minister reneging on a so-called recovery package for the tourism industry once the strike is over. Where is the promised \$30m? The Federal Government is running for cover.

**Mr Littleproud:** A bit like the Tasmanian education budget.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** As the Minister for Education said, the Federal Government is great at promising, but on the performance side of the ledger it does not do so well.

Again I make the point that this Government alone has had the courage to go out and charter overseas aircraft to service the tourism industry in this State. I can tell honourable members opposite—

**Mr Hamill** interjected.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** I will tell you something.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Honourable the Minister!

**Mr BORBIDGE:** I am sorry, Mr Speaker. I am being provoked.

I can confirm that the Tasmanian Labor Government, which is very supportive of this Government's initiative in respect of the charter of aircraft from overseas, has contacted this Government and indicated that, should the opportunity arise, it would like to participate with the Queensland Government in that program to try to help the Tasmanian tourism industry because, for various reasons, that Government has not had the capability of locating available overseas aircraft. We look forward to seeing the arrival of those aircraft in the not-too-distant future.

In reply to the honourable member for Sherwood, I indicate that I am not aware of the alleged incidents in Rockhampton.

#### **Insurance Claims by Member for Lytton**

**Mr HINTON:** I ask the Deputy Premier, Minister for Finance and Minister for Local Government: will he cause investigations to be conducted into double-dipping and possible insurance fraud by the member for Lytton, Tom Burns, MLA, in claiming insurance from two insurance companies for a trailer which, together with a car, was stolen while he was out on his boat? Is it a fact that Mr Burns made a \$400 insurance claim on Suncorp Insurance? Is it a fact that Mr Burns made a further insurance claim

on RACQ Insurance and was paid \$1,000 for the same trailer? Is it a fact that the RACQ contacted Suncorp and indicated that the trailer was its responsibility as Mr Burns had insured it with that company and made a claim for its loss on his policy? In other words, is it a fact that the member for Lytton, who is so free in this House with his allegations in regard to corruption, had his own snout in two troughs?

**Mr GUNN:** I regard this as an extremely serious matter. No other honourable member in this House has been prepared to descend to the depths to which the member for Lytton has stooped in his attempts to denigrate other members. I am having this matter investigated immediately. If it is proved correct, I will have it handed over to the Fraud Squad of the Police Department.

### **Green Paper on Coastal Management**

**Mr HINTON:** I ask the Premier: can he outline to the House procedures proposed by him with regard to the implementation of proposals outlined in the Green Paper on coastal management?

**Mr COOPER:** I will certainly make sure that the member for Broadsound is kept adequately informed as time goes by. He wanted to ask this question yesterday, but I believe that it would be far better for it to be placed on notice so that I can respond by letter.

I particularly commend the honourable member for mentioning this matter. Everyone knows, especially those people who live in the central region, that in relation to matters such as conservation and environment, the member takes a special interest in local features such as the Mount Etna caves, the wetlands, beachfronts and so on. He shares the interest taken by other Government members in Queensland's wetlands, rainforests and arid regions. Those areas deserve to be looked after and conserved.

The Government also takes on board that balanced development must take place in concert with the natural environment of this State. I commend the member for Broadsound on his interest in these matters. As I said earlier, I will be informing him in full in relation to this matter by letter.

### **Handicapped Association of the Redlands District, Fund-raising Function**

**Mr MACKENROTH:** In directing a question to the Premier, I refer to the politically motivated action recently taken against a fund-raising evening organised by the Labor Party. I ask: is the Premier aware that the community organisation HARD—Handicapped Association of the Redlands District, of which he is a patron—is organising a similar fund-raising evening on 17 November that is being promoted as a funny-money night? Is the Premier aware also that other patrons of this organisation include his own Attorney-General, Mr Clauson, the former Premier, Mr Ahern, Senator Lady Florence Bjelke-Petersen, the Minister for Education, Mr Littleproud, and the former Minister for Family Services, Mr McKechnie? I also refer to an article——

**Mr Clauson:** What about Con Sciacca? Where is Con's name? Come on, read it all out.

**Government members interjected.**

**Mr MACKENROTH:** I am quite happy if Mr Sciacca's name is mentioned. There is no doubt that I said "include". I did not read out the rest of them, such as Sir Roderick Proctor.

**Government members interjected.**

**Mr MACKENROTH:** I picked out the people with whom the Premier is involved.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The House will come to order. I am sure that the member has made an honest mistake.

**Government members interjected.**

**Mr MACKENROTH:** I drew the attention of the House to people from the National Party. I could also include among the names that of Sir Roderick Proctor. I also refer to an article in the *Toowoomba Chronicle* published on 7 October 1989 that states that the National Party member for Toowoomba North would attend a funny-money night on that date at the Toowoomba North State School. I ask: what action does he intend to take against the member for Toowoomba North for his actions? Can the Premier distinguish between the funny-money night with which he is personally involved and the one that was raided recently by the Licensing Branch?

**Mr COOPER:** I am certainly aware of the star-studded list that the honourable member read out. There were just a couple that he did not read out, but we can fill in the gaps. However, I will say that the honourable member certainly read out a prestigious, star-studded list. Those people support a very useful organisation. I am not aware of anything illegal that those people have done. I therefore have no further interest in the matter. Of course, the police still have an interest in the matter that was raised earlier. They will be following their investigations through to their conclusion.

#### **Advice Given by Minister for Justice on Funny-money Fund-raising Function**

**Mr MACKENROTH:** In directing a question to the Minister for Justice, I refer to information that was supplied to him last Thursday about a funny-money night that was to be held at a State Government school and also to the fact that he directed a person to the office of the Assistant Commissioner of Police to obtain information. I ask: being aware that a State Government school was to hold a funny-money function on Saturday night, did the Minister advise the police that he was aware that that activity was illegal and that they should take action?

**Mr HENDERSON:** I thank the honourable member for the question. He may be interested to know that the promoter of the event contacted my office after he had read about the incidents at Upper Mount Gravatt. He asked if in fact the function was legal. I pointed out to him that the previous offences had been committed under the Vagrants, Gaming, and Other Offences Act, which does not come under my portfolio responsibility but is the responsibility of the Honourable the Minister for Police. I contacted the office of the Minister for Police and said that the gentleman had inquired of his officers in relation to the legality of the function. It is not true that I contacted the police. The police contacted him.

For the benefit of the honourable member, I add that I have since instructed my department to give me a legal opinion on these matters. That legal opinion has been passed on to the Honourable the Attorney-General for his attention.

**Mr Mackenroth:** Did you report that the function was being held at a State school?

**Mr HENDERSON:** No. I could not initiate any action. It came under the responsibilities of my colleague and I left the ball in his court.

#### **State Electoral Rolls**

**Mr HOBBS:** I ask the Minister for Justice: could he advise the House on the preparation of the State electoral rolls for the approaching State election?

**Mr HENDERSON:** I am certain that this question is of interest to every member of this House. I wish to place on the public record of this Parliament my appreciation to the shadow Minister and the member for Stafford, both of whom are aware of the problems. I have discussed the matter with both members and thank them for respecting the confidences of those discussions.

From late February to the end of April last year, the Australian Electoral Commission conducted a Statewide roll canvass, which was funded to the extent of \$875,000 by the

State Electoral Office and somewhere between \$3m and \$3.5m by the Australian Electoral Commission. I stress that the State Electoral Office was not involved in the organisation of the canvass of the electors, because the agreement that was reached provided for the Australian Electoral Commission to engage the field staff and carry out the door-knock survey. As a result of that roll canvass, in excess of 280 000 enrolment claims were generated and 87 311 objections were received, 62 274 of which were successful and the names were removed from the roll.

Subsequently a number of honourable members, including my ministerial colleague Mrs Nelson and the honourable member for Stafford, raised concerns in this Parliament relating to the validity of election rolls. This is a most serious accusation, because the electoral rolls must be fair. If they are not fair, the entire election is unfair. I wanted to make absolutely certain that the State Electoral Office records were correct. The problem was how to go about ensuring that the records were correct. I sincerely thank two of my colleagues, Bob Katter, Minister for Mines and Energy, and Huan Fraser, the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology, who is in charge of CITEC, for their co-operation. It appeared to me that the best way to go about this was to match the State electoral rolls against an independent source of data. It was decided that the best way to do it would be to match the rolls against SEQEB accounts, on the assumption that people pay electricity bills and, if the names on the State electoral rolls could be matched up with SEQEB accounts, we could find out where the problems lay and have some idea of the state of the rolls.

Three marginal electorates were chosen. I instructed my department in two respects. The first was that absolute confidentiality of all material from SEQEB was to be maintained; that we were interested in nothing more than the surname and the residential address of the electricity-consumer. Secondly, I issued a written instruction to my department that under no circumstances whatsoever was any of the information to be made available to any person, including myself, except those people directly involved in the canvass. There is no way in the world that those lists will be made available to honourable members, Ministers or whoever else wants them.

The result of this exercise was very disturbing. The three electorates chosen were Maryborough, held by my colleague Mr Alison; Salisbury, held by Mr Len Ardill; and Stafford, which is held by Mr Gygar. There are 25 948 electors listed on the roll for Salisbury. When the matching process was attempted, it was found that 21 280 electors were matched by surname as consumers of electricity at their enrolled address. In other words, there was a discrepancy of 4 668 names. We decided to have a good look at those names. Several possibilities arose. Someone could live at an address to which there is no electricity supply, and 736 electors were identified as being at premises which could not be found on SEQEB records. It is quite possible that some of those people were paying electricity accounts under company names. Each of those residences was then physically checked by the State Electoral Office staff and it was found that 50 electors had left their enrolled address, 17 were enrolled at fake addresses, a few people were enrolled on vacant lots—which is rather interesting—and 19 electors could not be confirmed as living at the enrolled address. It was discovered that 644 electors were living at their enrolled address. Perhaps the Australian Taxation Office may be interested in who is paying their electricity accounts, because their domestic electricity tariff must be paid under a company name.

Two very disturbing statistics emerged. I draw the attention of this House to the fact that not more than six months ago the Commonwealth Government, through the Australian Electoral Commission, carried out a Statewide canvass of rolls, yet 1 131 electors were enrolled in Salisbury who indicated that they had paid their final electricity accounts and one would assume that they no longer lived in the electorate. Challenge notices have currently been despatched to 1 096 of those electors saying, "Who are you and what are you doing?" A total of 2 801 electors in the Salisbury electorate cannot be matched by surname on the roll. This suggests that they might be mothers-in-law or university students, but the number is extraordinarily high.

**Mr Comben:** No, it is not.

**Mr HENDERSON:** It is high. In the short time available it was difficult to know what could be done about all those electors.

The honourable member for Stafford is owed an apology by various members, particularly in the Labor Party, who accused him of making up information, because the results in the Stafford electorate were equally disturbing. There were 20 161 electors on the roll for Stafford and 17 196 of those could be matched, leaving a discrepancy of 2 965. On checking, it was discovered that 505 electors were identified as living at premises which could not be found on SEQEB records. Also, 638 had obviously left the area—I notice that the honourable member has objected to that number—and 1 822 could not be matched against any surnames on the roll.

What does this suggest? It suggests three things to me. The first is that the concerns expressed by some members are legitimate. The hysteria that accompanied the comments of the honourable member for Salisbury were unfounded and he is in fact owed an apology.

**Mr Ardill:** Get your electorates right.

**Mr HENDERSON:** The honourable member for Stafford. I apologise.

The second comment is that there is a real possibility of electoral fraud. It is really there. We know that it was a Commonwealth canvass that was carried out. Were anyone systematically door-knocking an electorate, he would soon find out the names of the people on the roll who were obviously not in the electorate and it would not take much effort to organise people to vote using those names.

The third thing is that the matter is so important and so critical to the election that I have taken the opportunity of personally discussing this matter with Sir Max Bingham, the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission. Sir Max was very interested in what I had to say and indicated that he wants to be kept informed about what is going on.

I challenge honourable members to ask themselves a simple question. I have a diagram showing the electoral pendulum which indicates all the seats in Queensland where small swings are likely to be effected. I have written to my colleagues Mr Katter and Mr Fraser seeking their permission to undertake a similar exercise in every electorate where a swing is likely to be effected so that we can discover what is going on in some of the marginal electorates.

The challenge is what we do with the information when we receive it. That is the challenge facing every member of this House. I assume they are interested in offering constructive advice. I thank my friend opposite for his co-operation in this matter. This Parliament must face the fact that, on the day of the State election, it may be necessary to challenge people to identify themselves when they turn up to vote.

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

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### State Electoral Rolls

**Hon. I. T. HENDERSON** (Mount Gravatt—Minister for Justice and Minister for Corrective Services) (11.24 a.m.), by leave: This matter is of considerable concern to all honourable members. I want to make a few further comments in the form of a ministerial statement. The State Electoral Office is criticised about the electoral rolls when people attempt to match the Commonwealth and State rolls. They inevitably point out that there are discrepancies. For example, the rolls were reasonably up to date on 31 August 1989 because they were prepared for a State referendum. At that date, 1 781 878 electors were enrolled on the Federal roll compared to 1 756 676 electors on the State electoral roll. Honourable members, particularly those opposite, like to suggest that this indicates

that something is wrong with the State electoral rolls. I have already said that the recent canvass was carried out by the Australian Electoral Commission.

There are a number of reasons for this discrepancy. First of all, there are differing residential qualifications. To enrol on the State roll, an elector must have resided in the electoral district for a period of at least three months before he can enrol for that address, whereas only one month's residency is required for enrolment on the Federal roll. Secondly, the citizenship qualification for enrolment differs between the State and the Commonwealth. Thirdly, itinerant persons, such as seasonal workers, who, by virtue of their employment, do not have a fixed place of abode are allowed to enrol on the Federal roll. Finally, electors who are presently travelling or working overseas for extended periods are permitted to remain on the Federal electoral roll whereas such electors are not permitted to enrol on the Queensland roll.

The challenge is: what we are to do about the problem I highlighted in my answer to the question from the honourable member? I challenge every honourable member to think about the problem because we must ensure that, when people turn up to vote on election day, they are legitimately enrolled in the relevant electorate and are therefore entitled to vote.

The State Electoral Office is in the process of looking at a number of other electorates. We will have the data before the election. I make no apology for saying that, somehow or other, it may be necessary to challenge certain electors in Queensland for proof of their identity when they turn up to vote. I know that the civil libertarians and certain Democrats will say that that is a breach of civil rights but what is important is that we ensure that the people who vote are entitled to vote.

I seek leave to have the remainder of this statement incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Over the past twelve (12) months, the State Electoral Office has made a concerted effort to bring the State Roll up to date.

Earlier this year, the State Electoral Office removed 23,186 electors from the Roll by objection as a result of information supplied by the Australian Electoral Commission concerning non-voters at the Commonwealth Referendum held in November 1988.

A further 7,244 electors were struck from the Roll following objections generated from returned mail e.g. notification of Enrolment Cards, notices to Prospective Jurors, and "Welcome Letters" sent by Members of the Legislative Assembly.

From late February to the end of April this year, the Australian Electoral Commission conducted a Statewide Roll Canvass, which was funded to the extent of \$875,000.00 by the State Electoral Office.

The State Electoral Office was not involved in the organisation of the canvass of electors, as the agreement made provided for the Australian Electoral Commission to engage the field staff and carry out the door knock activity.

In excess of 280,000 enrolment claims were generated by this Roll Canvass. Additionally, the Australian Electoral Commission supplied the State Electoral Office with a computer tape of electors who had apparently left their enrolled address. Objection proceedings were subsequently instituted against 87,311 electors by the State Electoral Office which resulted in 62,224 electors being struck off the Roll.

Although it was later discovered that the accuracy of work by some of the field staff employed by the Commonwealth left a lot to be desired, the exercise was completed. It not only provided a cleansing and updating of the State Roll but also saved the State in the vicinity of \$3m—\$3.5m.

The State Electoral Office has received and processed 402,813 electoral enrolment forms so far this year. By comparison, the total number received and processed in 1988 was only 262,943.

Objection processing generated by return to sender mail is still being undertaken by the State Electoral Office and will continue until the issue of the Writ for the forthcoming State General Election.

A computer generated report of the roll was recently produced enabling the State Electoral Office staff to detect and correct duplicate enrolments. This resulted in 2,075 duplicate

enrolments being removed from the Roll. A further check is intended before closure of the Roll.

Prior to the recently proposed State referendum, an extensive advertising campaign was conducted by way of radio and press throughout the State to ensure that electors were correctly enrolled. A similar campaign will be conducted in the lead up to the close of the roll for the election.

At the time of the Merthyr By-Election, the Electoral Roll for that District unavoidably contained more registrations than there were electors in the District because the Roll Canvass had been completed prior to the close of the Roll, and whilst enrolment forms generated had been processed and electors added to the Roll, there was insufficient time to remove electors from the Roll by the prescribed objection process.

There were 4,846 non-voters at the By-election. Non-voter notices were sent out by the Principal Electoral Officer. From the replies received it was ascertained that 973 electors had moved from the District prior to the By-Election. Appropriate action was taken, where necessary, to have these electors re-enrol for their new addresses.

Objection proceedings were taken against those electors whose non-voter notice was returned to sender by Australia Post or who failed to reply to the notice. As a result of these proceedings 1,969 electors were removed from the Merthyr Roll.

An objection can be made by the Principal Electoral Officer if he has reason to believe that a name ought not be retained on the electoral roll.

Objection proceedings are not normally instituted until a period of three (3) months has elapsed as action before the expiration of this period may disenfranchise an elector who, although he has changed his residence, has not yet qualified to enrol for that residence.

However, an elector may, upon payment of the prescribed sum of \$1.00, lodge an objection with the Principal Electoral Officer. The Principal Electoral Officer, if satisfied that such objection has been lodged with reasonable ground or cause, proceed with objection proceedings forthwith.

Requests are often received before the issue of the Writ for an election by Members of the Legislative Assembly and political parties for bulk supplies of application forms for postal votes and electoral visitor votes, so that canvassing can begin as soon as possible. However, the Elections Act 1983-1985 provides that electors may not complete these application forms until after the day of issue of the Writ. Accordingly, these forms are not made available until after issue of the Writ.

I would draw the attention of all Members to the requirements of the Elections Act which while not providing for such things as the size of signs, does stipulate that all election matters during the election period (the day of issue of the Writ up to and including the close of the poll) be authorised by the author/s giving their true name and address. The Elections Act authorizes the Chief Returning Officer or any elector to apply for an injunction from a judge of the Supreme Court to restrain a contravention of the provisions of the Act in relation to the non signing of political articles or the printing or publication of any electoral advertisement, notice, handbill, pamphlet or card containing any untrue or incorrect statement intended or likely to mislead or improperly interfere with any elector in or in relation to the casting of his vote.

In addition to the publicity campaign run by the State Electoral Office for enrolments prior to the closure of the rolls, the office also undertakes further advertising to cater for those electors who will not be able to vote at a polling booth (e.g. electoral visitor votes, postal voters and pre-election voters) and publishes in newspapers throughout the State electoral district maps indicating the location of polling booths to be used on polling day.

Members can rest assured that, subject to financial constraints and the availability of staff, the State Electoral Office is doing everything possible to ensure the Electoral Rolls for the forthcoming General election will be as up to date as possible. Many electors forget to re-enrol when they change address. However, the onus rests with the elector to ensure he is correctly enrolled for his current residential address.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr ARDILL (Salisbury) (11.29 a.m.), by leave: I point out to the Minister that I have personally contacted the State Electoral Office on numerous occasions to point out that some people whose names appear on the roll have in fact moved from the area. The Minister is misinterpreting the figures. Certainly there is a problem in many

electorates, but it is nowhere near the magnitude in Salisbury that the Minister appears to think it is.

**Government members interjected.**

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member must make a personal explanation, not debate the issue.

**Mr ARDILL:** I am trying to do that, Mr Speaker.

**Mr Gately interjected.**

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

**Mr ARDILL:** The problem in Salisbury is nowhere near the magnitude that the Minister seems to think it is. On average, in excess of 1 000 people a month move to the electorate of Salisbury. As the Minister pointed out, it takes a long time to transfer off the electoral roll the many people who move from houses in places such as Algester and Sunnybank Hills because they cannot keep up with repayments.

**Mr Veivers:** This is not a personal explanation.

**Mr ARDILL:** I wish that honourable members would listen instead of prattling on.

Electors have three months to change their enrolment to the new electorate. Many do not do it in that time. Although large numbers of people are moving constantly, in Salisbury the problem is nowhere near the magnitude that the Minister stated. The State Electoral Office would tell the Minister that the problem is caused by a delay in taking people's names off the roll.

#### REVOCATION OF STATE FOREST AREAS

**Hon. R. E. BORBIDGE** (Surfers Paradise—Minister for Tourism and Minister for Environment, Conservation and Forestry) (11.32 a.m.): I move—

“(1) That this House agrees that the proposal by the Governor in Council to revoke the setting apart and declaration as State Forest under the Forestry Act of those areas specified in the documents tabled on 26 September, be carried out.

(2) That Mr Speaker convey a copy of this Resolution to the Minister for submission to His Excellency the Governor in Council.”

These proposals make provision for the excision of land from State forests near Yeppoon, Mudgeeraba and Gympie. I would like to mention at this juncture that the proposals have been carefully considered by the Conservator of Forests and have his endorsement.

Turning now to the proposals before the House—the first proposal involves the excision of about 4 600 hectares from the Byfield State forest for national park purposes. I pay tribute to the representations made on this matter by the honourable member for Broadsound.

It is proposed that the subject area, as well as the adjoining Crown land, be added to the existing Byfield national park. The area, which extends from Sandy Creek in the south to The Peaks and Mount Atherton in the north, contains a diversity of plant communities which has resulted from the relatively high annual rainfall. Other features include the occurrence of the Byfield fern and the considerable scenic and recreational values of the region.

The design of a suitable national park/State forest boundary has been the subject of a detailed investigation by officers of the Departments of Forestry and Environment and Conservation. Final design has taken into account the need to positively protect the conservation, scenic and recreational values, whilst also giving full recognition to the importance to the timber industry and the overall community of the area's value for forestry purposes. Agreement has been reached and I fully concur with the design now submitted.



The next proposal seeks the excision of about 241 hectares from the Austinville State forest in the Gold Coast hinterland, also for national park purposes. I recognise the representations made by my colleague the honourable member for South Coast.

The subject area, from Fairview Mountain in the north to Mount Gannon in the east and the Pinnacle in the west, incorporates the higher of the landscape features of the area as well as the upper reaches of Mudgeeraba Creek and contains a diversity of rainforest and other forest types. It is bounded on the south east by the Mount Cougal national park and on the west by the Warrie national park. Its excision and subsequent declaration as national park would enable the consolidation of the national park estate in this vicinity.

Once again, the proposed boundary has been the subject of negotiation between officers of the Departments of Forestry and Environment and Conservation and agreement was reached on a design which will enable the area to be managed to best meet overall community needs.

The final proposal provides for the revocation from State forest 502 near Gympie of two small areas totalling 0.9331 of a hectare. The lessee of portion 87, parish of Gympie, which lies adjacent to State forest 502, has applied to convert the area of his special lease to freehold tenure.

A survey of the proposed freehold lot has disclosed that the fenced area includes 0.7919 of a hectare of State forest 502. This area is cleared and has for many years been managed as part of the special lease. It is now proposed to excise this area from the forest estate. A further section comprising 0.0835 of a hectare has been isolated from the lease area and is ideally located for later inclusion in the State forest.

Whilst investigating this matter, it also came to notice that a section of Laurel Road in the vicinity of lot 87 was not contained within its dedicated location. It is now proposed to have this area of 0.1412 of a hectare excised from the State forest to permit its opening as road. The excision of these small areas will have no adverse effect on the management of the balance of the reserve.

This rationalisation of boundaries will be of considerable benefit and I fully support its implementation. The lessee is to meet all costs in the matter.

I strongly support all of these proposals and commend them for the approval of the House.

**Mr EATON (Mourilyan)** (11.37 a.m.): With the exception of the two minor areas that the Minister mentioned, the Government is revoking State forest areas for use as national parks. The Opposition supports the revocation.

**Mr BEANLAND (Toowong)** (11.38 a.m.): The Government is to be congratulated on extending State forest areas for use as national parks. They will be a great asset to Queensland. The Liberal Party supports the revocation.

**Mr HINTON (Broadsound)** (11.39 a.m.): I support the motion and express my pleasure that an additional 4 600 hectares are being added to the Byfield national park. The original proposal was that the national park consist of 13 000 hectares. There was the first gazettal of 4 009 hectares and now an additional 4 600 hectares has been added, making a total of almost 8 700 hectares. Of course, it includes the Mount Atherton area, which is very scenic. A number of people will take great pleasure from the fact that this area is being added to the national park.

I might say that the next step in regard to the national park will be determined when the mining leases held by RZ Mines are sorted out. There has been a hold-up due to wet weather. The survey that is being conducted will have to be completed before the third stage can be gazetted which, of course, will be those sections not required by the mining leases and currently covered by an authority to prospect.

I might also mention that there is some \$6 billion worth of minerals in the ground in that area, so it certainly will be a great mining operation should it come into effect.

It is very important to the Government, of course, that before that is brought into effect or agreed to, a very adequate environmental impact study be received by the Government.

I might mention that there is a neighbouring proposal by Pivot in the army area for which a most inadequate environmental impact study has been provided to the Federal Government. The Federal Government said that it would decide on the environmental impact study by the end of September. In fact, it has delayed its decision on that environmental impact study until January or perhaps later. It is quite significant that it has done that because of the community hostility towards that project.

I have said before in this Chamber and I say again that that project has been put back by the Federal Government until after the State election. I have also pointed out before in this Chamber that there is in fact quite an extraordinary association between the company concerned and Senator Richardson, the esteemed Federal Environment Minister. In fact, Mr Peter Lawrence of the Pivot company and Senator Richardson are very close friends.

I have suggested before and I suggest again that this is a classic case of cronyism. A most inadequate environmental impact study has been accepted by the Federal Government. I do not believe that it would have been accepted by this Government if those proposed leases had been under State jurisdiction. The results of that study have only been accepted because of the close association between Mr Lawrence and Senator Richardson. Because of that association, the decision on the project has now been put back until after the State election. Should a Federal election come close on the heels of the State election, it will probably be put back again.

That has not fooled the people of my area. The people of the Byfield area have called a public meeting for this week. They have asked Mr Wright, the member for Capricornia, to attend that meeting and explain to them the relationship between Senator Richardson and Peter Lawrence and to tell them why the proposal, which was knocked back by the Federal Government, was not just ruled out of order and why the company is being given a second chance. It is being given a second chance to put forward another proposal which may be satisfactory on environmental grounds.

