Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 30 MAY 1989

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

QUEENSLAND

Parliamentary Debates

[HANSARD]

Legislative Assembly

SECOND SESSION OF THE FORTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT
Continued

TUESDAY, 30 MAY 1989

Under the provisions of the motion for the special adjournment agreed to by the House on 20 April 1989, the House met at 10 a.m.

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. L. W. Powell, Isis) read prayers and took the chair.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Assent to the following Bills reported by Mr Speaker—

Public Works Committee Bill;

South Bank Corporation Bill;

Coal Mining Act and Another Act Amendment Bill;

Coal and Oil Shale Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment Bill;

Drugs Misuse Act Amendment Bill;

Intellectually Handicapped Citizens Act Amendment Bill;

Stamp Act Amendment Bill;

Parliamentary Members' Salaries Act Amendment Bill;

Education (General Provisions) Bill;

Liquor Act Amendment Bill;
Acts Interpretation Act and Another Act Amendment Bill;
Wheat Pool Act and Another Act Amendment Bill;
Toowong Railway Station Development Project Act Amendment Bill;
Supreme Court Acts Amendment Bill;
Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act and Another Act Amendment Bill;
Sugar Acquisition Act Amendment Bill;
Superannuation Acts Amendment Bill;
Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act Amendment Bill;
Police Act Amendment Bill;
Parliamentary Contributory Superannuation Act Amendment Bill;
Mobile Homes Bill;
Local Government Superannuation Act Amendment Bill;
Mental Health Services Act and Another Act Amendment Bill;
Land Tax (Adjustment) Bill;
Judges' Salaries and Pensions Act Amendment Bill;
Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Bill;
Harbours Act and Other Acts Amendment Bill;
Fishing Industry Organization and Marketing Act and Other Acts Amendment Bill;
Domestic Violence (Family Protection) Bill;
Farm Water Supplies Assistance Act and Another Act Amendment Bill;
District Courts Act and Other Acts Amendment Bill;
Dairy Industry Bill;
Bail Act and Other Acts Amendment Bill;
Workplace Health and Safety Bill;
Railways Act Amendment Bill;
Universities and Colleges of Advanced Education Bill;
Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Bill.

MERTHYR BY-ELECTION

Return of Writ

Mr SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that the writ issued by me on 20 April 1989 for the election of a member to serve in the Legislative Assembly for the electoral district of Merthyr has been returned to me with a certificate endorsed thereon by the returning officer of the election, on 13 May 1989, of Santo Santoro, Esquire, to serve as such member.

Member Sworn

Mr Santoro was introduced, took the oath of allegiance, and subscribed the roll.

PARLIAMENTARY JUDGES COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

First Report

Mr SPEAKER: I wish to advise the House that the following report was ordered to be printed and circulated during the recess in accordance with section 29A of the Acts Interpretation Act 1954-1989, and I now lay upon the table of the House a copy

of the first report of the Parliamentary Judges Commission of Inquiry concerning His Honour Mr Justice Angelo Vasta, and accompanying documents.

Honourable members, there are eight boxes of accompanying documents; these may be inspected by contacting the Bills and Papers officer in the table office.

Whereupon the documents were laid on the table.

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

Death of Mr T. W. Rasey

Hon. M. J. AHERN (Landsborough—Premier and Treasurer and Minister for State Development and the Arts) (10.12 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"1. That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the services rendered to this State by the late Thomas William Rasey, a former member of the Parliament of Queensland.

2. That Mr Speaker be requested to convey to the family of the deceased gentleman the above resolution, together with an expression of the sympathy and sorrow of the members of the Parliament of Queensland in the loss they have sustained."

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members are reminded that this is a condolence motion.

Mr AHERN: Thomas William Rasey was a member of this House for seven years. He entered Parliament as the ALP member for Windsor in April 1950 in the Government led by Ned Hanlon and held that seat until the 1957 State election when the first Government of Sir Francis Nicklin came to power.

Tom Rasey was in the classic pattern of Labor parliamentarians of his era, with seven years of service to the public as an Opposition alderman of the Brisbane City Council before winning endorsement for a State seat. As a former truck-driver, insurance clerk, station hand, drover and trade union delegate, he had first-hand knowledge of the problems of the average man. Undoubtedly that experience of hard times developed the sympathy and understanding for which I am informed he was noted in his electorate and in this House.

In his day he was a first-class sportsman and prominent Rugby League footballer who twice represented Brisbane. Off the field, he served on the National Fitness Council for 27 years, including nine years as deputy chairman.

Political history shows Tom Rasey to have been a man of courage and conviction, because he stood firm with Premier Gair in refusing to be dictated to by the Trades Hall over the question of three weeks' annual leave that brought down the Gair Government. He paid the penalty for his principle but retained his dignity and self-respect. That is a matter that I am sure will be of comfort to his surviving relatives to whom I extend my sympathy and that of my Government.

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier and Minister for Public Works, Housing and Main Roads) (10.15 a.m.): I wish to second this motion of condolence to the relatives of the late Thomas William Rasey, a former member of this House.

Regardless of the political persuasions of the members who serve here, it is fitting that their contribution be recognised in this way because to serve in Parliament is to devote a large part of one's life to the public.

Thomas William Rasey devoted a large part of his life towards helping, firstly, his fellow workers in the Transport Workers Union, rising to become not only its president, but also State delegate to the union's federal council. He went on to serve as a Brisbane

City Council alderman, being the Australian Labor Party's leader in the council in the seven years to 1949. From there, in April 1950, he went on to be elected as the member for Windsor, serving in that position until he was defeated in 1957. So for more than 30 years of his life Thomas Rasey was involved in public life as a union official and politician.

Born in 1898 in Brisbane, he joined up with the 1st AIF in 1916, serving as a signaller with the 52nd and 42nd battalions until becoming a battle casualty in 1918. After the war, he went to work on cattle stations and droving before moving into truck-driving in the 1920s.

It was during that time that he was able to pursue one of his chief sporting interests, Rugby League football, where he played for Valleys and went on to represent Brisbane in 1923 and 1929. His interest in sport and the community was reflected later in life when he served as a member and deputy chairman of the National Fitness Council and president of the Windsor RSL.

I have only canvassed briefly the various key parts of the late Mr Rasey's life, but there can be no doubt that he was a man who put a lot into his life and, in return, had the opportunity to serve his community in several different ways. His record of service indicates that he did this to the best of his ability, which is as much as can be asked of any person in public life.

I join with the Premier in expressing to his family, relatives and friends my sympathy and condolences on his recent passing.

Mr GOSS (Logan—Leader of the Opposition) (10.17 a.m.): On behalf of the parliamentary Labor Party I join in speaking to this motion of condolence concerning Thomas Rasey, a former Labor member of this Parliament.

Mr Rasey, of course, served during another era of politics in Queensland and I personally did not know him, nor know of him, but there are those people in the Labor Party, to whom I have spoken, who remember Mr Rasey well. He was a member of a Labor Government when it last held office, representing the Windsor electorate, which is now represented by my colleague Mr Comben. Mr Rasey was the member from 1950 to 1957.

Mr Rasey rose to be a prominent member of the Labor Party in Queensland, serving not only in this House but also in the Brisbane City Council, as honourable members have heard, where he was leader for a time in the 1940s. He was a member of the Queensland Central Executive of the Labor Party and also the very influential inner executive of the Labor Party between 1944 and 1953.

Mr Rasey was a transport worker by occupation, and after two years' work as a drover on a cattle station, he gave active service during World War I. He was also a leading member of the Transport Workers Union of Queensland, which included terms as vice president and president of that union. As honourable members have already heard, outside politics Mr Rasey had a long association with the National Fitness Council and he was a prominent and successful sportsman as well, playing with the Valleys club and representing Brisbane on two occasions.

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (10.19 a.m.): Members of the parliamentary Liberal Party wish to be associated with the message of sympathy and condolence to the family of Thomas Rasey. I will not recapitulate his significant contribution in public life and to the community generally. He is remembered by one of my team. He had a reputation for great involvement in his electorate and in the community generally. On behalf of the parliamentary Liberal Party, I pay tribute to that service and express sympathy to Mr Rasey's family.

Mr COMBEN (Windsor) (10.20 a.m.): Tom Rasey was declared elected for the seat of Windsor on the day that I was born. He was a locally active and a popular member. At the time of his death recently a number of the older residents of Windsor came to me and remarked on their memory of Tom Rasey.

My parliamentary leader and others have outlined the bones of Tom's career and I will not delay the House by covering that ground again. However, I would like to say a few words about Tom as a local member. In Tom's day as the member for Windsor the seat stretched several kilometres north of its present boundaries into Chermside, Wavell Heights and Stafford. Tom was an archetypal local politician covering that area. He was always assisting local people and especially war widows with his activities concerning the local RSL club. He was a man who apparently willingly put his hand into his pocket. He was a man who had few assets, yet he was there in times of need. At least two of the people in my area to whom I have spoken can remember his own kindness to their families.

Tom's area in the early 1950s was a rapidly expanding area, with Stafford known as Nappy Valley. At that time Windsor school had an enrolment of 1 200, Wilston school had an enrolment of 1 100 and Wooloowin school had an enrolment of 1 000. Now each of those schools has an enrolment of about 300. That shows the difference in the type of area that Tom represented from that which I represent today. But all the problems of newly developed suburbs abounded in those times. Tom was active in the Windsor School of Arts and Progress Association as well as the Newmarket/Grange Progress Association—an activity in which I still follow him. Tom's memorial in the local area is the Kedron State High School. He acted long and hard to achieve the location of that high school. He had fights with the local alderman, Tom Prendergast, about what the use of that land should be.

Tom campaigned for many years with a soap-box and a good set of lungs. In those days of no television he even attracted audiences to street-corner meetings at 7 o'clock at night. At the end of his career and at the end of his time in this House, Tom expressed regret that TV had taken away his street-corner audiences and that times had changed. Those days were the times of megaphones and non-electronic media. During his later years in this House Tom supported the industrial groups and went a different way from that which most members on this side of the House would today go.

I only ever met Tom on two occasions. Both of those occasions were during the time when he was a resident of the Caboolture War Veterans' Home. At the age of 90 years he was a bright and active man and still a large man. He was able to recall events that are of only an historical nature to me. He was especially proud of his support for the Hanlon Labor Government, and his speech in seconding the Address in Reply in this House in 1950 is full of that admiration.

Tom was nursed in his later life by his wife Aileen, who did an excellent job. I have pleasure in expressing my own personal support and that of my wife and the ALP members of Windsor and the people of Windsor for this motion of condolence today.

Mrs NELSON (Aspley) (10.22 a.m.): I wish to join in speaking to the motion of condolence concerning Thomas Rasey. Thomas Rasey, or Tom as he was known, was one of my father's oldest and closest friends. I grew up close to where he lived, and he represented our family in the council and then in the Parliament.

He and my father went to war together and they played sport together. He represented Brisbane in Rugby League and my father played football with him. My father, who played for Valleys, went on to represent Australia twice in Rugby League. They were the greatest of mates, and the mateship that came from the first war began this nation's legend.

I believe that Tom Rasey deserves to be remembered today for the happy, strong, vocal man that he was. I was a very small child when my father died, but I can still remember the great support and friendship that Tom and his wife offered to my mother. I can still remember growing up with his friendship and support. He was a very fine man—a man I regarded with great affection. He and my father had many political debates. At that time they were both Labor men. In 1949 my father chose to support the Liberals, and that caused some strain on their friendship. However, their friendship

went back so many years that it was not severed. I think that that was a mark of the man. In my view, he was a great man.

Tom Rasey represented a battling electorate and, as the member for Windsor pointed out, a rapidly expanding electorate. I was a student at the Wooloowin school when it had an enrolment of 1 000 students. I can remember there being 82 students in my class. I can also remember Mr Rasey coming around and shaking his head in disbelief at the size of the classes and the terrible strain under which the teachers were placed in those days. Tom Rasey was a happy man, a big man, a strong man and a very good member of Parliament. I offer his family my support and sympathy at this time and place on record in this Parliament my great respect for a good man.

Mr WHITE (Redcliffe) (10.25 a.m.): I would like to join in briefly in the motion of condolence. I met Tom Rasey about 30 years ago when he first came to the Redcliffe Peninsula. In those years, as some members in this Chamber would know, he had a great love and fondness for Rugby League. I think that it is fair to say the junior Rugby League and junior sport in particular on the Redcliffe Peninsula would not have developed the way it has without the input and support that Tom Rasey gave so unstintingly over those years. I know that so many of Tom's friends and relatives who came to love and respect him over those years are very sad at his passing. Even though Tom was not in public life in Redcliffe during those years, he made a substantial contribution, particularly in the charity area, especially in his work within the church. Tom was one of those guys whom a person could ring and say, "Somebody has a problem, Tom. Can you do something to help?", and Tom would always be there.

In latter years, because of his severe arthritic condition, Tom had not been in good health. However, he always made a special effort to get out. There was nobody happier than Tom. Perhaps I could put it this way: Tom was happiest when he was sitting on the sideline watching a group of young kids playing sport. That was Tom Rasey in many respects. I salute him today. On behalf of so many people at Redcliffe who were helped by him over the years, I join with the other members in this House in expressing condolence.

Motion agreed to, honourable members standing in silence.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table—

Orders in Council under—

Rural Training Schools Act 1965-1984 and

the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Regulations under—

Driving Training Centre Act 1981

Drugs Misuse Act 1986-1989

Public Service Management and Employment Act 1988

Consumer Affairs Act 1970-1989

Rules under the Police Act 1937-1988.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Australian Economy

Hon. M. J. AHERN (Landsborough—Premier and Treasurer and Minister for State Development and the Arts) (10.28 a.m.), by leave: While history will be made in this House shortly today on another matter, it may well be that in another place another tragic page will be written in the history of this nation's economic performance under Labor. If, as has been indicated, the New York credit-rating agency Moody's Investors

Services downgrades Australia's credit-rating from AA1 to AA2, Australia will move as a nation into the little league of New Zealand and some Third World countries. And, of course, it will not be lost on the world's financiers that both New Zealand—a country which has also suffered terrible economic disasters under a Labor Government—and Australia are prisoners of policies that are dictated by big unions.

My colleague the Finance Minister this week already has indicated that if Moody's further downgrades Australia to AA2, this will add an estimated $20m a year to Queensland's interest bill and about $150m to the nation's interest bill. Australia now has a Federal Treasurer who can do no more than promise us an unenviable choice between high interest rates or a recession. "Take it or leave it," he says to the home-owners of Australia.

At the same time, the Federal Government has moved to alter dramatically the basis for the State's public housing programs. What that means is that the Labor Government is ordering the people to rent, not to buy. That has now become the official policy of the Labor Party. It is an admission of failure on a massive scale, and it is an admission that will throw it out of office at the next Federal election.

The underlying reason for Australia's economic plight is the involvement of the big unions through the ACTU in the Federal economic policy decision-making process. There is a combination of big unions and big Government making deals which bear no relationship to productivity. The result is that the union members themselves are getting financially slaughtered in their homes. In fact, those very members are beginning to wake up to their union bosses.

As reported in today's *Australian Financial Review*, the Australian labour market has undergone a major shake-out during the Hawke era, with union membership falling by an estimated 9 per cent during the past six years. Those figures are seen as a demoralising blow for the ACTU and as a direct result of its unprecedented political and economic influence on the Hawke Labor Government.

I want to make it clear to the people of Queensland that during my recent visit to China and my visit to the UK and Europe earlier this year, overseas bankers were saying to me, "We would like to give Queensland a higher credit rating." They cannot, of course, because it is not done in international banking circles to formally recognise that an Australian State is more reliable as a customer than is the nation itself. But that is the situation which is generally recognised in the international market-place. In effect, they say, "Great State; shame about the national Government."

On the positive side—Queensland is doing more than its share to correct Australia's shocking balance of payments deficit. It is responsible for about 25 per cent of Australia's exports, and I can assure members that my visit to China and the signing of the sister State relationship with Shanghai will boost that level of exports.

Queensland is now well placed to pursue major export contracts in coal, grain, rice, sugar and other products in addition to exporting its technology and expertise. Already the deals are being set up, and there will be major tangible results. But let us face it: all those efforts will be to no avail until Labor throws the big unions out of the policy-making process. Australia will continue to slide down the international rating scale until the ACTU is thrown out of its assumed place on the Federal Treasury benches.

Let me look at Labor's performance—if it can be called that—since 1983. There have been huge increases in home loan interest rates, massive foreign debts, record current account deficits, an internationally uncompetitive wages policy, excessively high inflation, a vulnerable currency, a new class of unemployed, falling living standards, stop-go economic growth and abysmal productivity levels, and a level of foreign debt under Labor which has grown from $35.5 billion in June 1983 to $121 billion last month.

The bottom line is that Labor cannot be trusted in Government. It cannot manage. It is a party ridden by factions and controlled by big unions, and the same applies to the Labor Party in Queensland.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Commonwealth/State Housing Agreement

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier and Minister for Public Works, Housing and Main Roads) (10.34 a.m.), by leave: I wish to inform this House of the position that currently exists in relation to the Federal Government's proposed new Commonwealth/State housing agreement.

Honourable members would be aware that at the recent Premiers Conference, the Commonwealth offered extra funding for housing but did not disclose at that time the horrendous strings that it proposed to attach to that arrangement. They have now come to light through a letter from the Federal Housing Minister, Mr Staples, and subsequent discussions between Federal officers and Queensland Housing Commission officers last week.

The situation that has been revealed is a centralist desire by the Labor Government to take over housing policies and priorities from the States. In the wake of that development, the Queensland Government is calling on the Prime Minister for an urgent conference of Federal and State Housing Ministers to renegotiate the proposed Commonwealth/State housing agreement. That proposed agreement, outlined in the wake of the Premiers Conference, contains a hidden agenda which was not made known to the Premiers at the time. If the proposed agreement was accepted and then maximised by the Commonwealth, the situation could well arise in which Canberra dictates what is to be built, where and for whom. There is no doubt that if the Premiers had been aware of the Commonwealth's proposed intrusion into State matters as part of the package, there would not have been the agreement claimed by the Commonwealth.

The proposed CSHA contains a bias away from home-ownership towards rental housing, a capacity for Federal veto of home-ownership schemes and proposed portability of public wait-lists which would disadvantage Queenslanders.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr GUNN: I point out that the Commonwealth Government is supported by the honourable member for Lytton.

The net effect of those proposals is to convert the CSHA—an agreement which is not due to expire until 1994—into a document which transfers total decision-making power on public housing to the Commonwealth. It is a totally centralist concept which flies in the face of federalism and States' rights and cannot be accepted in its present form by the State.

Under the proposed scheme, Queensland would receive an extra $65m for housing over the next three years. We believe that the extra funding is warranted, and Queensland is willing to fulfil its matching obligation under the proposed scheme, but the strings attached are totally unacceptable. Informal contact with housing authorities in other States—and not the Labor States, I might say—indicated that Queensland is not alone in this regard.

Because the Commonwealth has proposed that the new agreement operate from 1 July this year, there is an urgent need to sort out this matter quickly. In other words, the Commonwealth is trying to bulldoze its way into it. In addition to being able to veto home-ownership schemes offered by the State, the Federal proposal would mean that all Commonwealth untied housing funds plus at least one-half of related State matching funds would have to be directed to construction of rental housing.

Under the current agreement, the State Minister decides the allocation of funds between rental and home-ownership. The only proviso is that at least 50 per cent of expenditure must be on rental. My Government has no qualms about that. Currently, State Loan Council funds nominated for housing are used in Queensland for home-ownership lending. Because they will become part of Commonwealth untied funds which

must be used for rental housing under this proposal, those will no longer be available. Portability of public housing wait times between States would only disadvantage Queensland and other States with short wait-lists. There is no way that my Government could allow someone with, say, two years' waiting time behind him to transfer his application to Queensland and jump the queue of local residents.

Queensland is already getting plenty of applications through normal interstate migration. For example, in a two-hour period yesterday afternoon the QHC received nine applications from interstate people. Queensland's wait list of 11 900 is small compared with those of New South Wales, South Australia and Victoria, which range from 86 000 to 33 000. Such a proposal would only provide an incentive for States to encourage their clients—financially or otherwise—to move elsewhere.

Queensland will be writing to the Prime Minister to seek an urgent meeting of Federal and State Housing Ministers. In view of the damage that record high interest rates are inflicting on hundreds of thousands of Australians, I believe that it would be in the Federal Government's best interests to agree to its request.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Effect of Federal Government Decision to Deregulate Grain Industry

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Primary Industries) (10.39 a.m.), by leave: There are a number of very serious consequences which must impact on Queensland primary producers as a result of the obsession which the Commonwealth Labor Government has developed for deregulation, apparently at any cost. In the case of the grain industry, I have identified a number of consequences which could flow from the implementation of the Commonwealth Government's deregulation proposals. The removal of the exclusive handling powers of Bulk Grains Queensland in regard to export grain could result in a loss of throughput to Bulk Grains Queensland of some 300 000 to 500 000 tonnes per annum.

Mr Davis: You are making it up as you go along.

Mr HARPER: That would be primarily at the port of Brisbane. I know the honourable member is leaving the Parliament, but the port of Brisbane is important to him and it seems to me that he should have concern for the waterside workers who will be dispossessed of employment if this action of the Federal Government continues.

However, it will also lead to a revenue loss to Bulk Grains Queensland of between $6m and $8m annually. Also, of course, the deregulation of rail transport arrangements could result in increased road maintenance costs of up to at least $4m per annum. However, much larger up-front amounts would be required if road pavements should break up because of the additional loading or if traffic congestion problems require earlier duplication of certain individual road sections. These costs will fall to both the State Government and local authorities.

Based on a potential leakage of some 600 000 tonnes from rail to road, a potential revenue loss of up to $9m would also accrue to Queensland Railways. In the order of 60 additional semitrailers will also be required to handle the increased tonnage of grain travelling by road, both to domestic markets and to port. Of course, this could be much greater during peak periods, and when imposed on existing commercial vehicle volumes, the effect of these additional grain trucks on individual roads will be to cause convoys of semitrailers, delays to motorists and road safety problems from unsafe overtaking manoeuvres.

The cost of upgrading and duplicating principal local feeder roads and trunk routes from country storage to the ports is yet to be quantified, but would most likely be in excess of some $200m. Because of the imposition of these additional traffic volumes, there will also be congestion problems within urban areas. Based on accident rates quoted

at the National Road Freight Industry Inquiry of 1984, these extra vehicles could result in an increase of one or two fatalities and up to four injury accidents per annum.

The potential financial impact of the deregulation provision in the Commonwealth's Bill on Queensland's statutory storage, handling and transport authorities is obviously quite severe, notably the potential loss of rail revenue of up to $9m per annum, increased road maintenance costs of some $4m per annum and the enormous cost of up to $200m for upgrading and duplicating sections of the main highways from the grain belt to port. I cite as examples the Dawson, Warrego, Cunningham, D'Aguilar, Capricorn and Peak Downs highways, and probably others.

The potential revenue loss to Bulk Grains Queensland of some $6m to $8m per annum could result in significantly higher handling charges, which would have to be borne by growers who are also the collective owners of Bulk Grains Queensland. Although Bulk Grains Queensland is not owned by the Queensland Government, the Government has underwritten most of the external borrowings of that organisation and therefore has both a direct as well as an indirect interest in its future viability.

The Commonwealth Bill is currently again before the Senate and the final form of the legislation will not be known until the Senate has further considered the matter. It is ludicrous that, with the planting of wheat well under way in Queensland, with growers looking towards an early harvest, and with at last a reversal of adverse seasonal conditions, growers do not know at this late stage what the future wheat-marketing arrangements will be.

Mr Gunn: Shame!

Mr HARPER: As the Honourable the Deputy Premier says, shame!

Only recently has the Commonwealth Minister provided me with the draft of complementary State legislation which he would like to see enacted. Twelve months ago all of the State Ministers told the Federal Minister that they wanted to see what he was proposing. Only at this late stage—this month—has the Federal Minister provided that information to me as the responsible Queensland Minister. I have said consistently that, given the Commonwealth's approach, there is no need for complementary State legislation. This Ahern National Party Government will not succumb to the stand-over tactics of the Hawke Labor Government in its endeavours unilaterally—against the wishes of Governments and industry alike—to force the introduction of complementary State legislation at the whim of Canberra.

There is clearly a need for some form of interim arrangements to cover the 1989-90 crop season, which is already well under way in Queensland, as I have already said. I applaud the efforts of the State Wheat Board and the Australian Wheat Board in seeking to make arrangements for this crop and to bring some order to the chaos caused by the Commonwealth Government in Canberra. I have kept closely in touch with those moves and will continue to support a reasoned approach to reach at least an interim arrangement.

