



Speech by

CHRIS FOLEY

Member for MARYBOROUGH

Hansard 29 October 2003

PRIMARY INDUSTRIES AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Mr CHRIS FOLEY (Maryborough—Ind) (9.45 p.m.): I, like many other members of this House, have had significant amounts of correspondence from constituents and other Queenslanders on the issue of raw milk. I am not a drinker of raw milk, but I am very concerned that we do not live in a police state where people—

A government member interjected.

Mrs Pratt: That is unparliamentary. Why doesn't he withdraw?

Mr CHRIS FOLEY: Yes, I think that was unparliamentary as well.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McNamara): Order! I am sorry; I did not actually hear it.

Mr CHRIS FOLEY: I think the member for Logan—

Mrs Pratt: The member next to him.

Mr CHRIS FOLEY: The member next to him was casting personal aspersions regarding my diet.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I did not hear the member for Logan say anything. He is usually very hard to miss.

Mr CHRIS FOLEY: I ask that that comment be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I did not hear the member for Logan say a word.

Mr CHRIS FOLEY: I think it may have been the member for Southport, not Logan. I apologise to the member for Logan.

Mr MICKEL: I rise to a point of order. I have been maligned by the member for Maryborough. I seek protection from you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for this maligning of my character.

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

Mr LAWLOR: I am happy to withdraw.

Mr CHRIS FOLEY: Clearly, lots of other nasties are freely available for purchase in Queensland other than raw milk. My wife is a pathology scientist who has worked for Sullivan Nicolaides for 20 years, and one thing that I have learnt about science is that you can make scientific research say whatever you wish it to prove. I am not here tonight to discuss the pros and cons of raw milk products as against pasteurised milk products, but they do have a bearing on the consideration of the above amendment bill.

The member for Gladstone talked about the present loophole practice of labelling raw milk products such as bath milk, body butter and face cream marked 'not intended for human consumption' and the fact that that gives the well-informed consumer the right to exercise their rightful freedom of choice, keeping them healthy and out of the overburdened health system. Raw butter, milk and cream have successfully treated the following health problems: oedema, obesity, allergies, high blood pressure, psoriasis, diabetes, disease of the prostate gland, urinary tract infection, heart and kidney disease, hardening of the arteries, neurasthenia, arthritis, gastric and duodenal ulcers, and muscle cramps during pregnancy.

The well-documented problems associated with pasteurised milk which have been known for a long time—and these are on the other side—are that pasteurisation destroys the germicidal properties

of milk and bacteria also multiplies more rapidly in pasteurised milk than in raw milk. Pasteurisation also destroys the many enzymes that promote digestion and assimilation of the abundant nutrients in raw milk. A number of studies have pointed to widespread systems of calcium deficiency among people in the USA, yet Americans are amongst the highest consumers of milk and milk products in the world.

Up to 66 per cent of vitamins A and E are destroyed by pasteurisation. Some 38 to 80 per cent of vitamins B and C are also destroyed. The destruction of vitamin C usually exceeds 50 per cent. Most minerals cannot be absorbed because of the destruction of enzymes. Some 38 or more food factors are changed or destroyed, including proteins and hormones. Fats are also altered by pasteurisation as well as the whole protein complex, which is rendered less available for tissue repair and rebuilding. Pasteurised milk products cause atheroma and can raise blood cholesterol, where raw milk usually does not.

Suffice it to say that there is scientific evidence on both sides of the plate regarding this issue. Again I say that I am not particularly an advocate either way, nor am I a scientific expert on these matters. However, I believe that freedom of choice is essential in this particular area. Things like the physical damage that milk suffers through pumping, travelling in 30,000 litre tankers, pasteurising, homogenising, ultra heat treating, fortifying and modifying virtually treats a fragile food as if it were an industrial chemical. No credence is given to the presence of a myriad of essential nutrients that are as yet undiscovered by science.

I ask the minister why it is that McDonald's and other food chains can sell such life quenching foods legally but people are unable to obtain such life enriching foods as raw milk—if they really believe that is true, and I do not want to debate the science either way? One constituent who wrote to me asked whether that meant she had to take up bootlegging vitamin rich and healing foods on dark roads and behind closed doors.

My concern is purely the freedom of choice. I am not against setting standards for the quality control of raw milk. I want to make that clear for the record. But I think it is a touch ironic that the Labor Party prides itself on civil liberties to the point that it insists that people have the right to burn the flag but not to buy raw milk. I call on the minister to allow people, especially those who have compelling health reasons, to buy raw milk. If people have the right to skydive, race motor cars and engage in other dangerous activities, surely they should have the right to choose what milk they drink.