I think that Mr Wright and Senator Richardson have a lot of explaining to do to the people in my area because, quite frankly, the whole proposal stinks. I believe that the local people ought to be aware of it. In fact, they are becoming increasingly aware of it.

I support this revocation. I thank the Minister for his endeavours and those of his departmental officers. This addition to the Byfield national park is certainly very welcome in my area.

**Mrs GAMIN (South Coast) (11.42 a.m.):** I will be very brief. I wish to commend the Minister for the action that he has taken. I am pleased that my personal representations have been successful in that regard.

The 241-hectare tract of mountain that has been added to the national park area that runs up into Springbrook and joins up with the Warrie national park will be a very valuable adjunct to the national park system in my area. It is another example of how well environmental matters are being handled in the electorate of South Coast.

I thank and commend the Minister and the officers of his Department of Environment, Conservation and Forestry.

Motion agreed to.

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

### **Second Reading**

Debate resumed from 28 September (see p. 973).

**Mr McELLIGOTT (Thuringowa) (11.43 a.m.):** The Opposition does not intend to oppose this Bill. However, I want to make a few brief comments.

When the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act was passed in 1985 it was, of course, strongly opposed by the Labor Party, and it is fair to say that it caused shock waves around Queensland. Most people found it impossible to believe that a person with the dubious background and reputation of one Mike Gore could take a sizeable piece of Queensland and develop it free of the controls of the Local Government Act and the Albert Shire Council.

Queenslanders became even more agitated when they heard of the amazing range of concessions and special deals done between Gore and the National Party Government. Since then, of course, this piece of Queensland, along with many others, has passed into foreign ownership. The then Premier, Bjelke-Petersen, and the then Minister Hinze have gone from this place, and they may well be pursued by the Special Prosecutor in the weeks ahead.

In concluding his second-reading speech, the Deputy Premier said—

“I am quite sure honourable members will agree that the success of the Sanctuary Cove Resort development concept is beyond question.”

It depends how one measures success. I am sure that Mr Gore considers that it was successful. On the other hand, I doubt that Queenslanders will ever see another integrated resort development approved by this Government or any future Government.

The Fitzgerald inquiry has made people very aware of the way in which the so-called white-shoe brigade operated in this State. In addition, Queenslanders have become very concerned at the destruction of mangroves, wetlands and natural resources generally. We now see well-organised and vocal groups opposing large-scale developments. I cite the example of the MacKellar development in Cairns, the Florence Bay project in Townsville and the ministerial rezoning at Labrador on the Gold Coast. These days, projects such as those are being strongly opposed by people who are well organised, well funded and properly understand the need to preserve our natural resources.

The Opposition did not oppose the 1987 amendments to allow the lands adjacent to Sanctuary Cove to be absorbed into the resort so, as I said, the Opposition will not be opposing these amendments today. What is being created under this amending Bill is, of course, quite a large self-contained community for the rich and famous. I venture to suggest that it will have an electoral enrolment that is greater than that of a number of shires in this State. Like most honourable members, I visited Sanctuary Cove and could not help being impressed by the sheer extravagance and luxury of the place. I suppose that it will always remain an exclusive address for those living there permanently, but I wonder whether in time it will lose its curiosity value for visitors. When we start to see vacant shops and the failure to provide maintenance, no doubt there will be moves to rescind this legislation and to restore Sanctuary Cove to the real world, to be propped up by residents living elsewhere in the Albert Shire.

I would like the Minister to respond on one point. I note that as a result of the Bill residential density will increase. I seek an assurance from the Minister that headworks charges will be payable to the Albert Shire Council in respect of that increased demand on council services.

**Mr D'ARCY (Woodridge) (11.46 a.m.):** I spoke in the debate on the original Bill and on the occasion when it was first amended. I agree entirely with what the Opposition spokesman on Local Government said. The Government's treatment of the wetlands is a disgrace. To some extent, attitudes have changed since the introduction of the original legislation and there is now an appreciation of the need to retain wetlands. The damage that was caused initially and the way in which the development was carried out made it clear that amendment of the legislation would be necessary. The original Bill was rushed through this Chamber without full consideration being given to it.

I am aware that the Bill provides for the inclusion of private lands that had not been negotiated at the time when the original legislation was introduced. When Michael Gore first began development in that area, I was very critical of the Government departments involved. The left hand of some Government departments did not know

what the right hand was doing. Michael Gore was given a blanket approval. He went ahead in the gung-ho fashion of the white-shoe brigade and consequently destroyed a very large and precious area of wetlands in the Coomera River basin. It is absolutely essential that that area be protected. Even up to the present day, that area has been forsaken. In the future, an even greater depletion of animal and marine life will be seen in that area than has been seen so far.

I know many of the fishermen in the Sanctuary Cove area. Formerly, the south bank of the Coomera River was obviously mangrove and mudbank. The local fishermen prize the large summer whiting in that area. One of the baits that is generally used is the bloodworm. Bloodworms were found in that mudbank. It provided food for prawns and fish in that area. It was part of the mangrove cycle and supplied food not only for marine life in the Broadwater but also on the reefs. Those bloodworms are now virtually unprocurable. Rocks were dumped on them, sand was pushed up and the mudbank was totally destroyed.

The lesson that has to be learned from Sanctuary Cove is that Government departments did not know what was going on. That should not be allowed to happen again. After much prodding, the Government published a Green Paper. However, the Government still has not reached a stage at which it has a program of proper coastal management.

I remind the House of what the Minister for Land Management said about what had happened in the area—

“... the unauthorized destruction and removal of mangroves specifically protected under section 71 of the Fisheries Act had occurred, and that no permits had been issued to allow this removal or destruction of mangroves from either vacant Crown land or freehold property.

. . .

The relevant land was apparently in advanced stages of reclamation before application was made to the Land Administration Commission.”

The land was in an advanced stage of reclamation before application was made to the Land Administration Commission for a permit. The way in which the development took place is a disgrace. It should never happen in Queensland again.

In my files I have photographs of the tragedy. The photograph I have in my hand depicts a bulldozer pushing over the precious area of mangrove. Only today do we realise the very important value of that mangrove area. Because it is the most fertile land in Australia, per acre it produces more food for more animals and plants than any other cultivated area.

As I said, one department did not know what another department was doing. The Act has to be cleaned up. The Labor Party has a distinct policy for the management of coastal developments. Queenslanders should look carefully at that policy before the forthcoming election. Because of public opinion, the Queensland Government has been bludgeoned into taking some action. As far as the total Queensland coast is concerned, the paucity of action that the Queensland Government has taken is self-evident. Developments are still taking place up and down the coast. A moratorium has not been placed on developers to ensure that what happened at Sanctuary Cove will not happen again.

It is true that some developments have been stopped by public pressure. Recently, a development in Cairns was stopped, as was a development south of Raby Bay, despite the issue by the Government of a permit to carry out the development. It was not possible to stop the Lewis project at the mouth of the Coomera River, where 13 islands have been developed at Sovereign Islands. Land there is being sold at exorbitant prices. I continue to make the point that the Government received no return from that development or from Sanctuary Cove. It is all very well to see the great wealth that is generated. In fact, the rate-payers and tax-payers of Queensland subsidised a lot of that development because of the subsidised deal entered into with the developer.

Anything proposed in Queensland by Michael Gore or any of his companies should be scrutinised carefully. Recently he spoke at a development seminar. It was disgraceful to hear him say that he protected one tree because there was a bird in it. The Sanctuary Cove area was the habitat of thousands of sea-eagles. They had nested there for years. Recently, except on Coomera Island, I have not seen the preservation of any of those nests. It is a shame that developers of Michael Gore's ilk have in the past decade been allowed to rape and pillage the Queensland coastline.

**Mr BEANLAND (Toowong) (11.52 a.m.):** The Liberal Party supports the legislation, as it has supported the Sanctuary Cove concept from the outset, although at times members of the Liberal Party have been critical of some aspects of the legislation. The resort itself has been a controversial development and it has had its fair share of knockers. I think that honourable members would agree that it has been built to a very high standard and is certainly located in a magnificent area. Members of the Liberal Party believe that each such development concept should be submitted to this House.

Honourable members will recall that we opposed strenuously the Integrated Resort Development Bill. The Liberal Party believes that, in the long term, Queensland can sustain only a limited number of developments of that nature, particularly if they are to be of a very high standard. Failure to maintain high standards would create problems.

The development at Sanctuary Cove is a credit to all concerned. Because of the interest that is still being shown in it, I am sure that Sanctuary Cove will become one of a handful of similar developments that will succeed. The Liberal Party supports the legislation.

**Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier, Minister for Finance and Minister for Local Government) (11.54 a.m.), in reply:** I thank all honourable members for their contributions and support.

Mr McElligott, the member for Thuringowa, sought assurances that, because of the extra density, the additional headworks charges will be payable to the Albert Shire Council. I am assured that that will be the case.

Other integrated resorts that have been approved by the Governor in Council are the Mirage resort at Port Douglas and the Kingfisher Bay project at Maryborough. In the near future approval will be sought for an integrated resort at Woodwark Bay in the Whitsundays and for the Aqua Del Ray project in the Pioneer Shire.

The issues to which the member for Woodridge referred were raised in this House approximately four years ago when the legislation was introduced. The proposals that are contained in the Bill have been discussed with the Albert Shire Council, which has indicated to the Local Government Department that it has no objections to this legislation. The proposed amendments will facilitate the operational efficiency of both the primary thoroughfare body corporate and the principal body corporate, particularly by allowing annual general meetings to be held at more appropriate times that fit in more comfortably with financial-year budgeting.

I agree with honourable members who said that the Sanctuary Cove resort is excellent. Even though its residences are perhaps a little out of my league, I visit the resort as often as possible. Because of the availability of land, another 600 lots will be made available there. The development has been very successful, even though it received much criticism in its early stages. It has proved to be unique and to be of world standard.

Motion agreed to.

#### Committee

Clauses 1 to 20 and schedule, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

**Third Reading**

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

**STOCK ACT AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL****Second Reading**

Debate resumed from 28 September (see p. 969).

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (11.58 a.m.): At the outset I indicate the Labor Party's strong support for feedlots in Queensland and their continued development in the interests of the industry. For a long time I have been a very strong supporter of feedlots, and will continue to be so, mainly because of their value-added nature.

Queensland has the ability to use its grains to feed its own beef and to export that beef in a better condition than normal range herd beef. Those overseas markets provide so much for the economy of this State, which produces almost half of the nation's export beef.

Greater demand is being placed on Australia, and especially Queensland, to supply beef to the quality markets of the world. As a result, approximately 80 per cent or 85 per cent of the feedlots in this country are situated in Queensland. The major grain-growing areas of the Darling Downs, the Central Highlands and even the Atherton Tableland provide excellent facilities for developing the feedlot concept to lift our economy.

It must be made quite clear to feedlot-owners, people who wish to establish feedlots and the beef industry in general that the development of the feedlot system in this State must not occur at the expense of the life-style of Queenslanders. It must not occur by riding roughshod over community rights or by endangering the health of residents who live in areas surrounding the feedlots.

In the past, applications for feedlots have been controlled by local authorities. However, proper guide-lines have not been set down for feedlots in this State and almost every application for feedlots has finished up in the Local Government Court.

Unfortunately, I do not think this legislation will overcome the problem. With the transfer of control from local government and town-planning legislation to the Stock Act, feedlots will create more disturbance in the community. The introduction of this legislation is a deliberate attempt by the National Party Government to by-pass existing town-planning legislation in order to favour one particular group, that is, the feedlotters. I see in some aspects of this legislation cronyism at its worst; an attempt by persons at the highest level to look after certain people who are involved with feedlots.

I refer to an application that was made earlier this year for the establishment of a feedlot in the Bungil Shire, which surrounds Roma. The feedlot was to be situated about 32 kilometres from the town. However, despite the fact that there were two residences within 300 to 400 metres of the proposed feedlot, the proposal was not advertised. Originally, it was an application to feedlot 200 head of cattle. Now the figure is up to 1 500 head. Consequently, those people whose properties are very close to the feedlot will face further problems.

Objections to the proposed feedlot were made by all the owners of the surrounding properties. I think nine objections were lodged involving 23 people. It might be said that that was not very many people. However, it was 100 per cent of the people who were likely to be affected by the feedlot. The objections were lodged on various grounds. I will refer to some of those grounds and I will tell the House exactly who is responsible for controlling some of the matters raised in those objections.

One of the grounds was smell. The problems of smell and odour are dealt with under the Clean Air Act, which is an Act of this Parliament. The people said that their properties would be devalued. That subject is dealt with by the Valuation of Land Act.

Another ground related to health problems, which come under the Health Act. Objections were made on the ground that the underground water and the Bungil Creek area would be polluted. Pollution controls generally are covered by the Clean Waters Act of this State. They are a State Government responsibility. The problem of noise comes under the Noise Abatement Act. This feedlot was so close to some of the properties that noise would create a very, very substantial problem for the neighbourhood.

Objections were made on the grounds that there was a lack of guide-lines. That is true. In September, guide-lines were issued by the Government. Even though they have been issued, they are not firm; they are still flexible and still have to be implemented. They will not be gazetted, therefore there will be no legislative control to enforce their implementation.

Another ground of objection was the lack of advertising of the feedlot proposal. It is a basic civil right that, under local government and town-planning legislation, people in the community should be advised of the establishment of such a facility.

Another ground of objection was that the distances from residences were not taken into consideration. Again, that is a matter covered by the town-planning legislation of this Parliament. Another ground of objection was the lack of consideration given to objectors generally. Once again, that is against the basic civil rights of individuals within their communities.

Every single issue raised is covered by a State Government Act. Those objections were totally disregarded by the Bungil Shire Council. As a result, the people concerned appealed to their local member to see whether he would help them to overcome their problem and to find some way round all of the State Government Acts that were infringing on their rights and their freedom and which were going to make a great change to their life-style. Guess who the local member was? He was the millionaire grazier, a friend of the applicants and now the Premier of Queensland. In his letter of reply, he simply told the people—

“As elected State member of Parliament, I cannot interfere or direct a council on any item of council business.”

There really is not one item of council business involved. As I pointed out, there are seven or eight different State Acts in respect of which he should have been talking to the bodies concerned. But no, because of that cronyism connection—the National Party connection—the people were disregarded and he, as their local member, would give them no consideration whatsoever. He did not want to interfere with the council. What absolute rot!

Even councils themselves operate under the Local Government Act, which is a power given to them by this Parliament. The way in which they operate in their areas ought to be the responsibility of every member who has a local authority situated in his electorate. Instead, the member for Roma was more interested in looking after his friends.

Let me refer to another case, which is an even better example. At present, the Esk Shire Council has before it a proposal to build an abattoir near Coominya. That proposal has been floating around for some considerable time and there have been many problems with it. I do not want to refer to all of the problems. The applicant is Mr Max Winders, who bought land in the area and who is now trying to resell land and set up a couple of major feedlots. He also wants to set up an abattoir so that he can be supplied with killing stock from other nearby feedlots.

Already situated quite near Coominya, which is where he wants to build his abattoir, is a controversial feedlot known as the Buaraba feedlot. I do not have to say much to the House about that as I feel quite sure that the member for Yeronga will tell us a little bit more about it at a later stage.

As I did at the outset, I make it quite clear that I have no objection whatsoever to feedlots. I compliment the people who have set up the Buaraba feedlot to do something for the economy of this State, as well as for themselves, of course. That is natural.

However, that is the way that things will have to go. Those people are pioneers in the field. Unfortunately, they did their initial pioneering in a very, very urban environment in the outer suburbs of Brisbane, and that also has had to be changed. That is why they have established a feedlot at Buaraba. But, unquestionably, it has been controversial. As an indication of its controversial nature, I understand that the residents in the area are carrying out monitoring on a spot-check basis of things such as odour. That is being done in much the same way as is set out in the guide-lines that the State Government has now laid down in relation to feedlots. "Laid down" is probably not the correct expression; "issued" is probably the appropriate word because, as the Minister was reported recently in the newspaper as saying, the Government does not intend to implement the guide-lines.

During September, the odour from the pens was monitored for a period of 72 hours. A strong odour was recorded during 19 of the 72 hours. An offensive odour was recorded over 29 hours. The odour was recorded 830 metres from the pens. It is significant that the odour was found to be either strong or offensive for more than two-thirds of the monitoring period. The local residents believe that that is not good enough. I do not blame them for protesting one little bit because I certainly would not like to have to endure strong and offensive odours from a nearby feedlot for a significant period in any month, as indicated by the monitoring program.

The Esk Shire Council has already been brought before the courts in relation to this and other matters. Judgment was given in favour of the feedlot-proprietors because the pens were considered to be part of a normal rural pursuit. That is really where the problems lie. Insufficient research has been carried out on Queensland's town-planning Acts to set out restrictions that ought to apply in relation to the establishment of feedlots. Over the last 12 months I have had communications from approximately 25 different groups throughout this State that strongly object to feedlots being established in their areas. The main reason that feedlots are established in those areas is that a large grey area exists in the Local Government Act and the town-planning regulations. I do not believe that including these matters in the Stock Act will overcome the problems. Later I will illustrate that this move will in fact make the situation worse.

Mr Winders owns the abattoir site. A property situated close to the site is owned in part by a person called W. A. M. Gunn. All honourable members would know Mr Gunn as the greatest 2IC in the business. He has served as deputy to three successive Premiers. He served as deputy to two Premiers until he was ready to unload them; but I certainly have news for him. It will be a case of third time lucky for him because he certainly will not be deputy to a fourth Premier.

Mr Gunn applied for a water licence to pump water from a creek that flows adjacent to his property. Mr Winders has an option on that property and intends to establish a 5 000-head feedlot. Under the Water Resources Act, it is not usual policy to grant a water licence for a resaleable property because it adds value at the point of sale. Mr Gunn will get the increased value of the property beforehand because, after all, who is responsible for determining his application for a water supply for feedlot purposes? It will be none other than his slippery mate, Mr Neal. All honourable members know that both of them were involved in the ditching of Mr Ahern that resulted in a great coup occurring only a few weeks ago in the National Party. Mr Neal may have already pushed through the application so that Mr Gunn will gain personally from the sale. National Party people are such a nice bunch!

**Mr Newton** interjected.

**Mr CASEY:** The member for Glass House is trying to stick up for his colleagues. He is often ranting or cheering. I am informed that he was a member of the group that ditched Mr Ahern, in spite of the fact that, on a regular basis, Mr Ahern used to visit his electorate by helicopter to try to support him in his electorate. The member for Glass House will not last much longer. Today the bells toll for the member for Glass House. In spite of the fact that the former Premier tried to help him, "Slippery" Bill decided that he wanted to get out from under. He helped to plunge the knives into Mr



Ahern's back. During the great coup, the member for Glass House changed sides. Members of the National Party really are such a nice bunch!

I have referred to the Premier and the Deputy Premier, and I will now complete the trio. I refer to the trio as the father, the son and the holy terror. Mr Deputy Speaker, you can place your own interpretation on my remarks. I understand that Max Winders has also applied to establish a feedlot in the Wambo Shire, which is located not far from Coominya. The property is on Crown land and can run 30 000 head of cattle. I am informed that the shire council has acted as an entrepreneur to get the project off the ground. Who is the chairman of the shire council? None other than Sir Robert Sparkes. When the trio is put together, I will leave it to honourable members to decide who is the father, who is the son, and who is the holy terror.

**Mr Veivers:** A very popular bloke out there.

**Mr Newton** interjected.

**Mr CASEY:** I hear the back-benchers who are regularly instructed by Sir Robert Sparkes and told what they have to do. They were told that they had to get rid of Mike Ahern as Premier because he was going to clean up corruption and cronyism. The National Party's back-benchers do not want corruption and cronyism cleaned up in this State because they want to retain the life-style that they have enjoyed for so long. I have news for them. People power in this State will push them out of office. The power of the people in this State will ensure that for evermore the Sparkeses will not dominate this Parliament. People power will ensure that this State is ruled by the people, for the people and on behalf of the people by great Australian Labor Party Governments.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr CASEY:** On their last day as members of this Parliament, they can rant and rave. I have seen so many National Party members have their last day in this Parliament. Today the bell tolls for the National Party in this Parliament. Every time the division bells ring, I think to myself that they are the bells tolling for the National Party. National Party members will remember the mournful tone of the bells for the rest of their days. It will a painful memory for them because they will realise that they contributed towards cronyism and corruption. They placidly and mildly went along with everything that Bjelke-Petersen wanted to do and with everything that the Liberals did when they were partners in the coalition. They have also gone along with everything that has happened since the Bjelke-Petersen era came to a close. They continue to carry out the instructions of the Chairman of the Wambo Shire Council, Sir Robert Sparkes.

Sir Robert Sparkes' family has also gained from feedlots. I understand that there is a 2 000-head feedlot on a property called Lyndley. Consternation was caused several months ago when it was discovered that some of the cattle had a disease. They had been turned out into the countryside. At that time, the member for Warwick was very concerned, because he asked questions about the matter in this Parliament. Apparently there was widespread suspicion that it was foot-and-mouth disease. For a considerable period, a quarantine was imposed on the Toowoomba sale yards. It sent shock waves throughout the grazing industry, not only in Queensland but also in the other States of Australia. Everyone was worried about the stock on the Lyndley property owned by Sir Robert Sparkes, who is an adviser to the Esk Shire Council and many other shire councils in Queensland on feedlot matters. That is the reason why the control in this matter is to be transferred from the Local Government Act to the Stock Act.

Shortly before the commencement of this debate I was advised that the Minister will move a couple of amendments that will further qualify some of the points that I am about to make. These amendments are insufficient and do not go far enough.

**Mr Stoneman:** You would never admit it, would you?

**Mr CASEY:** I will tell the Minister why in a moment. If he is sensible and of sound judgment, and is prepared to make a fist of his new job as Minister for Primary

Industries in this State, he will take note of my comments. Unfortunately, so far this Minister has been prepared only to blindly follow the example of his predecessor, and everyone knows the strife that that Minister found himself in over drought relief and other matters.

After today officers in the Department of Primary Industries will be working overtime to promote this aspect of Government policy that is contained in this legislation. Mr Stoneman cannot get away from the fact that he has taken over a department that has an establishment of 14 journalists. That department has more journalists than most regional newspapers in Queensland employ and probably about half the number of journalists working regularly on the *Courier-Mail*. The Minister's predecessor established regional journalists in Toowoomba, Rockhampton, Townsville and Bundaberg. At that time he was nicknamed Neville "Goebbels" Harper because he was setting up his own personal propaganda machine in the same way as Dr Goebbels set up Hitler's propaganda machine in the days prior to World War II.

Much concern is being expressed in the community about the fact that many of the appointments to those positions were made on a political basis and without advertisement. People were told before they even applied for the jobs that they would be selected. As late as Monday of this week, the director of communications, who is in charge of this group of 14 journalists at the Department of Primary Industries, told one genuine applicant that he had not had a chance to get everything to the director-general. However, last Saturday's *Queensland Government Gazette* showed that the vacancies had been filled and gave the names of the appointees. This guy is still giving genuine job applicants a bum steer. These appointments were political. They were made without advertisement and contrary to the recommendations of the Fitzgerald report. In some cases there is evidence to prove that the successful applicant was chosen prior to the job being advertised. In order to make way for some of these politically motivated appointments to this propaganda unit, which, according to Mr "Goebbels" Harper himself, is costing \$500,000—

**Mr STONEMAN:** I rise to a point of order. That remark reflects on my department and its officers who are very professional people. I ask that the honourable member withdraw the inference in the remark.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Booth):** Order! Is the Minister referring to the word "Goebbels"?

**Mr STONEMAN:** Yes, the words "Goebbels" and "politically motivated".

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I rule that the word "Goebbels" is unparliamentary, and I ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

**Mr Beard:** Were those bulls at Rockhampton bum steers?

**Mr CASEY:** In answer to the interjection from the honourable member for Mount Isa—perhaps they were not bum steers but they made the Minister look like a bum steer.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I have asked the honourable member to withdraw the word "Goebbels". It is definitely unparliamentary in the way in which it was used by the honourable member.

**Mr CASEY:** That is a strange ruling, but I will accept it so that I can get on with my speech. Honourable members are given many nicknames and I would hate to tell this House the nickname that we have for the honourable member for Southport.

**Mr Veivers:** I would like to hear it; go on, tell me.

**Mr CASEY:** I am sorry, there are children in the public gallery.

**Mr Neville—**not "Goebbels"—Harper said that the unit would cost \$500,000 to set up and he moved aside or pushed out several long-serving staff members from their

jobs, including the long-serving editor of that excellent publication the *Queensland Agricultural Journal*. This is what the current Minister is moving into, and, if he takes notice of my comments during this debate, he will get the message.

The Queensland Local Government Association and many of the member councils are unhappy with the legislation. The Minister claims that one of the amendments is being introduced at the behest of the Local Government Association, which is true. However, I have seen the five or six page document sent to the Minister by the President of the Local Government Association. It sets out his objections. Also I have spoken to people in the shire councils who are not prepared to accept Mr Pennell's explanation to the Government. They are the people who will finish up with all the problems in their laps and, because of the change-over to this legislation, they will be unable to do anything about it. Also the Queensland Law Society was most unhappy with the legislation and, in another report consisting of many pages, the society told the Minister in no uncertain terms why it was unhappy.

This legislation will create more problems than it solves. The feedlotter must apply to the local authority for approval. In his application he must show the number of cattle for which he seeks approval. But, once the licence has been approved, he does not have to go to the local authority for approval for variations.

An amendment that has been foreshadowed will solve part of the problem when a licence is renewed. There will still need to be consultation with the local authority every five years but, in the intervening period, the chief stock-inspector has the opportunity to vary the licence and the conditions under the licence. It is he with whom a person—even the local authority—must lodge an objection concerning the operations of the feedlot. That is where the problem lies, because the legislation provides that the chief stock-inspector may—I stress “may”—use the guide-lines.

This is the type of thing that was happening under the drought relief legislation which became so controversial under the previous Minister for Primary Industries. Yesterday the previous Minister referred in this Chamber to what he called a confidential document from the department. It was a review of drought assistance in Queensland. It was made available to him in July 1989 and he did nothing about it. I would like to know whether the new Minister has read that document or whether he has shelved it. Mr Harper said that the document made many of the recommendations for change that were made by the Public Accounts Committee in its report, which is now a public document. Unless it has been shelved, I see no reason why the Department of Primary Industries internal review document could not also be made a public document.