In the case of the sugar industry, the Queensland Government and the industry itself oppose abolition of the embargo and its replacement by a system of tariffs. It is a matter of record that the industry's wishes—all sectors of the industry, I might add—have been rejected by the Labor Party. Fortunately, a combination of the representations that I have made to the Federal Minister for Primary Industries and Energy, John Kerin, has at least produced a more rational approach to the question of tariffs. The Commonwealth has now agreed to a fixed rate of tariff which will be set at $115 per tonne on 1 July this year, phasing down to $70 per tonne on 1 July 1992. Nevertheless, that does not absolve the Commonwealth Government from its responsibility for having disrupted a stable industry—a stability that has benefited producer, miller and consumer over decades. It is the Commonwealth Labor Government that has disrupted that stability.

Certainly the change that Mr Kerin has now agreed to is an improvement on the original proposal, but it remains to be seen whether it will adequately protect the

Queensland sugar industry from the impact of corrupt international markets and the dumping of subsidised sugar, particularly by the EC. Be all that as it may, it has not allowed for or provided a framework by which the Australian sugar industry can retain the cohesion that it has enjoyed for seven or more decades. Already disruption that is being caused by a break-away small group of co-operative sugar-mill owners can be seen in New South Wales.

At the same time, the Commonwealth Government has shown scant regard for the adjustment measures that need to be taken to minimise the adverse consequences of change that affect primary producers. A case in point is the refusal of the Commonwealth Government—and you, Mr Speaker, would be well aware of these facts—to allow sugar milling adjustment committee assistance to be used to assist mill transport rationalisation costs. The Labor Government has rejected the sugar industry. It has reneged on its agreement to provide its share of funding in an area in which we, members of the Ahern National Party Government, have indicated agreement to contributing a share. The Labor Party in Canberra has reneged on its responsibility.

In the midst of this chaos, the people of Australia are faced with rising interest rates. Home loans are being pushed beyond the reach of ordinary Australians. Farming input costs are continually rising while returns to farmers continue to fall. In short, this economic situation caused by the Hawke Labor Government—obsessed by its ideology—is apparently supported by the Labor Party of this State. It is apparently unable or unwilling to understand, to address or to resolve this economic evil that has the ability to destroy our society. It is being ignored; or if it is not being ignored, then the Labor Party does not have the capacity to resolve the problem.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HARPER: Instead, the Labor Party has determined a course designed to weaken the very sector that has the ability to save the Australian economy—the primary-producing sector. This sector has been the very corner-stone of this nation's economy. The Ahern National Party Government will not desert its primary producers. We will not stand by and allow the Federal Government to disregard the wishes and the rights of Australia's rural community.

In all of this action, of course, Canberra is heading towards its target—the Labor Party's objective—of destroying State Government. What the Australian people have clearly rejected is sought by the Labor Party to be achieved by stealth—that is, a change to the Constitution. That will not be accepted by this Government; nor do I believe it will be accepted by other State Governments, particularly the Government in New South Wales.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Pecuniary Interest Statement of Member for Flinders

Hon. R. C. KATTER (Flinders—Minister for Community Services and Ethnic Affairs) (10.50 a.m.), by leave: I want to put right statements made in the media concerning a report on pecuniary interests from me. On 22 May——

Mr Scott: Which office-girl are you blaming?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Cook under Standing Order 123A.

Mr KATTER: On 22 May, I filled out a form along with other correspondence concerning my pecuniary interests. I was in transit in Western Australia, constantly travelling and doing a searching, first-hand trip of the Leucaena grazing cattle fattening and growing trials on the Ord—the biggest cattle-fattening operations in Australia. As well, I inspected some of the eight multimillion-dollar emu farms, tourist mines, of the

Aboriginal Development Corporation, the Western Australian Development Corporation and Exim. I was not, as it was reported, soul-searching. Naturally, I would need a lot more time to undertake that task.

I did not notice any time requirements on the forms I had to sign. I returned the forms along with other papers upon my return to Queensland. In respect of statements that my staff were to blame—though I seriously believe they were quite unintentional by the media—I point out that half of my staff in Brisbane work well after 7 or 8 o'clock every night that I am in Brisbane and most seem to be in the office by 8 a.m. Often senior staff work as long as I do and are regularly at the coal-face until well after midnight—that is male staff, of course. The youngest girl in my office could only be described as a treasure. My staff work under a Minister, 85 per cent of whose responsibilities are situated 1 000 kilometres from Brisbane. With no phones and light aircraft travel, communication is impossible.

The Government was given details of my pecuniary interests many months ago and the media have always been provided with such information. The forms were filled out last week and, if there was any fault, it most certainly was mine and not anyone else's. If any inconvenience or problems were created for the House and its staff, I take full responsibility and personally apologise.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Is there any other ministerial business?

Mr Davis: Yes, mine.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Brisbane Central under Standing Order 123A.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr WHITE (Redcliffe) (10.55 a.m.), by leave: Suggestions have been made by the Labor Party's shadow Minister for Justice, Mr Wells, that I, amongst others, should not seek to carry out my responsibilities as an elected member and should not therefore sit in this place to consider the report regarding the conduct of Mr Justice Vasta. It is this suggestion, combined with the deliberate attempts by the Australian Labor Party to misuse and distort the material before the Fitzgerald inquiry, that requires me to speak today.

Last year Don Lane, the former member for Merthyr, made certain serious allegations regarding a number of members and former members of this Parliament. Those allegations were notable for the following reasons: firstly, they were made in the broadest terms and were heavily qualified; and secondly, there was not one detail or particular allegation against myself or any other named person. Mr Lane gave no direct evidence of actual or, indeed, any impropriety or abuse of ministerial and other parliamentary expenses and cash advances by myself or any other person named.

The honourable member for Murrumba has now suggested that it is therefore inappropriate for me to sit in this House when the report regarding Mr Vasta is discussed. He has said that the people named should come clean and open their books. He has further suggested that I, amongst others, have not opened my books with respect to these matters.

Every step I have taken with respect to this matter has been taken with the view that the proper place to respond to these matters is before the Fitzgerald inquiry. I have refrained from taking other steps because of my belief in the absolute importance that the Fitzgerald inquiry report be received in an atmosphere free from politics. I am appalled that these allegations are dredged up time and again by the Labor Party merely for blatant political purposes. It is time to say, "Enough is enough." My position is this: I responded to the allegations made by Mr Lane in the proper way; I have gathered what evidence I can and put it before the inquiry; and I have opened my books--as the member for Murrumba would suggest—to the Fitzgerald inquiry and the Auditor-General. I can do no more.

I seek leave of the House to table the documents that I presented to the Fitzgerald inquiry and have them incorporated in *Hansard.* Included in those documents are statutory declarations of the former accountable officers in my department, that is the Under Secretary, Mr Peter Jones, my private secretary, Mr Joe Consoli, and the accountant responsible for the handling of those ministerial matters and cash advances, Mr Patrick Dempsey.

Leave granted.

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

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

SUBMISSION BY TERENCE ANTHONY WHITE

A. THE ALLEGATIONS

At pages 19674 to 19678—DONALD FRANCIS LANE gave evidence to the Commission regarding the expenditure of Ministerial cash advances.

This evidence was given in broad terms and was heavily qualified.

For example, at page 19677, line 30, Mr Lane said that "... if you're asking me to identify, using that example as the sort of thing the Commissioner would like me to get at, ask me to name a Minister and say yes, I know that he did that at a particular time, even within years, I would have to say I couldn't do that from my memory."

The particular allegations arose out of questioning which begins at page 19677, line 36.

"... I have had sufficient experience with Ministers to know that once they put the money in their wallet it was used in a general way which would have included, perhaps, that sort of example of entertainment—not the movies necessarily—but entertainment with people other than associated with their Ministry, yes."

The Commissioner: "Are you doing all of that speaking generally, or are you seeking to suggest that you can identify particular persons who you know did such a thing?"—"Well, let me say that I know from conversations with some Ministers over the last 17 years who would have used that sort of loose method of handling the money, if you like, and I could probably mention a few of them as a result of conversations I have had with them."

The Commissioner: "I think we have probably got to the stage Mr Foley was going to—is that correct?"

Mr Foley: "Yes."

By Mr Foley: "Who are those Ministers?"—"Starting back in the earlier years, perhaps, Mr Knox; Mr Campbell; the late Mr Herbert; Mr Lee; Mr Terry White, and to the more recent years, Mr Muntz; Mr Lester; I think Mr Turner, I'm almost sure Mr McKechnie."

B. WHY MR LANE'S ALLEGATION CONCERNING MR WHITE SHOULD NOT BE BELIEVED

(a) The evidence given by Mr Lane is very vague and heavily qualified.

(b) It has not been the subject of cross-examination (Mr Lane was excused before that opportunity arose).

(c) Mr Lane has given no direct evidence of actual or any impropriety or abuse of Ministerial and other Parliamentary expenses and cash advances by Mr White.

(d) It is not clear whether Mr Lane is saying that he had any conversation specifically with Mr White regarding the matters the subject of his allegations. Indeed, any such conversation is denied by Mr White.

(e) Mr Lane has at least two motives not to tell the truth. First, to establish that a widespread system of abuse of Ministerial and other Parliamentary expenses and cash advances was the ordinary course when he became a Minister, so that he may be able to argue an "honest claim of right" in the event that he is prosecuted;

Secondly, in order to explain income for which he is otherwise unable to account which might, without the establishment of that state of affairs (i.e., systematic abuse of expenses), suggest income from other illegal sources.

(f) Mr Lane appears to have taken an opportunity to settle old political scores. He was a member of the Parliamentary Liberal Party and a Coalition Minister when Terry White was the Parliamentary Leader of the party.

The 1983 election campaign was fought by the Liberal Party, and particularly Mr White, in support of honest, open and accountable government.

Mr Lane did not support Mr White and, immediately after the election, having been elected as a Liberal, Mr Lane defected to the National Party, retaining all of his Ministerial rights and privileges. Mr Lane's defection with Brian Austin created the majority whereby the National Party was able to govern in its own right.

In evidence to the Commission, White has stated his opinion that, had a coalition government been formed at the time, a condition of the Liberal Party joining such a coalition would have been the immediate institution of proper mechanisms to ensure Parliamentary accountability in the Executive government.

(g) There is no other evidence to suggest misuse of funds or, indeed, any impropriety whatsoever, by Terry White.

C. THE EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF TERRY WHITE

Mr White has put the following material before the Inquiry which, in our submission clearly establishes that he has never improperly used his Ministerial or other Parliamentary cash advances, whether as alleged by Mr Lane or at all:

(i) Statutory Declaration of Terrence Anthony White—Annexure A.

(ii) Statutory Declaration of Joseph Consoli—Annexure B.

(iii) Statutory Declaration of Peter Jones—Annexure C.

(iv) Statutory Declaration of Patrick Dempsey—Annexure D.

The Commission's attention is drawn to:—

* Paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of Mr White's Statutory Declaration;

* Paragraph 6 of Mr Jones' Statutory Declaration;

* Paragraphs 2 and 3 of Mr Consoli's Statutory Declaration:

* Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of Mr Dempsey's Statutory Declaration.

This material demonstrates that no doubts exist in the minds of Mr White's then-Departmental Officers. Those include the Accounts Officer responsible for the handling of Ministerial Cash Advances and Mr White's Private Secretary, who also accepted that responsibility.

The Commission will note that Mr White has invited the Commission and, indeed, the Auditor-General, to inspect any and all of his records and vouchers for expenditure to allow these serious allegations to be tested.

Mr White is a successful businessman, who is and was at all relevant and material times financially secure independently of his Parliamentary income.

SUMMARY

1. Mr White has never had the need or the motivation to misuse his Ministerial funds or Parliamentary allowances.
2. He is and has always been scrupulously honest in his dealings with such funds.
3. He has always ensured that such funds are properly accounted for.
4. Mr White's record in public life and in business is one of absolute integrity and, as the public record shows, he has been prepared to risk his political future by staunchly supporting honest, open and accountable government.
5. Mr White, when a Minister in the Bjelke-Petersen government crossed the floor of the Parliament to support the establishment of a Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee.
6. Mr White led the Liberal Party in the 1983 election campaign in which the Liberal Party campaigned for honest, open and accountable government.
7. Mr Lane has admitted serious criminal dishonesty.

   He has never supported the principle of an accountable executive government.

   He has misled the electors of Merthyr by running as a Liberal, and, upon his election as a Liberal, defecting to the National Party.

   The public record, comprising media reports and Hansard, shows that Mr Lane has taken every opportunity to attack Mr White and his credibility.

   Mr Lane is a proven cheat and a liar, and his evidence, flimsy as it is, should, in our respectful submission, be rejected by the Commission.

D. THE IMPORTANCE OF AN UNEQUIVOCAL EXCULPATORY FINDING BY THE COMMISSION IN FAVOUR OF MR WHITE

Mr White is the subject of hearsay evidence only. As a public figure and particularly as a Parliamentarian he is substantially damaged by the mere fact of allegations of impropriety or wrongdoing regardless of their truth or falsity.

Mere denial of such allegations by Statutory Declaration and even an appearance before the Commission is not enough to clear the names of people named before the Inquiry in the eyes of the media and the public.

There is constant press and political speculation as to whether the Inquiry is, as claimed by the Premier, going to "resolve" these allegations by finding for or against those whom the allegations are made.

It is our submission that the Inquiry MUST make specific findings regarding these matters.

Mr White is a former Minister, a former Leader of the Parliamentary Liberal Party, a man with an unblemished public record and a reputation for integrity.

The only reference by Mr Lane before the Inquiry to Mr White has been and will be used as a political weapon to shame, ridicule and discredit him unless the Commission deliberately makes a finding in Mr White's favour.

Mr White has always been at the forefront of the fight for accountability of the executive government and he is jealously proud of his reputation for honesty and integrity.

Public confidence in the Parliament and Parliamentarians has been severely shaken by the many revelations before the Commission of Inquiry. In our respectful submission, it is essential for the Commission to publicly reject the flimsy tainted evidence against Mr White.

QUEENSLAND

TO WIT

I, PETER JONES of 71 Denham Terrace, Wellers Hill, Brisbane in the State of Queensland, public servant, do solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:

1. During almost the complete time that TERRENCE ANTHONY WHITE was a Minister for the Crown in Queensland, I was the Permanent Head of his Department.
2. During that time I found Mr White to be a person who conducted his dealings with integrity and honesty.
3. I would not be aware of the day-to-day dealings in relation to Ministerial expenses. Such action would be undertaken direct by the Minister's staff with the Accounts Branch of the Department.
4. It would be the accepted practice for Ministers to use cash advances when needed for purposes of travel associated with his Ministerial duties.
5. On such occasions, it would again be the usual practice for any such advances to be handled by the Private Secretary or Press Secretary. The monies advanced would be accounted for on the return to Brisbane.
6. To the best of my knowledge and belief at no time did I receive any advice from the Accounts Branch of the Department that Mr White had not properly accounted for any monies advanced on his behalf.
7. Likewise, speaking of my personal knowledge of the character of Mr White, I would be sure that at no time would he have used any such advance for personal use.
8. I can also say that on account of the audit procedures in operation that to suggest Mr White had "a sort of loose method of handling" Ministerial cash advances would not be correct.

AND I MAKE this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the provisions of the Oaths Act 1867-1981.

SWORN AND DECLARED by the abovenamed Declarant at Brisbane this 8th day of February, 1989, before me:

P. JONES
(Signed)

L. LAKER JP
(Signed)
Justice of the Peace

QUEENSLAND

TO WIT

I, JOSEPH JOHN CONSOLI, of Brisbane in the State of Queensland, Manager of Property Services, Department of Family Services, do solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:

1. I was Private Secretary to TERRENCE ANTHONY WHITE, M.L.A., during his term as Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs.
2. It was accepted practice to draw cash advances for the Minister to undertake official trips, and to provide cash reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses. To my knowledge, the money was used for official purposes only, and properly accounted for in accordance with Departmental requirements at all times.
3. Mr White was highly respected in his position, and in my opinion always acted professionally and with propriety and probity in discharging his responsibilities as a Minister of the Crown.

AND I MAKE this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the provisions of the Oaths Act 1867-1981.

SWORN AND DECLARED by the abovenamed Declarant at Brisbane this First day of February, 1989, before me:

J. J. CONSOLI
(Signed)

L. LAKER JP
(Signed)
Justice of the Peace

QUEENSLAND

TO WIT

I, PATRICK NOEL DEMPSEY, of 11 Grant Street, Ashgrove, Brisbane in the State of Queensland, Accountant, do solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:

1. During the period that TERRENCE ANTHONY WHITE, M.L.A., was the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs, I was in charge of the Accounts Section of Mr White's Department.
2. In that capacity, I was responsible for the day-to-day dealings with the Minister's office in relation to Ministerial expenses and Ministerial cash advances.
3. To my knowledge, I can say that Mr White always accounted properly for any monies advanced on his behalf or to him and that at no time to my knowledge did Mr White use any such advances for personal use.
4. I have read the evidence of DONALD FRANCIS LANE before the Commission of Inquiry with respect to Mr White and can say that to suggest Mr White had a "loose method of handling" Ministerial cash advances would not be correct.
5. All such monies handled by Mr White or his staff were always properly accounted for, and I have no doubt that Mr White never acted improperly with respect to these monies.

AND I MAKE this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the provisions of the Oaths Act 1867-1981.

SWORN AND DECLARED by the abovenamed Declarant at Brisbane this 7th day of February, 1989, before me:

P. N. DEMPSEY
(Signed)

L. LAKER JP
(Signed)
Justice of the Peace

QUEENSLAND

TO WIT

I, TERRENCE ANTHONY WHITE of 272 Ridley Road, Bridgeman Downs in the State of Queensland, Member of the Legislative Assembly, do solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:

1. I refer to evidence given before the Inquiry by DONALD FRANCIS LANE, M.L.A., in which he referred to me and others with respect to ministerial cash advances.

2. I deny vehemently any inference that I, as a Minister of the Crown or in any other capacity, used public monies for private purposes.
3. I specifically deny that I used "a loose method" of handling ministerial cash advances in the sense referred to by Mr Lane in his evidence or at all.
4. I never knowingly applied or connived in the application of public monies for my own personal use or for the personal use of any person. On the occasions that I drew ministerial cash advances, such advances were drawn and managed by my private secretary or relevant department head. Those monies were, on all occasions, properly accounted for. I invite the Inquiry to inspect any and all of my records and vouchers for expenditure, which inspection will verify this statement.
5. Don Lane was a member of the Parliamentary Liberal Party during the time in which I was the Parliamentary Leader in an election campaign that was largely fought by the Liberal Party in support of honest, open and accountable government. This approach was not then supported by Mr Lane and immediately after the election, Mr Lane having been elected as a Liberal, defected to the National Party, thereby giving it the capacity to govern in its own right without the need to form a coalition.
6. Had a coalition government been formed at that time, it would only have been formed on a basis which included the establishment of proper mechanisms to ensure Parliamentary accountability of the Executive Government, including Ministers.
7. I believe that Mr Lane's evidence to the Commission, as far as I and certain other of his former Liberal colleagues are concerned, is nothing more than an attempt to settle old political scores.

AND I MAKE this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the provisions of the Oaths Act 1867-1981.

SWORN AND DECLARED by the abovenamed Declarant at Brisbane this 30th day of November, 1988, before me: T. WHITE

L. LAKER, J.P.
A Justice of the Peace

Mr WHITE: Finally, I will not lie down and ignore my responsibilities as a member of this House—and I suspect no-one else will—simply because of the smear campaign initiated by Mr Wells. To do so would set a precedent with real dangers for the institution of Parliament itself. The people who perpetuate this fraud—and that is what it is—by misusing the material, are no better than those who the Fitzgerald inquiry seeks to expose.

I ask: should each member disqualify himself or herself each time a passing reference is made—particularly when it is broad and in general terms—and when there is not one shred of detailed evidence, no date, no time and not one example of misuse? The answer is, "Of course not." To do so would weaken the very strength of this Parliament and allow unprincipled political operators to remove from this Parliament those members with whom they disagree simply by dredging up lies. Such an approach is not right and can never be right. The people of Queensland should realise that the Australian Labor Party is involved in a shabby, dirty and low attempt to mislead them and politicise the Fitzgerald inquiry.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (10.59 a.m.), by leave: In regard to matters raised in public last week-end and again today by the honourable member for Murrumba when he suggested that I, amongst others, am not fit to sit in this House to debate and vote, I wish to make it clear that on 16 November 1988 I made a personal explanation to this House concerning matters raised in the Fitzgerald inquiry which I do not intend to repeat. I have provided the Fitzgerald inquiry with all the information it required, plus information that I thought the inquiry should have. There is nothing that has occurred either inside or outside that inquiry to suggest in any way whatsoever that I am not a fit and proper person to sit in this House to debate and vote.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! In accordance with the Sessional Order agreed to on 24 August, the Matters of Public Interest debate will now commence.

Mr ALISON: Mr Speaker, I wish to make a personal explanation.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! In accordance with the Sessional Order, the debate on Matters of Public Interest starts at 11 o'clock.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Allegations of Corruption at Seagulls Football Club

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (11 a.m.): Mr Speaker, I seek leave to table certain documents relating to my speech.

Leave granted.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the documents on the table.

Mr MACKENROTH: I wish to raise a classic example of this Government's continuing failure to tackle crime and corruption. By that, I mean the failure of this Government to pay close attention to the notorious former Queensland detective inspector for the Gold Coast, John Meskell.

Meskell has been named by no fewer than four separate witnesses before the Fitzgerald inquiry as being deeply involved in corruption. At the peak of his police career, Meskell was also a key figure in the richest licensed club in New South Wales, Seagulls at Tweed Heads on the Gold Coast. Meskell was vice-president of that club at the same time that his SP book-maker crony, Jack Meekin, was president. Meekin has also been mentioned at the Fitzgerald inquiry.

It is now clear that the Meekin/Meskell administration of the club was involved in financial fraud and rorts that have cost the club more than $1m. Total financial losses could extend to several millions. But most worrying of all was the attempted murder of a former Seagulls Rugby League football-player and the bid by then Detective Inspector John Meskell to cover up the crime.

One of the administration staff on the Meekin/Meskell team was a John Kolovos. Kolovos had warned Seagulls footballer Bob McDermott to stay away from a girl at the Seagulls club with whom Kolovos was associating, but McDermott persisted, so a professional hitman from Sydney, Kerry Pittas, was engaged by persons unknown to teach McDermott a lesson. Pittas hid near McDermott's house and attacked him with a knife. Fortunately, another member of the Seagulls football team, Ian Paton, came onto the scene. Pittas fled but Mr Paton was able to follow and identify the hitman's escape car.

This attempted murder occurred in Queensland. At the time the Gold Coast CIB chief was none other than the vice-president of Seagulls, Detective Inspector John Meskell. After only 12 hours' investigation, Detective Inspector Meskell decided that John Kolovos was in no way connected with the attack. To this day the person who commissioned the hitman has never been arrested and police arrested Pittas over a year later only after they were embarrassed into doing so.

Detective Inspector Meskell made such a poor job of it that when Pittas was eventually caught the trial judge, Mr Justice Connolly, recommended that the file be sent to the Attorney-General. Pittas got 20 years with hard labour but the person who commissioned him remains free and unidentified. To date there has been no action on the Meskell file by the Queensland Government. Interestingly, witnesses have said they saw Pittas at the unit of Con Kolovos, the heroin-addicted brother of John Kolovos, before the attempted murder. A car seen being driven away from the attack and later found burnt out was earlier seen at the unit of Con Kolovos. Detective Inspector Meskell was unsuccessful in following these leads.

The evening after the attempted murder, as Bob McDermott lay in hospital hovering between life and death, Detective Inspector Meskell presented himself at the Seagulls

football team's night. He told the players that the incident involving McDermott did not concern the club and that, if they had information, they should see him privately. But when a couple did present information, he did nothing about it. This was strange behaviour for an investigating police officer. It could only be the behaviour of a man seeking to cover up on behalf of somebody else.

Unless club members and other people on the Gold Coast are protected it is likely that the racketeers will make another attempt to seize what has now become a gold mine. Seagulls now has a financial turn-over of more than $150m a year—most of it in cash—and has between $50m and $60m worth of assets.

I now propose to outline briefly details of the rorts and rip-offs that occurred under the previous Meekin/Meskell administration. Firstly, I turn to the Coronakes contract. In 1986 the club let a catering contract to a Peter Coronakes. Before he was given the Seagulls' bistro contract, he and his de facto wife were employed by Meekin in his hotel at Lismore. Meekin instigated the catering contract at Seagulls and hand picked Coronakes for the job. No tenders were called. That is surprising, because turn-over in this bistro was between $2m and $2.5m a year. Meekin set the annual rental of about $200,000, which was paid by Coronakes to Seagulls. But that $200,000 fee was only about one half of the annual $400,000 profit that the club itself would have made directly from the bistro. It was an incredibly good deal for Coronakes but an appallingly bad financial deal for the club, which effectively gave away at least $200,000 a year profit to a private individual—Coronakes.

This cosy deal cost the Seagulls club between $300,000 and $500,000 in lost profits in a period of about 17 months. It is money that should rightly have gone to the club. The figures tell the story. Catering profit under the crooked administration in the year 1986 totalled $194,000, yet only two years later, under the new administration, catering profits for the club are now running at $665,000, an increase of more than 240 per cent. Who was really getting the rake-off? Not surprisingly, Meekin is a long-standing acquaintance, or even friend, of two of the most notorious criminals in Sydney, the so-called racing identity, George Freeman, and the notorious Sydney identity, Abe Saffron, who is currently in gaol.

Secondly, there was a video shop fraud. In conjunction with some of Meekin's associates, the Meekin/Meskell administration established a video shop in the foyer of the Seagulls club. The Seagulls club bore the cost of setting up the video shop, but the lion's share of the profit of somewhere between $70,000 to $100,000 went to Meekin's associates. But here is the neatest rip-off of the lot. After a while the video business was sold to a legitimate businessman but not before he made a payment of $90,000 for goodwill to Meekin's associates, who pocketed the $90,000. The club did not get a cent.

Thirdly, there was the Greenmount resort. Under Meekin, Seagulls bought the Greenmount resort at Coolangatta for $10.5m, but borrowed $11.5m. Where did the extra $1m go? There are several disturbing features about this purchase, especially the fact that the property had been previously offered to the rival Twin Towns Services Club for $1m less and Twin Towns had still turned it down. There was also a denial in the minutes of the board administering Greenmount not long after it was bought for Seagulls by the Meekin/Meskell administration. That denial related to a member of the Meekin board, Fred Johnson, receiving a secret commission when Greenmount was bought.

With this group of people, where there is smoke, there is fire. There is a strong belief that Johnson was paid a fee—a kick-back—being a portion of the commission on the sale of Greenmount to Seagulls, a total commission that would have been worth approximately $250,000. That should be investigated. In addition, the then manager of Greenmount has confirmed that Meekin and his associates enjoyed benefits free of charge at the expense of members at the Greenmount resort. Meekin, fellow director John Costello and others had free accommodation there. They and their associates continually enjoyed free food and drink. When the resort was eventually sold by the new administration, the $1.8m profit on the sale had already been eaten up by accumulated losses.

Fourthly, I refer to land that was bought for three times its worth. Another unusual property deal was Seagulls' purchase of 15 hectares of land at Piggabeen, near the club's current premises. The price paid for the land was more than three times its estimated true value. The Meekin administration paid $750,000 for it when its true value was approximately $200,000. An engineer's report on the land had shown that, because it was so unstable, almost none of it could have anything built on it except a single-storey building. It was marine mud. As well, when a sewerage line was laid, recently the soil was found to be so poor that the Tweed Shire Council was worried that settlement of the land would fracture the sewer line. The land should not have fetched a premium three times over the market. There was something smelly about the deal, and it was not just the marine mud.

Fifthly, I refer to Costello. The Meekin administration's key financial adviser at Seagulls was John Costello, who is currently facing charges over tax fraud totalling approximately $25m. Apart from being a director on the board of Seagulls, Costello was treasurer of the club. Also he had himself appointed by the board to a $50,000 a year position as financial consultant to Seagulls. In his period with Seagulls, Costello breached the Companies Act and other laws on no fewer than five occasions. Costello also attempted to cover up the Meekin/Meskell administration's massive tax liability. He told the 1987 annual general meeting that the club had no tax liability. In fact, as the new administration later discovered, the club's tax liability was more than a quarter of a million dollars. Clearly, John Joseph Costello was either incompetent or dishonest.

Sixthly, I refer to John Johnson. Costello was not the only director to try to rip off a large chunk of money for himself. Director John Johnson received a $50,000 contract as a marketing consultant for the Greenmount resort, but outside pressure forced him to drop it.

Lastly, I deal with Kaltag Proprietary Limited. Another neat little scam instituted by the Meekin/Meskell administration to divert income away from Seagulls and into their own pockets was carried out through the company called Kaltag Proprietary Limited. Under the administration of Alan Barnes, who also administered the video rip-off, a Seagulls gold card system was established. More than 1 000 of those memberships were sold for between $20 and $95, with the money going to Kaltag Proprietary Limited, not to Seagulls. The card entitled holders to discounts on various purchases of food and liquor at the Seagulls club and discounts at certain retail outlets on the Gold Coast. None of the benefits of the gold card system went to Seagulls. Through Kaltag, Meekin and his associates ripped them off and put them in their own pockets. It is estimated that the gold card system provided them with approximately $100,000 a year income.

Time expired.

Foreign Investment in Australia

Mr HINTON (Broadsound) (11.11 a.m.): I rise today to draw the attention of the House to the debate on foreign investment in Australia and to focus on the strong concerns and the misconceptions and the shocking mishandling of the issue by the Federal Labor Government, which includes the debasing of the Australian currency and the erosion of our international credit-rating that is occurring throughout the world.

It is a simple truth that the Federal ALP Government is selling off Australia piece by piece to help pay for the country's overseas trading deficit. The land that our forefathers carved out of the bush with axe, crowbar and shovel is being sold to help provide the present generation with a life-style now beyond our means. Our imports and foreign interest bill now exceed by approximately $1.5 billion per month—and it is growing—our export revenue and the proceeds from the sale of lands.

During the time of the Hawke Government, the foreign debt has escalated from approximately $30 billion to more than $100 billion. It is difficult to obtain from the Federal Government the exact figure for today's foreign debt. As ownership of our prime real estate disappears overseas and we become servants in our own land, it will be the

great legacy of the Hawke Government that it sold out Australia both financially and physically. It is the greatest crime against the next generation that the Federal ALP Government could commit.

Mr Smyth interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The current amount of cross-fire in the Chamber will not be tolerated by the Chair.

Mr HINTON: The public has a right to be concerned, and it is concerned. In Australia, a rising resentment will grow and fester until the problem is addressed to the satisfaction of Australians.

The debate on foreign investment is an economic one, but it will unquestionably assume racial connotations. The single greatest financial power in the world today is Japan. It is the greatest and most successful coloniser the world has seen. Not by force or arms but by financial strength, real estate ownership and the strength of its financial institutions, Japan has become the greatest creditor nation feeding finance to the greatest debtor nation—the United States—and into the debt-ridden chaos that is the Australian economy. Resentment of that will grow and grow. It is already affecting our tourist trade. Australia is no longer the No. 1 tourist destination for Japanese honeymooners; it is No. 2 and it is approaching No. 3.

A misconception exists that the debate that is now growing in Australia is responsible for the fall-off in the tourist trade. That is a foolish misconception. Australian resentment is the problem, and that problem must be addressed. It will not abate until Australians feel comfortable about their future, until the Australian Government takes the appropriate steps to protect the Australian heritage for our future generations.

I put to the House that all honourable members would make any guest welcome in their homes, but how many of them would put out the welcome mat if they feared that the guest may take over their home, that he carried mortgage papers in his pocket?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The trio of Government members having a conversation will cease.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: They are plotting the downfall of the Premier.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! That does not call for comments from members of the Opposition.

Mr HINTON: We, as a nation, must address those serious problems.

The Federal Government must reconstruct the Foreign Investment Review Board to give it real teeth, particularly in protecting our residential and rural property markets from the speculative exploitation that is pricing this generation of Australians out of their homes and creating the next generation as a nation of renters. The Federal Government is already effectively creating that state of affairs.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Why are you denying your own party up in your own electorate?

Mr HINTON: I am certainly not denying my own party in my electorate. I believe that I have a very strong reputation for looking after it.

The Federal Government has taken steps, but what incredible steps they were! On 30 October 1987 the Treasurer, Mr Keating, announced new rules by Government press release.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The interjections from the member for Wolston are disturbing the Chamber. I ask him to contain himself, otherwise I will warn him under Standing Order 123A.

Mr HINTON: Everyone knows that the member for Wolston is the Neville Chamberlain of the Queensland Parliament. His attitude is, "It'll be all right. It'll go away. Let's do nothing. Let's support the Federal Government."

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have offered the member for Broadsound the protection of the Chair, which he seems to have chosen to abuse. I ask him to continue with his speech.

Mr HINTON: It was not until April this year, that is, 18 months later, that the Foreign Takeovers Amendment Act was passed. The rules apply retrospectively to the date of the press announcement. As welcome as that legislation is, any retrospective legislation is an outrage against democracy.

Theoretically, under that Act, foreigners who have acquired an interest in Australian land since 30 October 1987, and who have not complied with the new Act, will be subjected to penalties of up to $250,000 for a corporation and $50,000 for an individual or two years in prison. In addition, the Treasurer can order the foreigner to divest himself of the land.

The legislation requires a foreign person to notify the Treasurer of his intention to acquire an interest in urban land, which includes the signing of a contract or an option agreement for obtaining an interest in land. Once notified, the Treasurer can determine whether or not the sale proceeds, according to whether or not it is in the national interest. Foreigners are defined as persons not ordinarily residents of Australia, that is, foreign nationals who have not been in Australia for at least 200 of the past 365 days or foreign visa-holders. Complex rules determine ownership through leases, licences, companies and trusts.

The scheme is remarkable because it allows for fine and imprisonment on a retrospective basis to the date of a press release, but is wider in scope than the press release itself. For example, in Mr Keating's press release, buildings under construction or property used for the normal commercial activities of the foreign company or individual were exempt, but they are now included in the legislation. What a farce! A purchase made within the law can now lead to imprisonment. And what on earth is the definition of the "national interest"? I suggest that it is whatever takes the fancy of the Federal Treasurer at the time.

The intention was certainly right, but the law is devastatingly wrong and is an attack on the basic principles of democracy. However, with the desperate need of the Federal Government for a foreign cash inflow, the national interest is clearly to sell as much land and property as quickly as possible, and that is the thrust of Federal ALP policy.

So what can Queensland do under these circumstances? I have previously outlined in this House my policy for a foreign land tax, to utilise the foreign land register on completion, and to create a mechanism whereby the Government of the day can encourage or discourage investment in different classes of property. I point out that a heavy rate could be struck in the case of urban or rural property markets to discourage investment or economically force relinquishment of those properties, that manufacturing or mining ventures could attract little or no tax and that property such as abattoirs could attract a high rate to break the chain of vertical integration. These would be economic decisions of the Government of the day.

The cash inflow to the Queensland Government could be very significant and important in that it could substantially reduce Queensland's reliance on funding from the Federal Government, making Queensland more financially independent. Finance could also be made available at low interest to new industries that are value-added export industries, expanding export income from Queensland and our industrial base.

I suggest that the possibilities are enormous and should be seriously considered. I have circulated this policy widely throughout Queensland and I have received considerable support.

The Federal Government is selling out Australia's heritage—not, I suggest for the comfort of members of the Opposition, because it wants to, but because of its hopeless financial mismanagement. Queensland has the chance to rectify this situation in this State. I suggest that it should not be missed.

Time expired.

Pollution of the Environment

Mr COMBEN (Windsor) (11.20 a.m.): Wherever we look in the world today we are confronted with environmental problems of immense magnitude. The legacy of DDT in the 1960s still impacts on us and our wildlife. The oil spill in Alaska has killed thousands of birds and mammals and may yet wipe out whole fisheries. An unknown virus has hit and is killing the seal colonies of the European North Sea.

Acid rain is killing European forests. The ozone layer is depleted with unknown consequences still to be seen. Increasing numbers of illegal toxic waste dumps are being discovered throughout the world. Ships laden with carcinogenic chemicals ply the seven seas trying to find a country willing to take a hold full of toxic cocktail in exchange for a handful of silver. Sewage pumped into the sea off Sydney Heads returns to pollute the surfing beaches. This morning on the ABC radio program *AM* there were claims of Sydney Harbour being an ecological desert.

The threats of future environmental damage are constantly with us. The Wesley Vale Pulp Mill stands accused of being capable of killing the Derwent Estuary. Mining of Kakadu could cause an environmental catastrophe, and everyone wants the nuclear waste dump and high-temperature incinerator somewhere else.

But whilst the world grows more concerned about these environmental issues and the long-term consequences of pollution, which leaves our children such a poisonous inheritance, there is one area of God's earth where the decision-makers are apparently untouched by the global concerns. If one listens to the members of the present State Government, one finds that that place is Queensland.

While the rest of the world worries, members of the Ahern Government are down at the beach with their heads in the sand, not seeing the toxic waste, or the sewage bobbing in the surf or the concerns in regard to radioactivity. Queensland appears to be the one area of the earth that is not moving to redress the wrongs of the past and to improve the legacy for future generations.

But although we see no action from Mr Ahern and his Government, we still have substantial problems. Evidence of the severity of air, ground and water pollution in Queensland is provided by the Ahern Government itself through the reports of its various departments and authorities charged with overseeing our State's weak anti-pollution laws.

The evidence of the Government's own servants is damning. The 1987-88 Health Department report has a number of interesting entries. It states—

> "Spanner crabs were found to contain levels of cadmium which were significantly above the maximum permitted concentration.
>
> . . .
>
> A number of mud crabs and sand crabs were found to contain levels of copper and/or cadmium and/or selenium above the maximum permitted concentrations while a smaller percentage of prawns were found to have raised cadmium and/or copper levels.
>
> . . .
>
> Eighteen of the 160 samples of fruit and vegetables obtained by inspectors were found to have pesticide residues above the maximum residue limit or to be contaminated with a non-permitted pesticide.
>
> . . .

Of the 84 samples of cereal and grain products examined for pesticide residues, seven were found to contain levels above the maximum limit.

. . .

A survey of 68 samples of kelp found approximately 16.2 per cent to contain arsenic levels above the maximum permitted concentration.

. . .

In some areas more than 50 per cent of untreated water samples have been found to be bacteriologically unsuitable for human consumption . . . inadequate tip control was again a problem in other areas.

. . .

Many complaints were received concerning spray drift resulting from the application of agricultural chemicals . . ."

The 1987-88 Department of Environment annual report states—

"Incidents involving loss of cyanide at gold extraction operations occurred during the year.

. . .

Investigations of fish deaths in the Albert River revealed that a distillery discharge was having a significant impact on the river's oxygen resources . . . twenty-six separate (fish deaths) incidents were investigated . . . pesticide-resulted fish mortalities are increasing . . . These actions are a moderating influence but, if urban spread continues with more freeways encouraging motor vehicle usage, future gross annual emissions of nitrogen oxides and particulates may increase."

The 1983 study of industrial liquid waste and hazardous and toxic waste, which was presented to the Government, found—

"The Dinmore facility was a disused mine shaft which was reported to receive about 10% of all wastes handled by cartage contractors. A large proportion of the wastes handled were nominated to be acids, alkalis and dilute heavy metal solutions."

They are the ones that are nominated, not the nasties that were not referred to. The study continued—

"By reasons of the lack of comment on the matter in the report, it is presumed that no treatment was given to the waste either prior to dumping into the mine shaft or in the shaft itself. The report stated that no adverse effects were known to have resulted from this practice."

At present, at the North Queensland Electricity Board depot in Cairns, 20 drums of the banned chemical aldrin are sitting, rusting in an open yard. Slowly this chemical is leaking into the surrounding environment and into the water-table.

This litany of pollution is an indictment of the present Government. After more than 30 years of Liberal/National Party Government, Queensland has become a polluter's paradise. Licences issued under the Clean Waters Act are licences to pollute. Queensland has a Third World standard of waste disposal.

Estuaries are recognised as being important nursery areas for many species of fish, prawns and crabs, yet every major estuary in Queensland and many of the smaller ones receive millions of litres of sewage and industrial effluent every day. The Fitzroy River receives at least 10 major discharges; the Mary River, seven; and the Burnett River, six. The Logan, Albert, North Pine, Maroochy, Calliope, Dee, Mulgrave, Pioneer, Herbert, Johnstone and Barron Rivers are only a few of those receiving multiple discharges. I understand that some effluents are discharged directly into fisheries habitat reserves.

While there may be a case for some of these discharges, what is not acceptable in Queensland today is that in the entire 16-year history of the former Water Quality Council, and now under the Division of Environment, not one prosecution has been

launched and not one study has ever looked at the effects of these discharges on estuarine organisms. Whether these pollutants deter juvenile fish and prawns from using the estuary or whether their survival rate is affected is completely unknown. While the massive fish kills which occur in the Burnett and Albert Rivers are obvious signs of gross pollution, detecting the subtle effects of rendering an estuary unsuitable as a nursery area requires careful research. This research is not even attempted in Queensland.

A number of factors have contributed to bring about this sorry state of affairs. But the saddest factor is the ongoing neglect by the present State Government, which is uninterested in taking its place in cleaning up the world. Queensland has some of the most polluted streams and rivers in Australia. The bacteria count in some creeks is 800 times the internationally accepted maximum levels. Yet this year this data for water quality was left out of the annual report and is obtainable only on special request.

Apart from the Willawong liquid waste disposal site, which is operated by the Brisbane City Council, there are no other designated disposal areas for industrial wastes in Queensland. The April 1978 report on waste disposal in the Brisbane and the near-Brisbane area identified three locations within the study area used for the disposal of liquid wastes. The areas included Dinmore, where there is now increasing residential development. No-one knows where the industrial site was and one does not know what will come out of it.

Outside of south-east Queensland totally unacceptable disposal methods are in operation. Toxic and hazardous material is often dropped from the back of trucks into the nearest quarry, creek or mine shaft. These illegal dump sites are never far from commercial development and will soon be overtaken by residential development. A dozen Diamond Street disasters are waiting to happen. But still we see no overall plan, strategy or legislation. Queensland's penalties are ludicrously low—$400 for contaminating a river—that is, if a prosecution is instituted. However, that does not happen in Queensland.

Queensland has two of the longest refuse tips in Australia. At Emerald, refuse enters the Nogoa River from the tip and finishes up 300 miles later at the mouth of the Fitzroy River in Rockhampton. At Warwick, refuse starts its journey on the banks of the Condamine River and finishes at the mouth of the Murray River in South Australia.

The Airlie Beach refuse tip in Proserpine Shire has been a concern for many years, but no attempt has been made to close it. Europe and the United States of America are both now moving to high technology-style land fills. Constantly monitored refuse tips are now lined with impermeable materials. Trenches are built into the base to collect noxious fluids that could leak out and contaminate water. However, in Queensland, refuse tips are opened in mangrove areas and on the banks of creeks. Our dumps are allowed to pollute our waterways unimpeded.

The National Party is determined not to learn from the lessons of New South Wales and the disasters of ocean outfall for sewage disposal. Unless action is taken now, future generations of Queenslanders will be left a poisonous inheritance that will take centuries to diffuse. The concerns about pollution have now reached such proportions that several hundred people are marching to this Parliament at this time. No issue is more controversial than that of the Redbank radioactive dump. What other Government in Australia would site such a facility in a geologically unstable area, which is subject to flooding and near residential areas? Only in Queensland could we see such a short-sighted decision made which would cause such heartburn to so many local people.

The coalition of concerned citizens, which has rallied outside this Parliament today, comprises ordinary Queenslanders who know that we do not have unlimited time to get our act into order. A far-ranging set of policies that will take us out of the Third World standards that our waste disposal is presently locked into is needed.

Time expired.

Environmental Pollution in Brisbane

Mr HENDERSON (Mount Gravatt) (11.31 a.m.): As honourable members look down the tunnels of time they find that significant issues have preoccupied the human race. For example, during the Stone Age early man was evolving towards a better form of technology mainly by using stone tools. After World War II came the nuclear age. It is my firm belief that the next decade and future decades could well be called the environment age.

I wish to follow on from some of the comments that were made by the honourable member for Windsor. Rather than using generalities, I am in possession of 16 photographs that show examples of environmental pollution in the city of Brisbane. Because they show exactly what mismanagement of the environment amounts to, I wish to discuss each of those photographs. To prove the case, I seek leave of the House to table those 16 photographs.

Leave granted.

Mr HENDERSON: Although honourable members probably cannot see the photographs easily, the first two were taken at the back of the industrial areas of Hemmant and Murarrie. They show a very common method of industrial waste disposal, namely, ponding. The area to which I refer was previously covered by mangroves. The photographs show that all of the mangroves in that area have died. As well, the area is adjacent to the biggest roosting area for white herons in Queensland. I refer to an area towards the mouth of Tingalpa Creek. Birds are avoiding that area. None of the photographs shows evidence of birds nesting or crowding anywhere near that pond, whereas another photograph shows a sole pelican floating on the water. The effect of ponding on the trees is significant in the photographs. All the trees and mangroves have been killed, which suggests that the contents of the water are toxic and that the toxicity is a combination of organic and chemical wastes.

The next two photographs, which were taken along the banks of Tingalpa Creek, are very interesting indeed. They show several things. First of all, the colour of the water is extremely significant. It suggests a high level of mineral concentrations, sulphates and so on in the water. If honourable members were to look carefully at the photographs they would notice that all of the vegetation immediately above water level and along the banks has died. As well, the colour of the soils suggests that they are heavily leached, probably as a result of mineral leaching.

The foreground of one of the photographs is particularly interesting. It shows that the only plants that are able to survive in that environment are flax plants, which are adapted to high levels of salinity and so on. That suggests a high level of mineral and organic pollution in that creek.

One of the consequences of pollution which honourable members do not often think about is clearly and plainly reflected in another photograph. As I said, all the vegetation along the banks of that creek is dead or dying. The immediate impact of all of that is fairly extensive soil slumping along the banks so that soil is carried onto the bed of the river. As soil is deposited on the bed of the river, high levels of siltation occur. Thus, the effect of pollution in the river is not confined solely to the river itself. It also affects the physical structure of the river. It is altering not only the depth of the river but also the structure of the banks.

The next photograph shows quite clearly the effects of that pollution. The river is flowing at a much shallower depth than it naturally and normally did in its pristine state. The photograph reveals that a series of eddy currents has resulted, which does not permit the settling of chemicals and wastes within the river. Instead, they are continually stirred up like a milk shake so that the chemicals remain active within the water. Another photograph shows clearly and plainly that the river has become a dumping ground. One has only to look at the amount of material that has been dumped in the river.

Another photograph shows a drain entering the river. It clearly and plainly shows chemical discharges from the local industrial area. The photograph was taken looking up the drain. The heavy infiltration of chemicals into the soils is obvious. It has killed all the vegetation. In the foreground of the photograph, not only is the chemical discolouration of the creek obvious but also the banks of the creek are starting to collapse, which adds to the significant erosion problem.

The next two photographs show the destruction that is occurring along the banks of the creek. As I said, that is most significant indeed. Nothing is growing below the high-water mark. Because of the toxicity within the river, everything has died or is dying. That toxicity is clearly and plainly the result of the effluents that are being discharged into the river.

A further photograph is the most damning of all. It does not look significant on the surface. The grass is growing. However, someone has dug a pit to expose what is below the surface. The photograph reveals that all the ground waters in the area are very heavily polluted. The background of the photograph shows that the soil, which is naturally sandy, has become almost black. It is so impregnated with chemicals, organic waste and so on, that probably every natural mineral has been removed from the soil and the soil is black.

The next photograph depicts a very interesting scene. It is a photograph taken at the back of one of the plants. It shows a series of ponds which are supposed to allow the water to settle. But what is shown here? Clearly and plainly there is an illegal pipe into the creek. A very close examination of the photograph reveals that effluent is being discharged from that pipe into the creek. One wonders how that in fact happens. It is irrefutable evidence of illegal dumping of chemicals into Tingalpa Creek.

I now draw the attention of the House to four photographs which show what is likely to be the long-term effect of this environmental destruction. I would like honourable members to have a look at these photographs, because they show that every mature tree in this area is dying. Their roots are continually in a cocktail of chemicals and organic waste that is killing them.

Finally, this next photograph depicts the ultimate problems that are being faced by people in this area. It shows that the industrial development along this creek is built on a series of river terraces. As I said earlier, the banks of the river itself are being destroyed. This development is destroying the lower river terrace itself, which is depicted in this photograph. The ultimate consequence of all of this will be that the upper river terrace will slump into the river, the general profile of the river will be changed, the level of the river will rise and in a couple of years' time the State Government and the local authorities will have to spend millions of tax-payers' dollars on flood mitigation programs in order to avoid that problem developing.

That is the catch-22 of all this. People say that if a society is conservation minded, development should not proceed. However, the consequence of some of this development is that the tax-payers of Brisbane and Queensland will be faced with million-dollar bills to restore the environment. In my opinion, this type of illegal activity does not pay, and it is time that it ceased.