I understand that, since his trip to the west and despite a statement that he made in Parliament the week before last, the present Minister has changed his mind on some of the drought relief recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee. The other day he put a submission to Cabinet, but he was kicked out through the door and has to go back again and do something to stop the rorts in the area that was controlled by the previous Minister.

**Mr Stoneman:** What an imagination!

**Mr CASEY:** The Minister may say that. He is fully aware of what happened in Cabinet. Some of his colleagues leak worse than Don Lane. He should be aware of that as well.

Once the licence is approved, it is up to the chief stock-inspector to decide whether he uses the guide-lines or not. The local authority can only give site approval or location approval and can set down some conditions in relation, for instance, to road conditions. But when it comes to the implementation of the guide-lines, it is up to the chief stock-inspector to decide whether they will be used or not. The guide-lines make up a fairly substantial and important document. I am sorry that the guide-lines have not been gazetted so that they would have some legal authority. They have absolutely no such authority at the moment.

The Minister has admitted that the guide-lines will not be enforced. Under this legislation, objections to feedlots were to be lodged with the feedlot advisory committee chaired by the chief stock-inspector. Thank goodness the Minister has had the good sense to foreshadow an amendment to provide that the chief stock-inspector will not chair that committee. Without that amendment, Caesar would have been recommending to Caesar what ought to be done.

The worst aspect of this legislation is the appeals provision. This is the main objection of the Opposition to the legislation. Under the Local Government Act, the town-planning court deals in a proper way with any objections against applications for licences or, more than anything else, the operations of feedlots. That is where most of the objections come from. The Stock Act provides a completely different type of appeal.

As you would know, Mr Deputy Speaker, amendments can only be made to the legislation before the House. Unfortunately, the appeal provisions of the Stock Act are not before the House. They should have been so that they could be strengthened, and that is the part of the legislation to which the Opposition takes strong exception. Judging by what is happening, there will be a flood of objections from areas where feedlots operate. Under this legislation, feedlots will be automatically licensed within three months.

The appeal provisions in section 27 of the Stock Act read—

“Any person who thinks himself aggrieved by any order or decision of an inspector”—

and that applies to the conditions under the guide-lines for feedlots—

“may appeal to the Minister on giving to such inspector notice in writing. . .”

that he objects. And later—

“The Minister shall, upon the making of all such inquiries, if any, as he considers necessary, determine the appeal, and his decision shall be final, and may be enforced in any court of competent jurisdiction.”

Whatever the Minister decides in any appeal cannot be contested in another court because every court must uphold the decision, and it must be enforced by any other court.

People who appeal against the closure of a feedlot under the Stock Act will not be in the hunt. Feedlot-owners have a right of appeal to the Minister, who is virtually the person who issued the licence. The problem is that the decision is final. That section of the Act is not being amended. Because no proper appeal provision is contained in the Stock Act and people's rights under the Local Government Act are virtually taken away from them, the Opposition will express its objection by voting against the legislation.

It is all very well to say that under the legislation the Local Government Act makes certain provisions in the first place and that the chief stock-inspector may refer back to it. Initially, people have a right of appeal to the Local Government Court. However, when the feedlot is in operation, if problems occur with bad management, the only appeal is to the Minister. When one considers the matter that I raised earlier about the Minister's involvement in issuing feedlot permits to his cronies who are making a quid out of the industry, one can see that the Government has big problems ahead. Thank goodness it will not be in office much longer!

**Hon. N. E. LEE (Yeronga) (12.32 p.m.):** At the outset, I point out that I have a pecuniary interest in the feedlot industry. However, I do not believe that a conflict of interest arises from my participation in this debate. My involvement in the feedlot industry allows me to make an objective and valuable contribution to the debate. Should any member disagree with my taking part in this debate, would he or she say so now?

**Mr Casey:** Keep going, Norm.

**Mr LEE:** In view of that interjection, I hope that the honourable member will not accuse me of using cronyism in order to obtain my feedlot.

The Liberal Party accepts the Bill in principle. Feedlots have been springing up willy-nilly all over the place. I agree that they should be controlled. However, the Bill has a few bugs. I suppose that one could say that it has a bad odour in places.

The industry accepts that feedlots should be cleaned up. I accept that they should be cleaned up to a certain extent and managed properly. In the past, no planning has gone into the siting of feedlots.

I remind the Minister that feedlotting is a rural industry and it should be allowed to operate in a rural zoning. The industry is expanding rapidly. As the Minister said, feedlotting will generate an additional \$335m for rural industry. Harsh conditions should not be imposed upon the feedlotters of Queensland, making them no longer competitive with their counterparts in States such as New South Wales and Victoria. As well, they must be allowed to be competitive on the overseas market. As the Minister said, the feedlotting industry is expanding rapidly. It will become one of the largest sectors of the Queensland beef industry.

It is important that producers in the meat industry market good-quality beef at all times. Consumers do not want tender meat today and tough meat tomorrow. They will not cop that. When mum visits the local supermarket, she wants to be able to purchase good-quality meat every time.

Mr Condon stated that the feedlot industry should expand into the far west of Queensland. That may be a good proposition for the stock-inspectors. However, grain and cattle would have to be transported to the west, which would increase transport costs. The far west has no slaughterhouses. As well, the ports from which the beef is exported are located on the eastern coast. It is important that feedlotters be located in areas which allow them to be competitive on the overseas market and also to produce high-quality beef. If feedlots were established in western areas, cattle would have to be transported from the coast to the western feedlot and the product would then have to be returned to the east to be marketed. The product has to be competitively priced.

It is important that the feedlotting industry remain competitive. Feedlot cattle will not travel. They are used to being able to have a feed, a drink of water and then a lie down. If they are transported more than 100 kilometres, they start to show signs of stress. Cattle in feedlot condition cannot be transported 1 000 kilometres. If they are transported long distances, they suffer from stress and tension, they get bruised and the colour of the meat and the fat alters. It is important that cattle are fed close to the killing works. They will not stand in a transport vehicle; they are not used to it. Some lie down immediately and they are trampled on by other cattle and bruised.

**Mr McPhie:** It was not far to take the cattle from your feedlot at Cannon Hill.

**Mr LEE:** That is quite true. That feedlot was a great success, but we had to shift. I will return to that shortly.

The cattle must be held near to the place at which they are going to be killed. They must be within 100 kilometres of the killing works. That is very important. That helps to overcome the problem of bruising. There is no way around it; the cattle must be held near the meatworks. As the honourable member pointed out, our company used to have a feedlot at Cannon Hill. I found that having a feedlot close to the meatworks is one way in which to ensure consistent good-quality meat.

People will not spend a lot of money just to have a feedlot near the markets. My family company certainly does not love spending money just to have an area in which to hold the cattle close to town. The cattle have to be held near the killing works. It is well known that our company has established a feedlot in the Brisbane valley. That feedlot was built to standards that are even higher than those required under those new guide-lines. It has agricultural drains, which are not required under those guide-lines. It has a 20-megalitre retention and settling pond. The Queen Mary could float in it. The yards are designed so that it is easy to gain access to them with machinery. An elevating scraper can be used in those yards; graders can be used in them. Three metres of concrete

has been provided around the water-troughs and the feed-troughs instead of 2 metres or 2.5 metres, which is required under the guide-lines. None of the pens drains from one to the other. Those yards have water diversion banks and are surrounded by 16 hectares of contoured pasture and cultivation, which is not required under the new guide-lines. Our company has built those yards to a higher standard than that required under the guide-lines.

It is possible that, even though one has built feedlots of a standard that exceeds what is expected under the guide-lines, one can be closed down because of a report on odour to a chief inspector. The present method of measuring odour is very unscientific. The Minister must consider doing something about that.

The member for Mackay could not make a decent speech. He attacked people. He attacked Bill Gunn and talked about cronyism. He mentioned somebody at Roma who is in competition with our company. I welcome a bit of competition.

**Mr Beard:** It is called free enterprise.

**Mr LEE:** Yes, it is called free enterprise. I believe in free enterprise. That is what the Liberal Party is all about. As far as I am concerned, good luck to that person.

**Mr Eaton:** You've got the best lot and the best feed, so you aren't worried about competition.

**Mr LEE:** That is right.

If one does not produce quality meat, one is not going to be able to sell it. That is what it amounts to. My company has a feedlot at Roma. I have found that the cattle cannot be transported to the markets in Brisbane without suffering stress and bruising, which discolours the meat. In order to carry on business, our company has to have another holding lot, such as the one in the Brisbane valley, so that quality cattle can be killed week in, week out.

**Mr Beard:** You are forced by the market-place—what the consumer demands.

**Mr LEE:** That is right.

The member for Mackay talked about cronyism and said that our company has a feedlot at Buaraba Creek, and so on. Unlike many other companies, our company had to spend a lot of money fighting a court case, which it won. Yet the honourable member is quite happy to accuse me of cronyism.

**Mr Casey:** I never accused you of cronyism.

**Mr LEE:** The honourable member went very close to it.

**Mr Casey:** No. I said you should explain your situation to the House, and that's what you are doing.

**Mr LEE:** Yes, I am.

Unfortunately, the owner of the adjoining property, a person by the name of Mrs Feldon, who had every right to oppose our company in that court case, has since joined what is called the Anti-Feedlotters Association. Honourable members can take it from me that what she is saying is just incredible. She made a complaint to the Esk Shire Council on a day on which there was a strong westerly wind. That wind blows directly away from her place. She complained that the odour from our feedlot was so bad that she had to lock herself in her house for five hours. That was a deliberate lie.

That is the sort of thing that will happen. That lady has now taken to ringing the local health inspector at 2 o'clock in the morning and saying, "I can smell that feedlot." She is making absolutely frivolous complaints. The chief inspector, who will have tremendous powers, is going to get sick of people ringing him and complaining at 2 o'clock in the morning——

**Mr Beard:** He would earn his crust.

**Mr LEE:** Yes, but eventually he will get sick of it and he will say, "I will get rid of this feedlot. That is the easiest thing to do." Under this Bill, there is no right of appeal against such a decision. That is what concerns the Liberal Party. The chief inspector could close down a feedlot. I did not say he would do that; I said that he could do it. The only right of appeal is to the Minister. God forbid—one day a Labor Minister might be in charge! I know that I should have my mouth washed out for saying that.

**Mr Lickiss:** How would you be with Mr Casey?

**Mr LEE:** One just could not stand it. The country would be in one hell of a mess. The ALP and the Federal Government are anti-rural. Every move they make is anti-rural. Having listened to Mr Casey's speech, I would say that he is also anti-rural.

**Mr Lickiss:** And anti-enterprise.

**Mr LEE:** The honourable member is right.

**Mr Beard:** He likes beef.

**Mr LEE:** Mr Casey would be the first one to complain in the dining room if he was given a bit of tough beef. He is against feedlots.

As I said, members of the ALP hate people in the rural industry. Look what Hawke has done. He has taken away all the benefits that the people in the far west and in other country areas deserve.

**Mr Lickiss:** All the incentives.

**Mr LEE:** As my colleague said, he has taken away all the incentives.

There is no scientific way to measure odour. The Minister has not established an advisory panel to finalise the guide-lines. I know that he proposes to move an amendment to the Bill. I ask the Minister how the odour measurement to which he referred was taken. Was it taken at ground level in the yards, in the wet area in the yards, at the boundary fence or one kilometre away? Someone should tell the people in the industry how a measurement will be taken so that they know what action they must take and manage their properties accordingly.

Mr Darcy Condon is the chairman of Community Feedlot Watch. An article in the press stated—

"Community Feedlot Watch, a lobby group formed in Toowoomba at the weekend, brings together feedlot opponents throughout south-east Queensland."

Mr Condon is reported as saying that neighbours within three kilometres of a feedlot had the most severe problems, but odours carried up to 20 kilometres. The article continued—

"The group wrote to the Premier, Mr Ahern, seeking a noxious industry declaration to strengthen the protection of residents around feedlots."

What a lot of garbage! That is the type of thing that I have to put up with. A woman who is an anti-feedlotter joined Community Feedlot Watch and lives one and a-half kilometres from our property. No-one could fault the management of our feedlot. I would welcome an inspection of it at any time. A man has said that from 20 kilometres away he can smell the odour from a feedlot. That is a ridiculous statement. As I said, it is wrong.

The right-to-farm legislation should be introduced urgently. If that is not done, the feedlot industry will be wiped out. What about the Queen Street farmers? They purchase a 40-acre block in a rural zone and build on it a bit of a shack that is a disgrace to the district. They visit that property on a week-end or once every month. They take their pet dogs with them. They might also take their children with them so that they can ride a horse on the property. They do absolutely nothing towards giving something to the

rural industry—absolutely zilch. The only thing they do is give the local authority a little bit extra money in rates.

**Mr Lickiss:** They usually take the land out of production.

**Mr LEE:** Of course they do! As my colleague said, they usually take the land out of production.

Many complaints have been received by the feedlot industry. A recent article in the press referred to the power given to the Government to close down feedlots. The industry is genuinely worried. Proposed new sections 28G and 28H give enormous powers to the chief inspector. That is very worrying.

I wish to read into *Hansard* some of the complaints that I have received from people who are well established in the industry. I will not name the persons from whom I have received the complaints. One letter states—

“The main concerns are as follows:—

1. The guidelines which were released some weeks previously set in place separation distances which would be unworkable. Their whole concept requires a great deal of R & D which is currently being addressed by A.M.L.R.D.C., while ALFA are to advise the priorities for research.

The Minister’s speech plays down the importance of the guidelines but this is in conflict with the Amendment Bill which provides for them to be Gazetted.

2. There is no time constraint in which applications for licence must be dealt with.

3. No apparent right of appeal.”

A letter from another important organisation stated—

“The major concerns of the group relate to the powers of the Chief Inspector of Stock in relation to his ability to determine standards and require changes to feedlot operations without there being an apparent review or appeal process.”

I am in possession of several other letters that continue in the same vein, but I do not intend to mention them in detail.

The whole industry is up in arms because it envisages dangers. It is up to the Minister to ensure that correct procedures are adopted. My colleague the member for Sherwood, the Leader of the Liberal Party, will take up that matter. I am sure that he will cover the complaints of the Queensland Law Society, which is worried that no appeal provisions have been included in the legislation.

The Minister stated that the guide-lines will not be gazetted. The Bill refers continually to the guide-lines, but no advisory committee will be set up to formulate the guide-lines. I make a plea to the Minister: if this legislation must be passed, could he hold it from royal assent so that it does not become law until the guide-lines and the input of the advisory committee are in place? Otherwise the industry will be reluctant to do anything. If the Minister were to do that, the industry would respect him. At the Committee stage, I will seek answers from the Minister. I am not trying to embarrass him, his officers or inspectors; but it is important that he answers my questions.

The Liberal Party opposes the clause that takes away the right of appeal and gives too much power to the chief inspector. As I said, I have a pecuniary interest in the industry, but I believe that I understand what it wants. I have taken the liberty of providing copies of my questions to the Minister and his officers so that he can answer them in detail.

**Mr Lickiss:** It is fair to say that you would have more experience in this industry than anyone else in this House.

**Mr LEE:** That is a reasonable statement. That would be the case in this House, but not in Queensland. Because my son is the manager of our property, he would have more experience in the industry than I have. I have been trying to manage my electorate.



**Mr Lickiss:** Debate is taking place in the towns.

**Mr LEE:** That is right.

**Mr Eaton:** You could keep half a dozen cows in the back yard.

**Mr LEE:** I could keep more than that in my back yard.

**Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (12.57 p.m.):** This is wide-ranging legislation. Most of its provisions have been covered by previous speakers, particularly Mr Casey. I envisage many problems that I hope will be overcome.

Mr Lee mentioned that the guide-lines will not be written into the regulations, which will leave them open to interpretation. As a result, kerbstone barristers or bush lawyers will make decisions and initiate actions that could lead only to more confusion.

The Minister may have created a false impression in his second-reading speech. I do not doubt that lot-fed beef has a value-added component; but the Minister mentioned an additional \$300 per head. He failed to indicate that that sum would be taken up in costs for feed and other expenses.

Because I was involved in the beef industry many years ago, I like to keep up with it and visit property-owners. I have had a little experience in the lot-feeding of cattle, which is capital intensive. A good end product needs a capital-intensive operation.

**Mr Stoneman:** It does create a lot of jobs and profit for the industry.

**Mr EATON:** That is true, but one must consider the end result.

People should not get the idea that they can borrow large sums of money and establish feedlots anywhere that they please, because they do attract objections. Because feedlots attract flies and create odours, they can cause health problems. Geographic and climatic conditions can add to those problems. Feedlots should be situated well away from towns and communities, particularly on the coast because of the prevailing wet climate. Several attempts have been made to establish feedlots in the wet-belt of north Queensland.

Sitting suspended from 12.59 to 2.30 p.m.

Debate, on motion of Mr Harper, adjourned.

## **CHILDREN'S SERVICES ACT AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

### **Second Reading**

Debate resumed from 4 October (see p. 1265).

**Ms WARNER (South Brisbane) (2.30 p.m.):** I rise in support of this Bill in broad terms. I have some reservations about its implementation, but I will discuss those later. The idea that penalties and options for sentencing be diversified is excellent.

The Labor Party is not opposing the Bill. However, I have a few doubts that community service orders can be transferred from the adult sphere to the juvenile sphere with the same effect. I suspect that that is not the case. In fact, as offenders, children require quite different and separate treatment from adults. I think there is also some community reserve about the idea of children being forced to work. Members of this House would be aware that the idea of child labour has a very shady and bad history. I am sure that they certainly do not want this legislation to fall into that category.

Another inconsistency, or should I say difficulty, is that the Minister, in her second-reading speech, said that community service orders would promote the prospect of rehabilitation through the acquisition of new skills and the establishment and reinforcement of work habits. There may be some inconsistency in trying to indicate to children that if they do something bad the penalty for that bad behaviour is work and that when they have been naughty they have to do work. Those are not the sorts of concepts that

we would want children to be developing about work, because that would be counter-productive.

A further problem is that, because not enough schemes are available, the adult community service orders are proving difficult to implement. They actually require some Government resources, which are strained. Not enough voluntary groups are in a position to help provide the infrastructure for the execution of those orders. That being so, I foresee similar difficulties arising in encouraging appropriate community organisations to take this matter on board. In fact, since the introduction of the Children's Services Act in 1965, provisions have actually been introduced for the establishment of day attendance centres. They have the same effect as community service orders in that the offenders stay in their own homes and go out to work at the attendance centre. One such centre is Shaftesbury at Spring Hill.

It seems that, if the Government wanted to enhance that aspect of the program, it simply could have expanded and extended the provision of the day centres, probably at a greater cost per capita than is intended at the moment. Still, if it is a job that is worth doing, it is worth doing properly. I would have thought that some consideration might have been given to the extension of those attendance centres.

The other thing that disturbs me about this legislation is the way in which the scheme will be financed. I understand that the \$60,000 that will be provided will be distributed throughout Queensland through the——

**Mrs Nelson interjected.**

**Ms WARNER:** If that is not true, I would be interested to hear the Minister's response.

I will relate my information about the way in which that money is to be distributed. The \$60,000 was to be divided by 10, which would provide \$6,000 to each region, and within each region there would be a number of offices. For instance, there would be five offices in the South Brisbane region and each would receive \$1,200. That is an absolutely minuscule amount of money with which to fund a proper program. That was the information I received about how the scheme was to be implemented.

I understand that, within the department, some considerable lobbying has occurred for the \$60,000 to be used in a single scheme. I would support the pooling of the resources into one area. If the Government intends to do something, it might as well do it properly in a smaller area rather than spread its resources so thinly that it is impossible to implement any program at all because the resources are dissipated throughout the State.

The \$60,000 is actually a major problem. In relation to adult community service orders, I understand that a program centred on Wynnum and Redlands takes up \$60,000—and that is just for one small area.

**Mrs Nelson:** The \$60,000 was for this financial year pending legislation coming in next year.

**Ms WARNER:** I am sorry, I cannot hear the honourable member.

**Mrs Nelson:** I'll tell you later.

**Ms WARNER:** I thank the Minister for that. If she can clarify those financial restraints or constrictions that I see emerging at the moment, I will be happy.

The other problem is that the Bill states that appropriate work will be arranged. Again, it seems to me that, if a person is a persistent offender or someone who commits an offence for which it is thought that a custodial sentence is inappropriate but nevertheless there is a need for some kind of intervention into that person's life, the Minister should not consider the motive behind the community service orders to be punitive. With juvenile justice, that would be wholly inappropriate.

I assume that the major priority would be rehabilitation. Rehabilitation does not mean getting a kid to paint a fence on a Saturday morning—simply because it is regarded as a good community service—without giving the child any community contact or any understanding of the relationship between painting the fence and the crime that has been committed or, indeed, developing in the child life-skills. Without including those factors, community service orders will have no rehabilitative effect at all.

The intent of the Bill is that community service orders should not interfere with education and existing work, if that is being undertaken. I, for one, have serious reservations about giving children absolutely no free time because, under those circumstances, they will not be in a position to learn either by going to school or by carrying out a community service order. Life will go past them too quickly and they will be unable to understand the processes that are being enforced on them. I have personal difficulty even with children who are not on community service orders carrying out work on week-ends or in the evening. I think that that activity interferes with the whole range of their developmental patterns.

I do not believe that sufficient consultation with the voluntary welfare sector was engaged in during the preparation of this legislation. For too long this Government has set up programs and said, "The community sector is the area in which we should get this program implemented." The department goes cap in hand to various church and community groups and says, "We will give you this small amount of money if you take over this program and implement it for us." That type of action places the voluntary sector in an incredibly difficult position.

The Minister would be aware that voluntary welfare groups exist because the people involved in them care. They are committed, whether or not Government resources are available. When social needs are recognised, the first reaction of those groups is to respond to those needs. The Government is only too happy to allow the voluntary sector to respond by picking up most of the tab and carrying the responsibility for services that, in the past, have been provided by the Government. These groups are letting the Government off the hook by responding to needs and filling the gap.

The present mood in the voluntary welfare sector suggests that enough is enough. Increasingly these groups have taken on the role of providing services in a whole range of areas. They are beginning to regard themselves as the primary providers of welfare services and the department as the secondary welfare service agency. The people involved in those groups have informed me that, under those circumstances, they wish to be involved in the planning process for the distribution and development of services.

The voluntary welfare sector has been left out of the planning, distribution and evaluation of those services. It may be all very well, if and when community service orders are implemented, to suggest that they will work very well. However, there is no harm in waiting to see whether or not the program becomes a useful adjunct to the existing sentence options. I have reservations in principle about some of the ideas that have been expressed, and I have already outlined my views on those matters.

The main problem with the voluntary welfare sector is that, even though it is under-resourced, its groups will take projects on. Great stress is being placed on those organisations. The outcome is that, although the community groups say they will take the project on, they cannot complete the tasks; and the Government does not carry out the program either, so the gap in the delivery of services widens. This is particularly so in relation to the problem of homelessness and the provision of support accommodation. The Government simply states that it has made a limited amount of funding available to the community service sector to provide housing, but very often the community service sector is unable to provide the service. The Government says that the community service sector is providing the service and the community service sector says that it cannot respond to the needs because of insufficient resources. The end result is that the service is not provided. The impression that the service is being provided is widespread, but in reality adequate resources are not available. I hope that that is not the fate of programs associated with this legislation.

I urge the Minister to take a very close look at the relationship between the Government and non-Government sectors in the provision of welfare services. The voluntary sector is beginning to feel abused; that it is the poor relation; and that it, instead of the Government, has to assume full responsibility without having any control over the budget. I am sure that the Minister is aware that the relationship is under strain. I believe that, instead of allowing the ad hoc arrangements to lurch from program to program annually, depending on the funds provided in the Budget, a more philosophically definite approach has to be adopted to clarify the Government's role and the role of the community service sector. I make that suggestion somewhat facetiously because, as honourable members and the Minister would be aware, I will be the Minister after the election. I can afford to engage in an academic argument. It is probably useful for me to engage in this debate, whereas it is probably not very useful for the Minister. It is a little irrelevant from her point of view. It could certainly be regarded as academic in the light of what will occur in the Aspley electorate at the forthcoming State election.

Putting those reservations and practicalities aside, I must say that it is an interesting subject. At least over the next couple of hours the Minister may wish to consider the matters I have mentioned and address them. Perhaps she will indicate her ideas on how the relationship between the Government and non-Government sectors should function. Perhaps more specifically she can indicate the community service organisation she is considering bringing on line for implementation of the community service orders, and the level of support and resources that will be devoted to the implementation of the program.

There needs to be community organisation. It is not enough merely to give a child some washing-up to do after a function over the week-end. The people within the organisation must have some skills or understanding of the child's position so that they can intervene to discuss and develop ideas which might lead to some level of rehabilitation of the child, or perhaps give the child some firm purpose for amendment in the future and a desire to improve his or her own life-style. The life-style of those children will not be improved if they continually offend and are caught for those offences. The people involved in the community organisation need to have a level of skill, knowledge and understanding so that they can put those ideas across. I do not think that the shoe-string budget of \$60,000 will actually provide the kind of expertise, knowledge and background that will result in an effective rehabilitation mechanism.

I have covered the major matters contained in this legislation. This is part of another look at the juvenile justice system, which is in need of a considerable overhaul. I ask the Minister to respond to a newspaper article, which appeared a week after she was elevated to the Ministry, concerning the John Oxley Youth Centre and the security problems within that detention centre. The Minister has been silent on the subject. Trying to operate that centre properly and giving the workers in the centre some confidence in the management, and vice versa, is a running battle in the Department of Family Services. Those relationships have broken down and, to say the least, the security at the centre is not the best. In addition, there was that very dangerous riot from which, in terms of levels of fear, the centre has never fully recovered. The centre falls broadly within this area of juvenile justice and I would be interested to hear the Minister's comments.

I am sure that the public service would be very happy if the Minister could give some clear indication as to what her priorities will be in the next six weeks. I realise that her major priority will be to win the seat of Aspley, and all honourable members understand what a difficult task that will be. However, it would be appreciated if she could spare some time from that task and give a little attention to Family Services.

As I stated the other night in this House, many people in the Minister's department are confused about the priorities in the Budget and about which programs will be proceeded with on a long-term basis and which programs will be axed. Perhaps the Minister could confirm the very persistent and ubiquitous rumour that is circulating, not only in the Department of Family Services, but also in the non-Government sector,

that the marriage enrichment program and the social workers in schools program will be axed. People want to know what is happening with these programs. Will they be axed, or will they stay? How long can we depend on this determination? In her reply the Minister could use what is probably her first opportunity fruitfully to explain to her own department and to the public at large what her priorities are within Family Services, which is something about which the members of the public and the officers in the Minister's department are completely uncertain and ignorant. With the indulgence of the Chair, the Minister might like to touch on the subject of whether or not that \$290,000 that will be saved as a result of axing those two programs will indeed go into the area of intellectual disability, or whether it will be distributed in some other way.