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

Crime in the Community

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (11.40 a.m.): I want to talk about another type of pollution, the pollution that is the extent of crime in the modern community. It could be said that this is after-sales service. In the lead-up to the Merthyr by-election, the Liberal Party placed law and order at the top of the agenda. The Liberal Party intends to maintain the pressure until something is done about it in our society and in places such as the electorate of Merthyr. The political tide goes in and out, and

this morning in this House we saw the return of the tide. However, the rising tide does not seem to be able to reverse——

Mr Newton: Come off it!

Mr INNES: The honourable member should go back to his papaws.

Mr Newton interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The member for Glass House will not prosecute a quarrel in the Chamber.

Mr INNES: A papaw is orange and soft in the middle. It suits the honourable member.

The rising tide that does not seem capable of being stemmed is that of crime in our modern community and in Queensland in particular. The reality is that since 1983 total offences have risen from 156 000 to 214 000, and those statistics should be familiar to everybody in this State. The number of murders has increased from 171 to 254 a year; assaults from 2 009 to 3 455; robbery from 572 to 703, and rising fast; rape from 137 to 288; breaking and entering from 30 003 to 34 282; motor vehicle theft from 8 040 to 10 068; and fraud from 15 399 to 25 425. The crimes relating to drugs are escalating at an alarming rate.

In no way are resources being applied to match that rising tide. Since the election in Merthyr, and an implicit promise by the Government to commit more resources in particular to that electorate, foul and dreadful crimes have been perpetrated. In fact, two savage rapes occurred only last week. One occurred at 7.30 in the morning. The victim was a woman who was resting in New Farm Park. Another occurred at night, the victim being a woman in the New Farm area. She was dragged from a car, violently assaulted and violently raped, and as a result she was admitted to hospital in a critical condition. That is a picture of what is happening. That is apart from the countless number of break-ins that take place daily in each suburb in this city and in other cities of this State.

Apparently, a promise was given that additional patrols would be provided in the Valley. The newly elected member for Merthyr has been down to the Valley, down to the scenes of those crimes, and he has questioned the police. The police are not there to tip a bucket on the Government, but they do answer questions. He has found inadequate resources, lack of effective preventive patrolling and the lack of a predictable presence of the police force. There is still the threat of the closure of the Hamilton and New Farm Police Stations.

During the Merthyr by-election campaign, the Liberal Party constantly found that elderly women, particularly those in the New Farm area, virtually have a fortress mentality. In New Farm several special residences or high-rise blocks are occupied by elderly women. Because women will not go out at night, clubs and groups have had to change their meeting times to day-time meetings. Younger women, single women, and those women who live in the air-hostess belt in the Hamilton and Ascot areas—they have traditionally resided in those areas because of their convenience to the airport—are in constant fear of break-ins, thefts and sexual interference. There is this constant fear among women in society.

However, this fear is not confined to women. Distress is caused to anybody whose property, home or person is in danger or violated. South of Brisbane, an appalling crime involved an 18-year-old person. The age at which people commit crimes is dropping. The sex relationship between the criminal and the victim is changing. More women are getting involved and are becoming associated with violent crime. More women are involved in gangs with hardened criminals. An 18-year-old person took two people out of an all-night service station, got them to kneel down, and in the most horrendous manner executed them.

Mr FitzGerald: That is the allegation. The trial has not taken place yet. They are allegations.

Mr INNES: All right, they are allegations. We know that there are two people dead with bullet-holes in them. The reality is that that creates a sense of fear. Nobody is saying that an additional two policemen would have stopped that crime from occurring, but what can be said is that the possibility and the predictability of police being around can help to deter the occurrence of these crimes.

What is the picture with regard to the police force? I mentioned recently the incidence of fraud and drug offences. To fight drug crimes, an escalation in Drug Squad activity is set in train, but that is done by crippling the Fraud Squad. Recently I met with representatives of the insurance industry. At the request of the police, they have had to provide the police force with equipment as basic as high-powered torches. Private individuals have to help the police by providing the most elementary items of equipment.

Sir William Knox: Did you know that the Serious Crimes Squad is now reduced to three?

Mr INNES: That is the story throughout the length and breadth of this State.

In recent times, I was, I suppose, the lucky recipient of special treatment. When my house was broken into, I demanded that the police come and take fingerprints, although they are becoming increasingly reluctant to do so. I recognised that there were fingerprints and, apparently because I am who I am, a year later I discovered that the fingerprint section had subjected the fingerprints to computer checking. That checking is available for all fingerprints, but it is not done for the overwhelming majority of fingerprints in Queensland because the Police Department cannot afford the computer time. It is an easy matter to check fingerprints by computer, but that basic technique is not used. In my case, the person whose fingerprints were identified had two pages of criminal convictions. Find the culprit, match the fingerprints and slot the offenders into gaol, and perhaps another two pages of breaking-and-entering offences or offences relating to violence will be prevented.

At the end of this financial year, Queensland will have been given only 60 additional police officers, which is 140 fewer than was promised in the State Budget one year ago. With approximately a month left, it is impossible for this Government to even half fulfil its promise made a year ago. As at 21 May 1989, the statistics relating to the police force show that manpower is at the level of 5 169 compared to 5 190 a year ago. Police officers are resigning at twice the rate at which they resigned 10 years ago. Even if the Government filled the excellent Police Academy at Oxley to its maximum of 400 a year, it would take approximately six years to get the manpower level up to the Australian average in terms of coverage. In Queensland we need better than the Australian average because in a decentralised State a greater number of police officers is required. The place that has the highest ratio of police officers to population is the Northern Territory, and with good reason. Police are still required even if the population is scattered. However, in this State, not even the Australian average is being reached.

A comparison of the ratio of police officers to population shows that Queensland's ratio is 1 to 537. In South Australia, where the population is bunched in the southern end of that State, it is 1 to 403. On the Gold Coast the figures are perhaps the worst in Australia, with one policeman to 758. Crime cannot be fought with that level of manpower. The predictable outcome for a person thinking about committing a crime is that the police will not be there to catch him.

Increasingly in this State, people are fortressing themselves inside their houses. The only people who can get complete coverage are those who buy their own protection from security agencies. In this State the irony is that in electorates throughout Queensland there are more private security agents on the roll than there are police officers.

The Liberal Party does not stand for a State in which the only people who are protected are those who can afford a private army. Members of the Liberal Party stand

for a State where a basic Government service and entitlement includes proper police protection provided by the public purse, which should be provided by the Government of Queensland. If a Government stands for law and order, then it has to give law enforcement agencies proper resources. The Liberal Party commits itself to the increase in the number of effective police officers. We commit ourselves to filling the Oxley academy to its level of 400 and to increasing the number of police officers until this State comes up at least to the national average. We commit ourselves to providing a police force with the basic equipment it requires for the basic squads that exist to carry out basic investigative police work. If Queensland had the Australian average of police, how many crimes would be deterred; how many more crimes would be detected; and how much more often would the cycle of repetitive offences be broken?

Federal Labor Government Economic Policies

Mr GATELY (Currumbin) (11.50 a.m.): Australians are doing "hard Labor" but, by throwing their support behind the new leaders of the Federal coalition parties, Andrew Peacock and Charles Blunt, they have one last hope of turning around this country's economic decline. Both those men have the political experience, expertise, vigour and vitality that is needed to save Australians from another term of "hard Labor". Six years of failed commitments to Australian families by the Hawke Labor Government are evidenced by spiralling interest rates, high taxes and inflation.

Traditional Australian values and living standards have been seriously undermined to the point at which Australia could become worse off than Argentina. The Federal Labor Government and its union cohorts have actively jeopardised the viability of not only many businesses but also the nation itself. Presently, 2.6 million Australians live in poverty. In 1983, 19 per cent of household income was required to purchase the average home, whereas currently it takes 30 per cent of household income. Mr Hawke's Government is the highest taxing Government in Australia's history. Along with Australia's huge foreign debt, that trend has to be reversed. Australians cannot afford the attack by Hawke, Keating and the ACTU on families, pensioners, students, businesses and rural producers of this nation.

In the field of youth unemployment, the Government has failed to help young unemployed people. Figures for January 1989 showed a continuing and unacceptably high level of youth unemployment. The overall unemployment rate for January was 7.4 per cent, which is the highest level since May 1988. For the 15 to 19-year-old category, unemployment remains at an appalling level of 19.8 per cent.

Since 1983, pensioners have suffered at the hands of the Labor Party. In the Labor Party's 1983, 1984 and 1987 election policies, it promised to increase the basic pension rate to 25 per cent of average weekly earnings. By September 1988 the Federal Government had still not achieved this. Basic pension rates were 24.7 per cent of average weekly earnings and pensioners have been hit hard by the Hawke Government.

In the 1983 election campaign Mr Hawke promised that there would be no new capital gains tax. That promise was broken in September 1985 when the Treasurer told Federal Parliament that the Government had decided to introduce a capital gains tax. Despite the 1983 ALP platform view—that is that people past retiring age should have security of income—the Government introduced its new pensioner assets test from March 1985. On 15 April 1983 the Prime Minister stated that there was no basis for the speculation that the tax on lump sum superannuation payments would increase, but on 20 May 1983 the Government increased this tax from 5 per cent to between 15 and 30 per cent. In the May 1988 mini-Budget the Government further changed superannuation taxing arrangements, thereby eroding the value of many superannuation policies.

Today pensioners are allowed to earn less than half the amount that they could earn in 1974 before the income test applied. Wives in low-income families are affected by a poverty trap that is caused by the interaction of the family allowance supplement income test and the dependent spouse tax rebate withdrawal rate. Wives of unemployment and sickness beneficiaries are also caught by a rigid income test on these benefits. The

people most affected in the community by the huge price increases in groceries and essential commodities caused by the new and increased sales and excise taxes are the pensioners. Judging by the performance of the Labor Party, pensioners must be sceptical of the Prime Minister's pledge made on 20 February 1988 that, "There will come decisions... which will, in fact improve further the position of pensioners in this country." The Federal Government is a dismal failure.

I turn now to look at the Hawke Government housing debacle. The Hawke Government has presided over one of the worst housing crises that Australia has ever seen. In 1983 when the Labor Party came into power only 19 per cent of household income was required to purchase the average home. Today a massive 30 per cent of household income must be used and that percentage is continuing to rise. On 13 November 1984 in his election policy Mr Hawke stated—

> "We pledge ourselves to bring home ownership once again within the reach of ordinary Australian families."

By February 1989, and in the face of record interest rates, this promise has totally failed. Housing interest rates are now at record levels. In March 1989 savings bank home loan rates were 16 per cent, but are now at 17 per cent, with bankers predicting further rises in the near future. In the nine months to March 1989 home loan interest rates have increased from 13.5 per cent to 16 per cent. The repayments on these home loans are crippling the average Australian family.

As from 30 June 1983 the Hawke Government abolished the previous Government's tax rebate for home loan interest payments, it introduced a new capital gains tax in September 1985, it banned negative gearing on rental properties between July 1985 and July 1987 and in 1985-86 it cut funding for the First Home Owners Scheme by $25m, by a further $37m in the present year and by $43m in the year 1989-90. Through funding cuts the Federal Government has reduced the value of the maximum grant available under the First Home Owners Scheme towards the full cost of home purchase from 11 per cent in March 1983 to only 5 per cent in February 1989. From April 1986 the Federal Government increased the 13.5 per cent housing interest rate ceiling up to 15.5 per cent for new bank borrowers, despite promises to retain the lower ceiling. This is just one more indication that the Federal Government cannot be trusted, no matter what it promises.

As a result of these actions by the Hawke Government there has been a massive increase in public housing waiting-lists from 109 800 people in December 1982 to a staggering 194 784 by December 1988. In October 1988 I called for this Government to have an urgent meeting with the Prime Minister, the Federal Treasurer, the Federal Minister for Housing, myself and the Honourable Peter McKechnie. On 15 December the Federal Government replied to the Premier by letter. The Prime Minister refused to meet with us and told the Premier that he would arrange a meeting with Mr Keating and Mr Staples, but has not bothered to let us know when the meeting will take place. That is how much he cares. The Federal Government has aided and abetted the bloating and gut-filling of the banks' profits and made certain that the people of Australia have been conned. The Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, and Mr Keating have told Australians that they are manipulating interest rates. That statement was clearly made during an interview on the *Sunday* program and they made no apology for it.

The people of Australia should speak up like the people in Tiananmen Square in Beijing and tell the Federal Government that they are no longer prepared to accept this manipulation of their finances in an attempt to meet the Federal Government's commitments. It is time that the people of this nation spoke up and told the Federal Government that this is not good enough. This Government has squandered $16.4m of Australian tax-payers' money through grants to various unions for a variety of reasons. This matter was raised in answer to a question asked by Michael Cobb in March 1988, which was not answered until December 1988. At least in this Parliament honourable members receive answers to their questions the following day, which is more than they get in Federal Parliament.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The time allotted for the debate on Matters of Public Interest has now expired.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Hon. N. E. LEE (Yeronga) (12 noon), by leave: Time did not allow me to follow my two colleagues in their personal explanations this morning. On 16 November 1988 I made a personal explanation on this subject, which is recorded in *Hansard* of that date at page 2638. I treat with contempt the statements made by the member for Murrumba. They are not worthy of my making any further statement on the details, as they are all contained in my previous personal explanation. I support the motion on the notice paper, as do my colleagues.

MR JUSTICE ANGELO VASTA

Removal from Office; Leave to Appear at Bar of House

Hon. M. J. AHERN (Landsborough—Premier and Treasurer and Minister for State Development and the Arts) (12.01 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"A. (1) That in view of opinion of the Parliamentary Judges Commission of Inquiry expressed in section 12.2 of their first report, His Honour Mr Justice Angelo Vasta be called upon to show cause why he should not be removed from office;

(2) that accordingly the House grant leave for His Honour to attend at the bar of the House at its sitting on Wednesday, 7 June 1989, commencing at 2.30 p.m., in person or by his legal representative to show cause why he should not be removed from office upon the ground that the matters referred to in (a) to (e) below do not warrant his removal from office, by addressing the House on those grounds, namely—

(a) giving false evidence regarding the AAT incident at the defamation hearing;

(b) making and maintaining allegations that the then Chief Justice, the Attorney-General and Mr Fitzgerald, QC, had conspired to injure him;

(c) falsely stating to the accountant who was preparing the income tax returns of Cosco that the cost of the company's plant was $14m, and, knowing that the company had been deceiving the income tax authorities with regard to the cost of the plant, taking no steps to end the deception;

(d) arranging the following sham transactions to gain income tax advantages—

(i) the loan from Cosco to Salroand;
(ii) the consultancy fee;
(iii) the lease of the Gold Coast unit; and
(iv) the exchange of cheques relating to overseas travel expenses;

(e) making false claims for taxation deductions in respect of the lease of the library; and

(3) that at such attendance at the bar of the House His Honour or his legal representative be allowed a time not exceeding 75 minutes to address the House only, in relation to the specific matters set out in the report and contained in part A(2) of this resolution upon the grounds stated in the resolution.

B. Upon the passing of this resolution Mr Speaker advise His Honour's legal representative and His Honour by letter informing them of the resolution and seeking written notice and a reply by 12 noon, Tuesday, 6 June 1989, whether

His Honour or His Honour's legal representative will appear at the said time and place accordingly."

The Parliament is and has now for some time been in possession of the report of the Parliamentary Judges Commission. That report speaks for itself. The commission was established following upon demands for such a commission by the judge.

Those events are now history. The Government is concerned with the present. The commissioners have found and reported to Parliament that there has been behaviour by the judge such that his removal from office is warranted. No responsible Parliament could in those circumstances do other than call upon the judge to show cause why he should not be removed. That course is consistent with history, convention, the law and proper constitutional practice. The resolution proposed by the Government will give the judge full and proper opportunity to show cause without embarking upon a re-examination of those matters so minutely and carefully examined by the commissioners.

I point out that the procedure to be followed is entirely consistent with the course adopted by the Opposition when it was in office in 1956 and the Parliament—with necessary adaptations for the judge's judicial status—in the case of the Chairman of the Land Administration Board, Mr Creighton, who was found guilty of misconduct by a royal commission.

I intend to say no more. I urge all honourable members to adopt a similar discretion in the interests of not prejudicing the judge and his right to appear before us to attempt to show cause.

Hon. P. J. CLAUSON (Redlands—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General and Minister for Corrective Services) (12.05 p.m.): In seconding the motion moved by the Premier, I intend to restrict my comments to the issue of Mr Justice Vasta either by himself, or through his legal representatives, addressing the Parliament at the bar.

As the Premier indicated, this is not the first occasion in recent times that this has occurred. On 2 August 1956 the then Chairman of the Land Administration Board, Vivian Rogers Creighton, addressed the Assembly. The facts of that case are instructive. In summary, during 1955 there were repeated allegations of maladministration in the Lands Department and accordingly, in February 1956, the Gair Government appointed Mr Justice Townley a royal commissioner to investigate the matter.

Mr Justice Townley reported on 14 June 1956, making adverse findings both against the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation, Mr Foley, and also against Creighton. Under section 15 of the Land Tax Act Amendment Act of 1931 the chairman of the board was responsible to Parliament and could be removed only by an address therefrom. For this reason it was decided that it was appropriate and proper that Mr Creighton should be given the opportunity to address the very members who, by their votes, would determine his position.

The analogies with the present situation are patent. It is certainly unusual for strangers to be given the opportunity to address Parliament from the bar. In the period since 1901 this has occurred on only one occasion, in the House of Representatives, and that was a 1955 case when the House punished two journalists for a serious breach of privilege.

So far as I have been able to determine, the only other instance this century of a stranger addressing the Assembly was on 29 September 1921, when Mr Justice Real spoke from the bar on the Judges' Retirement Bill.

Although the precedents for this unique motion are meagre, the principle they establish is clear. This Parliament has the right either to compel, or to offer the opportunity of, attendance at the bar so that a person who will be uniquely and personally affected by the actions of the House can enunciate succinctly and relevantly those matters which, as members, we should bear in mind when exercising our legal and constitutional duties. It is true now that generally speaking, although there may be exceptions, Parliaments

have desisted from examining witnesses at the bar, and the old saying "the High Court of Parliament" is now of historic rather than practical significance.

By establishing the Parliamentary Judges Commission, the Assembly delegated to that body the difficult and arduous task of hearing the evidence, determining questions of credit and law, and making recommendations which we will consider. Of course, the final decision rests quite properly with the Legislative Assembly. The parliamentary commission was established to assist Parliament, not to pre-empt its important constitutional role.

The Assembly is not the proper place for debate and interchange between strangers and parliamentarians. Rather our role is to make the final and ultimate decision as to whether to accept the commission's recommendations or not. We do not wish to rehear the matter or traverse extraneous and irrelevant matters which shed no new light on the important duty we have to perform; nor do we wish to engage in, or listen to, debate with strangers, which processes may only lower still further public respect for the judiciary and the administration of justice.

I believe that Mr Justice Vasta has the right—and we have the duty to allow him—to address us, either personally or by his legal representatives, should he so wish; but the purpose of this privilege is to assist us in our difficult deliberations, not to relitigate or reopen matters which are irrelevant to the question at hand.

Finally, I also wish to emphasise to honourable members that it would be inappropriate at this stage for there to be a debate on the findings of the commission and it would be better both for the dignity of this House and in fairness to Mr Justice Vasta that we give him the opportunity to address us before the matter is fully debated and a decision is made by the Assembly.

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (12.11 p.m.): The Liberal Party concurs with the view and with the spirit of the motion as to the debating of the substantial issues on this occasion. That should await the invitation to Mr Justice Vasta to appear before this House next week.

It is right that the mood of the House on this occasion should be sombre. It is an historic occasion, but it is also a matter of sadness for people who respect the institutions that govern our lives and which we claim proudly as part of our history that we are involved in this history-making exercise. It would be better that we were not involved. However, methods are set down constitutionally which should be conducted with dignity, dispatch and fairness. Members of the Liberal Party believe that the procedures set out offer that opportunity.

It is regrettable that a couple of instances mar the way to this occasion and this moment. The first matter of regret relates to the presentation of the report. As you will recall, Mr Speaker, before the report came to hand, I expressed some objection to the custom or the mechanisms by which so frequently members of the House read summaries of reports from our diligent colleagues in the press gallery before we had the reports to hand. Many members of this House have had to ring up and make requests for reports, of which summaries or extracts are reported, quite properly, by the press. Mechanisms within the House have not been tuned to the practice out of session of the circulation of reports. In session, we have the opportunity to receive the reports and to make comments simultaneously before the public attitude has been organised and before the selective reporting—I do not mean "selective" in any unfavourable sense—which is the right of the media, of extracts of certain reports.

However, this is an extraordinary and important report. I requested that members of the House have the same opportunity as the press to get access to the report and to make some statements, if it was necessary, about something which was extraordinarily important. I understood that the mechanisms were set in train to allow that. Because of the reality that the chairman of the judicial inquiry, the Friday before the Merthyr by-election, brought to the Speaker only a single copy of the report, I understand that there was a mechanical problem of reproducing it and giving it to members of Parliament.

Mr Justice Vasta's solicitors, the Leader of the Opposition and I received with dispatch copies of that report, while the more extensive printing process took place to allow the circulation of all members and the press. I understood that the basis on which we received that report was confidential and that it was not to be used until all persons had the opportunity of access to the report.

I was astonished when the Premier conducted a press conference at 3 o'clock in the afternoon to deal with the recommendations of the report, at a time when members of this House and members of the press gallery had not had an opportunity of access to the report.

If we are to get the system right, it means the punctilious observance of the forms—which include the unwritten laws as well as the written laws of the House—and other important elements of the Constitution. The rules cannot be broken when it suits. The rules are there to be observed by everybody. It might have been because of a rush of adrenalin or the Merthyr by-election, but it was wrong. It should not have been done until all members of this House had an opportunity to get access to that report.

The second matter of regret is the action of the member for Murrumba—

An Opposition member: We've heard this before.

Mr INNES: Yes, members of the Opposition have heard this before, and they will hear it again.

The action of the member for Murrumba and of his party—it was perpetrated in a newspaper circulated in Merthyr—was despicable, unjust, unfair, misleading, or worse. It was absolutely improper. In fact, in the community there had been the perpetration of a completely false situation. If one was allowed to use the word in Parliament, one would describe it as a lie.

The reality is that evidence was given by Mr Lane, who himself was accused and could not explain away very large amounts of money in his accounts. That matter is still to be dealt with, of course, by Mr Fitzgerald. However, on the provocation that the Labor Party has resorted to referring to these facts all the time, one is compelled to break one's own personal rules.

The reality is that Mr Lane made some broad generalisations to explain away large amounts of money that had to be explained away. In so doing, he cast a broad brush, saying that it happened because of the rorting of ministerial expenses. He was asked to elaborate on that, and in his own personal instance, he came up with a variety of mechanisms as to how he used public property or the public purse to finance his own personal affairs.

Widely reported and deliberately used by members of the Labor Party as a group were the morning newspaper headlines about the allegation. Nowhere have they ever looked at, explained or adverted to the more detailed examination of the evidence and the fact that when he was asked specific questions, Lane could not and did not nominate one instance, one item, one amount, one time, one date regarding any particular Minister or any particular misuse of ministerial money or property, so much so that counsel for the Government just abandoned the line of questions. If on cross-examination one destroys the very premise of the person's allegation, one does not continue with the cross-examination. When Lane was questioned, absolutely nothing could be alleged against any specific person which amounted to the sort of allegation that he made in evidence in chief, and the line of questioning was virtually abandoned.

My parliamentary colleagues denied absolutely even the broad-brush allegation and, at cost, went to the tribunal to make that denial. In this House they made that denial. Honourable members have heard the member for Wolston make denials. Members of the Liberal Party accept that denial. The Liberal Party is not calling for——

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Why did you then go on radio and smear me, if that is the case?

Mr INNES: I will answer that. I said that the member for Wolston was mentioned, but that was never mentioned by the member for Murrumba, nor did he mention Mr Gayler. Have honourable members heard the call for Gayler, the accusations against whom are far more devastating? Have honourable members heard a call from this group for him to stand down from the Federal Parliament? No, not a word! That shows raw hypocrisy.

Members of the Liberal Party do not ask for the member for Wolston to stand down. They accept his denial. They accept that no substantial allegation against him has been proved. Justice spokesmen and party leaders who have legal training in particular should not make savage, unfair, unprincipled and unjust attacks against other persons.

The National Party can look after its own affairs. My colleagues will take the steps accessible to them. I draw the attention of the House to notices of motion Nos 22 and 25—which are supported by the parliamentary Liberal Party and which it will continue to support—calling for the tabling of all records relating to ministerial expenses, not just while the National Party has had solo power but going back to the time when the Liberals were in the coalition Government.

Mr Mackenroth: You put a time-limit on it.

Mr INNES: It deliberately goes back to the time when the Liberals were in power. The honourable member will find it in the notice of motion.