**Mrs Nelson:** I think someone has been indulging in wishful thinking.

**Ms WARNER:** I will be interested to hear the Minister's comments on the matter.

I have been waiting. Yesterday morning, because I mentioned these matters in the first place, the Minister threatened to make me look like a galah. She had the opportunity to make me look like a galah yesterday morning and again during ministerial comment this morning. Now she has yet another opportunity to do that. I checked a number of sources, because it was not coming simply from one source. The Minister might want to close the lid on the matter so there will be no leaks and send out memos stating that anyone who leaks will have all their fingers and toes removed, but that will not save her.

**Mrs Nelson:** They're sick at the thought of having you as Minister, I can tell you.

**Ms WARNER:** No. I would suggest that the fact that I am getting the information——

**Mrs Nelson:** You aren't going to get in, anyway.

**Ms WARNER:** I find it interesting that the Minister would bother to go that far down the track, because that assumes that the Labor Party will get into Government.

**Mrs Nelson:** I said you're not going to.

**Ms WARNER:** I see. I know that the Minister has a very casual relationship with the truth. She is displaying that casual relationship in the Parliament and that is somewhat unedifying.

Nevertheless, if I could return to the——

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Booth):** Order! I would like the member to return to the Bill. There is a time restraint and I think we can do without the cross-firing in the Chamber.

**Ms WARNER:** I would have finished a long time ago if I had not been harassed.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I am suggesting that the honourable member return to the Bill and I am also suggesting less cross-firing from the Minister.

**Ms WARNER:** Thank you for your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker.

I realise that time is short and that we really must get on with the business of electioneering which, in the Minister's mind, is more important than the matters before us at the moment. I understand that the Chair feels the same way. I shall desist from the teasing and tormenting which is, of course, quite pleasant but probably a little irrelevant, because all of these matters will be swept away in the forthcoming weeks.

**Mr WHITE (Redcliffe) (2.54 p.m.):** The Liberal Party joins this debate to support the Bill, which introduces community service orders for teenage offenders.

**Mr Milliner:** What would a millionaire like you know about this?

**Mr WHITE:** A damned sight more than the honourable member does.

Labor Party members today have sunk into the ultimate abyss. They consider that anybody who has achieved in life or who strives for something should be looked down upon and derided. The tall-poppy syndrome of the Labor Party is alive and well. Mr Milliner and his colleagues despise anybody who achieves anything. The people of Queensland ought to know that a sense of excellence and achievement and a sense of getting on and doing something for people are not liked by the Labor Party. The reason is that Labor members want everybody to be dependent on the State. It is the hand-out mentality. They believe in the corporate State in which the silent majority of people are ignored by the likes of Mr Milliner and his colleagues.

**Opposition members interjected.**

**Mr WHITE:** They are very sensitive. It is quite apparent that Labor Party members are terribly sensitive about what is happening in this nation.

**Mr Smyth:** What about the chemists? They went on strike.

**Mr WHITE:** The honourable member talks about strike action. What is being done by the great leader of the Labor Party, the former president of the ACTU, the man of conciliation and the man of consensus? He is paying his mates, such as Abeles, \$5m or \$6m a week to fight a few airline pilots and deny them the right to get something better. He is denying them the opportunity to improve the productivity of this nation.

**Mr Milliner:** Do you support the pilots?

**Mr WHITE:** Yes, I support the pilots and I am proud of that. They are a great group of people. They are entitled to get together and negotiate their own arrangements with their employers on the basis of improving productivity in this nation. That is what the Labor people do not want. They do not want to improve the productivity of this nation. They want Australia to become another mendicant nation. They want us all to be part of the corporate state—big business, big unions and big government. That is what they want.

**Mrs Nelson:** Just like Mussolini's Italy.

**Mr WHITE:** Yes, as the Minister rightly points out.

The true colours of Labor Party members have been demonstrated yet again this afternoon. They despise progress, excellence and productivity. Those things are not what they stand for; they stand for mediocrity, keeping everybody down and lowering people to the same level of mediocrity. The honourable member for Everton, who is the great proponent of mediocrity, will lose his seat to Mr Smith, who is sitting in the gallery waiting for his time to come. And it will come after the election.

It is with great pleasure that the Liberal Party supports this legislation. It is a move in the right direction to widen the range of options in sentencing juvenile offenders. It may be of some interest that, in 1981, we in the Liberal Party were responsible for the introduction of community service orders in this State. It is fair to say that that has been a great success because it offered the magistracy and the judiciary an option that they did not have before. Members of the police force and the magistracy say to me that, basically, juvenile offenders have either to be sent to Westbrook or some other institution or be rapped over the knuckles. It is time that, in this country, we propounded that people accept responsibility for their actions. This legislation will give the courts the opportunity to promote that notion.

Could I encourage the Government to consider a further range of sentencing options, such as compulsory attendance centres and fines for people who can afford to pay fines when young people do enormous damage to the property of others? Another option is compulsory parental involvement in the process, and putting responsibility back where it ought to be, that is, on the shoulders of the parents instead of on the State. For too long in this country the responsibility for children has increasingly been lumped upon the Government instead of being placed back where it really should be.

**Mr Lee** interjected.

**Mr WHITE:** As the honourable member for Yeronga pointed out, that is the sort of thing that the Labor Party stands for. It would put all the responsibility on the State so that the people are dependent on it. It would get away from the concept of individual rights, which my party stands for, by breaking down the family. That is what the Labor Party stands for.

I suggest that the Minister and her department give further consideration to increasing the range of sentencing options to include compulsory family counselling, placing responsibility on parents and bringing in, where people can afford it, the concept of restitution. People are literally fed up with breaking and entering offences and juvenile vandalism. They are fed up with aggressive young offenders of 15 and 16 years of age getting away with absolute murder. It is time that something was done about the problem.

I am fed up with the way things have gone in the welfare area over the years. For too long it has been easy for people to opt out of their responsibility. The Liberal Party subscribes heavily to placing responsibility on the individual and the family rather than taking the easy way out, as is often propounded by people in the welfare lobby. The people who are propounding an increase in welfare services are the bureaucratic empire-builders who want to enlarge the size of the State. It simply has to stop.

Solutions to our growing problems exist, but fundamentally they get down to the State's taking a different tangent and offering incentives, encouragement and funding for the introduction of preventive programs so that families can be kept together. When people get into trouble, they should have the opportunity to rectify the situation before it becomes a matter of major concern to the community. Another solution is in the introduction of a wider range of parent skill programming and an increased utilisation of life education programs not only in schools but throughout the community to encourage people to accept responsibility.

I know that we have some time constraints on us, so I will be brief. However, I draw to the Minister's attention the growing concern about adoption. Honourable members know that a dramatic decline has occurred in the number of children available for adoption. Last year, in this State 170 adoptions were effected, whereas a decade ago approximately 1 200 babies were available for adoption. What have we seen? Since the introduction of counselling by social workers, many young mothers have been counselled to keep their children when manifestly they do not have the ability to do so. If a young woman can accept the responsibility and rear the child, I will not be critical of that. However, I am critical of the increasing tendency of so many young people to procreate and either not accept responsibility for those children or, alternatively, lump them on to the State.

In recent times, a young mother in my electorate had her fourth pregnancy. All have been by different fathers. I am prepared to accept the first mistake, but the other three are beyond a joke. Because the social worker told the young mother that, if she adopted the child out she would have long-term psychological problems, the first child was initially placed with grandma. For far too long in this State, rhubarb of that nature has been perpetuated. If people insist on procreating, they should accept the responsibility. If they cannot accept the responsibility, bring the child up and give it a chance, they should adopt the child out or put it in some other alternative permanent state so that the child has a fair go in life.

In the example that I cite, a second pregnancy came along. Unfortunately, the child was born with a hair lip. Arrangements were made through the public hospital system for an operation to be performed. The child returned to the natural mother. After a couple of months, the child was dumped in grandma's lap. Because of her age, grandma eventually had to dump the child into a family group home. The third pregnancy came along and it was a similar story. The woman is now pregnant for the fourth time. Those four children will have little or no chance of making a fair shake of their lives.

Whether the Labor Party likes it or not and whether or not it will continue to perpetuate the esoteric, funny, social engineering theories that we have been stuck with for too long in this State, we will have an increasing problem. It is time that we accepted the fact that any child born into this world is entitled to have a fair go. Something should be done about it.

How often do we see young children who are adopted out into secure, loving family environments who grow up, inevitably, to be responsible, contributing citizens of the country? Yet the Labor Party still wants to perpetuate the old-fashioned dogmas of social sciences that wish to inflict upon the State not only the cost of that but also the burdens that are born through family dislocation and juvenile delinquency. If Opposition members examine prison records, they will see a constant history with many of the inmates of the prison system. Initially, they have had a very difficult family environment and then they have progressed to juvenile offences, to Westbrook and right through the prison system.

**Mr Davis:** Remember the compulsory adoption one you had planned years ago?

**Mr WHITE:** Compulsory adoption?

**Mr Davis:** Yes. Instead of the child being kept, single mothers had to adopt out the child.

**Mr WHITE:** I do not recall what the member for Brisbane Central is talking about, but I am quite happy to debate the matter with him if he provides me with the relevant facts.

I do not resile from the comments that I have made this afternoon. Because so many people are fed up with the way in which the welfare system has gone, something has to be done about it.

The Liberal Party is happy to support the amendment. It is to be hoped that the department will administer that program well and that it does lead to something constructive being done for young people in this State.

**Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (3.08 p.m.):** I support the Bill, which amends the Children's Services Act to allow for the introduction of community service orders for children.

Firstly, the Bill will assist in tackling the problem of crime—particularly juvenile crime—in the community. Juvenile crime is a problem in all areas. It is so prevalent that anybody wandering around on a Friday or a Saturday night can observe the enormous amount of damage that is caused by this small number of people. I want to emphasise that the number of people involved is very small.

**Mr Davis** interjected.

**Mr STEPHAN:** The honourable member is trying to distract me. He reminds me of a juvenile, but he is grown up. I might say that I wish the honourable member well in his retirement. He will be missed next year in this House.

During 1987-88, some 3 557 children appeared in Children's Courts throughout Queensland. In many ways, this represents only the tip of the iceberg, as almost 70 per cent of children apprehended by police for the commission of a criminal offence are dealt with by the issuing of a caution. The Juvenile Aid Bureau is doing a fantastic job. It is available to assist and give a bit of confidence to this small number of young people who are getting themselves into trouble. It helps to stop the problem before it begins.

However, where children continue to offend against the criminal law, or commit offences of a more serious nature, it is essential that courts are able to make orders that will have a real and lasting impact on the child. These orders should help the child to see the error of his ways before he adopts a criminal life-style and help him to become a responsible citizen. In the long term, community service orders will go a long way towards deterring children from pursuing a criminal life-style in their adult years. This



will, in turn, have a positive impact on our adult correctional system and the whole community.

The Bill will provide courts with a greater range of sentencing options for children. That is very important. When a court is required to sentence a child who has pleaded guilty to, or been found guilty of, a criminal offence, it should have at its disposal a range of sentencing options in order to ensure that the punishment does in fact fit the crime.

In the interim, this Bill will make available to magistrates and judges when sentencing children one of the most effective orders already being used in the sentencing of adults. The evidence from other States in which this type of order has been used for children is that it is a valued addition to the range of options available. It should never be underestimated.

The provision for community service orders for children will allow young offenders to have the experience of giving something back to the community and encourage their development to responsible adulthood. A high price is paid by the community for the damage caused by juveniles. Activities such as stealing, breaking into houses, joy-riding in cars and assault do not affect just the person who is assaulted or whose property is stolen; they have an enormously adverse effect on the community. The community pays in the form of higher insurance premiums and the need to employ greater numbers of police and correctional services officers. The consequences of family conflict and break-down are also a very important factor that cannot be underestimated.

The tangible experience of repaying the community, whether this is in a direct way such as the child being ordered to clean up the graffiti that he has sprayed on the local railway station or, more indirectly, the child being ordered to mow the lawn at a local nursing home, is very important to these young offenders. When they mix with people who are a bit older than they are, they can see the effect of their actions.

**Mr Davis:** What if a National Party sign goes up?

**Mr STEPHAN:** That is not graffiti. A National Party sign going up in any area is certainly not graffiti; such signs command respect from the community. I do not have to put up signs in my electorate. It has been agreed that election signs will not be placed on trees or poles in my electorate. That has been voluntarily agreed upon. I notice that in the city there is not quite the same degree of co-operation. However, that is not my problem.

For a number of reasons, the detention of young offenders should be seen as a last resort. These include the evidence that rehabilitation may be more likely when the child remains in his own family and community—which makes a lot of sense; the evidence that detention centres can have the undesirable effect of entrenching children further into criminal life-style; and the prohibitive cost of detaining young offenders and providing programs for them.

It is clear that community standards require the option of detention for children who commit serious offences such as rape, robbery with violence and arson, and children who offend repeatedly. That must be there as a deterrent. In addition, while they are in detention, efforts can be made to help these children to get through this difficult stage in their lives.

Community service orders provide an option for many children who might otherwise be considered for detention because of the perceived lack of consequences of certain community correctional orders. Under a community service order, the child's liberty is significantly restricted. That is a major factor. The child cannot always go out with his mates and with his family to football matches or other recreational and entertainment pursuits. That is very important indeed.

Finally, the Bill is flexible enough to allow the order to be adapted when the circumstances in a child's life change. I have already referred to the situation in which a child wilfully fails to comply with a community service order. In other instances, the

circumstances of children may change after a community service order is made. This can happen with young people who are unemployed at the time when the order is made and find work in another community in which community service orders are not available.

The Bill allows a boy, a girl, parents or an officer of the Department of Children's Services to approach a court to seek an extension of the time required to complete the community service order. The Bill contains flexibility to genuinely help young people who find themselves in trouble. I commend the Minister for introducing the Bill.

**Mr SHERLOCK** (Ashgrove) (3.16 p.m.): I welcome the opportunity to join briefly in this debate and congratulate the Minister on introducing the Bill. I note the presence of Mr Alan Pettigrew in the lobby. I have always enjoyed working with him. I am aware of the valuable work that he does in the background in controlling the Department of Family Services.

I remind honourable members, particularly the member for Brisbane Central, that when Mr Terry White was Minister for Family Services and Corrective Services, he introduced community service orders in this State. In those days, Mr Graham Zerk was the Director of the Department of Children's Services. Honourable members will recall that he criticised the Government in a very courageous report in 1987 when he spoke about the shortcomings in funding received by the Department of Children's Services and how Queensland stacked up against the rest of Australia. I hope that the Minister takes on board some of those criticisms—many of which, I think, were justified—in the course of her contribution to the Family Services portfolio. I assure honourable members that, in Government, the Liberal Party will take on board those contributions from Mr Zerk.

The member for South Brisbane referred to young people and said that she did not believe that young people should work because it restricts their development and their opportunity to be educated and to grow. What a lot of poppycock that is. It is a typical Labor attitude towards the development of young people. Nothing develops young people better than giving them responsibility, because they respond to responsibility and they grow. They learn initiative, self-reliance and the value of an honest day's work for an honest day's pay.

**Mr Smyth:** You've never worked in your life.

**Mr SHERLOCK:** I can tell the honourable member that a pharmacist works 70 or 80 hours a week. I have been doing that for 30 years. I have been working in voluntary organisations for 20 or 30 hours a week in addition to my normal life. I find parliamentary life no different.

Young people respond in exactly the same way. It is false to say that one can overload them. One does not overload them; one gives them the opportunity to grow, to respond and to learn about self-esteem and self-worth. Their energy and enthusiasm are boundless. One needs only to give them the opportunity to do that.

**Mr Burreket:** Labor members believe in sitting in union offices and collecting union fees; so you'll have to explain a little more to them.

**Mr SHERLOCK:** I understand that philosophy. I thank the honourable member for drawing it to the attention of the House.

I point out to the Minister that it is equally important that we do not exploit young people. Today in the work-force one often sees the exploitation of young people. They should be given fair pay for the contribution that they make. I will never support in any forum the exploitation of the work done and the contribution made by young people.

I turn to the matter addressed in the Bill, that is, community service orders. As the member for Redcliffe outlined, the introduction of adult community service orders has been very successful in Queensland. Because I have some experience in that area, I can tell honourable members that the system works. It is a system of punishment for a

crime and paying one's debt to society. However, it is also about rehabilitation and putting something back into society because the offender has wronged in some way.

Let me tell honourable members about my experience in the scout movement, in which I have had considerable experience, in this very issue of community service orders. I found that in the scout movement the community service order option worked for two reasons. Firstly, the Scout Association was able to provide people who could co-ordinate and supervise the work that could be done. They are capable people. Secondly, they provided projects that captured the imagination of the people who took on the community service orders. They often work in the open, in campsites and such places—the healthy outdoor environment. It is good, positive stuff, away from the cities, away from the towns, and away, perhaps, from the chattering of their mates, so they are able to carry out their community service orders.

In 1985, I attended a dinner in the Rockhampton district at which the then president of the Scout Association, Mr Justice Alan Demack, proclaimed that the Rockhampton district had been responsible for overseeing 10 000 hours of community service work just in that area. That was a significant milestone. A young man had taken on board something like 240 hours of community service work, which he put into Seeonee Park, the local district campsite. He was so rapt in that project that it took him six months to complete his community service order. At the completion of that order, he put in another six months of voluntary work to ensure that the project was finished in the way that he wanted to see it finished. Is that not exactly what this project is all about and exactly what the would-be Minister for Family Services from South Brisbane does not understand?

The Bill will work, and the project will work, because they meet all the necessary criteria. The adult community service orders have been successful. The 1987-88 annual report of the department states that 2 360 orders were issued, 83 per cent of which were successful. Only 401 orders were revoked.

I believe that it was in 1984—the Minister can correct me if I am wrong—that Mr Muntz first talked about introducing junior community service orders. I was very pleased about that. The only question I ask is: why has it taken five years to reach this point? The project is all about being positive; it is about training young people in rehabilitation, in learning new skills and giving them the opportunity to look for self-esteem and self-worth—the very things that Ms Warner does not understand. Community service orders have the added advantage of keeping a family together. What is the point in sending 13-year-olds, 14-year-olds or 15-year-olds up the river to a farm or to some other place? It is far better for them to be kept in the home environment and far better that they are in an environment in which no stigma is attached to the debt that they have to pay to society. The spin-off is that assistance is provided to voluntary, non-profit agencies.

This week, Mr White outlined the Liberal Party's policy for the ageing. As to its policy for young people—the Liberal Party will establish a contact agency to put volunteers in touch with organisations that require voluntary assistance. This initiative complements that.

Mr White mentioned other initiatives that the Minister might consider, including restitution for the commission of crimes. It is unfair that victims of crime are out of pocket. It is unfair to them, to society and to tax-payers. Young offenders must learn that they have a responsibility to make restitution. In particular, parents must learn that, if their children default and are unable to make restitution, they must take responsibility.

This scheme has some good features. It ensures that religious conflicts are avoided so that people can practise their religion. It also avoids interference with education and training. In addition to all of those factors being taken on board, workers' compensation provisions are included.

In her second-reading speech, the Minister referred to the Bill that is expected to be introduced in 1990, namely, the juvenile justice Bill. I understand that the thrust of

that legislation will be to increase the age of children within the care of the juvenile justice system to under 18 years. I look forward to that Bill being introduced in the Forty-sixth Parliament. The Liberal Party supports this Bill.

**Mrs McCAULEY (Callide) (3.25 p.m.):** I am pleased to join in this debate and to compliment the Minister on her swift action in introducing this legislation, which will have a significant impact on a number of young people and their families. I agree entirely with the former Minister, who spoke about the value of young people learning the value of work. It is most important that they learn the value of a good day's labour.

Community service orders will provide a humane, economic and constructive alternative to the option of imposing custodial sentences.

**Mr Prest:** She wouldn't have a clue. She is reading it.

**Mrs McCAULEY:** The honourable member for Port Curtis does his community service on Saturday afternoons in his office, but I do not know why he has the curtains drawn when he does it.

The observation could be made about community service orders that the punitive element is not intended to arise from the onerous nature of the work itself but from the loss of the offender's leisure-time. The reparation is made symbolically to the community rather than directly to the victims.

It could be said that the fostering of social responsibility through service to the community, co-operation with others, constructive use of leisure, the acquisition of new skills and the reinforcement of work habits are all regarded as valuable in promoting the rehabilitation of offenders.

During the past few weeks in the Tannum Sands area of my electorate extreme damage was caused by vandals to trees that have been planted in that area, which is most unfortunate. The Calliope Shire Council has an excellent curator of parks and gardens, Nick Alderson, who has done a tremendous job in greening and beautifying the area. It is sad that fools have wrecked that work.

The introduction of community service orders for adults has been well received. The 1987-88 annual report of the former Chief Probation and Parole Officer stated that the community service program had a success rate of 83 per cent, which is very commendable. Of course, differences exist between the adult and juvenile correction systems. Because of their dependency and immaturity, children require guidance and assistance. Parents' responsibilities for their children's actions must be recognised. Parents do not seem to acknowledge that most important point that they must be responsible for their children's actions.

The system that is applicable to adults has been appropriately modified in this Bill. One of the more significant differences is that an order may be made, with or without the court, that a conviction be recorded against the child. That is the situation with a number of other sentences for children. Fewer hours have been prescribed for children. The maximum of 120 hours for 15 and 16-year-olds and the maximum of 80 hours for younger children who are 10 years and over are roughly comparable with the maximum hours that are applicable to children in other States.

Another difference is that the Bill provides that a child may be ordered to perform community service without the necessity for that child to formally consent to the making of the order, which is similar to the situation that exists in other States. In addition, under the proposed arrangements the community service order will be the actual sentence.

By comparison, in the adult system a community service order is made instead of passing sentence. The proposed arrangements for children will be more readily understood by the children concerned and are consistent with the existing system under which other sentences are handed down to children who are found guilty of offences.

When a child fails to comply with the requirements of an order the court may, on application by the Director-General of the Department of Family Services, make alternative orders.

**Mr Prest:** You are clearing the gallery.

**Mrs McCAULEY:** If the honourable member would like me to be more specific, I will be.

That process is simpler than the arrangements that are applicable in the adult system, in which non-compliance constitutes an offence. It will be noted that Children's Courts will also have the option of accepting an undertaking that the order will be complied with in the future. Whilst children will be covered for medical expenses and permanent disability compensation if they are injured when performing community service orders, they will be eligible to receive weekly workers' compensation payments that are equivalent to forgone earnings. Another difference is that, under the Bill, all reasonable steps must be taken to ensure that children who are undertaking community service are segregated from persons who are serving sentences for which they were convicted as adults.

It is pleasing to note that in several provisions the Bill recognises the responsibilities of parents; for example, those relating to the whereabouts of the child and the child's religious upbringing. The amendments to the Young Offenders (Interstate Transfer) Act 1987 will allow children who are sentenced to perform community service to be transferred between Queensland and other States on a similar basis to that applying to young offenders under other orders.

Based on the many advantages of such orders as outlined by the Minister, I strongly support the Bill and commend her for her actions.

**Mr ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (3.30 p.m.):** I promised the Whip that I would speak for only two minutes. I support and congratulate the Minister. Recently she opened a new stage of the Westbrook Youth Centre. It is tremendously important for us to become involved with community service orders. For a number of years—probably five or six—I was a member of the corrective services committee. During that period we seemed to be getting nowhere trying to keep people out of gaol.

This legislation introduces infinitely superior alternatives. Young people have a much better chance of being rehabilitated if they can be kept out of institutions in the first place. The answer, of course, is to give them community work which is of such a nature that they see it as being of real necessity and value to the community. Then young people will at least receive some self-satisfaction and will be able to feel reasonably good about themselves in the work that they are doing. I support the schemes provided in this legislation.

In my electorate I have seen the practical application of such schemes. Inmates from Westbrook have worked at the Jondaryan Woolshed. That work is tremendously valuable. I ask the Minister to ensure that it is ongoing. A facility such as the Jondaryan Woolshed is of immense value to the community and is also a tourist attraction. It is preserving our heritage, our history and our past.

Many avenues are available in which young people can undertake this type of work. They could provide walking tracks in our national parks. That would assist the community. Because of the shortage of funds, that work would be helpful in developing and maintaining our parks.

With those few words, I support the Bill.

**Hon. B. A. NELSON (Aspley—Minister for Family Services) (3.33 p.m.),** in reply: I thank all honourable members for their contributions to this debate. I note that the whole House supports the legislation. That is an indication of how the whole community feels about the need for alternatives to detention for young people and the desire of all political parties in the Australian body politic as far as possible to keep young people

outside prisons and to provide suitable deterrents to keep them out of a life of crime as well.

I note the honourable member for South Brisbane's comments that she supports the Bill but with some reservations. If she had studied the second-reading speech she would have learned that community service orders in the adult sphere have been very successful, as was indicated by the member for Ashgrove, with an 83 per cent success rate. That certainly dispels her argument that the orders were promoting child labour and also that there was a risk of the failure of the program. This is quite untrue, as the children will be very well supervised by departmental officers, whose role will include rehabilitation.

The honourable member also suggested that these orders might interfere excessively with a child's free time. I thought that was a bit astonishing, because it is the children's behaviour in their free time that gets them into trouble in the first place. I agree entirely with the remarks of the members for Redcliffe, Ashgrove and Callide about the need for young people to develop a proper attitude to work. But this is community service. In a sense, it is learning how to be a volunteer, something that many adult Australians already know. It is a community service; it is not labour in the sense of paid work.

Naturally the times during which the student is involved in his education or his paid work will be taken into account by the department in determining when the hours are to be worked. In fact, most community service orders are now carried out by working a certain number of hours on a Saturday, anyway. Some other programs involve additional hours. However, the orders are arranged to take into account people's life-styles and workstyles.

In regard to the non-Government organisations, the Government will continue to do what it has always done, that is, consult widely. Under this scheme the activities of those organisations will be funded. Several expressions of interest were received from voluntary agencies even before the legislation came before the House. Training will be provided for non-Government personnel before the implementation of the Act.

The honourable member mentioned the allocation of \$60,000 but she should realise that this would cover the latter end of the financial year after the Act and regulations are in force. Increased funding will be provided in the 1990-91 Budget.

The honourable member also seems to have missed the point that the failure to satisfy an order will not necessarily be an offence. Mr Deputy Speaker, with your indulgence, the honourable member also mentioned a number of other issues, one of which was a fundamental philosophical thing about attitudes to community service and to the Family Services Department. In particular, she mentioned the John Oxley Youth Centre. I concur entirely with the views of many people that the John Oxley Centre suffers significant administrative difficulties. Prior to becoming a Minister I was concerned about that. After becoming Minister, I immediately instituted discussions with my department head and we have consulted with the trade union movement, which has made representations to us and presented a very, very good submission. The terms of reference of that submission will be used for a decision that I will make early next week about the John Oxley Centre, about which I will advise the honourable member for South Brisbane.

I take issue with her on philosophical grounds. As she raised the issue in her own party's recently announced welfare policy, I am thankful for the opportunity to enlighten the House as well as the people of Queensland about some of its very serious defects. Firstly, this Government has recognised that families are a valuable resource and it has subsequently produced policies and programs which guarantee that this Government will ensure that quality of life issues and the quality of life for families are enhanced.

**Ms Warner:** Why didn't you increase the family support scheme?

**Mrs NELSON:** Because in two financial years the Federal Government cut out all funding. It phased it out in 1987-88.

**Ms Warner:** No, they didn't.

**Mrs NELSON:** Yes, it did. I checked it today.

**Ms Warner:** No, they didn't. They just stopped direct funding.

**Mrs NELSON:** The Federal Government cut it out.

Secondly, this Government recognises that the well-being of families is a joint responsibility of the community and the Government and that each has a role to play. Communities are ideally placed to identify the local needs of families and with the assistance and support of the State Government are becoming more able to respond to those needs. The ALP wants to change all that. It has adopted the usual money-buys-everything solution. The ALP's policy would perhaps be better titled "Goss and the ALP—Substituting Government for the Family", because that title accurately portrays the ALP's plans.

**Ms WARNER:** I rise to a point of order. The ALP has not launched a welfare policy. I ask the Minister to be more precise about the aspect of the ALP's policy to which she refers.

**Mrs NELSON:** I have in my possession a copy of the Labor Party's welfare policy. It may not have been released. Perhaps I am releasing it on behalf of members of the Opposition. It is certainly the policy that is about to be released in the forthcoming election campaign.

**Ms Warner:** Where did you get it from?

**Mrs NELSON:** I have a copy that contains the old policy and the new policy that the Labor Party is about to announce. It fell off the back of a truck.

**Ms Warner:** It doesn't exist.

**Mrs NELSON:** It came into my possession a few days ago. It certainly does exist. The ALP wants to abolish the existing Department of Family Services and replace it with a bureaucratic welfare Ministry. This implies an emphasis on welfare instead of on the family. It is a dangerous direction to take and it conjures visions of a self-serving, expanding bureaucracy removed from the needs and aspirations of Queensland families. I can actually cite extracts of the policy and demonstrate that the whole connotations of the policy envisage a return to the workhouse mentality of the nineteenth century. The Labor Party should be aware that a change of emphasis has taken place and that the trend is away from negative institutionalised services towards a positive focus on social well-being and strengthening of the family.

Page 290 of the ALP's welfare and community development policy states that the ALP would establish consultative committees that would be representative of "workers, managements committees, local authorities, State and Federal Governments, trade unions and relevant co-ordinating peak councils." There is not one mention of community organisations, church groups or the private sector; nor is any mention made of the thousands of Queensland volunteers who unselfishly invest so much time and energy in providing support in the community.

Page 296 of the policy states—

"A Labor Government will provide support for non-sexist, non-denominational pre-marriage courses."

The policy implies that marriage counselling courses that are currently conducted by churches and church agencies may not be supported. In any case, churches would be excluded from the policy formulation committees that would be established under a supposed Labor Government. It is even more serious that page 294 of the document states——

**Ms WARNER:** I rise to a point of order. I must take exception to the Minister's comments. She would be aware, in common with everybody else, that the management

committees comprise large numbers of church groups. The management committees are quite often church groups.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Perrett):** Order! I call the Minister.

**Mrs NELSON:** I point out to the House that page 294 of the policy states that Labor proposes exclusion of the private sector from the delivery of child-care services by complete denial of any type of funding. The policy also proposes to duplicate some excellent already-existing services.

I must take this opportunity to respond to the outrageous claims made in the House earlier this week by the member for South Brisbane. She raised them again during this debate. The honourable member claims that the marriage enrichment program and social workers in schools scheme was to be scrapped, and that funds would be allocated elsewhere. I wish that the member would get her grape-vine leaks right. The truth is that the guide-lines for the marriage enrichment program are under consideration by my department. Moreover, a 12-month pilot program of employment of social workers in schools has begun at the Rochedale State High School. This pilot program will run its full course. I am the Minister. This pilot program was promised to go for a year. I have given an undertaking to the Education Department following its request that the program will go for a year and will be properly evaluated prior to any expansion of the scheme.

I have confirmed what the previous Minister committed—that there will be a pilot program for a year which will be properly evaluated, in consultation with the Department of Education, before the scheme is expanded. That is what was committed by this Government, and that is what will happen.

The member for South Brisbane also inaccurately claimed that plans for legislative changes to adoption laws had been shelved. That is not true. My predecessor held meetings with 13 different organisations that represent a wide group of people who are interested in these matters. A great deal of accord was found to exist among the groups. Submissions in writing were called for. Currently these submissions are being examined by my departmental officers. Everyone speaks about being the Minister; the member for South Brisbane is going to be the Minister; the member for Ashgrove is going to be the Minister. I am currently the Minister. I will not make any predictions about the election because, respectfully, I believe that it is in the hands of the people of Queensland. However, I am extremely confident that the party I represent will be governing this State after the next election.

I wish to quickly thank the member for Redcliffe for his support of the Bill on behalf of the Liberal Party. I acknowledge the role he played in the introduction of CSOs for adults. He mentioned the need for a greater range of sentencing options to be given. As indicated in the second-reading speech, the legislation is currently under review for 1990, when I expect to be able to introduce a Bill with a greater range of sentencing options.

The member for Gympie made a very thoughtful contribution to the debate. He is quite right when he says that this Bill will achieve the four policy objectives to which he referred.

I thank the member for Ashgrove for his support of the Bill. It is very clear that he appreciates the need to ensure that children bear responsibility for their actions while they are provided with guidance and assistance. I endorse his comments on the need to promote family life and the role of the non-Government sector. I alluded to those matters earlier.

I compliment the member for Callide on her contribution to the debate. It is obvious that she has a sound understanding of the principles that underpin community service orders. Because the offenders are children, they need a modified version of the system that is applied to adults. These modifications are provided for in the Bill.

Motion agreed to.



**Committee**

Hon. B. A. Nelson (Aspley—Minister for Family Services) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—

**Mr SCOTT** (3.45 p.m.): I have a brief contribution.

**Mr Beard**: Valedictory address—hear, hear!

**Mr SCOTT**: I do not think I have made one speech when the nongs on the other side have not interjected.

**Mr Beard**: We like you.

**Mr SCOTT**: I notice the affection coming across; it is almost killing me.

The Minister did not reply to the point raised by the shadow and next Minister—although I know that latter part was rebutted by the Minister—concerning supervision and the facilities in Cairns. This troubles me greatly. Probably the Minister did not forget it and I know that she has not had a great deal of time to visit these areas. This matter is troubling the people in Cairns and representations have been made to me about this aspect of the legislation. They did not know that the legislation would come before the House so quickly. I would like to be able to reassure them specifically about the way supervision will be carried out, whether there will be increases in staff and who will have that responsibility or whether it will be palmed off to someone else.

**Ms Warner**: I don't think the whole program is going to get that far north.

**Mr SCOTT**: There is that worry, but I will allow the Minister to tell us.

**Mrs NELSON**: I did address this matter. The funding for training programs for people in the voluntary sector to which the honourable member alluded has been provided and the necessary supervision will be provided in combination with the voluntary sector and the department. The amount of money mentioned was only for the latter half of the financial year and a full year of funding will be made available, which is the amount required for the following financial year. I am conscious of the fact that children—particularly younger children—require an entirely different form of supervision to the supervision required for adults, but I believe that the program will work very successfully, and it will work as well in Weipa as it will in Woolloowin.

**Mr Scott**: And in Cairns?

**Mrs NELSON**: And in Cairns, I am sure.

Clause 5, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 6 and 7, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

**Third Reading**

Bill, on motion of Mrs Nelson, by leave, read a third time.

**SURVEYORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL****Second Reading**

Debate resumed from 3 October (see p. 1124).

**Mr EATON** (Mourilyan) (3.30 p.m.): I was led to believe that the Children's Services Act and Another Act Amendment Bill would be followed by the resumption of the

second-reading debate on the Stock Act and Local Government Act Amendment Bill. I am happy to debate the Surveyors Act Amendment Bill.

I have had discussions with the surveyors and they are happy with the amendments and the Bill overall. This legislation is a move towards self-regulation. In the future surveyors will play a great role in this State, particularly in mapping and surveying and land-use studies. A great role will be played by both Government surveyors and surveyors from the private sector. For some time privatisation has been spreading across the nation, but I and my party approach privatisation with much caution because the Labor Party believes that private enterprise and socialism can work side by side. The Labor Party does not want to do away with Government employees or surveyors. Government surveyors should not be kept hanging around waiting for something to crop up; they should all be gainfully employed. It would be of benefit to the Government as a whole if a certain number of people with expertise, such as surveyors, were working for the Government so that the right decisions can be made. When the Labor Party takes office in this State it will be calling upon private knowledge from outside the Government to help it to make decisions.

I assure surveyors that they have nothing to worry about from the Labor Party, because we believe that surveyors play a great role. I agree with many of the submissions made by private surveyors and assure them that the Labor Party will face up to the problems in surveyors' organisations throughout Queensland, and surveyors can look forward to co-operation from the future Labor Government.

**Hon. W. D. LICKISS (Moggill) (3.52 p.m.):** It is rather coincidental that one of the first pieces of legislation I was involved in—and one of the reasons for my entering this place—was concerned with surveying, planning, evaluation, land administration and the like. It is quite significant that my last speech on a Bill 27 years later is on the same matter.

One of the satisfactions one derives over a period in Parliament is achieving an ambition. One of mine, having served my cadetship with the old Survey Office of the Lands Department, was being Minister when that office was made a department in its own right. The Department of Mapping and Surveying, which is now the Department of Geographic Information, proves the point—and the previous speaker alluded to this—that the combination of private surveyors in the profession of surveying and mapping and Government surveyors in Government surveying and mapping does work well. There is a demonstration of this point. It is happening in Queensland and Queensland is leading the field not only in Australia but in the Pacific rim. Queensland is able to export the technology developed and perfected in Queensland.

One of the first things I did when I took over the department was to draft the original surveyors legislation. Unfortunately or fortunately, whichever way one looks at it, I became Minister for Justice and Attorney-General before I had the chance of seeing the legislation through Parliament.

There is a clear indication that the profession in Australia and particularly in Queensland has been at the forefront of development, and still is. In one of my early speeches I indicated quite clearly the extra cost of project management and project development if adequate mapping and surveying input had not previously been made. It has been demonstrated now that, with sophistication and modern technology and the convenient way in which maps can be produced, the professions of surveying and cartography are so overlapped that they have virtually become one. As an indication, I point out that one of the deputy surveyor-generals served a period in his major profession as a cartographer. Like everything else, what were once single disciplines—the art and practice of map-making or cartography, the profession of surveying and the profession of planning—are now multidiscipline activities.

The purpose of the legislation is to provide further self-regulation for the profession. Having held office in a number of professions in the technical arena, such as cartography and valuation, and following the surveying profession very closely, I am a great believer

in self-regulation being the best way to bring the best out of a profession. A profession is very jealous of itself and therefore makes sure that everything that happens in the profession, when it is regulated by the profession, furthers that profession in its capacity to provide a better and more efficient service to the community. This Bill does that. It gives to the surveying profession a greater degree of self-regulation, particularly in relation to self-discipline.

One of the problems with the original legislation was that, if a surveyor had to appear before the committee, it was a fairly cumbersome and costly business. If the profession, through the board, wanted to discipline one of its members for lack of efficiency, proficiency or administrative acumen, as the case may be, which caused other people concern, there was a necessity for the board to appoint a committee comprising a District Court judge and two surveyors to hear the case. There was no appeal and I do not think it was necessary to have one.

Some matters that necessitated investigation were of a relatively minor nature. Instead of appointing that committee to hear such a case, the board is given an option to decide whether the person should appear before that committee or the surveyors board itself. That is far more simple and less costly when minor disciplinary action needs to be taken against a surveyor. On the other hand, the surveyor concerned is protected on the basis that, if he wishes to go before the committee comprising the District Court judge and two surveyors, he has an option to so elect, or he can decide to be dealt with by the Surveyors Board.

The Bill contains other measures, some of a machinery nature. One is the question of the liability of a consulting surveyor against a registered surveyor. That is another beneficial requirement. The main one is the flexibility that has been introduced to deal with disciplinary matters.

**Mr Lee:** Didn't you bring this Act in?

**Mr LICKISS:** No. I was given the privilege of setting up the Department of Mapping and Surveying. My first portfolio was Survey, Valuation, Urban and Regional Affairs. The Titles Office has now been involved with the Lands Department and the Lands Department is now part of the total scheme, that is, Land Management.

I commend the Government on the legislation.

**Mr Scott:** What did you think of the surveying term "metes and bounds" that crept into the community services legislation? Did you like that as a means of surveying? Would you say that's a little bit loose?

**Mr LICKISS:** Metes and bounds, in simple terms, is bearings and distances. In other words, each line was described as being on a particular bearing and having a distance. That is metes and bounds.

**Mr Scott:** So it's a little bit tighter?

**Mr LICKISS:** That was the requirement in land-title surveying. It is still a requirement, but the measuring of distance and the recording of bearing is much more sophisticated now than it was in the old days.

The Liberal Party supports the legislation. I wish the Department of Geographic Information a great deal of success in the future. Having been responsible for setting that department up, I know that it will serve Queensland very well.

**Hon. N. J. HARPER** (Auburn—Minister for Land Management) (4.02 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions. I note their comments. In this area, the Government has moved very quickly towards a co-operative effort with private enterprise.

Motion agreed to.

**Committee**

Clauses 1 to 10, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

**Third Reading**

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

**BILLS: REMAINING STAGES****Allocation of Time-limit Order**

**Hon. N. J. HARPER** (Auburn—Leader of the House) (4.04 p.m.) by leave, without notice: I move—

“That so much of the Standing Orders and Sessional Orders be suspended to enable the following Bills to be passed through all their remaining stages on this sitting day. At the time so specified Mr Speaker or the Chairman, as the case may be, shall put all remaining questions necessary to pass the Bill including clauses en bloc and any amendments to be moved by the Minister in charge of the Bill, without further amendment or debate—

Retail Shop Leases Act Amendment Bill, second reading at 4.35 p.m.; report from Committee and third reading at 5.00 p.m.”—

**Mr McELLIGOTT:** I rise to a point of order. By way of clarification, I ask: is the Leader of the House referring to the Bills that are presently on the notice paper and not any new Bill that might be introduced?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I would assume so. I will allow the Leader of the House to continue.

**Mr HARPER:** The motion continues—

“Stock Act and Local Government Act Amendment Bill, second reading at 5.10 p.m.; report from Committee and third reading at 5.45 p.m.”

Question put; and the House divided—

**AYES, 45**

Ahern	Katter
Alison	Lester
Austin	Littleproud
Berghofer	McCauley
Booth	McKechnie
Borbridge	McPhie
Burreket	Menzel
Chapman	Muntz
Clauson	Neal
Cooper	Nelson
Elliott	Newton
FitzGerald	Perrett
Fraser	Randell
Gamin	Sherrin
Gately	Simpson
Gibbs, I. J.	Slack
Gilmore	Stoneman
Glasson	Tenni
Gunn	Veivers
Harper	
Harvey	
Henderson	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hinton	Stephan
Hobbs	Hynd

**NOES, 37**

Ardill	Santoro
Beanland	Schuntner
Beard	Scott
Braddy	Sherlock
Campbell	Smyth
Casey	Vaughan
Comben	Warburton
D'Arcy	Warner
De Lacy	Wells
Eaton	White
Gibbs, R. J.	Yewdale
Goss	
Hamill	
Hayward	
Innes	
Knox	
Lee	
Lickiss	
McElligott	
Mackenroth	
McLean	
Milliner	<i>Tellers:</i>
Palaszczuk	Davis
Prest	Gygar

PAIR:

Row

|

Underwood

Resolved in the affirmative.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I advise honourable members that for any further divisions the bells will ring for two minutes.

## RETAIL SHOP LEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### Withdrawal

On the order of the day being discharged, the Bill was withdrawn and the Deputy Clerk read the original order.

### New Bill, All Stages

**Hon. H. D. J. FRASER** (Springwood—Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology) (4.13 p.m.): Mr Speaker, I move—

“That another Bill be brought in founded on this order and that so much of the Standing Orders be suspended to enable the Bill to proceed through its remaining stages forthwith.”

Question put; and the House divided—

#### AYES, 45

Ahern	Katter
Alison	Lester
Austin	Littleproud
Berghofer	McCauley
Booth	McKechnie
Borbidge	McPhie
Burreket	Menzel
Chapman	Muntz
Clauson	Neal
Cooper	Nelson
Elliott	Newton
FitzGerald	Perrett
Fraser	Randell
Gamin	Sherrin
Gately	Simpson
Gibbs, I. J.	Slack
Gilmore	Stoneman
Glasson	Tenni
Gunn	Veivers
Harper	
Harvey	
Henderson	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hinton	Stephan
Hobbs	Hynd

#### NOES, 37

Ardill	Santoro
Beanland	Schuntner
Beard	Scott
Braddy	Sherlock
Campbell	Smyth
Casey	Vaughan
Comben	Warburton
D'Arcy	Warner
De Lacy	Wells
Eaton	White
Gibbs, R. J.	Yewdale
Goss	
Hamill	
Hayward	
Innes	
Knox	
Lee	
Lickiss	
McElligott	
Mackenroth	
McLean	
Milliner	<i>Tellers:</i>
Palaszcuk	Davis
Prest	Gygar

PAIR:

Row

|

Underwood

Resolved in the affirmative.

### First Reading

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

### Second Reading

**Hon. H. D. J. FRASER** (Springwood—Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology) (4.18 p.m.): I move—

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

Owing to the lateness of the hour, I move—

“That the second-reading speech be tabled and incorporated in *Hansard*.”

**Mr McELLIGOTT:** I rise to a point of order. The Minister's suggestion is totally unreasonable. Honourable members have just seen this Bill for the first time and we are expected to respond to its contents within 20 minutes. That is totally unreasonable. I think that we are at least entitled to the Minister's explanation of the contents of the Bill.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members, I will put the motion.

Question—That the second-reading speech be tabled and incorporated in *Hansard*—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 45		NOES, 37	
Ahern	Katter	Ardill	Santoro
Alison	Lester	Beanland	Schuntner
Austin	Littleproud	Beard	Scott
Berghofer	McCauley	Braddy	Sherlock
Booth	McKechnie	Campbell	Smyth
Borbidge	McPhie	Casey	Vaughan
Burreket	Menzel	Comben	Warburton
Chapman	Muntz	D'Arcy	Warner
Clauson	Neal	De Lacy	Wells
Cooper	Nelson	Eaton	White
Elliott	Newton	Gibbs, R. J.	Yewdale
FitzGerald	Perrett	Goss	
Fraser	Randell	Hamill	
Gamin	Sherrin	Hayward	
Gately	Simpson	Innes	
Gibbs, I. J.	Slack	Knox	
Gilmore	Stoneman	Lee	
Glasson	Tenni	Lickiss	
Gunn	Veivers	McElligott	
Harper		Mackenroth	
Harvey		McLean	
Henderson	<i>Tellers:</i>	Milliner	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hinton	Stephan	Palaszczyk	Davis
Hobbs	Hynd	Prest	Gygar

PAIR:

Row

Underwood

Question resolved in the affirmative.

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

This Bill represents a further refinement of the Retail Shop Leases Act 1984-88.

This Act regulates retail shop leases in Queensland and provides for a forum for low cost resolution to disputes between landlords and tenants.

It remains pathfinding legislation in Australia in what has been a difficult area.

These amendments are being put to this House only after extensive consultations with all involved sectors of the community. It is important legislation for the small business sector, especially at a time when it is under severe attack from the incompetence of the Federal Labor Government.

This is why we are proposing that this legislation be passed through all stages before Parliament rises.

I have given the Opposition parties fair notice of our intentions.

A Bill known as the Retail Shop Leases Act Amendment Bill 1989 was tabled in Parliament on 10 August 1989 to lie on the table to receive public input.

As a result, a number of submissions have been received from various landlord and tenant groups as well as from individuals. Discussions have taken place with the Queensland Retail Traders and Shopkeepers Association, the Retailers Association of Queensland, various law firms, the Australian Institute of Valuers, Australian Institute of Petroleum, the Queensland Motor Trades Association, the Builders Owners and Managers Association and representatives of the law society and others.

Pursuant to these meetings and after considering each of the points, it was decided that a new Bill be drafted.

The Retail Shop Leases Act was assented to on 12 March 1984 and was amended on 15 April 1985 and 3 May 1988.

While all sections of the Act play an important part in the market-place, the part of the Act that provides for mediation is proving very successful as in excess of 80% of all mediation hearings are resolved at that level.

A Green paper detailing certain proposed amendments was circulated in October 1988. A total of 550 copies was distributed. Responses were received from a cross section, including the petroleum industry, representatives from BOMA, the Queensland Retail Traders and Shopkeepers Association, the Retailers Association of Queensland, the Australian Institute of Valuers and from individual landlords and tenants.

My officers administering the retail shop lease legislation in Queensland continually monitor and report on the many and varied complex issues relating to retail leases.

As a result of the ongoing monitoring of the effectiveness of the legislation in the market-place, this Bill is intended to clarify certain aspects of the Act which have been brought to my attention by both landlords and tenants.

While most other States in Australia have introduced various forms of legislation to address the problems being experienced in the area of retail leasing, Queensland is acknowledged throughout Australia as being the first and only State which has positively identified and successfully addressed this problem.

A number of adaptations of 'voluntary codes of conduct' have been tried in the market-place in practically every State of Australia.

Such codes play an important part when blended in such a way to work in harmony with a particular piece of legislation such as the Retail Shop Leases Act.

While the Act establishes the basic ground rules concerning contractual arrangements between landlords and tenants, by intention it does not intrude into the workings of the free enterprise system.

Among the amendments proposed are:

- The inclusion of service stations within the ambit of the Act;
- A clearer definition of the rights of tenants to borrow money against their assets, free of unreasonable restrictions by landlords;
- A clear statement in lease documents of the method of any rent review during the currency of the lease and for a disputed "market rent" to be determined by a specialist retail valuer; and
- Landlords will be obliged to fully inform tenants on all relevant factors relating to the lease conditions up to 14 days prior to the lease being signed.

In detail, the amendments to the principal Act are as follows—

*Clause 1 and 2 of the Bill are the short title and citation.*

*Clause 3—Amends Section 4—Interpretation.* The amendment inserts additional definitions of adequate particulars, landlord and service stations.

*Clause 4—Amends Section 5—Application of the Act.* Removes particular concern in relation to certain wording within the Act implying retrospectively. *The Act and the Bill have no retrospectivity.*

This section further defines more precisely the definition "entered into" when possession is given prior to the signing of formal documents.

*Clause 5—Provides for a new Section 5A.* The principal Act is amended with a new section introduced to allow the inclusion of service stations under the Act. This section has been written in such a way so as to recognise "tenancies" associated with the business of service stations and relates to tenancy only and does not intrude into the area of contract as applicable to franchising arrangements.

*Clause 6—Amends Section 8—Certain Payments to Landlords Prohibited.* This section prohibits the payment of "key money" and portion of goodwill or any other sum to the landlord in connection with the granting, renewal or assignment of a lease and prohibits payments by tenants into a sinking fund or otherwise for the amortisation of costs and expenses to all retail shops.

*Clause 7 Amends Section 10—Rent Review.* This section provides that the method of any rental review to take place during the currency of a lease shall be stated in the lease and furthermore, if rent is to be adjusted on the basis of “market rent” and if no agreement between the landlord and tenant can be reached on what rent is to be paid, the matter must be determined by a specialist retail valuer.

The amendment assures that rent shall be calculated having regard to the market rental of the premises, the terms and conditions of the lease, and such other matters that are relevant to the determination.

*Clause 8—Amends Section 10A—Provisions concerning determinations by specialist retail valuer.* The amendment provides that a specialist retail valuer’s determination shall be expressed in writing which shall identify the location of the retail shop to which it relates and the matters on which the determination is based.

*Clause 9—Amends Section 10B—Designation of specialist retail valuers.* The amendment defines more precisely the designation of a specialist retail valuer.

*Clause 10—Amends Section 11—Requests for assignment of lease.* This section provides that if a tenant applies to a landlord or an assignment of a lease and the landlord unreasonably withholds his consent, then the matter can become the subject of a dispute.

*Clause 11—Provides for a new Section 11A—Tenant’s right to mortgage.* The principal Act is amended by inserting a new section. Many leases include a restricting clause preventing tenants from using their business, including goods, chattels and their right of occupancy as collateral and security to secure credit.

This new section prevents a landlord from unreasonably withholding consent to a tenant wishing to use assets for security purposes.

*Clause 12—Provides for a new Section 12—Sharing of operating expenses.* This section provides that where a landlord requires a tenant to contribute to the overall costs of outgoings, the lease shall specify those elements which constitute operating expenses and how they will be determined and recovered from the tenants.

This amendment repeals this section and substitutes a new section that requires more information of what constitutes operating expenses and the provision of more detail of how certain costs are calculated and provides that no one item of outgoings will represent more than 5% of the total outgoing claim.

However, provision is made and the amount allocated to an item may exceed 5% if the item relates to a tax, imposed or charged, levied or made under any Act, or law applicable in the State; or an outgoing consisting of one component (specifically identified) that cannot be dissected so as to comply with the limiting provisions of this subsection.

It further provides that when land tax or other charges on land are included in outgoings, they shall be restricted to the land on which the subject premises are located or land which is used for the benefit of the tenants in the conducting of their business.

*Clause 13—Amends Section 13—Option to renew lease.* This section provides the tenant with an implied option to renew the lease to an overall term of five years.