Some of our colleagues have attempted to get the Auditor-General himself to go back and investigate the affairs. The Liberal Party has said, "Put it before the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee, an all-party committee." That position is still being maintained. The Liberal Party is totally happy to support the placement before the Public Accounts Committee, on the table of this House or anywhere else, of all records relating to ministerial expenses to get rid of this absolutely unjust and unfair character assassination against my colleagues. The National Party can take its own attitude on whether it is prepared to disclose the matters, but the members of the Liberal Party want it all on the table to get rid of the lie and the nonsense for all time.

I come back to the solemn occasion that this is. It is part of the examination or re-examination caused by the events of the last two years of the constitutional foundations of our State, of our system of government. If we are going to get it right, if we are going to stop occasions like this happening in the future, we have to be governed by two broad considerations: firstly, we must observe the letter and the spirit of the law, particularly as so many constitutional principles in our system are unwritten laws, unwritten codes of conduct, and, secondly, we must stop the constant use of completely false, baseless, unfair attacks on each other or on other people. Can honourable members imagine being a police officer in recent years in Queensland?

Mr Gately: You called them liars.

Mr INNES: That is also a lie. Honourable members will recall that it related to particular allegations and particular circumstances. However, the broad brush bucket-tipping aspect of politics in this State leads to everybody being ghetto-minded. One side makes a massive accusation against the other, massive accusations are made in political retaliation and somewhere mixed up in that is the truth and the sensitivities, if not of members of Parliament, of their families, their friends or other people involved. Somewhere in all the bucket-tipping over the years are the sensitivities of honest policemen. By the time that everybody has had a go at them and tipped everything in every direction, they, of course, form an enclave—a ghetto—where the only people who are seen to protect police are policemen. Their families form the same ghetto-mindedness.

Let us take this opportunity to act ourselves with some fairness, with some sense of justice and with some sense of dignity. If that is done, perhaps we can restore the name of the House and respect for the institutions, including this House and our superior courts.

Mr GOSS (Logan—Leader of the Opposition) (12.25 p.m.): The Labor Party is on record as saying that the judge should be given an opportunity to come and speak in his own case and in his own defence before the report and the recommendation are debated. In that sense the Opposition is pleased that the Government is pursuing a course that will enable the judge to come before the bar of the House and avail himself of that opportunity if he wishes. As I said, the Opposition is on record as stating that before today, but the clear understanding that I think most members of Parliament, the media and the public had was that what we were going to have today was some sort of debate on the report that would be suspended with the judge coming in next week. That, of course, was quite wrong and that is why the member for Murrumba, and subsequently I, raised objection and canvassed the point very strenuously over recent days. As we see it, the Government has moved to our position, and we welcome that.

Government members interjected.

Mr GOSS: It is not the first back flip and it will not be the last. When I say that members of the Opposition welcome the back flip, I point out that we have one reservation, which relates to the limitations placed on the judge. The member for Murrumba will deal with that when he follows me in this debate.

It is an important principle of natural justice that the person concerned have that opportunity and that, after that, we pursue it. Statements have been made by Government representatives about not wanting to turn this debate into a sham or a circus. If there was really a responsible, solemn and sober attitude to this debate and if the Government truly wanted to have it carried out in a responsible way, it would have acted in a way that a responsible Government and a responsible Premier would have acted, that is, they would have consulted with the Opposition and with the minor party to set down appropriate ground rules whereby this matter could be addressed in a bipartisan or tripartisan way. If that was done, there would have been none of this confusion. Instead, we heard a brief and garbled report this morning about what was going to occur. I really do not think that that is good enough for a Government that makes these fatuous claims about adhering to the highest standards of the Westminster system.

The Opposition believes that the conduct of the Premier throughout this matter in recent weeks has been one of seeking a public execution for two reasons: firstly, so that the Premier can add to his persona some element of toughness that is perceived to be lacking; and, secondly, some suggestion that he or his Government is cleaning up corruption in this State. That has been a wrong approach and one that the Opposition rejects. Members of the Opposition are pleased that the order in which this matter is to be dealt with is to be reversed in the way that we have argued. The Opposition has a reservation, and my colleague the member for Murrumba will address that.

Mr WELLS (Murrumba) (12.28 p.m.): The Premier told us this morning that Parliament had been recalled to make history. In fact, Parliament has been recalled so that the Premier can say that we are going to make history. With a little more organisation we could have had the judge address us today and we could have begun on the substantial issues before this Parliament. But we do not have that organisation, so we have been brought to a one-day sitting at which the only significant business is this formal motion. The grand panoply of Parliament has been reassembled; Mr Speaker's mace has been dusted off; the Governor's aide-de-camp has polished his sword; and members have flown in from all over Queensland for this special one-day sitting.

What are we going to do? Are we going to determine the great issues of the independence of the judiciary? Are we going to make constitutional history? Are we going to take a major step in the cleansing of Queensland's public life? No! What we are going to do is issue an invitation. Moreover, we are going to issue an invitation that could have been issued before. Certainly it requires a resolution of this House to invite some private citizen to speak at the bar of the House, but the Government could have advised the judge that such a resolution as this was to be put on a special sitting day and concurrently have invited him to be ready. Alternatively, when Parliament was

sitting a few weeks ago, the Government could have introduced a contingency motion. However, the Premier wanted to have his day in the eye of history where he could parade his pretentions to wear the aegis of justice. Moreover, he wanted that day in the limelight free of possible contradictions. He wanted at least one day during which he moved only a comparatively non-controversial motion under which he could masquerade as the embodiment of retributive justice without any of the disadvantages of having to endure a debate on the points of substance.

The Government was very secretive about what procedures would be followed today. Members of the Opposition did not know until this morning what the procedures were going to be. Until the Premier rose to his feet we did not know what motion he would move. That is not very good planning for history. Previously the Government had floated the idea through the press and other channels that today we were going to debate the report and that the House would adjourn after an invitation was given to the judge to come before the House. At that time the Opposition argued that to do it like that would be a breach of natural justice. The Opposition argued that today's debate would be conducted in the eye of history. It emphasised that it was important that the basic principles of natural justice should be adhered to.

The Opposition emphasised that the well tried, well recognised principle of natural justice, the latin for which is audi alteram partem which means "hear the other side", or alternatively the principle that an accused person should be heard in his own cause, should be observed and that His Honour ought to be given the opportunity to be heard in his own defence.

The Government has now come some of the way towards observing that basic principle of natural justice. Nevertheless, it has not gone all of the way towards observing that basic principle of natural justice. I will refer to that in a minute, because I foreshadow an amendment to the Government's motion. The Opposition believes that that basic principle of natural justice is so fundamental to the Constitution of this State and to its Westminster tradition that it should be observed not only in general but also in detail.

The Premier wants to make history, but he was unable to organise an historic occasion even so much as one day in advance. There is now a purely formal motion before the House with no substantial discussion. At what cost has the House been recalled in order to consider this purely formal motion? I am in possession of some rough estimates of the cost of recalling Parliament for a single day's sitting. Those estimates come to a very considerable figure—a cost which is to be borne by the tax-payer for this special one-day sitting which the Opposition emphasises could have been avoided by a little more organisation, by a contingency motion passed when Parliament was sitting earlier this year, or by simply notifying the judge that such a motion as this was likely to be moved on a special sitting day.

I emphasise that these are rough estimates because they are old estimates and are underestimates. Under the old cost structure, for one day's sitting which finishes at 6 o'clock the cost of producing *Hansard* is $20,000. The cost of producing Votes and Proceedings is $5,000. The cost of employing extra refreshment room staff is $300. An extra switchboard-operator costs $100. Additional Hansard typists cost $600. The estimate for air fares—again an old figure—is $13,000. It is costing approximately $39,000 to bring this Parliament together for a special one-day sitting. That expense is to be borne by the tax-payer and it could have been avoided. The Opposition wishes to draw to the attention of the House that in order to move such a motion, it was unnecessary to have a special sitting. It could have been done with a little bit of organisation and without that additional cost.

I move the following amendment—

"Omit from part A(3) all words after 'allowed' in line 3 and insert in lieu thereof—

'to address the House in his own defence'."

I am referring to that section which appears on page 2 of the Premier's motion, which currently reads—

> "that at such attendance at the bar of the House His Honour or his legal representative be allowed a time not exceeding 75 minutes to address the House only in relation to the specific matters set out in the report and contained in part A(2) of this resolution upon the grounds stated in the resolution."

As amended, part (3) would read—

> "that at such attendance at the bar of the House His Honour or his legal representative be allowed to address the House in his own defence."

The Opposition moves that amendment because of its commitment to the principle audi alteram partem, that a person should be heard in his own defence. In doing that, the Opposition is neither supporting nor opposing the judge. It is merely insisting that the basic principles of natural justice should be allowed to be respected by this Parliament on the occasion of the historic sitting which, I repeat, is not occurring today but will occur next week.

When a person is entitled to address a court in his or her own defence, he or she is entitled to plead on two grounds; not only the ground relating to his or her guilt or innocence of the offences as charged but also with respect to the penalty. That person is allowed before any court in the realm and before any court in the Westminster system to plead in relation to the penalty, exculpating circumstances and circumstances which would tend to exonerate him or her. He or she is allowed to range very widely in his or her own defence in order to address all of the matters that might be relevant to the body that is determining the sentence that is to be passed upon him or her.

This Parliament has a motion before it to call the judge before the House. When the judge comes before the House he will be restricted in his remarks only to those matters relating to matters raised in the report. But those are not the only matters that might be of relevance to what determination this House might make with respect to His Honour.

The lowest criminal, the worst murderer and the worst arsonist has the opportunity to plead to any court before which he appears a range of matters which might tend to exculpate him, exonerate him or be relevant to the mitigation of the sentence. Yet that right, which is fundamental to the British system of justice which we have inherited and which is accorded to the lowest criminal, is not going to be accorded to a judge holding the Queen's commission. The judge is not going to be allowed to range broadly over the subjects before the Parliament. He is going to be restricted only to very, very specific matters, which is a fundamental breach of the principle of natural justice that an accused person is entitled to be heard in his own defence. It is a breach for which the Opposition will not take responsibility.

On behalf of the Opposition, I repeat that this special sitting has been an avoidable expense—a cost to the tax-payer caused by the administrative incompetence of this Government. Let us pass this motion—preferably amended—to invite the judge to address the Parliament. But let us remember that we did not need an extra sitting day on which to do it. When we think back on this day when 89 people came here to invite one person to come to the bar of the House, we might think that never in the course of human government was so little achieved by so many for so few.

Mr BRADDY (Rockhampton) (12.39 p.m.): I rise to second the amendment moved by the honourable member for Murrumba. I support strongly the principle that he has put before the House. If the motion is passed, next week, for the first time, there will be appearing before the bar of the House, if he so desires, a justice of the Supreme Court of Queensland or his counsel.

The Honourable the Premier has seen fit to suggest to the House that the time to be allowed to Mr Justice Vasta be restricted to 75 minutes. Of course, we are aware that Mr Justice Vasta may speak only in relation to the inquiry that was instigated. If he wishes, he may speak in his own defence in an attempt to convince the House that

it should not agree with the recommendation of the commission of inquiry. He is also entitled to speak in relation to the penalty which should be fixed by the House if it in fact agrees with the recommendations and findings of the commission of inquiry.

In its report the commission has made clear that it is a matter for this Parliament to make decisions in relation to all of these matters; to make decisions in relation to the guilt of Mr Justice Vasta and, if the House so finds that he is guilty, to make decisions in relation to the penalty that should be visited upon him. Therefore, as we all know, it is a very serious matter.

In these circumstances, I suggest that to impose upon the judge a time-limit of 75 minutes is inequitable, unjust and unfair. We are, of course, accustomed to inequitable, unjust and unfair treatment of citizens of Queensland by this Government. The Opposition will not agree with that treatment being visited upon the judge. At this time the Opposition does not take a stand in relation to the guilt or innocence of Mr Justice Vasta. It says that he is entitled to be heard for whatever time is necessary for him to make his plea.

In a court of law a person who faces conviction is entitled to speak either personally or through his counsel for whatever time is necessary. This commission of inquiry sat for more than 40 days, at extreme expense to the Government and to the people of Queensland. What possible reason is there now to restrict the judge to a time-limit of 75 minutes in this place? After the millions that have already been spent, what possible reason of expense could be put forward? In any event, honourable members will be brought back to this place in the way that has already been discussed. So why is it proposed to limit the time to 75 minutes? Is it because the Government is frightened of what Mr Justice Vasta might say in this place? Is it because the Government does not have the courage to sit and hear what the judge will say in relation to this particular matter and his defence? Is that the real reason why this Government is prepared to put before the House this sham of restricting a man who stands to lose his reputation, his job and his honour and to whom the Government says, "Seventy-five minutes only."?

God knows, we in this place are accustomed to Ministers having unlimited time when they present Bills. No time-limit whatever is placed upon them. I venture to suggest that no legislation that has been introduced into this place has been more serious than a man defending his reputation and his very livelihood before the bar of the Parliament of Queensland.

I am aware that in the Creighton incident, which was referred to by the Premier, a time-limit was imposed. At that time, the mover of the motion, Mr Hilton, moved that, in relation to the Chairman of the Land Administration Board, "the time allowed for such address shall not exceed the time allowed for speaking on that motion to the mover thereof, namely seventy minutes." In 1956 an equation was made between the time allowed to the mover of the motion and the time allowed to Mr Creighton to appear and defend himself. In the present case it is interesting that the mover of the motion was allowed only 30 minutes, so clearly the Government has already moved away from the principle that was adopted in 1956. It is not sticking to the principle that the judge be allowed only the same time as that given to the mover of the motion. *Hansard* of 1 August 1956 reveals "that the time allowed for such address shall not exceed the time allowed for speaking on that motion to the mover thereof, namely seventy minutes", which must have been the time allowed at that time.

The Government has moved to change that. The Government thought that even 30 minutes might be a bit rough, so it decided arbitrarily to allow 75 minutes, which is the time that has been proposed to the House. We are not bound by what was done in 1956. There are many things that we in the Labor Party do not agree with in relation to the Gair Government and those who were members of it, and we certainly do not agree with this present proposal. It is shameful for this House to impose upon a man whose reputation, career and honour are at stake a time-limit of 75 minutes in which to speak about his guilt or innocence or the penalty that should be visited upon him. I suggest that it is clearly done out of fear. This Government again is on the run and

now it is running from a judge whose reputation has been placed by a commission of inquiry before the House, to be judged. It appears that this Government is so pathetic that it cannot even sit for more than 75 minutes and listen to a judge speak to the House in his own defence.

The Opposition is prepared to sit here for whatever time it takes. Just as a judge and jury in court sit and listen to the final address of counsel for the accused for whatever time it takes to speak in relation to innocence and penalty, so should this House. Members of the Opposition reject the arbitrary time that has been set by the Government in its craven fear of what might be said.

I have great pleasure, with respect to the House, in seconding the amendment.

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (12.46 p.m.): The Liberal Party will support the amendment. This is an extraordinarily solemn occasion.

The Standing Orders of this House give to a Minister in charge of a Bill unlimited time to inform the House of every aspect of the Bill he chooses. Nothing more important or solemn than this motion could occupy the time of the House. One would have thought that, although it might not be in the interests of people to speak at such length that they begin to annoy other honourable members, after 43 days of hearings and the complexity of interweaving the grounds, neither justice nor any good purpose would be served by cutting short the time of the judge or his legal representative. In the interest of fairness, the Liberal Party supports the amendment.

Hon. M. J. AHERN (Landsborough—Premier and Treasurer and Minister for State Development and the Arts) (12.47 p.m.): The Government has gone to a great deal of trouble to get the best advice possible in respect of this whole procedure. On this occasion I suspect that the honourable members of the Opposition have had to study hard to try to find one particular facet of the Government's strategy in bringing this matter before the Parliament on which to raise criticism. There is very little basis at all upon which to bring criticism.

The plain facts are that I believe that the member for Murrumba and the member for Rockhampton have not consulted their leader in respect of this matter. This morning, that was very broadly revealed when the member for Murrumba said that he had no copy of the motion that was to be moved. Obviously he is not talking to the Leader of the Opposition, because the Leader of the Opposition had a copy of the motion this morning and had a discussion.

This particular matter concerns whether or not there should be a limitation of 75 minutes applied. The plain facts are that a judges commission of inquiry took place and that, at the request of the commissioners who had approached the Government for an amendment, that commission was extended to enable the commissioners to sit longer. Honourable members will recall that that was done so that everybody concerned would be given due time and so that every respect for the process and gravity of the matter would be observed. All of that was sensibly agreed to. The cross-examination and time to talk was given, as sought, and that is how it should be.

When the Government looked into whether a time limitation should be placed on this debate, it was obvious—bearing in mind the Creighton precedent, which is the only one that we were able to find in this Parliament—that the Labor Government of the day realised that there had been a royal commission and determined that a time limitation should be applied. That Government decided on a limitation of 70 minutes. That is the precedent, and there are not many in respect of these matters.

The situation is clear. What has not been understood is that it is always competent for the House to provide an extension for a speech if members wish to do so.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr AHERN: It is clearly true that it is in the hands of the House to provide an extension to His Honour should it be determined that he has not had an adequate opportunity to present his case.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr AHERN: That is true. Throughout my 21 years in this Parliament, it has often been used. There is no doubt that members of the Opposition are casting widely in finding a way to criticise this procedure because they feel that they have to criticise it in some way.

The truth is that the Government has taken excellent advice and has presented it well, which is its responsibility, to the Parliament. It has been discussed with Opposition members this morning—and not before, because previously on one occasion confidences have been broken, found to have been dragged all over newspapers of the country, and run in editorials of the *Australian* when straight-out falsehoods were propagated by the Leader of the Opposition, who was abusing the confidence.

Mr GOSS: I rise to a point of order. Those comments are grossly untrue and grossly offensive. I seek their withdrawal. This person is the last one to accuse people of breaking confidences.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition finds the comments offensive.

Mr AHERN: I withdraw the material.

Mr Goss: You had better not open up that Pandora's box.

Mr AHERN: I withdraw any offensive material, but I can tell the Leader of the Opposition that, because of my experience, my practice will be that when I consider it appropriate to consult with the Opposition, it will be on the morning of the decision and no earlier.

Mr GOSS: With respect, I rise to another point of order. The Premier has repeated the offensive remark by the reference to his experience. It should be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GOSS: I have not finished yet. Mr Speaker, the Premier makes a most serious accusation. It is one that is most unfair and untrue and he knows it. If he wants to get into some of the confidential discussions that have occurred between us and Mr Fitzgerald, I will deal with him very roughly.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition takes offence at the remarks.

Mr Goss: Withdraw it, or we will have it out right now.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition!

Mr AHERN: I withdraw any offensive material, but in relation to the debate on the Acts Interpretation Act, I was offended by the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition that were totally false.

Mr Goss: That is not so.

Mr AHERN: That is certainly so.

Mr Goss: You botched your explanation, you donkey.

Mr AHERN: I find the personal remark made by the Leader of the Opposition offensive and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr Hamill interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ipswich! The Premier finds the interjection made by the Leader of the Opposition offensive. I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr GOSS: He is clearly not a donkey. I withdraw it.

Mr AHERN: The honourable Leader of the Opposition has lost his cool in this matter. Methinks he doth protest too much.

This time-limit is based on a precedent set by the Labor Government of Queensland at the time when this matter was brought before this Parliament. There is a clear precedent and there is a capability placed in the hands of the House to provide an extension if one is thought necessary. Therefore, this amendment is unnecessary and the procedure brought forward is reasonable. In these circumstances it is possible for the House to be held up for some days and, after a commission has ranged unrestrained for weeks over the matter, it is proper for the matter to be brought before the House in this way. Therefore, I reject the amendment.

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (12.55 p.m.): When addressing the House the Premier destroyed the basis of his own argument by rejecting this amendment. The Premier said that an extension will be granted if it is desired. If an extension is to be granted, why place a limitation in the first place? The entire basis for placing the 75-minute limitation in the resolution is therefore removed and unnecessary.

I point out to the Premier that he should perhaps take further advice about the ease of granting an extension. I remind him that the House would not be operating under the normal terms of Standing Orders; it would operate under the terms of this resolution. A resolution imposing a 75-minute limitation would require more procedures than the Leader of the House merely standing up to grant it. In any event, that complexity aside, the Premier has himself stated that the judge will be given virtually unlimited time if he so desires, and that being the case, and the Premier having said that an extension will be granted if it is necessary, there is now no reason to place the limitation in the motion. Therefore the amendment is not only sensible, but also necessary to make sense of the processes which this House is about to follow.

Hon. W. D. LICKISS (Moggill) (12.56 p.m.): There are two points I wish to make. The Leader of the Liberal Party mentioned that under Standing Order 109 a Minister is not limited by time when making an explanation to the House. The analogy to be drawn here is that the person invited to address the Parliament should not be placed at a disadvantage by time in any way. The time element should be open to him so that that person could not leave the House and say, "I was limited by time in putting my case."

The second point I wish to make is that part (3) of the motion states—

> "That at such attendance at the bar of the House His Honour or his legal representative be allowed a time not exceeding 75 minutes to address the House only in relation to the specific matters set out in the report and contained in part A(2) of this resolution upon the grounds stated in the resolution."

When this Parliament meets again to deal with this matter it will do so in accordance with the resolution carried by this House today. The resolution will be binding on this House as from today until that duty is discharged. It will be in vogue and will be supervised, perused and controlled by the Speaker when conducting the House next week. Therefore, if next week the person addressing the Parliament, Mr Justice Vasta—if he so desires—wishes to go beyond the 75-minute limitation and is unable to go beyond 75 minutes, then an amendment will have to be made to the resolution under which the House will be working. It is for that reason—and rightly so—that the Leader of the Liberal Party has indicated that the Liberal Party supports the amendment. I hope that my remarks will be seen to endorse the statement made by the Leader of the Liberal Party.

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Nicklin—Leader of the House) (12.58 p.m.): The debate seems to be directed more towards what the power of this Parliament is or is not. This

House is master of its own destiny and if, at some stage during the next few days of this session, this House decides to do other than what is contained in this resolution, then this House is competent to do so. Several honourable members have spoken about the question of the House being bound by the resolution, and it is simply not true.

This House is and always will be master of its own destiny and able to do as it wishes in this place. It is not a court of law; it is a group of members of Parliament who control their own destiny and the sooner the lawyers in this place understand that fact, the better off we will all be.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the question—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 42		NOES, 38	
Ahern	Lester	Ardill	McLean
Alison	Lingard	Beanland	Milliner
Austin	Littleproud	Beard	Palaszczuk
Booth	McCauley	Braddy	Santoro
Burreket	McKechnie	Burns	Schuntner
Chapman	Menzel	Campbell	Scott
Clauson	Muntz	Casey	Sherlock
Cooper	Neal	Comben	Smith
Elliott	Newton	D'Arcy	Smyth
Fraser	Perrett	De Lacy	Vaughan
Gamin	Randell	Eaton	Warburton
Gately	Row	Gibbs, R. J.	Warner
Gibbs, I. J.	Sherrin	Goss	Wells
Gilmore	Simpson	Gygar	White
Glasson	Slack	Hamill	
Gunn	Stoneman	Hayward	
Harper	Tenni	Innes	
Henderson	Veivers	Knox	
Hinton		Lee	
Hobbs	*Tellers:*	Lickiss	*Tellers:*
Hynd	FitzGerald	McElligott	Davis
Katter	Stephan	Mackenroth	Prest
PAIRS:			
	Borbidge	Underwood	
	McPhie	Shaw	

Resolved in the affirmative.

Motion agreed to.

Sitting suspended from 1.06 to 2.30 p.m.

QUEENSLAND INTERNATIONAL TOURIST CENTRE AGREEMENT ACT REPEAL BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 11 April (see p. 4413).

Mr BURNS (Lytton—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.30 p.m.): It is 11 years since the Parliament sat all night to debate the Queensland International Tourist Centre Agreement Bill, or the Iwasaki con trick Bill, as I called it at that time. By introducing this legislation, the Government is admitting that it was conned at that time by a very smart old Jap.

At that time, an agreement was signed between the Queensland Government and Mr Iwasaki covering 8 276 hectares of land. In his second-reading speech, the Minister said that 5 200 hectares, or 65 per cent of the total area, was purchased as freehold on the open market. That statement is not exactly right. In fact, the Livingstone Shire Council, against its wishes, was forced to sell some land at that time to the Iwasaki group. The council opposed the proposal, but the Government acted as a real estate agent for Iwasaki and obtained the land from the Livingstone Shire Council. An area of 2 558 hectares of land was held under perpetual lease selection, special lease and

grazing farm, which, prior to negotiation of the agreement, the Iwasaki company had contracted to purchase. That has since been converted to freehold. The opposition of the people of Queensland and Australia to the sale of freehold land to overseas interests was negated at that time by the arrangements made by the State Government. An area of 4 hectares was contained in a water reserve, which the agreement enabled the Iwasaki company to acquire as freehold. Another 248 hectares were contained in a special lease over which the agreement enabled the Iwasaki company to be registered as lessee and subsequently to be issued with a deed of grant. Out of the 8 276 hectares, 266 hectares were contained in two special leases. Therefore, of the total area covered by the agreement, 97 per cent is freehold land owned by that foreign gentleman and 3 per cent is owned by the Crown. I remind honourable members that the freehold title is right to the high-water mark.

Under the Act, the Government had some obligations, as did Iwasaki. At the time that Iwasaki came to Queensland, he promised Disneyland, 100 000 tourists a month, a million tourists a year, to turn water into electricity, to breed prawns—almost everything. He visited Government offices handing out beads and watches to people. When anyone took a stand against him, the Premier of the day, Mr Bjelke-Petersen, said, "Give this man what he wants." He got what he wanted.

The Government undertook to enable Iwasaki to obtain land held by the Livingstone Shire Council. That action was completed. The Government undertook to provide for certain roadworks to the entrance to the resort to be constructed by the State, at a cost to the tax-payers. Those roadworks were undertaken at considerable cost to the Government. The final stage of the four-lane highway linking Yeppoon with the resort entrance has been commenced.

The Government undertook to grant the Iwasaki company exemptions from the Livingstone Shire Council town-planning scheme and from the provisions of the Canals Act and the Beach Protection Act. That meant that Iwasaki was not covered by town-planning. The Iwasaki company was given a right to convert the special leases to perpetual lease tenure, which was carried out.

The Government varied laws of the State in relation to the control of certain matters, for example, beach protection, control of motor vehicles on the beach, certification of plans of survey and so on. All of those things were done.

The Government entered into an agreement with Iwasaki and kept its side of the deal. In return, Iwasaki broke many of the obligations that he had under the agreement. He broke not only the promises that he made about tourists, but also those that he made about a public road to landing reserve R.11 on Fishing Creek. A road was constructed, but without consultation with the Livingstone Shire Council. Some sections of the road are outside the road reserve and it has not been dedicated for public use. Iwasaki ignored the Queensland Government, the agreement and the rules.

He was to provide a road through the resort land, with eight points of access to the high-water mark, parking facilities and pedestrian ways for use by the public between sunrise and sunset. He built a private road to the resort buildings, but provided only two public beach access points. Furthermore, he kicked off the beach Australians who were collecting worms. If anyone tries to deny that, I can produce the fishermen who were kicked off. I was present when Iwasaki's guards came down and said, "You are not allowed on this beach." They claimed that the company owned the land to the high-water mark. When we tried to argue that we were below the high-water mark, they told us otherwise, and we left.

Iwasaki was to provide 77 hectares of land for use by the public as recreation area between sunrise and sunset. That has not been provided, and the Government accepts that it has not been provided. He was supposed to provide a resort complex of international standard which, when developed, would be of benefit to the whole State. What did he give us? Under the arrangement, he was to commence in April 1979. By April 1989, he was to provide 500 rooms in first-class hotels, 100 rooms in other hotels, 250 motel rooms, 1 680 flats, 475 villas, a golf course, two beach centres, five international

villages with 330 rooms and a transport centre. At present, he has a collection of caravan parks and flats. The Liberal Party and the National Party at that time indulged in all sorts of subterfuge and took all sorts of legislative steps to ensure that Iwasaki got his way.

The company did not complete Stage 1 of development of the resort by 1 April 1984 or Stage 2 of development by 1 April 1989. It has not submitted a program of works for Stage 3, which was to have commenced this year. The company has constructed picnic tables and shelter sheds on the beachfront allotments where they were not supposed to be. It has constructed the golf clubhouse and resort administration building on a single lot when they should have been on separate lots. It has constructed a formed 8 metre gravel road along the western side of the spit and within the area held under special lease. It did not have approval to do that. The greater part of the road is contained in the esplanade and, again, no approvals were sought to construct the road on the esplanade.

The Iwasaki company has ignored completely the Government of Queensland, the laws of Queensland and the agreement that we spent all night passing. However, what is the Government doing to it? It will do virtually nothing.

Eleven years ago in this Chamber I reminded this Government of the warning from its own expert committee on land involved in the Iwasaki development. That committee was headed at the time by the then Co-ordinator General, Sir Charles Barton, and comprised the following members: Dr J. Harvey, the Director-General of the Department of Primary Industries; Mr L. Lawrence, the Secretary of the Land Administration Commission; Mr Arthur Muhl, Senior Planning Officer of the Department of Local Government; Mr Jim Peel, Director of the Department of Harbours and Marine; and Mr J. Wilson, Director-General of Tourist Services, Department of Tourism, Sport and Welfare Services. That committee said—

> "Accessible features are scarce in central Queensland. Their future use should be planned."

In the same speech, I warned Parliament and the Government as follows—

> "To suggest that the annulment of this agreement"—

that is, the Iwasaki agreement—

> "is the only possible penalty is sheer lunacy."

I said that 11 years ago, and I say today that I was right then and that the Government was wrong to do what it did for Iwasaki. This Government gave that land away to a foreign gentleman who had no intention of keeping to the agreement. The Premier's second-reading speech on this Bill proves all of the things that I have said today.

Iwasaki treated this Parliament and the people of this State with contempt. All members of the Opposition received at that time were arguments that they were being racist when they said that he would not keep to the agreement, when they said that people in Japan were telling them that his history showed that he would not do it. Members of the Opposition were sneered at and the argument was put forward that they were racist.

The people of Queensland want to know what is happening to their land in this State, who owns it and who controls it. I think that the Iwasaki agreement started some of the flood of argument about foreign investment in Queensland.

In that same speech 11 years ago, I added—

> "By the time this occurred"—

that is, annulment of the agreement—

> "he would own all the land he requires and the cancellation of the franchise would suit Iwasaki down to the ground, allowing him to go his own way without the presence of a Government agreement."

How accurate those warnings were! That is exactly what the Government is going to do today. It is going to annul the agreement. All of the arrangements whereby Iwasaki had to do certain things by certain times and provide all of these resort facilities are going to be annulled. He does not have to do those things any more because there will no longer be any agreement. He will now have to comply with the town-planning by-laws of the Livingstone Shire Council. He will have to do what any other Australian businessman has done, but he has had 11 years' start.

Iwasaki had the opportunity to freehold all that Government land and he had the Queensland Government of the day, the Liberal/National Party Government, work hand in hand with him as his real estate agent. Sadly, as I see this new legislation, the words of warning that I gave were ignored and as a result Queensland has forfeited for ever into foreign hands more than 8 000 hectares of beachfront land. The people of Queensland have been dudded by this crafty old Jap Iwasaki and his National Party and Liberal Party collaborators in this State. It is no use saying, "Blame old Joh.", as the Ahern Government does in regard to almost every controversy that confronts it.

Hansard records that on 16 and 17 May 1978 this Parliament passed the Iwasaki agreement. Every National and Liberal Party member in this Parliament was fully behind the then Premier and this cunning old Jap. During that historic debate, the present Minister for Transport, Mr McKechnie, told honourable members—

> "I do not think the night should be allowed to pass without it being pointed out to the people of Queensland how important it is that we have found in Mr Iwasaki a friend in the country to which we must export our primary produce."

No change in the arrangements with Japan has resulted from this agreement. I go to Japan on a regular basis and I mix with a lot of Japanese businessmen in the course of my activities as the Australian President of the Japan Karate Association. I am presently introducing Queensland businessmen to Japanese businessmen who are interested in importing beef. This is the first time there has been a change in those arrangements, and it is because the Japanese Government has decided to free up the beef quota arrangements in Japan in a couple of years' time.

Mr Lee: What about giving us his name?

Mr BURNS: There is more than one.

One particular gentleman who owns 48 major restaurants in Japan that serve beef—at least one of which seats 1 200 people at a sitting and has a turn-over of some 250 million yen per year—has been out with representatives of the Meat and Livestock Corporation and others looking at Queensland lot-fed and grain-fed beef for the quality market in Japan. Of course, the member for Yeronga is in that business, and I will most certainly make arrangements for him. That is the way to go. We want to sell Queensland beef if possible.

My argument is not an anti-Japanese one. I said in that first debate in this Parliament and I still say that I do not believe that freehold land in this State should be sold to foreign nationals. The first thing I read about it was in 1965 when the Aliens Act had been changed. Prior to that time, when Queensland land was sold to a foreign national, the Queensland Minister had the right to look at that and say, "This could be in our interests", or, "This is not in our interests." If it was not in this State's interests to have those people take over the land, the Government had some right of veto. The Government could say, "That cannot happen", or, "That will not happen."

Mr Hinton: The Labor Party voted for that legislation.

Mr BURNS: Well, it made a mistake. I was not a member of this Parliament in those days. Every member of the National Party voted for the legislation. The member for Broadsound has conveniently become interested in foreign investment because he has found that it might hurt him in his electorate at present. But, 11 years ago, there was not one squeak out of the member for Broadsound or any other member of the Liberal/National Party.

Members of the Opposition were accused of being racist. I went to Yeppoon and I told the people of Yeppoon that they were being conned. I know people who went to Yeppoon and did their packet because they thought that Iwasaki was going to bring a flood of Japanese tourists into Yeppoon and they were all going to make a million. Those were the promises that were made by the National Party Premier, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, and the Liberal members of the day.

I can remember the former member for Sherwood giving me a bucket in this Chamber about being a racist because I dared to stand up and say what I am saying again today and what I have said every year since I became a member of this Parliament. The member for Broadsound need not tell me what someone did in 1965. His Government introduced the legislation. The Labor Party could not have voted for it if the National Party had not introduced it.

Mr Hinton: The only person who spoke against it was Tommy Aikens. He was the only one.

Mr BURNS: The National Party introduced it. All the member for Broadsound has done is strut around the place. I heard his speech this morning. He was not saying much this morning about introducing legislation to control foreign investment. The same could be said about the members of the Liberal Party. They are going to get rid of the Foreign Investment Review Board, which is about the weakest organisation in Australia as far as controlling foreign investment is concerned.

Mr Vaughan: They have changed their mind.

Mr BURNS: The honourable member says that they have changed their minds again. Bad luck! One never knows when the members of the Liberal Party will change their minds or their leader again, so we are never too sure what we might get there.

The plain facts of the matter are that at that time legislation could have been introduced. Members of the National Party are making a lot of noise. When August comes, they should introduce the legislation. If they do, I bet that the Labor Party will vote for it. I issue that challenge to them. They should put their money where their mouths are if they think that they can do something about it.

The people of Queensland have been dudded by the National Party, which has acted as a real estate agent. The member of Parliament who represented the Broadsound electorate prior to Mr Hinton fell over his trousers to take points of order early in the morning. Honourable members will recall that his belt fell out of his trousers and he nearly broke his ruddy neck getting around the benches in the Chamber to take a point of order when I said that Iwasaki was an old crook. I was suspended from the Parliament for two days because Joh Bjelke-Petersen and members of the present Government expelled me from the House because I said that old Iwasaki was a crook. When I would not withdraw the statement on the ruling of the Speaker, I was suspended from the House for two days.

Mr FitzGerald: You were not thrown out because of that.

Mr BURNS: I was. It is a matter of public record what happened on that occasion.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! If the Chamber does not come to order, someone will be suspended for another two days. I doubt whether it will be the member for Lytton.

Mr BURNS: I will drink to that.

In 1978 Mr Ahern was very enthusiastic about the Bill. Not only did he support the original franchise legislation, but also he was the teller for the Government. He spent all night counting the supporters to make certain that the Government had the numbers. As the Government Whip he rallied up the numbers to ensure that the Bill was passed. Mr Ahern was there all the way with this phantom development.

It is interesting to recall some of the people who were all the way at that time with old Joh and Iwasaki. The Minister for Finance, Mr Austin, was there; it was his first all-night sitting of the Parliament. He voted all the way with Iwasaki. The Minister for Community Services, Mr Katter, was not late that night.

Mr Austin: I think I missed a couple of votes that night.

Mr BURNS: The Minister missed a couple of votes? Good on him. I will have to check up on that.

For the first time in his life, Mr Katter was not late that night; he was here. The Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services, Mr Neal, was here. The Minister for Northern Development, Mr Tenni, was here. I have named four Ministers who were present. I forgot old Bill Gunn, the Deputy Premier. He was here. All of those persons supported Iwasaki all the way. Today, they all have egg on their face because they are now withdrawing the agreement. Iwasaki was the one who received the most out of the legislation—the benefits—and the people of Queensland paid for that. They gave away their land and spent their money. The Government kept its side of the agreement and Iwasaki did nothing. What are we doing to him? We are slapping him on the wrists. We are saying, "We will annul the agreement." However, he has got away with it. The horse has bolted.

Mr Hinton: He bought his land.

Mr BURNS: Get out! Iwasaki bought his land subject to special arrangements. The honourable member does not even know what he is talking about. Fair dinkum! I know that the honourable member is a successful forger, but as far as the other arrangements are concerned, he ought to——

Mr HINTON: I rise to a point of order. The statement made by the honourable member is untrue and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr BURNS: I do not think that it was untrue, but I will withdraw it. It is a matter of public record, but I will withdraw it. It was a bit unfair. I should not have said that about the honourable member.

Mr Prest: He is not successful.

Mr BURNS: I did not say that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to return to the subject being debated.

After the recent grandstanding by Martin Tenni at the Port Douglas Mirage sell-out, it is timely to remind the voters of Barron River how supportive their local member was of Iwasaki and his central Queensland land grab. What is the true story behind the legislation now before Parliament? Like the failed agreement that it revokes, this repeal Bill from a Premier who helped pass the previous one has about as much benefit for genuine Queenslanders who love Queensland as a piece of used Vasta toilet-paper. All it does is remove from sight off the State statute-book the continuing humiliation of a phoney agreement that Iwasaki never observed and never intended to observe. All it does is drag from sight the embarrassment of a parliamentary agreement that Governments over more than 10 years have failed to enforce and, far worse, even monitor.

Mr Austin: You are better when you speak off the cuff.

Mr BURNS: I am.

Iwasaki keeps 8 010 hectares of irreplaceable central Queensland coastline with an unbroken beach frontage of over seven kilometres. He hangs onto land that he freeholded. Today, the way to look at that Iwasaki land is to think of half of Bribie Island being offered for sale tomorrow to a Japanese owner for a development/resort. If that was done, there would be hell to pay. If half of South Stradbroke Island was being offered

for sale tomorrow to a foreign national to develop in a similar way, with special deals, with the Beach Protection Act wiped aside, the Mining Act wiped aside, town-planning laws wiped aside, local councils wiped aside and special arrangements over the purchase, there would be hell to pay. We are talking about an area that is half the size of Bribie Island.

Mr Hinton: It was wasteland.

Mr BURNS: The honourable member was a city boy who went up there and won the seat of Broadsound. If he stood on the Bluff at Yeppoon and looked along that beach, he would see one of the most magnificent straight stretches of beach that he will see in Queensland between Maryborough and Mackay. The National Party sold that out to foreigners for a song.

Mr Hinton: I blocked the Iwasaki company from getting the whole Bayfield area.

Mr BURNS: The honourable member blocked him from nothing. Old Joh left here. If he had been here today, this agreement would not be on the cards and he would have had the rest of it there. In fact, the fishermen and other persons conducted a campaign that forced Howard and others in the Federal Government at the time to stop Iwasaki from expanding his empire. The honourable member was not even around. He was still selling pigs in Brisbane.

As I said, Iwasaki keeps 8 010 hectares of irreplaceable central Queensland coastline with an unbroken beach frontage of more than seven kilometres. He hangs onto land that he freeholded, but he never developed it under a one-sided agreement.

Mr Austin: Did you see it before he started to develop it? Turn it up!

Mr BURNS: What has he developed?

Mr Austin: Did you see it before he started to develop it?

Mr BURNS: Yes, I saw it. It was wet. In fact, that is one of the reasons why Charles Barton and others said that it should not be developed. They made recommendations about the swampland. I am talking about the fish-breeding areas.

Mr Hinton: It is swampland.

Mr BURNS: It was. At that time they talked very much about some of the land that was very valuable for fish-breeding. They recommended against the construction at that time. That information is contained in the report. The honourable member can obtain it from the Parliamentary Library. The report was tabled in the Parliament on 5 March 1975. It is No. 122. The recommendations against the resort are there for everybody to see. It is true to say that there was a narrow stretch of good sandy beach. I have fished and camped at Fishing Creek. I must say that the sandflies were a bit thick, but at the same time it was a magnificent fishing spot and a great camping area.

Mr Veivers: He reckons it wouldn't run two bandicoots in the open.

Mr BURNS: All he ever thinks of is two bandicoots. If he put his aim a little higher than two bandicoots, he could get somewhere. That has been the trouble. The cheap attitude of the National Party keeps him at bandicoot level.

Iwasaki hangs onto land that he freeholded but never developed under a one-sided agreement that he ignored even though the Government seems to have kept its part of the bargain. That cunning old Japanese fraud must be laughing all the way to the shrine of Hirohito as he studies this new legislation from "too-tough Mike". It is like convicting a criminal of armed robbery and then letting him go free with all of his stolen money. If this Government has not been actually harpooned by Iwasaki, it certainly has been well and truly Japooned, as the latest events show.

Not only does this legislation leave that foreign defaulter with all of his land except 266 hectares leasehold, but it also goes further to legalise all the works that he has

undertaken so far, presumably including those that the Premier now lists as being in breach of the original agreement. No-one has said whether he is going to be forced to knock them down, or what. Can Mr Austin answer that question?

Mr Austin: No.

Mr BURNS: No.

If ever there has been irrefutable evidence before this Parliament of the dangers of allowing foreigners to freehold Queensland land, it is the disgrace of the ongoing Iwasaki saga. Here, as well as at Sanctuary Cove and Port Douglas, valuable coastal land has passed irretrievably into overseas hands via projects that have enjoyed State Government patronage through Parliament. It is no wonder that the voters in Townsville recently were not prepared to give the National Party yet another opportunity for similar exploitation at Florence Bay.

From its starting point until the present time, the Iwasaki experiment has involved little more than an elaborate dream. Since that pathetically slow development began 11 years ago, Australia has managed to start and finish the massive new Parliament House in Canberra. During the very same period Queensland has planned and staged both the Commonwealth Games and World Expo. Those massive promotions and constructions reached fruition in far less time than it has taken the marathon Iwasaki project to crawl behind schedule towards its half-way mark on the Capricorn Coast. There are a few motels and a few flats.

I believe that Iwasaki signed a parliamentary franchise agreement with the Queensland Government which he never meant to observe or obey. I believe that Iwasaki and his company have—as reported by the Premier in his second-reading speech—deliberately breached provisions of that agreement through illegal construction of roadways, picnic tables, shelter sheds, a service station and golf administrative buildings. I believe that Iwasaki and his company never at any time made the slightest effort to comply with development timetables that they themselves endorsed when the franchise agreement was signed.

The clear evidence is that Iwasaki and his company deliberately dishonoured an agreement that they entered into with this Parliament, even though the Government appears to have met its responsibilities under the very same joint commitment. I do not believe that this Government would have treated Australians in the very same way.

In such circumstances, this legislation is far too soft on Iwasaki. The head of Iwasaki's Yeppoon resort, Tomi Yamada, said as much on 13 April of this year when he showed no concern whatsoever about the loss of 266 hectares of leasehold land. The company indicated that it was not even considering a legal appeal over plans to revoke the franchise agreement. The evidence is that Iwasaki will not be inconvenienced. He has already gathered what he sought in the first place, that is, control for all time over 8 000 hectares of our prized central Queensland beachfront.

With the help of the traitorous National and Liberal Parties in this State, Iwasaki has secured unshakable ownership of a greater stretch of our beachfront between Cairns and Coolangatta than has any other individual or company. He has acquired that huge oceanfront monopoly through the favours of a parliamentary franchise agreement which he has arrogantly dishonoured and disobeyed. As I said, in such outrageous circumstances this legislation is far too soft and will not lose Iwasaki or his henchmen one second's sleep.

As I explained, Iwasaki keeps his ill-gotten land and at the same time loses the mild irritation of being saddled with a meaningless but occasionally annoying franchise agreement which he never observed or intended to observe. Apart from a few rather vague penalties, construction of a minor roadway and responsibility to local government by-laws, Iwasaki is free to go his own way in his own time. He is free to build as much of his original resort as he wants when he wants.

I believe that the case against Iwasaki and his company is so clear cut that they should be stripped of all land, freehold or leasehold, that they have not already developed. I am certain that most Queenslanders agree with my belief that there are no mitigating factors that entitle those Japanese cheats to yet another chance from a Government that has already turned somersaults to patronise them.

Iwasaki's latest excuse for inability on a project that is already hopelessly behind schedule is that he now needs an international airport. If he gets that wish, I have no doubt that his next demand will be a space station.

In 1978 Iwasaki said that five jumbo jets per week would be landing at the Rockhampton airport and that there would be one million tourists annually. The first bloke who went to the area was Bruce Small. He went up there with his dark glasses on, had a look around and said, "There will be 100 000 people here this year." About two months later Russ Hinze went up there and said, "There will be a million-a-year flood starting next year." It was claimed that 3 700 jobs would be created there. That was all going to happen overnight. Iwasaki said that a Disneyland would be built together with massive international hotels.

Mr Veivers: That only happened 200 kilometres south at Surfers Paradise.

Mr BURNS: There was a slight miscalculation in location.

Iwasaki kept on going. Whenever he was challenged he came up with a new scheme. He used to say, "I will spend $10m in the next five years." When he was told that he was falling behind he said, "I will spend $20m in the next two years." He did not spend $10m in five years or $20m in two years. He just made those statements and went away.

From the day that Iwasaki learned that he could manipulate the spineless National and Liberal Parties in this State——

Mr Austin: I wasn't spineless.

Mr BURNS: The National Party was spineless as far as Iwasaki was concerned.

I cannot believe that people would allow Iwasaki to do what he used to do to some of the Australian staff in the Executive Building. I do not believe that Japanese visitors should be handing out gifts to people and then, when those people do not do what the Japanese want, go and see the Premier, who orders those people to do what the Japanese want. That happened in those days. Mr Austin was a member of the National Party at that time.

Mr Austin: I was a Liberal at that stage.

Mr BURNS: I am sorry. The Minister was a Liberal at that time. I have to keep track of his record of where he has been and who he was with at the time. How is he going now? Does he intend to go back to the Liberals?

Mr Austin: I am all right now.

Mr BURNS: The Minister has settled for a while.

Mr Gygar: You need a calendar or a weather chart to work out where he is.

Mr BURNS: Did Hansard get that?

Mr Austin: Your blokes will have to improve on your 16 per cent to make an impression.

Mr BURNS: Would the honourable member for Stafford like to reply?

Mr Gygar: I am just reminding him that he is going to have a lot of fun when his vote halves at the next election.

Mr Austin: It is still enough to win.

Mr BURNS: Do honourable members mind if I continue?

In the 1970s the National and Liberal Parties pursued their courtship of Iwasaki with their eyes wide open. First, there was the warning of the Government's own expert Barton committee. I ask the honourable member who represents the area in question to read the worthwhile recommendations of that committee. It was a very high-powered committee. It said such things as foreign freeholding of Australian land was not in the interests of the people and would be unacceptable. The committee made those recommendations at the time, but the Government went ahead and freeholded 97 per cent of the land. The committee recommended against the start of the resort in that way, although it said that a big resort such as that was probably better than a lot of little resorts being built in the area. The committee made a number of very good recommendations, but they were all ignored at the time.

As I said, the Government's own expert Barton committee warned of the possible dangers of such a development in the area in which it was planned. Fears were expressed by conservationists about damage to such local ecology as unique bird and fish habitats. From many quarters, including the RSL, came genuine doubts about such a large slab of our far-from-unlimited central Queensland coastline passing into overseas control. All of these doubts—all of these warnings—were cast aside as the Liberal and National Parties, including the Premier, rushed blindly into their sweetheart deal with Iwasaki.

I do not intend again taking Parliament through the history of a development that has been already extensively debated; but it is important that Queenslanders are reminded of the enthusiasm of the Nationals and the Liberals as they recklessly bound this State to an agreement they now concede was wrong and must now be invalidated.

Mr Austin: When you read the pulls of *Hansard* tomorrow, you will say, "Who wrote this?"

Mr BURNS: I can tell the honourable member that he will be sorry he made some of the interjections that he has.

How much money did Iwasaki pour into the slush funds of the National Party to reward its political generosity? I invite the Leader of the House to answer that question. How much money did Iwasaki give to the National Party's State election campaign?

Mr Austin: I was a Liberal then.