As there is some misunderstanding as to the intention of this section, the amendment more clearly spells out the intention.

*Clause 14—Provides for a new Section 14A—Provisions concerning trading hours.* Amends and clarifies certain sections addressed in the Retail Shop Leases Act relating to trading hours pursuant to retail shop leases.

*Clause 15—Provides for a new Section 15—Implied provisions concerning compensation.* This section provides that a landlord may be made liable to pay reasonable compensation to the tenant if the landlord’s actions or failure to act in certain cases leads to a loss of profits to the tenant.

There has been some uncertainty regarding the intention of this section by members of the legal profession and others resulting in some difficulties in its application.

This section has been repealed and rewritten to more clearly define the intention of the Act and to apply to shopping centres, strip shopping developments and stand alone shops.

*Clause 16—Provides for a new Section 15A—Documents and information to be given to tenants.* This section makes it obligatory for a landlord to provide to a tenant or prospective tenant information to allow him to make a sound commercial decision prior to entering into a lease.



This amendment more clearly spells out the intention of this provision and defines the information which must be made available to a tenant relating to the conditions of occupancy.

*Clause 17—Provides for a new Section 23—Jurisdiction of Mediator.* The mediator has no power of determination. He seeks to bring the disputants together and to find a resolution to the dispute.

The new amendment defines the competence of the mediator.

*Clause 18—Amends Section 24—References to a Mediator.* This section has been amended to be more precise and to remove some areas of uncertainty.

*Clause 19—Amends Section 27—Disputes referred to Tribunal in certain circumstances.* This section defines the procedures that relate to the referral of a dispute to a tribunal.

This section has been amended to be more precise and to remove certain areas of uncertainty.

*Clause 20—Amends Section 36—Extent of Jurisdiction.* This section relates to the extent of the jurisdiction of the tribunal concerning certain provisions under the Act.

The amendment for inclusion of service stations has made it necessary for the Act to more precisely define the jurisdiction of the tribunal in certain circumstances.

*Clause 21—Provides for a new Section 38—Status of tribunal and powers of its members.* This section is amended to exclude certain far-reaching powers considered to be unnecessary for the tribunal.

*Clause 22—Amends Section 55—Exclusion of other Jurisdictions.* This section relates to the exclusion of jurisdiction not being justable at any time by any other court or tribunal under certain circumstances where a dispute is in progress under the Retail Shop Leases Act.

This amendment more clearly defines certain provisions under this section.

*Clause 23—Specified Business—Amendment to the first schedule of the Act.* The first schedule to the principal Act is amended to include "service station".

The proposed amendments will greatly enhance the administration of the Act.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Harper, adjourned.

## STOCK ACT AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Debate resumed (see p. 1761).

**Mr EATON (Mourilyan)** (4.25 p.m.), continuing: Prior to the luncheon recess I spoke about the capital intensive nature of feedlots. In principle the Labor Party supports the Bill but it has some grave reservations about the right of appeal. The chief inspector will be able to issue a permit even if the council does not give permission. This provides an opportunity for the Government to overrule local authorities.

Honourable members would be aware of the value of feedlots, particularly in the far-flung areas of the State. Lot-feeding is important to north Queensland. An application has been made to establish a feedlot on two areas of reserve land near Mareeba. I do not know whether that has been approved. The Government should have bent over backwards to ensure that that feedlot was established a few miles from Mareeba where it would not cause any of the problems that feedlots can cause from time to time in built-up areas. That feedlot would be a great boon to the area. The meatworks has been closed down and an offer has been made to build a private abattoir to service the needs of the local beef industry.

Cattle from Cape York Peninsula and the gulf region have to be transported hundreds of miles to the market-place. Because of the state of the roads and the speed with which those cattle have to be transported, they are often cut, bruised and battered and are unsuitable for sale. Sometimes cattle that are lame or limping have to be taken out of the sale lot because they would spoil the look of it.

I have witnessed at first hand the efforts of local people to establish feedlots in an attempt to save the industry for the benefit of the local community. If anyone needs support it is those people. The Government should bend over backwards to help them.

Large sums of money are required to transport cattle from the gulf and the cape. Many years ago when I visited the gulf it cost \$28 to transport each head of cattle. The graziers in those remote areas are disadvantaged because of the distance of their properties from markets.

The Minister mentioned the value-added component of \$300 per head, but the purchase of grain such as sorghum, barley and oats, as well as peanut husks, accounts for much of that amount. Feedlots create a market for that produce. Graziers do not have to compete on the high-quality grain market. In South Australia poultry-farmers and feedlot-owners buy poorer-quality grains because they are quite suitable for their requirements and the high-quality grain is used in bread-making.

My electorate covers three local authorities, namely, the Cardwell Shire, the Johnstone Shire and the Herberton Shire. Attempts have been made in the Cardwell Shire to establish feedlots. The weather conditions in that region, particularly on the flat, undrained coastal country, create problems in the establishment of feedlots. Because of the area's geographic and climatic conditions, it will be difficult to establish a large-scale feedlot there.

More ideal conditions exist in the tableland area of the Herberton Shire where grain-growing is conducted. Maize is grown on the Atherton Tableland and sorghum is grown near Mount Garnett. The graziers in that region have managed to grow wheat and sorghum. That grain is being used in the feedlots in that region. Following a trial, grain-fed cattle are now being produced and there is a ready market for them. The property on which the cattle are being produced was sold, but the person who commenced that venture is now managing it and will be doing so for the next couple of years to help it to become established in a sound financial way.

As I mentioned earlier, many things need to be taken into consideration in the establishment of feedlots. If they are not established properly, many problems can occur. However, providing they are established outside the built-up areas and away from densely populated areas, whether they be in a big community or a little community they should benefit that community and the beef industry as a whole.

I know that the operators of the feedlots want to establish them close to markets and, if the cattle have to be transported any distance, close to transport facilities. The Minister and the department should take those matters into consideration. If feedlots are set up properly in the first place, many of the problems will be overcome.

As I said, it is a capital-intensive industry. That will have to be taken into consideration when permits are granted. If feedlots are allowed to be established willy-nilly, problems will be encountered right from the word go. This State does not want any more businesses to go broke. Because a good international market is available, feedlots will become very competitive. However, with the fall in the share market and the way in which the economy is going, I just hope that the beef industry can maintain its present economic status for some time.

Many people involved in industries have outlaid a lot of money. Although the people involved in the beef industry are pretty rich at the moment, a look behind the scenes will reveal that the Fairlanes and the Mercedes Benz that they driving are not all paid for. Many of them are leased, or under hire purchase. When there is a crash in the industry, although those people might lose their Mercedes Benz or Fairlanes, it is the workers in the community who will suffer. Whether an industry is big or small, if it cannot pay its bills and its employees, that has a snowballing effect and problems are experienced not only by the Government but also by all concerned.

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (4.33 p.m.): I do not intend to canvass the broader rural matters for too long. That has been done by other honourable

members and very competently by the most experienced feedlot person in the House, the member for Yeronga. I want to apply myself directly to the issue of the absence of an appeal section in the legislation, and the absence of an appeal section in relation to the issue of a licence, not just in relation to the variation or cancellation of a licence.

I recognise the importance of this industry. I recognise the very fundamental and practical point that the emergence of a feedlot industry has done a great deal to ensure an increase in quality and consistency of quality of meat. Although the member for Yeronga did not say it, all the beef that he and his son produce is consumed domestically in Australia, predominantly in Queensland. That is so because they can guarantee meat on specification all the time and every time. By feedlotting, beef of very high and consistent quality can be produced. As a result, the people who buy their meat at supermarkets get excellent cuts of meat and precisely what they want, and the meat is exactly the same quality as that bought on previous occasions.

It must be understood that feedlotting provides great benefits to people who live in urban areas. There is an enormous tendency for people who live in urban areas not to want to realise how meat is produced. People are a bit squeamish about the fact that, to put the steak on the plate, cattle have to be reared and butchered. Those are realities that everybody has to accept.

The fundamental principle that I address is one that is time-honoured in our legal system, that is, the right to work. We have heard people talk about the right-to-farm legislation. The right to work is something that is seen to be sacred or at least very important in our legal tradition. That is why I think everybody knows about clauses, either reasonable or unreasonable, relating to the sale of businesses and the right for exclusive use of a certain business name or business premises for a period of time.

Traditionally our legal system has said that if an attempt is made to make the prohibition clause too extensive, either because it takes too many miles or lasts for too long, it cannot be done. It is avoided by the courts. The courts say that the period of exclusivity in taking over a business has to be reasonable, because the right of a person to go about his business or work is considered by the law to be very important.

That relates to common law. The law that the Parliament makes is statute law. The statutory law should always reflect the enormous importance of the right of people to work. All laws relating to licences and permission to work have to be attended by the safeguarding of those rights and the freedom from arbitrary interference or cancellation of the right to work.

If I can draw a very simple analogy, it could be said that a driving licence is a privilege. The law provides special rights for people whose licences are cancelled and who because of their work have a need to use their licences. They are able to go before the Magistrates Court and say, "Look, I just want a day-time licence." The fundamental common-law principle of the importance of a person being able to go about earning his livelihood is recognised.

In relation to businesses that require licensing by the Government—without Government interference anybody could work at whatever he wants, subject to town-planning requirements. Once a licensing system is introduced, it imposes some restriction on the right to work. But in the case of motor vehicle dealers or real estate agents, a licensing system is set up in the interests of consumer protection, but it is attended by the right of a person to go to the Magistrates Court to appeal against any cancellation of the licence or any refusal to grant a licence. That is a fundamental principle. Any private-enterprise Government that is worth its salt must recognise the individual's rights to conduct a business. Restrictions apply only in relation to other social purposes, such as consumer protection or protection of people from what could become a nuisance, as in the instance of feedlots. They seem to be the only real reasons for establishing a licensing system. Legislation governing the practices of motor vehicle dealers, real estate agents, auctioneers, second-hand dealers and pawn brokers provides rights of appeal against either refusal to issue or cancellation of licences. Over the years, I have risen in this Chamber and demanded that legislation in those areas should provide a system of appeal

to an objective umpire. On previous occasions I have argued against appeals being made to a Minister because they are not heard in public and are not subject to the normal rules of justice.

It is extraordinary that this legislation allows for the establishment of feedlots, subject to town-planning conditions. The Government's intention is to make feedlots highly regulated without preserving the rights of a person who is affected by the licensing system to be able to refer the problem to an umpire and have the case litigated. This legislation sets a very bad precedent.

I realise that the precedent for this approach is to be found in the casino control legislation, but I draw attention to the differences in the subject-matter of the two Bills. This Bill does not deal with one or two establishments; nor does it deal with an industry that has an international record of being associated with organised crime. This legislation covers the rights of a primary producer to go about his business in a completely well known and internationally accepted way, subject to his not interfering with the life-style of his neighbours.

The National Party entertains its primary-producing base with right-to-farm legislation. It should include in this legislation the very elementary rights and safeguards that will protect the livelihood and rights of people to appeal to a court if a chief inspector refuses to grant a licence. People should have the right to have those decisions checked. The honourable member for Yeronga mentioned earlier the Leeson case. That matter resulted in costs amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal fees and expert opinions. The case was pioneer litigation and it set new standards. Millions of dollars were involved in setting up the establishment. A great deal of money was spent on concreting and excavation to safeguard the rights of neighbours. Nevertheless, the licence was cancelled by a bureaucrat and the only recourse available was to appeal to the Minister. There was not even an obligation on the inspector to give reasons for the cancellation.

The example given by Mr Lee earlier is a very practical one. As I understand the circumstances, a person complained at 2 o'clock in the morning. The first complaint was made before any cattle were even on the property. A neighbour saw a couple of trailer loads of stock being brought onto the property, but that was done only for the purpose of testing the weighing machine. The stock was taken off the property on the same day as it was brought in, but a complaint was made that night.

All honourable members would know from personal experience in their electorates that when somebody has a fixation about a subject, they start hearing things and smelling things; in short, they start looking for trouble. They become completely obsessed. Surely multimillion-dollar investments will not be closed down without giving people the right to appeal to a third party or an independent, objective umpire on proper grounds.

**Mr Casey:** If a pop band started up next door to your house at 2 o'clock in the morning, would you complain?

**Mr INNES:** Of course.

**Mr Casey:** What is the difference? Why aren't they entitled to complain?

**Mr INNES:** I have just given the reasons. In the instance I mentioned, a complaint had been made when there were no cattle on the property. Highly motivated people who have an obsession make complaints without foundation. I am not saying that complaints without foundation will not be made, but surely the way to have the matter properly examined is by reference to an independent umpire or by lodging an appeal. The concept of natural justice means that before an individual's rights are taken away, he is entitled to a fair hearing and to reasons for the refusal of a licence or permission. People have a right of appeal. If they are knocked back, they are entitled to have the reasons why they are knocked back set out so that they have something to fight with. It is a very elementary principle.

I am sure that the Minister has introduced this legislation in the best interests of serving the community. A lot of flak has come from rural areas about feedlots. I have

certainly become aware of complaints relating to feedlots that concern a couple of pastoral estates. Nevertheless, this is a very important industry and area of business. No person should have his business taken away from him without a right of recourse to some independent public tribunal. The casino control legislation was exceptional.

I have no doubt that the Minister means well. Confident though he may be that he will give judgment objectively, he must realise that people do not trust those procedures. The reason for the existence of courts is that people did not trust kings and noblemen who dispensed arbitrary and powerful justice. When the Government is dealing with right-to-farm legislation, the basic principles should be enshrined. The Government should carefully examine legislation that interferes with the rights of farmers to ensure that it operates in accordance with traditional time-honoured standards. The Government should introduce into this legislation a proper, objective right of appeal.

The Liberal Party will oppose the clauses that do not allow a right of appeal.

**Mr McELLIGOTT (Thuringowa) (4.45 p.m.):** I rise to briefly support the comments made by the member for Mackay in opposing this legislation. It is clear that the relatively new development of the feedlot industry in Queensland has caught the Government on the hop. The Government has not provided a response to the problems caused by the feedlot industry.

As shadow Minister for Local Government and in common with the member for Mackay, I have received representations in relation to feedlots from throughout the State. People involved in the industry, including feedlot proprietors, Government departments and complainants, have no idea how to cope with the problem. I do not think that the legislation that is before the House today will resolve the problem.

I do not claim to have the expertise available to me off the top of my head, but it seems to me that the appropriate way to deal with the problem would be to make amendments to the Local Government Act giving local authorities the power not only to receive and consider rezoning applications to accommodate feedlot developments, but also to police their operation and management. In every instance of an appeal to the Local Government Court in which I have been involved, that court has supported the feedlotter. One of the most basic reasons for the court's support of the operator has been that the judge has argued that a feedlot is a normal rural pursuit that is constructed and operated in a rural zone. I do not think that one can argue that a feedlot is a normal rural pursuit. It is certainly a very concentrated example of a rural pursuit, and it has some obvious impacts on the local community that do not arise from what I would regard as normal rural pursuits. That is the basic point around which this whole argument revolves.

The solution might be found by making some sort of an amendment to the town-planning sections of the Local Government Act to define feedlots in the same way as noxious industries. Special provisions are made in planning documents and procedures for noxious industries and it should be possible for similar allowances to be made for feedlots. I am not sure precisely how that would be done.

One thing that has been highlighted in this debate is the problem caused to town-planners right around the State by the relatively new phenomenon of rural residential developments. In the not-too-distant past things like noxious industries and rural pursuits have been located a suitable distance away from the urbanised areas of towns and cities so as not to create a problem. With the advent of rural residential development, that residential development and residency has moved out into the more sparsely populated areas surrounding the cities and towns. People have now established themselves in what they regard as a quiet residential environment and have moved there for that reason. Naturally they become upset and complain when something like a feedlot, a quarry, bypass road, a new rail deviation or any of those things come along to disturb their peace and quiet.

One member mentioned the right-to-farm legislation. Again, I am not competent to debate that subject today, but it is a problem that Governments—particularly local

governments—must come to grips with. Clearly, if someone who has been operating a farm in a certain way for generations suddenly finds that a tourist resort is to be built next door, it is hardly reasonable to expect that farm to close down or drastically alter its operations simply because some newcomers decide to build a tourist resort next door.

**Mr Innes:** Do you think this spread of rural urban is presenting problems and increasing conflicts?

**Mr McELLIGOTT:** That is the point I was making; I think it is. I am not suggesting that it should not have occurred. Obviously people have leant towards that sort of development.

Southern members would recall the precise details of one example of this kind of conflict. However, I do recall talking to a deputation of people who were concerned about the opening of a quarry in their vicinity. On investigation I found that for the last 60 years the area had been a quarry reserve in the name of the Brisbane City Council. I believe that it is located somewhere in the Somerset area. Now that the council has decided, quite legitimately, to start quarrying that reserve, naturally all of these people living on these quiet residential lots around the quarry reserve are starting to complain. They have every reason to complain, because no-one wants a quarry next door to them. However, by the same token, that area has been reserved for quarrying purposes for 60 years. Urban development has tended to be concentrated in a relatively confined space, and the noxious industries and other problem industries that are likely to cause concern to residents were established on the outskirts. The point I make is that rural residential development has caused this problem. I agree with the comments made by the Opposition spokesman, the honourable member for Mackay, that the appropriate way to resolve this matter would have been by the inclusion of some special provisions in the planning sections of the Local Government Act.

In closing, I believe that this is a very good example of how an all-party parliamentary committee could have been used to investigate the whole matter. It seems to me that this is a very real problem throughout the State, and if representatives from all parties had sat down together and had the benefit of expert advice, they could have come up with some real solutions. As it is, today this House is being asked to consider legislative changes which I believe do not fit the bill. This is a desperate attempt to silence people who are concerned about the ever-increasing number of applications being received. When the new Government takes office in the new year it will have real difficulty sorting the matter out.

**Hon. M. D. STONEMAN** (Burdekin—Minister for Primary Industries) (4.51 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions to this debate. They have obviously given the matter a great deal of thought.

I commence my reply by referring to the remarks made by the Opposition spokesman, Mr Casey. I am delighted that he appears to support the feedlot industry. He made that point clear at the outset, but he then proceeded to turn round and tear it apart. I feel that he is being somewhat vindictive and destructive. I am disappointed that he became so personal in respect of the very professional officers in my department and the Department of Local Government in respect of their approach to this quite unique legislation. Mr Casey's attack on my department does not sit well with me, it will not sit well with my department, nor will it be appreciated by the primary producers of this State.

I should like to paraphrase something said by the distinguished former Labor politician, Mr Fred Daly. Many years ago, when Mr McMahon was promoted to Minister for Primary Industries, Mr Daly, who had a great deal of humour but always maintained respect, said that Bill McMahon's qualifications for the job were that he had a cat, a canary and a length of garden hose. The qualifications for membership of the Queensland ALP are a union ticket, a vindictive nature and a big stick, because that is what the members of the party are taking to the primary producers of this State. I do not believe that that attitude will go down very well with the farmers.

The Queensland Local Government Association is working very well within the constructive processes that have been developed in the lead-up to the introduction of this Bill. Quite frankly, I have no knowledge, formal or informal, of anything other than a willingness by that association to continue to go down that track. I pay tribute to its senior officers, particularly its chairman, Mr Jim Pennell, and the executive officer, Mr Greg Hoffman.

I assure the honourable member for Mackay that full consultation has taken place with all parties involved in this most important industry—the honourable member himself acknowledged that it was a most important industry—including local government, the Lot Feeding Association, the grain industry, the cattle supply industry and the United Graziers Association. The proposal before the House is not the result of cronyism. There was full and complete consultation with the relevant parties.

The legislation and the associated guide-lines represent productive consultation between the Department of Local Government and my department as well as the relevant industry interests. The guide-lines do not exist under Queensland environmental conditions or anywhere else in Australia and maybe the world, so I guess that, in this, there is an element of a suck it and see process.

I say to the honourable member for Mackay that, under the Bill, all feedlot proposals must be advertised with public objections invited and the consent of the local authority obtained before the feedlots are established. That is part and parcel of the process.

The honourable member for Mackay referred to the prescribed conditions in the consent approval. Where the conditions of feedlots are to be varied, for instance for an increase in the number of cattle, which has happened in one instance in my own area, the further consent of the local authority is required. These conditions are based on the chief inspector's advice.

Let me assure the honourable member for Mackay that the guide-lines will be gazetted as soon as the relevant parties have had a chance to give full consideration to them. Equally importantly, there is a need for extensive research into the operation of feedlots in a tropical environment. We must be continually mindful of the fact that the tropical environment has conditions that do not occur in many other instances. This work has commenced and some scientific research work is being undertaken that will undoubtedly result in amendments to the guide-lines in due course, as those findings can be put into practice and are acknowledged to be practical.

I look forward, as I am sure everyone else does, to innovations in respect of odour levels and the control of odours.

The honourable member for Mackay referred to the appeal mechanism under the Stock Act. It should be recognised that the Stock Act involves many other aspects which need to be taken into account when considering an appeals mechanism. Control of an outbreak of an exotic disease, for example, may not be best pursued with an appeal mechanism as proposed by the honourable member for Mackay.

I commend the honourable member for Yeronga. I note that this is the last occasion on which he will debate a Bill in this Parliament. If only all debates were understood as well as this one has been understood by the honourable member for Yeronga, the work of the House would be so much more positive. I commend him and wish him well for the future.

Currently I am preparing a submission for possible release in respect of the Green Paper. That will be subject, of course, to a Cabinet decision.

The honourable member for Yeronga referred to the appointment of the cattle feedlot advisory committee. I have already written to the various organisations involved calling for a panel of names. I signed those letters about a fortnight ago. On receipt of the panel of names, I will move to establish the committee immediately following the Act's coming into effect.

The honourable member's practical approach to the industry was particularly apparent when he spoke of such areas as stress, feeding problems, transportation and associated bruising. He made the valid point that the cattle were fattened under conditions that were not natural and did not accord with what we could call the bush way of life.

The honourable member referred to the consumer increasingly asking for a consistent quality. Feedlots will increasingly become part and parcel of our way of life and that is why this Bill is so important.

After the election, I plan to visit a number of feedlots and look at the various problems that may arise.

**Mr Casey:** You will be able to take a holiday.

**Mr STONEMAN:** I believe then that we will be able to come to grips more practically with the problems out there in the real world of feedlots. If Mr Casey is still able to maintain his position as Opposition spokesman in this area, I will be delighted to suggest a program so that he could increase his knowledge in this area. I am aware of the dangers of the non-specifics in some areas of the guide-lines but I suggest that to have no guide-lines is far worse than having what we have here.

The member for Yeronga raised also the matter of odour measurement associated with feedlots. That is a very important process. For his information and for the information of other honourable members, I will briefly outline the approach that will be taken in dealing with feedlot odour problems under the powers in this Bill.

Firstly, the guide-lines set air quality objectives for certain acceptable levels of odour exposure at different types of impact locations. The feedlot design and management standards that are set out in the guide-lines are those which will permit feedlots to operate within the air quality objectives if those standards are met.

Feedlot odour problems will be investigated in the first instance by an inspection of the feedlot to ensure that the required standards of management and operation are being carried out. If deficiencies are found, the licensee will be required to take corrective action, but will be given adequate time to do so. No-one should conjure up the idea that someone will come along in jackboots to close down a feedlot in a pre-emptive manner. There is no intention to summarily close down a feedlot on the basis of an odour complaint as suggested by the honourable member for Yeronga.

In the course of research and investigation of feedlot odour problems, we have available several methods of objectively measuring odour. Those include dynamic olfactometry and the use of scentometers. Those methods are somewhat cumbersome and are not available for routine, everyday use. Their use would be confined basically to research areas or specific investigations into intractable feedlot odour problems.

I will turn now to the contribution by the honourable member for Mourilyan. I will deal with the honourable member for Sherwood later. I am pleased that the member for Mourilyan recognised the high cost of transportation in some of the extremely remote areas of this State. He referred to the peninsula. It is a pity that some of his Federal colleagues did not recognise those high costs of transportation when they approached the drought-relief procedures which are currently uppermost in many people's minds. It is not the function of the chief inspector to overrule the local authority on any matter relating to site approval, including the holding capacity of the feedlot. It should be noted that all decisions are taken following consultation between the chief inspector and the local authority.

The honourable member for Thuringowa expressed some concerns. The Local Government Act amendment will not remedy the problem that he instanced. However, when he said that no-one knows exactly how to overcome the integration of feedlots into the broad range of local authority areas, he was correct. This Bill is a facilitating process that allows practical and evolutionary practices that are acceptable to the community and workable for the feedlot industry.



In conclusion—following the comments made by the honourable member for Sherwood, I draw attention to an article in the *Courier-Mail* of 5 October 1989 attributed to Mr G. Vickery, President of the Queensland Law Society, alleging that the Bill contains provisions which deny natural justice to an aggrieved person because of lack of an appropriate appeal mechanism against the decision of the chief inspector of stock.

The chief inspector of stock is a senior departmental official who is already empowered under the Stock Act to make significant administrative decisions. That is not uncommon under statute law, where named public officers are empowered to revoke licence rights and the like.

In relation to the appeals provision, Mr Vickery correctly made the point that there is an appeal to the Minister against the decision of the chief inspector. However, Mr Vickery went on to say that such a mechanism was inadequate and that there should be a further appeal to the District Court. He failed to recognise the very important point that the Supreme Court, not the District Court, already has jurisdiction, which cannot be ousted, to review administrative decisions, in this case by the chief inspector or, on appeal, the Minister.

Grounds for such review by the Supreme Court are that the decision was made in bad faith, that extraneous matters had been taken into account, or that the decision-maker acted arbitrarily. Appeal against the decision of the chief inspector is available to the Minister. Further review of an administrative decision by the Supreme Court is available to an aggrieved person.

The position adopted by the Queensland Law Society in its recent correspondence with me is that it would be preferable to provide for a more structured appeals process involving the Magistrates Court, as has been incorporated in the Second-hand Dealers and Collectors Act, the Pawnbrokers Act and the Hawkers Act. I am prepared to give consideration to that proposal and to include it in the usual Green Paper process when next an amendment to the Stock Act is necessary. However, it would not be appropriate to adopt such a significant change in the provisions of the Stock Act without full consultation with all other parts of the livestock industry which would be affected and who, it should be emphasized, have not requested that change.

Before the Bill passes to the Committee stage, it would be helpful if I advised that I propose to move two amendments to clause 5; one as it relates to the proposed new section 28B and the other as it relates to the proposed new section 28J.

The proposed amendment to new section 28B is to place a statutory obligation on the chief inspector of stock to consult with the relevant local authority on receipt of an application for a licence to operate a cattle feedlot and to take into account the local authority's views before the granting or renewal of a licence.