Mr BURNS: That is right; the honourable member was a Liberal. Well, how much did the Liberals get? They were in it, too. They were in it hand and glove. The Liberal Party was in it right up to its neck, getting its little share of it. Iwasaki must have been handing money out, because the Government could not possibly have written these agreements on behalf of the people of Queensland if it was not getting a sling somewhere. If the Liberals were not getting it, the National Party was doing well.

How much did he give to Bjelke-Petersen personally? Maybe we will find that out in the next few weeks. In fact, if ever the so-called Fitzgerald report is released and Joh and Hinze and a few others are not put in gaol, I will think it is a farce. How much did he give to Bjelke-Petersen personally? Was it his mysterious delivery boys who left some of those paper bags full of money in Joh's Executive Building office? I wonder whether it was in yen. Maybe that is why the people did not know who it came from.

I am told from a reliable source that during negotiations Senator Lady Flo received an expensive jewelled watch from Mr Iwasaki. I wonder whether she put that in the pecuniary interests register down south. What other presents were given to the Bjelke-Petersens and members of Sir Joh's Cabinet?

Remember Joh's overseas trips? I think he spent a week with Iwasaki. This Premier, his deputy and members of both the National and the Liberal Parties still gave their blessing to Iwasaki, knowing all the doubts, all the fears, all the warnings, all the very real possibilities of political cronyism, slings and false pretences in terms of performance.

On 19 March 1978, while negotiations were still being finalised, the *Sunday Sun* newspaper reported Iwasaki pampering Joh and then pre-Senator Flo on a junket to his luxury resort in Japan.

Mr Lee: Your 75 minutes are up.

Mr BURNS: Yes. I cannot defend myself.

Even that prima facie evidence of graft and collusion did not deter the timid Aherns, Gunns, Austins and others from loyally lining up behind their old boss. They simply did not want to know or see as he forced through a still incomplete agreement that was already starting to smell. In August 1978, when this agreement was ratified by Parliament but not yet signed by Iwasaki, the media disclosed that one of this old Jap's mates, Albert Aoki, from Hawaii, had miraculously sought out John Bjelke-Petersen, the then Premier's son, for rural partnership in Queensland. It was an incredible coincidence that this associate of Iwasaki chose for this type of subsidy Joh's John, out of all of the then struggling primary producers in Queensland, even though payment terms seem to have profited only John and the deal shows no signs of ever proceeding any further. I think there is also another one.

Mr Austin: This has all been said before.

Mr BURNS: Yes, and it will be said again and again. At election time, as I travel around the State, especially in the Yeppoon area, I will remind people of it.

Where is Aoki now? Even then the Aherns, the Gunns and other people with their fingers on the pulse did not twig that there was something terribly suspicious; something that was not quite on the level. But this amazing drama went on. After Parliament sat all night on 17 May 1978, rushing through this supposedly urgent franchise legislation, Iwasaki contemptuously did not even bother to sign the agreement until six months later, on 30 November. Still the Aherns, the Gunns, the Austins and others did not wake up that something was not quite square. I love that cartoon depicting Mike Ahern in Cabinet with a bandanna wrapped around his eyes and with plugs in his ears, sitting at one end of the table. Everybody else knew what was going on, but he did not see anything, did not hear anything, through all those years. Poor old Mike. It must have been difficult finding enough bandannas and corks to keep him supplied for the regular Cabinet meetings that he attended so that he could be blind and deaf to everything that was going on.

In January 1980, John Howard, the then Federal Treasurer—he was the Opposition Leader and is now a back-bencher—used the Foreign Takeovers Act to knock Iwasaki back on his bid for another 1 500 hectares to take his unproductive empire up to almost 10 000 hectares of Queensland land. Howard, in the Fraser Government, sensed something was drastically wrong less than two years after this agreement was approved—but not the Aherns, not the Austins, not the Gunns and not other members opposite. They did not wake up. All those other brainstorms with this new vision of excellence could not wake up at the time that something was crook up in Iwasaki land.

I move on now to January 1982, when the Government's then Treasurer, Sir Llew Edwards, the hero of Expo, reported that the project, not yet through its first five-year development deadline, was then already six months behind its timetable. Still Mike Ahern, Bill Gunn, Brian Austin and others did not utter a single word that something was amiss.

Mr Austin: Why don't you come up to my electorate at the next election and campaign against me?

Mr BURNS: I will come up and talk about the toll that the honourable member is putting on the road that the people do not need. I will go to his electorate and I will talk about Brian Austin's toll any time he likes. I am sure the people up there will be pleased to hear about Brian Austin's toll-road. I understand that the road will be named after Mike Ahern, because no toll will be collected in the honourable member's electorate,

only in the Premier's. Is that true? The toll plazas are set up in Mike Ahern's electorate and in the Cooroora electorate, yet there is none in the honourable member's. It will be named the Mike Ahern toll-road. There is no doubt about it. No wonder the honourable member left the Liberal Party; he was too smart for it.

In August 1982 the Rockhampton *Morning Bulletin* guessed things were not going quite as well as they should be. On 2 August that year, it carried the headline on page 1, "Iwasaki's resort: what's going on?" Editorials in that paper screamed, "Yeppoon resort still a dream" and "Facts are difficult to get". Still Michael Ahern, Bill Gunn, Brian Austin and others were silent in their unswerving devotion to Iwasaki and old Joh but, unfortunately, not to the Queensland people.

The facts are simply that Queenslanders have lost more than 8 000 hectares of irreplaceable beachfront to an old Japanese rogue because of the collaboration and negligence of the National Party and the Liberal Party. Today members of this Parliament are asked to revoke a treasonable agreement that in 1978 the Labor Party fought clause by clause to avoid.

Mr Austin: I am going to Tokyo tomorrow. Do you want me to say goodday to him?

Mr BURNS: I thought the honourable member would be going to Iwasaki's 88th birthday party in Yeppoon. Members of this Government traipsed up there for the opening ceremony. I must say that the gods were kind because it poured rain all day. At least when he got rained out it provided some justification and some satisfaction. I hope his 88th birthday celebration is just as big a wash-out.

The facts are also that this belated legislation is designed to annul a romance that the National and Liberal Parties began, but it does not hurt Iwasaki who took them—and, through them, Queensland—for a ride. The people of Queensland have been conned. Honourable members can laugh and joke, but they have to become serious about this matter sooner or later. The facts are that Iwasaki has had a marvellous deal out of this agreement, and Queensland got a poor deal. There is nothing in it for Queenslanders. Since the Iwasaki resort began, all types of people have spent millions of dollars on development that people can be critical of, but it must be remembered that they began those projects in accordance with the laws of this land. They had to deal with city councils and local government by-laws as well as other laws of the land, and they accepted those rules. They built hotels and resorts and have since tried to sell them. Iwasaki has not built his resort, yet he obtained all types of special deals through the National Party. He keeps his land; he is protected legally; and he does not any longer even have the annoyance of an empty parliamentary franchise to breach or dishonour.

Who was paid off for this rort? Possibly the only concession, favour or gift that Iwasaki and his cohorts did not get through their Liberal and National Party real estate agents is drought relief. Maybe even that will turn up when that inquiry is completed. I reckon it would be a fair bet that he tried to rip that off as well, because at one stage he wanted to go into cattle-fattening. Half way through the deal when the international resort was failing, he then had a plan for cattle-fattening and he proposed to build a wharf at Yeppoon to export cattle direct to overseas markets.

I point out to the member for Broadsound that he should read the press cuttings. I know that he shifted to Yeppoon, became the member for Broadsound and is resident in the area, but he should go back through the press cuttings and find out the promises that Iwasaki made. He would then realise that Iwasaki treated this Government and this State as fools. He made any promise at all; he dreamt them up, and he fronted them out. The press printed them and millions of people believed them. If they did not believe him, I do not know why these conditions were written in for him. It is a fair bet that he is laughing and that he will be enjoying himself at the expense of Queenslanders at his birthday party.

I call him a villainous old Japanese scoundrel. He must see this belated, toothless legislation as a sick and sorry Queensland joke.

A Government member interjected.

Mr BURNS: I went to Japan and tried to check up on him. Over there, I found out that he had a history of being involved in the railways in China during the war. He was regarded during the war as a villain. A major Japanese businessman came to Australia and stayed in Brisbane hotels in an attempt to see the former Premier and others to warn them about Iwasaki. The Government would not meet him at that time. I would be willing to bet that he now realises what a bunch of mugs were running the Government at that time.

This legislation is harmless and far too late; it is apologetic, and it will be dismissed cynically by Iwasaki as something that he would expect from his conservative collaborators in Queensland. If there was to be a crowning insult to this tragic political sell-out, it must have been the recent report that Iwasaki plans to spend millions of dollars in the next fortnight on a massive 88th birthday party on his central Queensland estate. More than 750 guests, most of whom will be flown specially from Japan, will be given a free week's holiday on the resort that he has contemptuously refused to build according to his promised timetable. Each of the 88 candles at this birthday bash represents, sadly, almost 100 hectares of irretrievable central Queensland oceanfront that has been bequeathed to him by the Liberal and National Parties.

It will be interesting to note how many of these generous political friends will be invited to his celebrations.

Mr Austin: Not me.

Mr BURNS: Have you been invited?

Mr Austin: No.

Mr BURNS: Will you go if he asks you?

Mr Austin: No.

Mr BURNS: What has changed?

Mr Austin: He will not invite me.

Mr BURNS: This legislation is pathetically inadequate. It does no more than annul, without a fair property settlement, a political marriage that has already been consummated. If the Capricorn resort had proceeded as Iwasaki had promised, Queensland would now have three hotels, six motels, 29 blocks of flats, 230 villas, two golf courses, one golf inn, two beach centres, five international villages, a transport centre, Disneyland, monorails, wave-generated electricity centres, prawn farms, beef-exporting industries and you name it. Instead, what Queensland has is an average-sized tourist complex on a huge expanse of mainly undeveloped beachfront.

When Iwasaki blows out the candles at his birthday party near Yeppoon next week, I believe he should say a prayer of thanksgiving for his Queensland conservative allies in the Liberal and National Parties, and for Sir Joh and Mike Ahern who made it possible.

Mr HINTON (Broadsound) (3.13 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to rise and support the legislation. In doing so, I say how pleased I am with the strong position adopted by the Premier, Mike Ahern, when I drew this matter to his attention as representative of the electorate concerned. Before I go any further, I wish to thank John Mulheron and Jan Bimrose for the dedicated way in which they went about drawing up the repeal legislation. It was not done in a hurry. It was done over a considerable period to ensure that the Act was correct in every detail and would not be subjected to the type of rubbishy attacks that honourable members have listened to during the last three quarters of an hour.

Mr Austin: Wasn't it shocking?

Mr HINTON: We heard about prawn farms and feedlots and all types of other things that were, quite frankly, inventions of the mind. I say that because, if one refers to the franchise agreements and the history of the resort, none of those was ever contemplated. In fact, the area is not even suitable for any of those ventures. Really, it was all nonsense and someone has exercised considerable licence in relation to this matter.

Mr Burns: I will give you the press cuttings for each of those projects.

Mr HINTON: I am sure that in the past the honourable member has complained about people writing things that he had never said. If the honourable member went to Yeppoon and had a good look round, he would appreciate the absurdity of trying to set up a feedlot in that area. It is simply not on.

Mr Burns: Your members on the Government side believed it. They all believed it. The National Party believed it.

Mr HINTON: Rubbish! The prawn farms could only be in areas subject to special leases that Iwasaki was not able to touch. They were located near Corio Bay and it would not have been physically possible for Iwasaki to have set up prawn farms in those wetlands.

The honourable member for Lytton should go back to the area and have another walk along the beach. Apparently he was chucked off the beach but, of course, that is a public area. If the honourable member was chucked off, that action was taken against the law and the honourable member should have stood on his dig. In fact there is free access to the public right along the beach.

Nevertheless, there is a great deal of truth in what the honourable member for Lytton has said about the abuse of the agreement. In some ways he is inaccurate. He said that the agreement has been only half completed. He is quite wrong there; it has only been one-quarter completed. There were four 5-year agreements from 1978 to 1998. At the end of the first 10-year period the first 5-year section was not complete. The buildings themselves were complete, but the public facilities, such as the road to Fishing Creek, recreational areas and beach access points were not constructed. In fact there were to be eight beach access points and only two have been constructed by the Iwasaki company. The honourable member for Lytton is accurate when he states that the agreement put forward and passed in good faith by this Parliament in 1978 was treated with abuse and contempt by the Iwasaki company. That is the reason why the House is debating the repeal of this Act today with the full blessing of the people in my district and the full support of the whole area.

I wish to mention some of the outrageous propositions put by the honourable member for Lytton. He said that the company should be stripped of all its freehold land. The Labor Party has always been against the freeholding of land, but that statement by the honourable member for Lytton represents an attack on the freehold ownership of land by every Queenslander. If the honourable member wishes to attack every person who has fairly and squarely bought freehold land, then no-one owning freehold land is safe.

Mr BURNS: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member for Broadsound will distribute this speech all over Australia. I am against the freeholding of land by Japanese nationals, but I am not against the freeholding of land by Queenslanders. The statement made by the honourable member for Broadsound is untrue and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): The honourable member for Lytton asks for a withdrawal of any inference that he is against the freeholding of land in Queensland.

Mr HINTON: I will withdraw anything that the honourable member finds offensive, but I do not think that he would disagree that he has made a major attack and created a degree of concern. Every freehold land-owner in Queensland would be concerned by his statement today.

In a paper distributed by me, I have agreed that the Aliens Act of 1965 is a bad piece of legislation that permitted the sale of freehold land to aliens. That legislation was wrong. I have read every single word uttered during the debate on that legislation. I point out to the honourable member for Lytton that his party—as well as the Nicklin Government—totally supported that Act. Every single Labor Party speaker in that debate supported that Act. The only person who was far-sighted enough to oppose the legislation at that time was the Independent member for Townsville South, Mr Tom Aikens. At that stage he was concerned about what would happen in Australia as foreign investment grew. The Act was introduced because people were concerned that immigrants coming to Australia who had not attained Australian citizenship would not be entitled to buy land in this State. The members on both sides of the Queensland Parliament at that time were not very far-sighted. However, a repeal of the Aliens Act today would cause an enormous amount of difficulty, particularly logistically because so much freehold land has already been sold overseas. That would be difficult to correct.

Mr Burns stated that I should introduce legislation. Two or three times in this House I have stated my support for a foreign land tax on all land, be it freehold or leasehold, so that the Queensland Government could monitor the level of foreign ownership of any land or property in any area in this State. The resultant income would profit the Government. That is a better approach than that put forward by Mr Burns today.

I support and congratulate the Premier on the strong action that he has taken. The Government may not go as far as Mr Burns would like and attack freehold land-owners, but this legislation has pleased the people of Queensland. In addition, it has received very strong support in newspaper editorials written right around Queensland, including the *Courier-Mail*, which usually delights in having a slice of the National Party. When I was elected member for Broadsound and visited the Yeppoon district, I found that the Iwasaki company was having a negative effect on the development of Yeppoon and the Capricorn Coast. Although the company had not produced the goods according to its agreement, the program was still enshrined in legislation and the development was bound by law to be built. This was a problem. Developers wanting to invest in the coast visited my office and looked at the legislation. They discovered that there were so many hundreds of rooms yet to be built according to the law, but the 1 000-odd rooms already constructed at the Iwasaki resort had a low occupancy rate. I would suggest that to a very large extent this was a result of bad marketing or a lackadaisical attitude towards marketing.

Mr Burns: I don't think he ever tried to market it.

Mr HINTON: The honourable member could be right. I think the company tried hard. It spent some $300,000 on its last television campaign, but it has not been a good marketer. The resort's low occupancy rates reflect that fact.

It certainly was off-putting to developers who visited the coast and saw the lack of success of a major concern and the number of rooms still to be constructed under the law. In more recent years the Iwasaki complex has had a negative effect on the development of the coast in my electorate. That was one of the principal reasons why I raised the matter with the Premier. I felt that the legislation should be repealed so that the company would be put back on an equal footing with other developers.

I stress that that is what the Government has done. It has not given any special concessions or allowed land rip-offs, as the member for Lytton put to the House. It has brought the company back to an equal footing with every other company that is operating in this State. That is where it should be; it probably should have been in that position in the first place.

Under the original legislation, the Iwasaki company had exemption from provisions of the Beach Protection Act, the Canals Act, the Coal Mining Act, the Local Government Act, the Mining Act, the Petroleum Act and the Water Act. When the Bill is passed, the company no longer has those exemptions.

Mr Burns: Do you reckon, after he has had 11 years of these Acts not applying, he starts off equal with everyone else?

Mr HINTON: No. I am saying that I think that he has done bugger all in those 11 years. The honourable member has used that expression. However, the company will now be on an equal footing.

I am not saying that the initial agreement was right. That is why I have been a very strong advocate of this repeal Bill. However, we are concerned about today and where we are going in the future. The company will be on an equal footing with everybody else. That has been my major concern in bringing the matter forward. Those actions have been very strongly supported. In fact, the actions have been effective, because the Capricorn Coast is starting to grow and take off with tourist development. In relieving some of the uncertainty about the Iwasaki resort that was so dominant in that area, we have provided an effective measure in that regard.

I make the point that things are not as black as the member for Lytton has been putting forward. Over the period, the Iwasaki resort may not have developed to the potential that was expected, but it still employs approximately 130 people, which is of great value to the Capricorn Coast. During the period of construction, it contributed significantly to the building industry and is still a vital part of the economy. Now that the legislation has been brought into effect, the resort fits into the area quite harmoniously and is well received. Of course, the occupancy rates of the resort have been substantially better in recent times than they were in the past. A substantial number of conventions have taken place. The golf course is being used to sponsor some major events, which should have been done some time ago. The company is entering into that field with some success.

With these provisions, the Government is asking the company to carry out some of the work that was promised. Under the terms of this repeal Bill, the road to landing reserve R.11 on Fishing Creek must be constructed to the requirements of the Livingstone Shire Council. The fishermen of the area appreciate that aspect.

The three local authority zones have been well received. The Special Facilities zone is being created for the developed area of the resort, including the buildings and the golf course. The company has six months in which to have a designated purpose approved for those areas. If it does not act on the matter, the Special Facilities zone will revert to Rural A. Therefore, the company is compelled to take fairly swift action in that regard.

The balance of the freehold land will now be zoned Rural A. The areas that were not freeholded, that is, the special leases that surround Corio Bay, which are unique and special environmental areas have been resumed by the Crown. Given the fact that they were virtually a present to the company, well they should be resumed. I advocated strongly that those areas revert to Crown control, and I am very pleased that that is to be the case. Under the terms of the legislation, those areas are being converted to environmental parks. That aspect has been welcomed by the conservation movement, which is very strong in my electorate.

I will track back over what was offered to the company once the decision was taken that something had to be done about the Iwasaki resort. When I drew the matter to the Premier's attention, on 6 August last year, we arranged to visit the resort to have discussions on the future of the resort with Mr Iwasaki, Senior, who made the trip from Japan. We were offering the company three alternatives. If the company could put forward a plan of substance that could be guaranteed as far as construction was concerned and which would be satisfactory to the Queensland Parliament, there was a possibility that we could introduce a new franchise agreement. The second alternative, which still stands, is that part of the resort could come under the Integrated Resort Development Act. I mentioned the Special Facilities zone. It could well be that within the next six months the company will apply for the developed area to be incorporated under the Integrated Resort Development Act. If it is, there is a strong chance that it could be

successful. The third course of action is that the total area could revert to the control of the Livingstone Shire Council.

On 6 August, when the Premier and I visited the resort and spoke to Mr Iwasaki, Senior, he put forward a program which included an international airport, an international hotel, a second golf course, an international village and various other accommodation units. The Premier accepted that offer, but we demanded and made very clear to the company that any such program that was put forward would never be as it was previously on a never-never arrangement of "maybe", "perhaps" and "when". Any program put forward would require financial guarantees such as a bank bond. Only under circumstances in which we could guarantee that the conditions would be brought into effect would a second franchise be delivered to the company.

It is history now that after some weeks the company allowed its offer to lapse. None of those proposals have come into effect because the company was not prepared to wear the bank bond that was a condition at that particular time. I suggest that, if bank bonds had been incorporated in the initial agreement, perhaps the Government would not be in the position of having to introduce repealing legislation, as it is today. Very strong and very firm conditions were imposed on the company by the Government. They were not being met, the offer lapsed, and of course the Government reverted to the third option, that is, to place the area back under the control of the Livingstone Shire Council.

It has been suggested in some quarters that the Government has discriminated against the Iwasaki company. I want to put that myth very clearly to bed, because it is certainly not the case at all. The resort is now probably doing better than it ever has done, with increased occupancy rates. It is not suffering any heavy financial penalties other than the loss of those leases, which it was certainly not entitled to keep, and in fact has gained in some areas.

As the member for Lytton pointed out, buildings and structures were put up in an illegal manner under the terms of the original franchise agreement. In other words, quite frankly, mayhem has prevailed in regard to construction. The new legislation contains a validating clause which makes legal all those areas that were previously illegal. The Government has really got the company back to square one. It has cleaned off the slate and the company is going from here under the same conditions as every other operator in Queensland.

I return to the point that was made by Mr Burns and I stress that there is no way in the wide world that this Government would even consider for one second under any circumstances stripping a buyer of freehold land in this State of that land. I believe that that would be a major attack on freehold tenure in Queensland. It would send tremors through the whole structure of this State, and it would certainly be of great concern to many people who own freehold land. The Government has no intention of taking that particular step——

Mr Slack interjected.

Mr HINTON: The member for Burnett reminds me that that will be the case unless of course the owners are foreign owners and they fail to fill in the foreign land register. In that case, the owner could be stripped of freehold land. There are no two ways about that. The Government has very strict controls in that regard. I am pleased to see that the member for Rockhampton agrees with what I have had to say.

It is very positive legislation which solves a serious problem. It has been very, very well received in the community. I certainly support the legislation very strongly.

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (3.34 p.m.): I believe that I am the only member in the Chamber at the moment who was present on 17 May 1978 when this whole business started with the passage of the Iwasaki Bill, as it was then known. It was an interesting time. I well recall not having to turn on the headlights of my car the next morning as I drove home after a very bitter, wide-ranging and somewhat acrimonious debate.

It is interesting to note now the magnificent vision of some people 11 years later, saying what should have been done and what could have been done. They certainly are men of vision. The problem is that their 20/20 vision is all in hindsight. I think any of us can be just as observant looking back 11 years past.

The Bill was certainly controversial but it was also visionary because at the time that it was passed Australia was standing on the brink of what looked to be possibly a great boom in Japanese tourism. That boom has since happened. As we were trying to see how this State could benefit from that boom and what mechanisms were necessary, the Government tried some different and innovative things. I do not necessarily totally endorse the Iwasaki agreement as it eventually emerged, but I do endorse the philosophy behind it, which was that here was a great opportunity for this State to get in on the ground floor of what was going to be a very, very significant industry in this country, that is, the tourist industry.

It was felt at the time that there was a need to demonstrate our good faith, to demonstrate that we welcomed productive capital investment by overseas people and that we welcomed Japanese tourists to the country. The result of that methodology was the Queensland International Tourist Centre Agreement Act, which purported to be a deal between the Government of Queensland, representing the people of Queensland, and a person who came into this State with what seemed like an almost limitless supply of money, energy, enthusiasm and vision. He presented a picture that was extraordinarily rosy, and he presented a picture which, frankly, any Government would have had to take into account and would have had to take on board if it was serious about development.

I have said that not everybody agreed with what the Government did at the time, and I think, from memory, I was one of them. However, the Government at least tried to do something. The argument is not necessarily that it was wrong in trying something at the time. I think the argument is that when it failed, the Government failed to act. It became obvious from 1 April 1984, if not significantly prior to that time, that the heads of agreement that were reached between the Government of Queensland and the Iwasaki company were being breached flagrantly, openly, deliberately and, I suggest, provocatively. It had become apparent by that time that the Iwasaki organisation had no intention whatsoever to take any notice of the obligations that it had accepted or to deliver on promises made.

One of the questions that should be answered today is: why has it taken until 30 May 1989 for the Government to act when for at least five years it has known that this Act and the agreement behind it were being breached and breached and breached? In essence, what the agreement brought about and what the Iwasaki legislation proposed was a planned development.

The Government wanted to attract this great visionary to this State. It is all right for Mr Burns to call him an old Japanese fraud and all the rest of it. But Mr Burns, as much as any other member of this Parliament, has seen what Mr Iwasaki has achieved in other places. People can say what they like about Mr Iwasaki—and a lot of it may not be complimentary—but they should at least be a little fair. Some of the things that this fellow has built have been quite extraordinary, as any member who has had any interest in the subject and looked at his developments and what he has brought about in southern Japan would have to vouch for, even grudgingly. I think even Mr Burns, in a corner, would have to admit that.