The second amendment relates to the proposed new section 28J. Following extensive consultation with parties affected by the legislation, it has become apparent that it would be more appropriate for the chairman of the cattle feedlot advisory committee to be selected from the membership generally of the committee rather than impose a statutory responsibility on the chief inspector of stock to adopt that role. The cattle feedlot advisory committee will comprise people with experience in the livestock and feedlot industries, local government, commerce, environmental conservation and a person with special expertise, together with technical representation from my department, notably through the chief inspector of stock. From that eminent body, it is my intention to select as chairman a person who would be best equipped to mould the committee together as an effective policy advisory body to the Minister. The amendment which I propose to move in Committee will accommodate that change.

I commend again those who have been involved in the consultative processes—local authorities, the feedlotters, the graziers and honourable members. I commend the Bill to the House.

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

AYES, 40		NOES, 17	
Alison	Knox	Ardill	
Austin	Lester	Casey	
Beard	Lickiss	Comben	
Booth	Littleproud	Eaton	
Borbidge	McCauley	Gibbs, R. J.	
Chapman	Menzel	Goss	
Clauson	Neal	Hamill	
Cooper	Nelson	McElligott	
Elliott	Newton	Mackenroth	
FitzGerald	Perrett	McLean	
Fraser	Randell	Milliner	
Gamin	Schuntner	Scott	
Gately	Sherlock	Vaughan	
Gibbs, I. J.	Sherrin	Warburton	
Gunn	Simpson	Yewdale	
Gygar	Slack		
Harper	Stoneman		
Henderson			
Hobbs	<i>Tellers:</i>	<i>Tellers:</i>	
Innes	Stephan	Davis	
Katter	Hynd	Palaszcuk	
PAIR:			
Row		Underwood	

Resolved in the affirmative.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members, I had intended to cancel dinner tonight and replace it with the Speaker's function. However, as it looks as though the House will now be sitting late with the debate on the next Bill and the Valedictory, I propose to adjourn at 6 o'clock and have the Speaker's function from 6 till half past 7—which will be dinner—and resume at 7.30.

### Committee

Hon. M. D. Stoneman (Burdekin—Minister for Primary Industries) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—

**Mr LEE (5.16 p.m.):** In my speech during the second-reading debate I said that I would raise certain matters at the Committee stage. I have provided the Minister with a copy of the questions that I intended to ask. I know that the Minister has already received answers from his officers. To save time, I seek leave to table my questions and have them incorporated in *Hansard*. I ask that the Minister do the same with his answers.

Leave granted.

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

### STOCK ACT AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Page 2: Clause 5.  
Section 28A.

(2) A person who, immediately before the commencement of this section, was using premises as a cattle feedlot shall not be proceeded against for an offence against subsection (1) for using the premises as a cattle feedlot during the period of 3 months after that commencement or, if within that period he makes application for a licence to use the premises as a cattle feedlot, at any time after that period expires until the application is determined.

**Question:** In the case of where a court of law has set the conditions and the feedlot has been constructed to the Court's conditions and standards, can the Chief Inspector *NOT* grant a licence.

Page 3: Section 28B. Application for cattle feedlot licence or renewal.

(c) shall be accompanied by the prescribed fee.

Question: What is the prescribed fee?

Section 28C. Licences.

(2) Where the Chief Inspector makes a determination that an application for a licence will be granted if the Local Authority, in whose Area the relevant premises are located, consents to the use of the premises as a cattle feedlot, he shall notify the applicant in writing of his determination and provide the applicant with a report of the matters considered by him in making the determination.

Question: No time limit imposed on Inspector. Can take months!

Page 4: (8) The holder of a licence may, with the prior written approval of the Chief Inspector and upon payment of the prescribed fee, transfer or assign the licence to another person and where the approval is granted, the holder shall, in accordance with the direction of the Chief Inspector, furnish the licence to the Chief Inspector to be endorsed with particulars of the transfer or assignment.

Question: Who is the holder of the licence? Can it be a company, private or public, and on what conditions can it *not be transferred*?

page 5: Section 28F. Chief Inspector may require information.

(2) A notice under subsection (1) may require that information be provided from time to time—

- (a) at intervals specified in the notice: or
- (b) upon the occurrence of a specified event.

Question: Is a special event when some fictitious complaint is lodged about odour?

Section 28G. Cancellation or suspension of licence.

- (b) has failed to comply with any provision of guidelines made by the Chief Inspector under section 28H (1) (b).

Question: What are the guidelines? You said they won't be gazetted. How can this Act work without Guidelines?

Section 28G.

(3) Chief Inspector may—

- (a) cancel the licence;

Question: Who can you appeal to? What rights have you to appeal to the District Court?

Section 28H. Chief Inspector may issue guidelines.

(2) The Chief Inspector may at any time amend the guidelines or may revoke the guidelines and issue new ones.

Question: He alone can amend, revoke guidelines or issue new ones!

Page 7: Clause 10.

Section 33C.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of any by-law or town planning scheme, a person shall not use land within the Area of a Local Authority for the purpose of a cattle feedlot unless the Local Authority, upon application made by the person pursuant to this section, has first given its consent to the use.

Question: Local Authority has given consent, but what time limit has the Chief Inspector to give consent?

**Mr STONEMAN:** In the spirit of co-operation and in accordance with the honourable member's request, I seek leave to table my answers and have them incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

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

Question 1

The Chief Inspector may grant the feedlot licence and the Chief Inspector will endorse the licence with the requirements as set by the court.

## Question 2

The fees are to be set on an industry cost recovery system.

The actual fee is yet to be set, but will have reference to the size of the feedlot.

## Question 3

No time-limit has been set. However, the administrative process within my department will ensure that all applications are handled speedily.

## Question 4

A cattle-feed licence can be held by a company, private or public, or an individual.

The condition of transfer of a licence is that the obligations upon the existing licence will continue to apply to the new owner of the feedlot.

## Question 5

The object of clause 28G is to allow the Chief Inspector the right to require information on the ongoing practices at the feedlot, including disease control measures.

## Question 6

The guide-lines are the Queensland Government guide-lines. The guide-lines will be gazetted. It is a requirement of clause 28H subclause (3) of this Bill that they be gazetted, but only after full and complete consultation.

Other details will be incorporated into the proposed feedlot regulations, which will be based upon the information contained in the guide-lines.

## Question 7

In the first instance an appeal may be made to the Minister for Primary Industries who may seek advice from his Cattle Feedlot Advisory Committee in deciding the matter.

An objector who is still not satisfied may appeal to the Supreme Court on the grounds that he has been refused natural justice.

## Question 8

Whilst the Chief Inspector has the statutory power to amend or revoke guide-lines, all amendments or revocations will be made in consultation with the Minister's Cattle Feedlot Advisory Committee.

## Question 9

No specific time has been set. However, the administrative procedure and requirements within the department will ensure that undue delays do not occur.

**Mr INNES:** The first thing that I would like to point out for the record is that the honourable member for Yeronga abstained from voting during the last division, and will abstain from voting during any subsequent divisions, so that it cannot be suggested that he was influenced in any way by any pecuniary interest.

Clause 5 proposes new sections 28C and 28G. They deal with the powers of the chief inspector. Proposed new section 28C allows the chief inspector to grant an application for a licence, or the renewal of a licence, to use premises as a feedlot. Proposed new section 28G gives a discretion to the chief inspector. Those two proposed new sections highlight a matter to which I referred earlier, that is, the lack of a convenient and appropriate appeals system at this time. I noted the Minister's statements that in the proposed Green Paper he will consider streamlining the issue of appeal. That was one of the matters that members of the Liberal Party took into account in voting in general to support the legislation. We have no objection to the setting up of a system of regulated feedlots to improve the standard of them and to minimise conflicts.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

**Mr INNES:** Members of the Liberal Party hold very strongly the view that there should be laid down an accessible system of appeals against the chief inspector's decision. I noted the argument advanced by the Minister, that is, that the powers of the chief inspector are very extensive. We recognise that the exercise of some of the powers of stock-inspectors or the chief inspector perhaps should not be subject to the normal consequences and protection of the law. If one is dealing with issues that might involve quarantine or other exceptional and sudden matters for the protection of stock generally,

or other issues, it might be proper to allow the chief inspector or stock-inspectors to be given exceptional powers. However, that is not the position; this is something that protects livelihood. In the case of a feedlot, it is a total business operation. Because of the extent of an investment in a feedlot and because it can be a complex operation, the Liberal Party believes that simple and accessible systems should be provided.

As to the systems that are available—the Supreme Court approach is a complicated one. According to the present system of administrative law, restrictions are imposed on the type of cases that can be presented. Of course, Supreme Courts do not sit in many areas in which feedlots are located. It has to come down to a lower level and more accessible system of courts. Members of the Liberal Party welcome the Minister's indication that he will take on board the rationale behind the argument. However, we think that it is important enough to make a stand on the issue at this time, and we would divide the Committee on this clause because we believe that the clause should provide for a proper and accessible appeal system.

**Mr CASEY:** The Liberals seem to be a little too thick for me to get things through to them. I will point out very quickly what I said prior to the luncheon recess. To facilitate the passage of the Bill through the Chamber and because of the importance of this day to so many members, and so that we could get the business over and out of the road, in the second-reading debate I clearly stated the Opposition's feelings about the appeal provisions of the Bill. I indicated to the Minister that members of the Opposition would show their objection by dividing the House on the second reading of the Bill. We did that because we believed that the whole context of the Bill, under which the powers have been taken away from the local authority and handed over to a chief stock-inspector and a Minister to make any determination on objections and appeals, was wrong. I reiterate that now. That decision was a wrong decision. All the Liberals are doing now is holding up the passage of the Bill.

**Mr STONEMAN:** I move the following amendment—

“At page 3, after line 19, insert—

‘(4) The Chief Inspector shall advise the Local Authority (in whose Area the premises are situated) of the receipt of the application and shall consult with the Local Authority in respect of any matter relevant to the use of the premises as a cattle feedlot which the Local Authority places before him, before he grants a licence or the renewal of a licence pursuant to section 28C (1).’ ”

**Mr INNES:** Because the proposed new sections are part of clause 5, is it the Minister's intention to deal with the proposed new sections individually or is the Committee dealing with the entire clause 5?

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! The intention was to put the entire clause. The Minister foreshadowed two amendments, one of which he has moved. Unless the honourable member wishes to debate the matter further, I intend to put the first amendment.

**Mr INNES:** That is fine.

Amendment agreed to.

**Mr STONEMAN:** I move the following further amendment—

“At page 6, omit lines 19 to 22 and substitute—

‘the committee.

(4) The Minister shall by instrument—

(a) appoint the members of the committee;

(b) designate a member as chairman of the committee;

(c) appoint persons to fill any casual vacancies arising on the committee.’ ”

Amendment agreed to.

Question—That clause 5, as amended, stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 42		NOES, 35	
Ahern	Katter	Ardill	Santoro
Alison	Lester	Beanland	Schuntner
Austin	Littleproud	Beard	Scott
Berghofer	McCauley	Braddy	Sherlock
Borbidge	McPhie	Campbell	Smyth
Burreket	Menzel	Casey	Vaughan
Chapman	Muntz	Comben	Warburton
Clauson	Neal	D'Arcy	Warner
Cooper	Nelson	De Lacy	Wells
Elliott	Newton	Eaton	White
FitzGerald	Perrett	Gibbs, R. J.	Yewdale
Fraser	Randell	Goss	
Gamin	Sherrin	Gygar	
Gately	Simpson	Hamill	
Gibbs, I. J.	Slack	Hayward	
Gilmore	Stoneman	Innes	
Gunn	Tenni	Knox	
Harper	Veivers	Lickiss	
Harvey		McElligott	
Henderson	<i>Tellers:</i>	Mackenroth	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hinton	Stephan	McLean	Davis
Hobbs	Hynd	Milliner	Palaszcuk
PAIR:			
Row		Underwood	

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clauses 6 to 10, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, with amendments.

### Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr Stoneman, read a third time.

## RETAIL SHOP LEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### Remaining Stages; Abridgement of Time

**Hon. N. J. HARPER** (Auburn—Leader of the House) (5.35 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would otherwise prevent the Retail Shop Leases Act Amendment Bill from passing through all its remaining stages at this day’s sitting.”

Motion agreed to.

### Second Reading

Debate resumed (see p. 1785).

**Mr McELLIGOTT** (Thuringowa) (5.36 p.m.): The Opposition made the point very clearly earlier in the day that it is totally dissatisfied with the way in which this very important piece of legislation is being handled. It is quite remarkable that a Bill of this type, which is obviously of great import to the small-business sector of Queensland, is being handled in this way.

It is quite extraordinary that the original Bill has remained on the notice paper since 10 August, yet in the dying moments of the Parliament we are being asked to consider an entirely new Bill. It is complex legislation. Clearly, the Opposition does not have access to expert advice at a minute’s notice.

My very quick reading of the Bill since it has been presented to the House indicates to me that at least some of the barrage of objections that were raised to the original Bill have been dealt with, but, very clearly, not all. I find that extraordinary, given that when the original Bill was introduced to the House by the Minister then responsible for it, Mr Borbidge, he made the statement that a Green Paper detailing certain proposed amendments was circulated in October 1988, that 550 copies in total were distributed and that responses were received from a cross-section, including the petroleum industry, representatives from BOMA, the Queensland Retail Traders and Shopkeepers Association, the Retailers Association of Queensland, the Australian Institute of Valuers and individual landlords and tenants. He then went on to say that since the introduction of this legislation numerous awareness programs had been conducted around the State and that there had been consultation across a wide sector of the small-business community.

Despite all that, when the original Bill was introduced to this House, it brought a tremendous degree of objection from responsible organisations such as the Queensland Law Society, BOMA, which of course wrote to all members of this House, and the Queensland Retail Traders and Shopkeepers Association. Generally there was widespread concern about the original Bill. As a result of that concern, it has been withdrawn and a new Bill substituted.

As I said, the Opposition is dissatisfied with the way in which this has occurred. My quick reading of the new Bill indicates that there are still problems associated with it. The Opposition will vote against the Bill but, given the hour of the day, I do not propose to divide the House. I believe that at this time in the history of the Parliament what this Government chooses to do with the Retail Shop Leases Act will be on its head until, of course, there is a change of Government and a realistic look can then be taken at the way in which the Government of Queensland assists the small-business community.

As an indication to the House that I am not being frivolous about this, I will cite two examples of my concerns about the Bill. Firstly, clause 6 states, "Certain payments to landlord prohibited" and refers to the prohibition of the payment of key money or goodwill. I lay on the table seven examples of a requirement in leases for inner-city premises in Brisbane under which payment of a lease premium or goodwill is required. Huge sums of money are involved. In one case it is \$70,000, in another, \$30,000, and so on.

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

**Mr McELLIGOTT:** That sort of thing is occurring now, and this legislation will not prevent it occurring in the future.

I also mention that clause 12 covers the sharing of operating expenses, but the provisions of this Bill will not resolve the problems that exist in shopping centres throughout Queensland. The lessees of specialty shops are being asked to pay a percentage of operating expenses based on the floor area of their shop as a proportion of the total floor area of specialty shops. Major retailers are being exempted from payment of operating costs. In effect, lessees of specialty shops to a very large extent are subsidising the rental paid by large organisations such as Franklins. My information is that shopkeepers are paying approximately \$65 per square metre as their proportional operating expenses whereas they should be paying approximately \$35 per square metre.

The issues of land tax and local government charges are not covered by the Bill. As I indicated, there are a number of matters that the Bill does not address in any satisfactory way. The Labor Party therefore opposes the Bill but does not intend to divide the House.

**Mr BEANLAND (Toowong) (5.41 p.m.):** The Liberal Party supports the new Bill that is before the House. Retail shop leases are always contentious issues, not only from the point of view of the tenant but also from the point of view of the landlord.

Generally, the new Bill is far more acceptable than the previous legislation. Obviously the Government's reaction to the outcry in the community was in response to various

interest groups and organisations that had made submissions following the introduction of the previous Bill. There is no doubt that the Government has moved to accommodate many of those objections in an attempt to improve and fine tune aspects of the leases.

The amendments cover a number of major issues of concern. However, one of the matters still worrying small-business operators involves the delays in signing leases. There is no doubt that leases lie at the heart of costs that confront small-business people. Leases contain clauses that allow outgoings incurred by landlords to be passed on to the tenant. Although some of those problems have been addressed in this amending legislation, the problems associated with land tax still need to be examined.

As the time for the State election draws near, it is worth while noting that the Liberal Party is the only political party in this State offering a policy of abolition of land tax. I know that the small-business community appreciates that policy greatly. It would not matter how much a business-operator juggled costs and outgoings; land tax would still be the major bugbear that worries small-business people. Several years ago the Government introduced annual valuations. At that time I indicated that the change would detrimentally affect the small-business community whereas the State Government, not local authorities, would reap a windfall. It makes no difference to local authorities whether valuations are carried out on a five-year basis or on an annual basis because as soon as the level of revenue had been set, rates were set as a proportion of property values. That position does not apply to land tax, which is very much tied in with the Retail Shop Leases Act and amendments that are presently before the House.

Because this legislation does not come to grips with the problem of land tax, shop tenants on the Gold Coast, the Sunshine Coast and in areas of Brisbane and Port Douglas who have received huge increases in annual valuations will still be confronted with the problem of having land tax costs passed on to them. The State Government's coffers have certainly reaped a windfall. I notice that the estimated receipt of revenue from land tax has risen from \$47m in 1986-87 to \$99m this financial year. Over a period of four years, land tax has almost doubled.

Although it is disappointing that this Government has not taken any action to remedy the land tax problems, the small-business community need not be concerned. After the State election, the Liberal Party will be in power—as you, Mr Speaker, would appreciate—and its members will be looking after land tax problems.

Problems associated with rental are addressed in the legislation, apart from the delay in signing leases, by provisions relating to the role of the specialist valuer. By virtue of these amendments, the specialist valuer will have a greater role to play than was the case previously. It is pleasing to note that the draconian proposals that would have increased enormously the powers of specialist valuers have been abandoned. By virtue of the previous provisions, specialist valuers would have been able to move in on small-business people and force them to reveal private information relating to all aspects of their business.

The other matter involves resolving the question of tenants mortgaging their leases and landlords being unable to hold them up unduly. That is a matter of concern to a number of small-business people and honourable members, and is addressed in the legislation. Perhaps the Bill does not go as far as many members would like, but I know that small-business people have had a lot of input into the legislation and will be appreciative that some of these changes have gone through. I am sure that it will not be too long before more fine tuning will be required. Small-business people will be appreciative of the fact that another step has been taken towards fine tuning these leases to get them to the point where not only the tenant, but also the landlord—two parties are involved—are represented fairly and equitably under the Retail Shop Leases Act.

**Mr BURREKET (Townsville) (5.47 p.m.):** Because of the shortage of time, I will make my comments fairly brief. I strongly support the Bill.

Having been involved with small businesses and leases over a number of years, I know all the problems associated with them. I point out to the Opposition spokesman



for Small Business that one of the major problems is that none of the leases are the same because they are drawn up by different legal officers who introduce their own variations and interpretations. That is why many of the tenants run into problems.

A number of very innovative proposals are contained in the legislation. The officers in the department have worked extremely well with both Ministers to put this legislation together. I know that the large number of small-businessmen in my electorate will appreciate the advantages and protection that this Bill will give them.

**Hon. H. D. J. FRASER** (Springwood—Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology) (5.48 p.m.), in reply: I thank the honourable member for Thuringowa for his comments on the Bill and take on board some of his suggestions. The fact is that he was informed. I made an effort to inform him last week, and yesterday I offered him the services of a senior officer of my department to discuss the legislation with him and the member for Toowong. Both members were fully aware of what was going on.

**Mr Beanland:** I appreciate that. Thank you.

**Mr FRASER:** I thank the honourable member for Toowong.

In addition, I thank the member for Townsville for the points he made. He realises the importance of this Bill for small business in Queensland. When I took over this portfolio I knew that legislation of this kind would not please everyone, but a consensus and a fairly reasonable agreement can be reached with compromise.

One of the pioneering clauses of the Bill brings service stations under the provisions of the Retail Shop Leases Act. That is a very important safeguard for service stations and I do not think that any honourable member on either side of the House would disagree, especially when so many service station proprietors have had their tenures terminated in the last month. Mr Campbell has just entered the Chamber and I know that he has had a problem in Bundaberg. The Government realises the problems. Through the introduction of this legislation the Government is proving that it is genuine in its attempts to help small business in Queensland.

Motion agreed to.

#### **Committee**

Clauses 1 to 23, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

#### **Third Reading**

Bill, on motion of Mr Fraser, read a third time.

#### **VALEDICTORY**

**Hon. T. R. COOPER** (Roma—Premier and Treasurer and Minister for State Development) (5.51 p.m.): On this, the last sitting day of the Forty-fifth Parliament, I wish to take the opportunity to pay tribute to the many members of the House who are retiring.

On the Government side, our Chairman of Committees, Ted Row, will retire after serving 17 years as a member of the House and six years as Chairman of Committees. On many occasions he has also acted as Deputy Speaker and has always carried out very efficiently the duties attached to these positions.

Four other Government members who all came into the House at the December 1974 election are to retire. I refer to Bill Glasson, Peter McKechnie, Martin Tenni and Gordon Simpson. Mr McKechnie is not presently in the House, but I saw him before he left and said my goodbyes to him. All of those members served as Ministers of the Crown. They gave exemplary service and we pay a tribute to them for the work which

they have performed in many areas to advance the progress and development of Queensland.

On the Opposition side, two of the Labor Party's longest-serving members will not be seeking re-election. Brian Davis and Les Yewdale have both served 17 years as members. Brian Davis has been Opposition Whip for over five years and has carried out his onerous duties very well.

Bob Scott is another Labor Party member who, after 12 years as a member, is retiring. We also say farewell to Eric Shaw, who, like Bob Scott, was elected to the House at the November 1977 election.

Bill Lickiss has been a Liberal member of the Queensland Parliament for 26 years. Bill gave very distinguished service as Chairman of Committees of the Parliament from 1972 to 1974 and as a Minister of the Crown from 1975 to 1980.

We also say goodbye to Norm Lee. I have known Norm for a mighty long time. He comes from the heartland, the good country out there. He has feedlots in the Roma area as well as in Brisbane. Norm was elected to the House 25 years ago and was also a distinguished Minister of the Crown for over 5 years.

To all of those members I express my thanks and the thanks of my colleagues for their service to the State, to the Parliament and to their fellow citizens, and I wish them all a very healthy and a very enjoyable retirement. I really could not see some of them retiring.

It would be very remiss of me if I did not express my appreciation to you, Mr Speaker, the officers of the Parliament and the staff at Parliament House for their help over the past year.

To the Clerk of the Parliament, Alan Woodward, in absentia, the Deputy Clerks and their staff, both here in the Chamber and in administration, I express the thanks of the Government.

I also express appreciation to the Chief Reporter and his staff, the Parliamentary Librarian and his staff, the manager and staff of the refreshment rooms, the parliamentary attendants, the telephonists, the secretarial staff, the cleaning staff and the gardeners. All of these persons, in their own individual ways, help and assist in the running of the parliamentary complex. We expect much of them and they are on call at all times of the day and night. To each and every one of them I say, "Thank you."

I also express our appreciation to the Parliamentary Counsel and his staff and the Government Printer and his staff. Between them, those officers prepare and print the legislation which is presented to this Parliament for consideration. We demand much of them, often at short notice, and I would like them to know that their assistance is highly regarded.

Finally, a word of thanks to our electorate secretaries. They are responsible for running our electorate offices, and we do appreciate their help at all times. We all realise that staff can make or break us and the value of their work is inestimable.

This has been a most productive Parliament. I look forward to the next Parliament with anticipation and relish.

I thank you, Mr Speaker, for your invitation to attend your break-up function. Over there, we can exchange further pleasantries.

### SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

**Hon. T. R. COOPER** (Roma—Premier and Treasurer and Minister for State Development) (5.55 p.m.): I move—

"That the House, at its rising, do adjourn to a date and time to be fixed by Mr Speaker in consultation with the Government of this State."

Mr GOSS (Logan—Leader of the Opposition) (5.56 p.m.): The Forty-fifth Parliament of Queensland has indeed been a remarkable and very historic Parliament. We have all been amazed at times by the extent and the amount of the political controversy in which we have all been caught up. Hopefully, out of all this will come things that are good and worth-while for the future and for the people of this State.

On behalf of the Opposition, I express my appreciation to you, Mr Speaker, for the role that you have discharged in this place. It is a very important role and a difficult one at the best of times. It has been doubly difficult in these very trying circumstances. I thank you on behalf of the Opposition for your forbearance and on at least one occasion when you certainly interceded on my behalf in a way that I thought very fair and appropriate.

To all the people around this Parliament who make it work so well, so efficiently and so quietly, and who discharge their duties efficiently and inconspicuously, I offer the thanks of the Opposition. In that expression of gratitude I include the Clerk of the Parliament, Mr Woodward, the Deputy Clerk, Mr Doyle, the table staff who discharge their tasks so well, the parliamentary attendants who carry out a range of duties for us in such a quiet and efficient manner; the Hansard staff who somehow manage to record and report our every word; our friends in the media to whom I express appreciation for doing such a good job in reporting the very positive and, at times, controversial statements by Opposition members, and we encourage them to keep trying; and the many other people who are essential to the operation of the Parliament and the job we do, including Mr Bannenberg, the Parliamentary Librarian; the secretarial staff; the telephonic staff; the people in the dining rooms, the refreshment rooms and the cafeteria, the attendants, the security staff; and the maintenance, cleaning and gardening staff. They all carry out important roles. I extend appreciation also to the Parliamentary Counsel and the Government Printer and their staff who support the Parliament so well.

On behalf of myself and the members of the Opposition, I thank our electorate secretaries who, as the Premier so rightly said, can really make or break us in our electorates. To my own electorate secretary, who has had an additional burden to carry since I became Leader of the Opposition, I express my personal appreciation.

I express my appreciation to my personal office staff in the building—Maurie, Stella, Hazel, Sharon, Sharon, Kathy, Joe, Lindsay and Kevin.

I express my thanks to my deputy, Tom Burns, and his staff.

I also thank for their discharge of duties in this place the Opposition Whip, Mr Davis, and the Opposition Leader of Business in the House, Mr Prest. As members are aware, Mr Davis and three other members of the Labor Party—Les Yewdale, Bob Scott and Dave Underwood—are leaving us and we certainly wish them the very best for the future. I am sure that, late at night next year when the bells are ringing, they will suffer a twinge or two. However, we will soldier on. I am sure that those members will discover that there is life after Parliament.

I also extend our best wishes to the other members who are retiring—the members of the National Party referred to by the Premier, and also Mr Lee, Mr Lickiss and Mr Shaw.

It is appropriate to mention the role played by the Premier. This has been a remarkable Parliament in the sense that we have seen three Premiers, each of them carrying out that demanding role in very controversial and difficult circumstances. On many occasions—not all the time—there has been a spirit of some co-operation and goodwill. Hopefully, that can be built upon in the future in this place. Of course, I include Mr Innes, the Leader of the Liberal Party, in that comment. That spirit of co-operation came to the fore particularly in relation to various events that occurred in the course of the Fitzgerald inquiry and subsequent to that. It was a very important phase in our history, one which we have learnt a lot from and which will provide good things in the future.

It has been a remarkable effort by Mr Fitzgerald. I will depart from the usual form of a valedictory and pay a tribute to one person outside this place, that is, Tony Fitzgerald, who has done a remarkable job in the interests of the future of this State. Even though it has been the subject of controversy, the task that he carried out was a mammoth one. If we learn the lessons of the work that was done there and the work that can be done in the future, this Parliament will be a better place for that and it will serve the public interest in a very positive way.

To all the other members and to all the staff inside and outside the Chamber, I extend the best wishes of the Labor Party both for the battle ahead and for Christmas. I look forward to seeing all my colleagues back here next year. I look forward also to seeing at least some Government members back here next year.

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (6.03 p.m.): I join in the usual greetings and wishes which are expressed at this time of the year and in this time of the Parliament. We have all lived in historic times. I suppose that every generation takes upon itself the vanity of saying, "We have lived in historic times." However, no commentator, no matter how objective or subjective, could look at the events of the past three years in the history of Queensland and the history of this Parliament and not say accurately and truly that we have all lived through historic times in this State.

Three administrations in three years is an extraordinary number. Each new Premier might not mean a new party, but it certainly means a new batch of leadership in the State, a new emphasis and a new team. It has been at times interesting and at times worrying to watch the way in which the Government of the State has developed.

The Fitzgerald times will be seen by history to be significant. It is very rare that a whole administration is subjected to the intense scrutiny that was provided by Mr Fitzgerald with his exceptional skills and his unusual techniques. It is fair to say that under such scrutiny no governmental administration anywhere could fail to be shown to have problems, be they abuses of power or be they agencies under the direct control of Government which have gone off the rails. Police forces will always be subject to attack and counter-attack and to attempts to compromise to the disadvantage of individuals. It all came together in the Fitzgerald era. We have all lived through it. Let us hope that the lesson that has been learnt—or partially learnt—at some significant cost to the respect of all our positions and institutions has been such that it has laid the foundation for something better in the future.

I pay the usual compliments—because they are usual, they are no less felt—to you, Mr Speaker, for the courtesies that you and your predecessor have given to the House; to the Clerk and his table staff for their unfailing courtesies and help; and to Hansard, who have had to put up with my record-breaking deputy who has turned over more pulls per session than anybody else. We have in the Parliament Tom Burns, and to beat his volume of delivery is some feat. I pay compliments to the Parliamentary Library staff, who are ever ready and ever helpful, and who give us competent and accurate assistance in converting a newspaper headline or a couple of paragraphs into something more substantial and better thought out; to the secretarial and office staff; and to the extraordinarily hard-working officers who look after travel arrangements in this House. Their task must be an absolute nightmare. The efficiency and courtesy which are shown by the person in charge of the mayhem that must be involved in organising travel for members of Parliament, particularly in times of strikes, never ceases to amaze me.

A special comment should go to the attendants not only for the courtesies that are extended in the Chamber but also for the high standard that they have achieved in their work of taking the school groups round this place on our behalf. Many of us run out of time or have competing obligations. The quality of instruction given by the attendants is excellent. I am not taking a cheap shot when I say that some of them even understand or have heard of the doctrine of the separation of powers. The reality is that the attendants have become extraordinarily well informed. They know a lot about the history of this place. They do a great deal as ambassadors of the total parliamentary complex and they reinforce some sense of pride and history and some sense of purpose in the institution.

I thank the refreshment staff, the gardeners and the cleaners for their services over the last three years.

As for our friends in the media—from time to time we might not feel that they are our friends on a day-to-day basis. However, it is an interesting and unusual working relationship that most honourable members enjoy with the media.

I also thank my own staff for their assistance.

I turn to the members who are retiring. At times it is said that the Parliament is no longer as robust as it was, that there are no Tom Aikens. When some of us are gathered round together, we say that Parliament has become dull or we ask where the characters have gone. But I think if honourable members look at the list of members who are departing this place, they will find that this House still has characters. Everybody has his or her own bit of individuality.

Obviously I want to pay particular compliments to the two members of my party who are retiring—Bill Lickiss, with 26 years' service, and Norm Lee, with 25 years' service. It was very fitting that both of them went out today by speaking to legislation that was either appropriate because of their personal interest or because of their professional backgrounds and contributions in public life.

Bill Lickiss really set the new direction for the Department of Geographic Information and the reform of the Valuer-General's Department. The work that he did with regional planning and mapping was very significant. Anybody who has been to Sunmap or seen the equipment available and the techniques embraced by the department has seen something of the legacy of his professionalism as a cartographer and a person who is very familiar with and professionally qualified in valuation and planning.

Norm Lee makes a bit of history as he leaves by abstaining from taking part in a vote in regard to something in which he had a very strong personal interest and in which it could have been said that he had a pecuniary interest, that is, the legislation dealing with feedlots. Like Bill Lickiss, Norm is a character, but in a different way. Nobody will ever forget his slogan, "We make it great in the Sunshine State." We can still ponder whether the suit really was Australian-made or whether it was made in Hong Kong. Norm is one of the few people who can travel around Hong Kong in apparent anonymity because of his unusual name. Looking for a Mr Lee in a hotel in Hong Kong is a fairly difficult proposition.

The parliamentary terms of both of these colleagues and friends of mine represent an extraordinary span of service to this State. It has been very dedicated service, and their characters and professionalism have added to the public life and public service of this State. On behalf of my colleagues and, I am sure, all other honourable members, I compliment them for their many long years of service.

Several Government members are retiring: Mr McKechnie, Mr Tenni, Mr Glasson, Mr Simpson and Mr Row. Anybody who thinks that the characters in this place are dead should have a look at Martin Tenni. The others are characters in their own way, but Martin Tenni certainly demonstrates some of that robustness that is often associated with people from far-north Queensland. I have not always agreed with his views on crocodiles. At times I think he has given too much ammunition to Canberra by some of the very individual ways in which he expresses himself. Nevertheless, Martin Tenni is a character. I have not always complimented him for some of the things he has said or done in public life. However, according to my information, the mining legislation that was recently debated in this Chamber was extraordinarily well received by the mining industry, was substantially supported by the affected groups as well as the user groups and the mining industry itself, and is likely to go down in history as a tribute to him for introducing a major piece of legislation about an extraordinarily important industry. I think it is a fitting monument to his period in public life. I do not mean to denigrate the contribution of the others, but I cannot trespass on the time of the House too much.

Les Yewdale, Bob Scott, David Underwood, Brian Davis and Eric Shaw are also characters whom I will miss. I have often been the victim or the butt of the interjections from three rows in front by Brian Davis——

**Mr Davis:** Tell us about Sir Samuel Griffith.

**Mr INNES:** The honourable member mentioned it; no Samuel Griffith today.

On behalf of my party, I wish all the retiring members a long and happy retirement. Members of the Liberal Party would be pleased to see them and have a drink with them in the future.

At the end of an extraordinary three years, on behalf of the parliamentary Liberal Party, I would like to convey best wishes to everyone. I know that that is somewhat qualified in politics, but we wish everyone well, particularly those who are retiring. I hope that the retiring members enjoy spending some time with their wives and families. As for those who are back next year—we look forward to the fray.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I think all honourable members would agree that it is much more sensible to continue with the Valedictory speeches now. I call the honourable member for Nundah.

**Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (6.15 p.m.):** I would like to trespass on the time of the House to make some reference to colleagues who are retiring. I endorse all the remarks made by the previous speakers. However, I think it would be appropriate if I made reference to some of the longer-standing members who are retiring with whom I have had a close association.

I would particularly like to mention Mr Davis, who has held the position of Opposition Whip for a considerable time—six years. The position of Whip is probably one of the most difficult in the House. To hold the office of Whip for a long time and to be able to help in the running of the House is a notable achievement. Although Mr Davis interjected on me frequently during many speeches and contributed as much to my speeches as to his own, because he found interjecting on my speeches a successful way of making speeches, I pay a tribute to him for the contribution that he has made to the good order of this House.

I served with Mr Glasson in Cabinet. Of those members who are retiring, he is the only person, apart from my two Liberal colleagues, with whom I served in Cabinet. I enjoyed being with him in the Cabinet. He was certainly one of the personalities of the Cabinet at that time and subsequently. Around the Cabinet table, Mr Glasson was affectionately known as Jed Clampett. At first, he was Minister for Police, which was a very difficult portfolio at that time, as it has been subsequently. He handled it with considerable skill. He had a special talent and was a person who was very easy to approach. His ability to mix freely contributed greatly to a very distinguished career in this House. He is one of the few members left in the House who served in World War II. Fewer and fewer of those members remain in this House. However, there are still some left, and Mr Glasson is one of them.

Ted Row, who is representing us at a conference, is absent from the Chamber. His long service in this House has been distinguished not only by being Chairman of Committees but also by being associated with the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and representing us in that field. Many people take the CPA for granted, but he took it very seriously. As a result of his special interests and the support that he has had from all of us, he has helped put Queensland on the map in CPA business around the world. We are very fortunate to have had a person of his experience to carry the colours for us in Commonwealth Parliamentary Association matters.

I turn now to Norm Lee and Bill Lickiss. On previous occasions when my two Liberal colleagues and I have celebrated twenty-fifth anniversaries, we have had an opportunity for some levity. I do not intend to take advantage of them tonight under the privilege of this House. On those occasions I took advantage of them without privilege and I was not sued. I appreciated very much their close association and support.

The work we have done together through good times and bad times will be remembered. They retire from this House with a considerable amount of affection from those who have been closely associated with them.

Norm Lee was elected to this House at a by-election. It is always extremely difficult for a person to come into this House following a by-election, after everyone else has settled down, and sort himself out. For some time, Norm Lee had a difficult time establishing himself in the Parliament. His very special qualifications over a long period, not only as a Minister of the Crown but also as a very active member on a number of committees of this House—and a very vociferous one—certainly made a contribution to this Parliament. I am sure that many members in this House will miss his personality.

Bill Lickiss is an ex-serviceman of World War II. He is the only member of Parliament who has been awarded a bravery award whilst serving as a member of Parliament. Bill Lickiss was one of my colleagues in Cabinet and, of course, a colleague in the party room and in this House. To him we also say a fond farewell. His contribution to the House is well documented and I do not intend to go through it in detail. I will certainly miss my two Liberal colleagues. I am certain that, in the course of time, their contributions in the Parliament of Queensland will be recorded as being outstanding.

**Mr YEWDAL** (Rockhampton North) (6.20 p.m.): I rise for the last time in this House. I do so to place on record my appreciation to a large number of people who have supported me over a period of 17 years while I represented the seat of Rockhampton North. First of all, I express high praise to my wife and family who, to some extent, were neglected because I had to reside at Parliament House and travel throughout the State.

I also express my thanks to my electorate secretary, who has been a tower of strength for some 16 years. I further thank all my party members for their untiring efforts over a span of approximately seven years in manning polling-booths, assisting in fund-raising and general activities in support of my retention of the seat of Rockhampton North.

During my stay in Parliament I have appreciated the enormous support of all members of the Parliament House staff. I am proud to say that I did not at any time experience any bad feelings in the lengthy period I have been associated with a host of friendly and courteous personnel. It would be remiss of me if I did not make reference to my parliamentary colleagues during the time that I have had the pleasure of their advice and assistance, particularly during the 1974-77 period.

Finally, I would like to refer to the forthcoming elections. I will be delighted to return to this place as a visitor and enjoy the thrill of a Labor Government on the Treasury benches.

**Hon. W. D. LICKISS** (Moggill) (6.22 p.m.): After 26 years, I suppose one has mixed feelings at the time when one leaves the Parliament. In 1963, I entered Parliament as a very junior member with, I think, David Cory, Henry McKechnie—Peter's father—John Murray and Geoff Chinchin. I forget the names of the members of the Labor Party who entered Parliament at that time. I have seen many people come and go. The doyen or the father of the House, Sir William Knox, would have seen more than I did. However, being the next senior member of the House, I have seen a great deal of activity in this Parliament.

It is significant that, during my time as a member of this Parliament, there have been six Premiers. Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen served a record period as Premier in the history of Queensland. He also holds the record for having served for more years than any other member in the Parliament of Queensland.

I am told that since 1859 there have been some 890 members of Parliament who served in the Legislative Assembly. It must be borne in mind that Parliament first met in 1860. Of those 890 members, only about 33 served for more than 25 years. From what I can gather, I am about 26th on the list. It is interesting to note that, because of electoral uncertainty and the troubled times of Parliament, only about 30 per cent of

members of Parliament have been able to avail themselves of superannuation. I hope that the forthcoming election will meet the expectations and anticipations of all members of the House. Of course, we will not know the results until after the ballot-boxes are cleared.

I pay a special tribute to the Clerks of the Parliament and their assistant clerks at the table over the years for the help that they have given me, particularly when I was the Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker. They continue to serve Parliament very well indeed. Because of the calibre of the officers who have served at the centre table, honourable members have been very fortunate, and this Parliament has benefited.

I turn now to the Hansard reporters. One of the first things that I was told when I became a member of this House was, "You shouldn't really prepare speeches. Don't be worried, because if you don't do as well as you think you do, you will be quite pleased to see the *Hansard* the next day." For the contributions that they have made to my speeches I thank them very sincerely.

I thank also the dining room staff for the pleasantness and assistance that they have always shown. The office staff have always been helpful. As mentioned by my leader, the travel staff have been helpful, too. I thank Ted Newton for the pain and frustration that he must face when trying to meet our travel commitments, particularly under today's arduous conditions. I thank also my electorate secretary, Mrs Beveridge, and, for their tolerance over the years, I thank my family and my wife whom I hope to see more of in the future.

Parliament is a wonderful institution. It is what you make of it. Those who abuse the institution of Parliament are the net losers. I wish all honourable members the very best in the future.

**Mr DAVIS (Brisbane Central) (6.26 p.m.):** In the past when valedictory speeches were made there was nothing worse than listening to some old "B" talking for about 40 minutes and holding up the proceedings while everybody wanted to go and have that big meal. I have decided to cut out all the crap and all the tripe and say a few words of thanks. Because I am an emotional sort of person I do not want to go too far in case I end up spluttering and breaking down.

My predecessor, Johnno Mann, was a great stalwart of the community and an uplifting sort of personality. When asked about his role as a parliamentarian he said, "It was the best bloody job I ever had."

I have been a member of this House since 1969. When I leave this Chamber, the only member left to show the flag of the 16 who came into the House at that time will be my old mate Ed Casey. Since then there was only one short period of three years when I was not a member of this House because there was a slight difference of opinion with the electorate. During my time as a member of this House I have seen a huge number of personnel come and go.

**Mr R. J. Gibbs:** I got you on the ticket to get you back in.

**Mr DAVIS:** That is right. I thank the honourable member for that. I also thank my mate Bill D'Arcy, who was on that same ticket.

Job security in this House cannot be depended upon. It might be appropriate if, after I leave the House tonight, Mr Speaker comes forward with a gold watch and chain.

Over the years there have been some disappointments. I suppose that one of the biggest disappointments was that, this year, we did not have a garden party. That is one of the things that I will miss the most. Those social functions were one of Brisbane's leading lights. The garden parties that were held in the grounds of Parliament House and Government House were magnificent.

**Mr Casey:** Don't forget Miss Glennie's hat.

**Mr DAVIS:** And Miss Glennie's hat, of course.



I take this opportunity to thank those people with whom I have been associated for many years. Mr Speaker, you are one of six Speakers with whom I have served. I must admit that you have not sent me from the Chamber. In the early days I had many differences of opinion with Speakers who did not seem to know Standing Orders. We had to educate a couple of them. In fact, I used to clash with one of my colleagues who is leaving the House tonight, namely, Bill Lickiss, when he was Chairman of Committees.

This Parliament should think about arranging more of those overseas trips. I learnt many good things from those educational overseas tours.

To my parliamentary colleagues—I think they are a great mob of people. I realise that, because I was the Opposition Whip, at times we may have had slight differences of opinion.

**Mr Scott:** Digger, who is going to continue those little drawings that you used to amuse us with? Are you going to arrange for someone to do that?

**Mr DAVIS:** I will not own up to anything like that.

I also thank my electorate secretary, Josie Rosa. She has been with me for 10 years. She will be leaving in a couple of weeks' time. She has been a marvellous support and help.

I would also like to thank——

**Mr Milliner:** Jeannie.

**Mr DAVIS:** No, she is coming later.

I also thank my co-Whips, Tony FitzGerald, Len and Tom, because they have been great people to work with. We have had no trouble.

I also thank the former Leader of the House, Brian Austin. I found Brian very easy to work with. We might have clashed a few times before he was Leader of the House. I also found that he was a great person——

**Mr Austin:** You got a car; what are you talking about?

**Mr DAVIS:** No more! That is the trouble with people. You try to give them a bit of a cream puff and what do they hit you with? A brick! I had three more pages of comments about Brian Austin. He is finished.

The other members who are retiring with me—Les, Bob and Dave—have been great mates. Dave Underwood, who is not in the Chamber now, dropped in earlier to say farewell to us all.

My old mate up the back, Norm Lee, was another member who was on an overseas trip with me. The overseas trips with other members to undertake studies of the different parliamentary systems on the other side of the world have been very good.

I think it was Woody Allen who described politicians as being on the social list of occupations one step above child-molesters.

The families of politicians have had to put up with a lot over the years. In my case, I say thanks to my two sons, Mark and Rex, who were born and raised in politics. I thank Jean for all her work and support over the years.

I think there is also another saying that not all the brains are on one side of the House. When I first came here I believed they were only on one side of the House; but after a while I got to know some of the people. I will not go overboard on this, because everyone saw what happened when I went overboard before and gave credit and praise.

I suppose this country is different from a lot of other countries in that at least we can argue with our colleagues on the other side of the House. We can fight, we can debate, but at least we do not have to go to the gun.

Over the years I have criticised my country friends and I have said that they have had certain manure under their feet and so forth. Even though I came from the country,

I have criticised it. I will end on the note that I have used over the years and which honourable members know so well—moooo!

**Hon. N. E. LEE (Yeronga) (6.34 p.m.):** That is a pretty hard act to follow.

First of all, I apologise to everybody here. Had I known that my resignation would have caused such earth-shattering consequences, as it did yesterday when earthquakes occurred on the other side of the world, I certainly would not have resigned until today.

**Mr Scott:** Sallyanne is about.

**Mr LEE:** That is typical of the honourable member. He cannot keep his mouth shut at any time.

After 25 years as a member of Parliament, my decision was not easy. During that period I faced 12 elections. I would be foolish to say that I will not miss the Parliament. Although one whinges and whines about this place, one certainly makes a lot of good friends. During the time that I have been in politics, today is the only day on which I know where I am going. I know I will not be back. Many other honourable members do not know that; that is for sure. A hell of a lot of them do not know that they will not be back. But I do.

I believe that during my period in this place I have made many friends on both sides of the House, both those who have retired and also those who are still here—even some of the new, very young members who have been here for only two or three years.

It is said that it is not possible to make friends in politics, but I disagree with that. I believe that one can. One can see through a person's politics and trust him as a mate and travel with him overseas. When one goes on a trip with other members, that is when it is possible to realise just what they are like. I feel sure that when I come back to this place one day somebody will buy me a drink and say, "How are you, Norm?" I hope that is the case, anyhow.

I take this opportunity to thank both the library and the catering staff, and particularly the Hansard staff. I reckon today would have been a real doozey for them. It would have been a record day for them. I do not know how they will sort out the mess that occurred here today; I really do not. Nevertheless, they seem not only to be able to sort those things out but also to sort out speeches and put them into correct grammar. I thank them very much for all they have done. It has been a pleasure to read a speech after the Hansard staff have produced it.

I also thank the attendants and the press. I do not know what the press have done for me, but nevertheless I will thank them. I might need them some day.

I thank particularly my wife and family. They have to put up with a hell of a lot from a member of Parliament. I thank my electorate secretary, Crys Pinn and those before her. When I first became a member there was no such thing as an electorate secretary. A member's wife was his electorate secretary. I have watched things change over 25 years.

Quite often we hear the new members complain that things are a bit tough and hard; but with all the mod cons and electorate secretaries, I think they get it a hell of a lot easier than we used to.

As I say, I thank very much indeed those who have given me the friendship that they have. I wish them good luck in the election. I say to them: merry Christmas and good health.

**Mr SIMPSON (Cooroora) (6.38 p.m.):** This is an interesting occasion. When my wife and I decided that I should serve Queen and country and the people of this State by dedicating myself to democracy, I did not realise that Parliament had an element of humour. It is obvious that, despite the lateness of the hour, humour is very much a part of this Parliament.

I am very impressed by the Hansard staff. I will be even more impressed when I see how they spell one of the last words used by Mr Davis in his speech. I have no doubt that they will accomplish that task with their usual tremendous degree of skill. By recording the proceedings of Parliament, they provide an essential ingredient in Queensland's system of government.

I have been a member of this Parliament for 15 years and I have made a large number of friends. Later I hope to be able to spend a little bit more time with them than I have been able to spend with them in the past. Time is of the essence for people who represent electorates and it is difficult to keep in touch with friends.

I pay a tribute to my wife and family for the tremendous contribution and sacrifices they have made over the years. Members of the public do not always understand or recognise the role that members' wives and families play. I am pleased that the Minister for Education is present in the Chamber because often people do not show the proper respect for the parliamentary system and members of Parliament that they should show if democracy is to survive and flourish. An understanding of Parliament has to be sold to the public. It has to be packaged as an essential part of that rare system of government in this world, the Westminster system.

I also take this opportunity to thank the staff who perform work inside and outside the Parliament's buildings. I compliment the gardeners especially who have worked to make this Parliament what I regard as the best of all those that I have visited or have any knowledge of. Some honourable members probably do not realise that this place has character and volatility. Although at times I am sure Mr Speaker feels that the volatility is hard to contain, I point out that in some Parliaments no-one interjects; and when members are called on to speak, they speak for only five minutes. Those Parliaments are not spontaneous or volatile but I believe that the Queensland Parliament is. Those characteristics are very delicate and must be preserved.

This Parliament has one Chamber. At some time in the future, people may consider the suggestion of returning to a two-Chamber system worthy of earnest consideration. Irrespective of the number of Chambers, the Parliament will work only when a team effort is being made by everyone from the catering staff or the library staff through to the Ministers.

Earlier Norm Lee mentioned that electorate secretaries are a fairly recent innovation. They are essential and, in terms of providing services to the electorate, they do 85 per cent of the work. People talk about the provision of extra electorate staff, but I believe that if extra staff were provided, members would tend to distance themselves from the people they represent. Honourable members should bear in mind that they are representatives of the people and that they come to this Parliament to make the rules that will provide good government for the people they represent.

One of the memories about this place that I will cherish is the Christian breakfast that has been held without miss for 13 years. It is my earnest prayer that they continue and that all political parties continue to be represented at them. It must be realised that Queensland's system of government and Queensland courts of law are based on Christian ethics. In the hurly-burly of debate, that matter tends to be overlooked. It is important to remember that fact, especially in the light of the other Governments and various religions that hold sway in other parts of the world. I believe that if Christian ethics are not cherished in a democracy, the nation runs the risk of being much worse off.

On that note, I will conclude by wishing everyone a blessed Christmas. I ask honourable members to preserve this wonderful tradition of the Westminster system of government for Queensland. Thanks for having me here with you.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, let me join with you in thanking the staff very sincerely and congratulating them on the work that they have done over the past three years. I have invited them all to the function that will be held in a few moments. I am sure that all honourable members will wish to thank them personally.

The last three years will provide honourable members with many memories. I am sure that the way historians will record it will bring a smile to the faces of many honourable members who will say, "We were there. That's not quite what happened." At least we will be able to smile about it.

I wish all honourable members the very best for the near future and also for the long-term future. It is now my pleasure to invite everyone to join me in a few drinks in the function rooms.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.45 p.m.

#### BILLS ASSENTED TO AT CLOSE OF SESSION

The following Bills, having been passed by the Legislative Assembly and presented for the Royal assent, were assented to in the name of Her Majesty on the dates indicated—

(25 October 1989)—

Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill;  
University of Queensland Act Amendment Bill;  
Statute Law (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill;  
University of Queensland and Queensland Agricultural College Amalgamation Bill;  
Griffith University and Brisbane College of Advanced Education (Mount Gravatt Campus) Amalgamation Bill;  
Electoral and Administrative Review Bill;  
Stock Act and Local Government Act Amendment Bill;  
Primary Producers' Co-operative Associations Act Amendment Bill;  
Trust (Reserve 1030) Variation Bill;  
Mineral Resources Bill.

(31 October 1989)—

Criminal Justice Bill;  
Water Resources Bill;  
Wivenhoe Dam and Hydro-electric Works Act Amendment Bill;  
Sanctuary Cove Resort Act Amendment Bill;  
Surveyors Act Amendment Bill;  
Children's Services Act and Another Act Amendment Bill;  
Retail Shop Leases Act Amendment Bill;  
Fire Service Bill.

## DISSOLUTION

On 2 November 1989 the following Proclamation was issued by His Excellency the Governor—

A PROCLAMATION By His Excellency the Honourable Sir Walter Benjamin Campbell, Companion of the Order of Australia, one of Her Majesty's Counsel learned in the law, Governor in and over the State of Queensland in the Commonwealth of Australia.

[L.S.]

W. B. CAMPBELL,  
*Governor.*

In pursuance of the power and authority vested in me as Governor of the State aforesaid, I, Sir Walter Benjamin Campbell, do, by this my Proclamation, Dissolve the Legislative Assembly of Queensland.

Given under my Hand and Seal at Government House, Brisbane, this second day of November, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and eighty-nine, and in the thirty-eighth year of her Majesty's reign.

By Command,

RUSSELL COOPER

God Save the Queen!