The planned development proposed that in exchange for certain advantages being given legislatively to the Iwasaki company, it in turn would accept certain obligations. Regrettably, it did not fulfil its side of the deal. What did it not do? The things which the company did not do and which most disturbed me are the ones that show that the company had a blatant contempt for the public of Queensland at large.

Previously we have heard about the story that the member for Lytton told the House about being ordered off a beach. Without doubting the honourable member's veracity in this Parliament, I find it hard to believe that anybody in this State or nation

could order Tom Burns off a beach and persuade him to do it quietly, especially if the honourable member knew that he was in the right. Let us call that an apocryphal tale typical of things that have been repeated by others. There were supposed to be eight points of access constructed for the public down to the beach. That did not happen. Only two access points were eventually constructed. A total of 77 hectares was supposed to be set aside as a public recreation area. That did not occur. The public at large was treated with nothing short of contempt. So, too, was the Queensland Government. The basis of this planned development agreement that had been entered into and supported by statute was that a phased development would be constructed. Stage 1, which was to contain all sorts of wonderful things—they have already been enumerated in this House so I will not reiterate them—was to be finished by 1 April 1984. Stage 2 was to be finished by 1 April 1989. All sorts of stories were told about what was going to occur. Construction of international villages, boat lakes, golf courses and all the rest of it was solemnly promised and undertaken by the Iwasaki organisation. However, none of it eventuated, with the exception of a couple of beachfront blocks that were constructed. They lay vacant for years before they were occupied and were never adequately marketed. One suspects that they were only grudgingly put up at the time because of intense pressure being applied through the media and by the Government. A number of technical breaches of the Act occurred. However, I do not think that they are of great import—matters of picnic tables being put in the wrong place and a minor matter of rezoning. Those things do not concern me greatly. However, what really concerns me is the total breach of the spirit of the agreement by the Iwasaki organisation and upon that total breach the failure of this Government to act and to do anything about it.

It is all right to have one's fingers burnt once. There is an old statement—one could call it an American folk fable—which is, "Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me." This Government has been shamed about two dozen times by the Iwasaki company. It took the Government 11 years to wake up to the company and to do something about it. There may be excuses for the first period up to 1 April 1984 when the first agreed phase had reached its end, but there can be no excuse for the Government's failure to act between 1 April 1984 and 30 May 1989, when it last debated the Act that is repealed by this Bill.

Other interesting aspects of the proposal before honourable members were listed in the Minister's speech. He stated that the Iwasaki company requested major changes to the agreement and what it proposed those changes to be. The company proposed that the whole project should be extended from 1998 to 2018 or 2038. In other words, the company expected us to believe that what it had not done in the first 20 years it would stretch out and do over a period of 60 years. I suppose it is worth a try, but one must have grave doubts about the good faith of a company that would make such an outrageous proposal as that. It is saying, "I am sorry, I robbed you the first time round, but give me a second chance and another 40 years and we will see what we can achieve the next time."

The company wanted to delete all reference to staged development in the agreement and say, "Let us develop it when we feel like it at any time that we might happen to get around to it." It wanted the deletion of one of the major provisions of the Act, which was that the development was to be a co-ordinated development by the Iwasaki organisation all under its control and to allow it to sublease properties within its acquired land to organisations other than its own outfit. In other words, it wanted to set up not just a real estate development plan in the area but something like a resort brokerage so that it could sell off bits and pieces wherever it wanted to to get other people to put up their money to do what Iwasaki had solemnly promised the people of this State, by agreement, to do himself and to have finished by this year.

If there is anything complimentary to be said about the Government, I suppose that one must remark that at least it was not mug enough to fall for that one. The company also wanted some other things which, given the lack of good faith that this corporation has shown, must only be regarded as sinister. It wanted to delete provisions that specified the purposes for which given parcels of land could be used and to say that

it could use the land for anything else that it wanted which was somehow consistent with the provisions of the agreement. In other words, having been exempted from all of the local authority requirements under the head Act, it then wanted to be exempted from any oversight whatsoever by the principal Act or by any other action of the Government—in other words, a carte blanche to run its own little empire making its own decisions free from any interference or trammel whatsoever by the State Government, by a local authority or by anybody else. It is not going to get it. But what is the company going to get 11 years down the track and at least five years after it had been specifically and legally in breach of the agreement into which it had entered? Because it is a matter of some concern, I ask the Minister to expand on that.

It seems that the Iwasaki outfit is being slapped across the face with a wet feather. Where are the penalties? It is a fairly reasonably accepted proposition that if one makes a deal with a person and says, "Look, if you do this I will do something else" and if that person does not do it, he should suffer some penalty.

Mr Hinton: There are no penalties in the franchise agreement.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member interjects and says that there are no penalties in the franchise agreement. If the honourable member cares to re-read the debates, he will find that that is one of the major arguments that was used against it. Questions were asked as to why there were not any provisions covering a breach of the agreement. Using 20/20 hindsight, that was a severe deficiency in the agreement.

Now that we are introducing legislation to correct the deficiencies in the agreement, surely that aspect requires attention. There can be no doubt in anybody's mind that the Iwasaki organisation has totally and blatantly failed to meet its obligations. The question then arises: what penalty should it suffer? This Act contains none. I respectfully suggest to the Minister that it is not enough to say that because there were none in the franchise agreement it would be unreasonable to impose any now. What sort of penalties would be appropriate?

I hope that the sort of nonsense with which the honourable member for Lytton went on would be rejected out of hand by every member of this Parliament. The honourable member proposed quite seriously, by implication, that that organisation should be stripped of the ownership, without any form of restitution or recompense being paid simply because it failed to comply with the provisions of the Act. That should have sent shudders of fear down the backbone of every Labor member in this House. If that is the sort of ratbaggery and lunacy that the Labor Party wishes to be associated with, it can forget about power in Queensland for another 32 years. Are members of the Labor Party seriously proposing that this Government or any Government of Queensland—and by implication a Labor Government, because Labor members have proposed it—should go out and strip ownership of land from people without notice by legislation simply for failure to abide by agreements with the Government?

I agree with penalties, but to do that would be to introduce one of the most draconian laws that have ever been mooted in this Parliament. Now that the Leader of the Opposition has returned to the Chamber I would be interested to hear his comments on that. Does he endorse the remarks of the honourable member for Lytton, that a Labor Government would strip the ownership of land from the Iwasaki organisation and, by implication, any other organisation which fell foul of a future Labor Government in this State? Queensland would really be in bad shape if that were the sort of Government——

Mr De Lacy: Only those that had special legislation passed in this Parliament and then didn't honour the legislation.

Mr GYGAR: I was directing my remarks to the Leader of the Opposition. However, I hope that that interjection has been recorded in *Hansard*, because two front-benchers are on the record in this Parliament as saying that because some companies that have

invested in Queensland are in breach of some section of the law, the Labor Party wants to strip them of the ownership of land.

Mr De Lacy: No, special legislation.

Mr GYGAR: Now we are getting back to it. This State is in trouble. I hope that the Premier has noted this. The Labor front bench is now proposing that retrospective legislation be passed by this Parliament to strip Mr Iwasaki of the ownership of all of that land. Who is next on the Labor hit-list? Will it be Bernie Power because he will not bring in VEAs? Are we going to legislate retrospectively to strip him of his brewery? Once the ownership of land is attacked, the very basis of the legal system of this State is attacked. A brewery at the Gold Coast is small beer—if honourable members will pardon the pun—compared with the retrospective stripping of ownership of thousands of hectares of land which the Labor Party in its cavalier fashion has just announced to this Parliament that a Labor Government would do. Let us hear what Mr Goss has to say in the board rooms of Queen Street to explain away his two front-bench colleagues on this issue.

Mr Goss: You're just jealous because you weren't invited.

Mr GYGAR: Did a member of the Opposition interject that he was not getting any more invitations? After some of the nonsense that Mr Goss has been caught out saying in recent months, I could understand that.

The Government must direct its mind to the question of penalty. Quite plainly the defect in this Act is that whilst it seeks to restore some sort of a position, the Act contains absolutely no penalty whatsoever. Undoubtedly the Government would say that this mistake will not be made again. I hope that honourable members hear that assurance that if there are to be any future franchise arrangements or special deals, having been once bitten we will be a little bit twice shy and that included in any future arrangement will be penalty provisions to lay it on the line that if structured, programmed progress points are reached and passed without there being appropriate action, the penalties provided in the Act will be imposed.

Realistically, the Government cannot let that bunch get away with what it has pulled in Queensland which, in historic terms, has been one of the biggest con stunts. We have been taken for a ride.

Mr Hinton: They were stripped of the leasehold lands which were environmental parks.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member says that they have been stripped of the leasehold lands which were environmental parks. On all of the plans that I have seen dating back to May 1978 it was never proposed or mooted that they would have any real beneficial ownership of that land at all; that all it would be would be an environmental park under their control for the future, perhaps to add some marginal greater attraction to their property and the facilities that they offer. In real terms, stripping them of that does not greatly degrade them. In fact, one could say that it gave them a minor advantage, because as an environmental park it is now up to the State Government to manage it, look after it and ensure that it is properly policed. In the past, while it was still going to be used as an environmental park, Iwasaki had to pay the bill for what his tourists were going to do and what facilities they wanted to use. That is not a very heavy penalty to pay.

Mr Hinton: They were special leases.

Mr GYGAR: Certainly they were special leases, but I suggest that no true beneficial ownership flowed from it and that Iwasaki was not done a great disservice by having it taken from him.

There must be a penalty. I do not hazard a detailed suggestion as to what that penalty ought to be, because one would need to study some more complicated arrangements about the land that is there. I would have suggested that, in seeking to rectify the

first error that it made by not putting in the Act firm penalties for failure to meet guidelines, the Government should have deemed it far more appropriate that this repeal Bill, carrying as it does certain ongoing requirements, include certain requirements that, unless the organisation reached new points of involvement and investment by given dates, specific penalties would flow to it by way of fine and, if necessary, by way of resumption. It is one thing to seize land from people by retrospective legislation; it is quite a different proposition to say to them, "Now listen, pal, if you don't do it this time, we are going to resume your land for public purposes and you are going to lose it because you failed to do it." I suggest to the Government that it is a situation that is analogous to that of persons who hold pastoral leases and other leases which contain developmental requirements. Those leases of Crown land state that unless X amount of dollars is invested over Y number of years, the lease will be lost, and with it all of the additions and buildings that have been placed on the land. That is an accepted provision for rural and other land. I do not think it would have been impossible for the Government to construct a similar scheme to apply to this land.

Whilst one is discussing this subject, it would be remiss not to note, at least in passing, that Iwasaki is not really on his own in this State. He is just another developmental pirate of a breed that seemed to grow and prosper in the last dozen years in Queensland. Old Yohachiro Iwasaki is right out of the Keith Williams mould, whereby a person grabs a piece of land, does with it what he likes and then tries to talk the Government into letting him get away with it. That is still going on. Anybody who has been to Airlie Beach and Shute Harbour and has seen what Williams is still getting away with will know what I mean. Honourable members will remember Keith Williams. He is the fellow who took over the pastoral lease, built a tourist resort on it in total defiance of all the rules and regulations of local authorities and then walked out in front of the television cameras and said, "Come on, give me a break. Do you want me to pull the darned thing down?" Perhaps if the Government had said, "Yes, we do. In fact, we don't want you to do it; we are going to tell you to do it", the history of Queensland and its treatment of people who think that they can do what they like and get away with it may have been a bit different.

This Government has failed to develop—and I say this in a very general sense—adequate controls to make sure that developers in this State obey the law. It is a problem with Iwasaki; it was a problem with Williams, and it is still a problem when we consider the Hinchinbrook Channel area, where another environmental vandal is putting bulldozers through mangroves before he gets any approval whatsoever to do it. It is a long-running sore with this Government. It is one that is typified by what has occurred with Iwasaki. It is one that is still occurring, and it is one that this Government really must tackle.

The buccaneer days of development in Queensland surely are over. If this Government has a commitment to openness, honesty, integrity and all those other wonderful catch-phrases that it spends a fortune of tax-payers' money putting on the television screens and in the newspapers, it had really better get its act together. The buccaneers are still out there. The Iwasakis, the Williamses and the rest of them will get away with whatever the Government allows.

As I have said, Iwasaki has pulled one of the biggest con jobs in the history of this State. He has virtually got away with it, because the Act contains no penalties, and it should. There are others like him out there still trying on stunts and still getting away with them. Until this Government makes an example of one of them, or more if necessary, it will go on and on and on and the so-called vision of excellence will become more and more tarnished.

The Liberal Party supports the repeal Bill, noting that perhaps it is a bit too late and it is a bit too little, but at least it does something to show that the people who try to rob the people of Queensland by entering into worthless agreements and then treating them with contempt will eventually at least suffer some small deprivation of their ability to do business in this State, even if they do not suffer major fines or other penalties

which, frankly, we in the Liberal Party believe would be very appropriate in this case and in other cases.

Mr BRADDY (Rockhampton) (3.58 p.m.): I support the trend that was adopted by the honourable the Deputy Leader of the Opposition when he spoke earlier in this debate. Since he spoke, it has been interesting to hear the contributions made by the honourable members for Broadsound and Stafford. I welcome the support expressed by the honourable member for Broadsound. It is the first sign of support that has ever come from the National Party in Queensland to bring to task, to some extent, this foreign company which has treated the Government, the Parliament and the people of Queensland with contempt. But then, of course, the member for Broadsound was under pressure from his constituents and from people who reside in his area. He was more acutely aware than were other National Party members of the great depth of feeling that existed in Yeppoon and around central Queensland about how this National Party Government had allowed Queensland people to be played for fools by the Japanese company concerned. Unfortunately, we differ in this matter not in relation to the penalty that is finally being visited upon the company concerned but in relation to the fact that the penalty is not sufficiently severe.

The member for Stafford, in his contribution, suggested that the penalty was not severe enough. He poured ridicule upon the member for Lytton in suggesting that some freehold land should be taken off the company. However, he admitted that his wit and his intelligence were not such that he could suggest an alternative; that it was not really up to the Liberal Party in Queensland to suggest alternatives as to how some more severe penalty should be visited upon the company concerned. The Labor Party does not run away from exhibiting some wit and some intelligence in this matter and in this place. It is important that the Liberal Party comes forward and for once says what it would do about these matters. The fact that Queensland is entering an international era has to be understood in relation to tourism. Some understanding of the Japanese attitude and mentality in relation to tourism has to be exhibited. I believe it was unfortunate that during this debate the Liberal Party failed to make any really positive contribution.

Let me look at what occurred in relation to the subject lands. Originally, an area of 8 276 hectares was to be made subject to the agreement. Part of that area—5 200 hectares—was purchased by the company as freehold on the open market. As part of the agreement, an additional 2 558 hectares held under perpetual lease selection, special lease and grazing/farming tenures became subject to an arrangement made by the Queensland Government and sanctioned by the Queensland Parliament. The arrangement meant that that land would be converted to freehold through standard freeholding procedures. That proceeded and, as honourable members now know, 97 per cent of the subject land is now freehold, as the Premier informed the House earlier.

Honourable members are told that freehold land is sacrosanct and that if a Labor Party in Government were to suggest that penalties other than those that have been inserted in the legislation presently before the House should be visited upon the company, that would completely undermine the whole system of government. I say that that is not so.

I believe that what the Labor Party could do is obvious and quite sensible. The 2 558 hectares that were converted from leasehold to freehold land could be the subject of legislation to the effect that the Government could say to the company, "You are so openly in contempt of the Queensland Government and of the Queensland Parliament that there must be a penalty imposed in relation to this land. Approximately 30 per cent of the land you obtained was not freehold at the time that the agreement was entered into. In relation to legislation and matters required to be done by the Queensland people, we have kept our word but you have not kept yours. Let us sit down and work out an agreement."

The member for Broadsound indicated that he and the Premier tried to do exactly that, but the company was not prepared to enter into an agreement. I suggest that in relation to the detail provided by the honourable member for Lytton, the Government

should say to the company concerned, "Right, we will convert the land freeholded with our consent because Government consent was required to convert it—not the land you purchased on the open market as freehold land—back to leasehold tenure. Because you will not reach an agreement with us, we will give you a timetable. You will keep to this timetable, and if you do not, at the expiration of the leasehold period the land will revert to the people of Queensland." The Government could say to this company, "It is entirely your choice. We agreed to freehold the land after the agreement because you solemnly promised by way of an agreement to do certain things. You have not done them and you now want an additional 60-year period to put the project into the never never. In effect, you conned us into transferring it to you freehold at a subsequent date. We will put it back into leasehold and you will comply with a schedule of arrangements that we impose on you or that you negotiate with us on an agreed basis."

No fair-minded person in Japan or in Queensland could possibly object to such an arrangement, because there is no doubt that the people of Queensland were conned in relation to this matter. There is no doubt that the people of Queensland were let down badly by the Bjelke-Petersen National Party Government and the Liberal Party that was part of the coalition when the agreement was entered into. The member for Broadsound admitted that he was not the member for the electorate at the time, but the legislation did not contain sufficient penalties. Understandably, the present member feels some degree of satisfaction because, finally, he was able to get this National Party Government to get up off its back and stop being tickled on the tummy by this Japanese company. He was able to get the Government to at last do something and say to the company concerned, "We are not to be treated with complete contempt."

To do "something" is not to do enough, however, and that is the problem in relation to this matter. Queenslanders live in a sovereign State and this Parliament has sovereign powers. The Government must say to the company, "We will give you a second chance. We were remiss because certain things were not done previously, in spite of the fact that we were warned by the Labor Party and others at the time. We will give you a second chance but we will put you back under leasehold conditions. The effect of that arrangement will be that anything you have developed you may still keep, but the project will now be on a time scale. The company will either comply with what the Government says or it will reach a new agreement that is reasonable, fair and equitable to the people of Queensland and to the company concerned." That arrangement would not erode the underpinnings of Queensland society. I believe that the people of Queensland would support that arrangement and that the Japanese people would understand it.

It is simply not good enough to do less than that. The member for Broadsound, Mr Hinton, draws comfort from the fact that at last he is being seen to be doing something about visiting a penalty on the company. Unfortunately, some people do not read deeply or profoundly enough into what is being done. The problem is that he will be given kudos for achieving the little that is achieved by this legislation.

The Opposition opposes this legislation, not because a penalty is being fixed and imposed on the company, but because insufficient penalty is being fixed. It is in the power of this Parliament to return the 2 558 hectares that was freehold back to a leasehold state. If that were done, the company would not only be on its honour to complete the project—which was all that was binding on it before—but it would also be liable to a penalty that would apply over a period. The penalty would be that at the end of the leasehold period, it would lose its land.

It is important for Australians to realise that Australia's relationship with Japan and Japanese companies is carried out on a strictly commercial, honourable and profitable basis for Australians. The Japanese people have turned out to be—as everyone knows—the great trading people of the 1970s and 1980s. Japan is now the great creditor nation of the world as well. Not only is Japan the leading trading nation, but also it is the leading creditor nation of the world. If the Japanese people believe that they can get away with treating people in the Pacific or anywhere else in the world with contempt, they will continue to do so.

A very interesting book titled *Yen!* was published recently. It is subtitled *The Threat of Japan's Financial Empire* and is written by an American financial journalist named Daniel Burstein. He makes some very interesting remarks and the book contains interesting lessons for Australians on to how not to behave towards the Japanese when entering into commercial arrangements with them and how to understand the mentality of the Japanese people. The author talks about how the Japanese take great pride—and justifiably so—from walking out of the ashes of Japan after World War II and building Japan up into the world's leading trading and creditor nation in such a short time. That is very significant to the Japanese because as a people they have all contributed to the country's development. The author refers to other traits which Americans—and by analogy, Australians—should learn and understand.

At page 67 of his book Daniel Burstein states—

> "In a completely serious TV interview, a businessman boasted about how Japan would turn Australia into its mining concession and the United States into its grain silo in the twenty-first century.
>
> Such ideas were symptomatic of what Japanese government officials themselves took to calling the 'arrogance problem.' "

At page 68 of the same book the author states—

> "Equality in relationships is a concept that runs against the grain of the neatly ordered, intricate hierarchies of Japanese culture. It is a simple matter for the Japanese to accept being inferior to someone else. It is equally simple to be that person's superior. These are not subjective judgments but objective ones determined by criteria like age, education, and rank. An inferior speaks and acts in one manner, while his superior employs a totally different behavior and language. Cases of true equality are rare and hard to manage because they fall outside the rules.
>
> So it is with Japan's relationships with foreign countries. For most of the postwar period . . .The great Japanese success in export industries began to break down Japan's inferiority complex. The financial role reversal shattered it.
>
> Just as it seemed perfectly natural to the Japanese to adopt an inferior position when facts showed the United States to be richer, it became logical to adopt a superior position once those same facts showed Japan to be number one."

Japan is No. 1 in the world as a trading and creditor nation. Even the United States is substantially in debt to it. The author of this book goes on to powerfully and successfully argue that Australia cannot deal with a nation that has that mentality by lying down and allowing it to walk all over it. For all the years under the Bjelke-Petersen administration the Queensland Government laid down and did not enforce this agreement. The Queensland Government allowed this Japanese company to walk all over the Queensland people and its Parliament.

The member for Broadsound has stated that the Government is finally doing something, but it is still crouching. It is on only one foot and is down on one knee. Queenslanders are allowing Iwasaki to walk over them in a crouched position. They are no longer completely supine; they are almost up on their feet like a free people. It is not good enough. If Queensland had a Labor Government it would deal with the Japanese on the basis of equality. That equality would be to say to this company, "You obtained the freeholding of 30 per cent of this land from the Queensland Government on condition that you kept certain conditions. You have failed to keep these conditions and the freeholding is cancelled. It will revert to leasehold. If at the end of the period of leasehold which you have been granted you have still not complied with the agreement or the schedule that we have given you, we will not extend the term of the lease." No free people could complain about that and no free society that is used to freehold land concepts would complain about it, either. That is the requirement that is needed and is one that was self-evidently beyond the Liberal Party, because its spokesman said that he had no suggestions to make as to what that party would do if it was in government. The Labor Party has the suggestions and would be prepared to implement them.

Australians have much to learn about their relationship with Japan. Japan is a nation which in years to come will be the most significant nation in the Pacific region, that is, our part of the world. This Government and the Government before it have let the Queensland people down badly. It is opportune to refer to some other relevant matters concerning Australia's relationship with Japan in order to get into the minds, hearts and souls of the Queensland people the fact that Queensland must become more dominant in its relationship with the Japanese. We must be prepared to stand up to them and not indicate that we are prepared to sell our birthright for any development.

It is important that Australians understand the arrogant attitude of some Japanese companies and entrepreneurs. There are some recent examples to which I will refer that are contained in the book *Yen!* I refer to page 70 of the book which states—

> ". . . think-tankers at MITI (Ministry of International Trade and Industry) announced a plan to build 'silver communities' abroad. The idea was to export Japan's exploding 'silver' population (those over sixty-five) to a series of Japanese-style leisure worlds in countries that met three criteria: good medical care, political stability, and a high concentration of Japanese restaurants. The meagre yen-based pensions of silver-haired Japanese who retired in the United States"—

or Australia for that matter—

> "would convert into so many dollars, they'd live out their days like kings.
>
> . . .
>
> MITI's high-handedness could be seen in the fact that this plan, which targeted the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, was announced without ever consulting any of the countries involved. Nor did MITI consider that providing homes for hundreds of thousands of elderly Japanese might not be the way foreign countries would prefer to expand trade with Japan. MITI's assumption was that beggars couldn't be choosers.
>
> . . .
>
> MITI believed the money would be so helpful to the local economy, no one would mind the imposition on national dignity."

I well remember when that suggestion was made. When members of the Labor Party criticised it and said that it was high-handedness and arrogance for the Japanese to announce that they would shift their elderly people to Australia without asking us first whether we agreed with it, some of the conservative members of this place and conservative supporters in Queensland were outraged. They had their hands out for the dollars. That was all they wanted.

Members of the Opposition want more than dollars. We want dignity for the people of Queensland and of Australia. The Japanese people understand that. They are a dignified people. However, with their approach to equity and equality, when they are in a position of superiority they will, if they can, exert that superiority. Unless we stand up to them, we will not be able to live with them in the next century. Unless we adopt some of their methods, of course, we will not live with them either. We have to adopt some of their approaches to education. Only 1 per cent of Japanese are illiterate, compared with a much higher percentage in Australia. Approximately 95 per cent of Japanese students complete high school, compared with only about 60 per cent of Queensland students. The Japanese, with half the American population, have as many engineers as the Unites States of America. They have concentrated on maths and science skills. There is much to learn and admire about their single-mindedness, their concentration of ideas and their ability to rise from the ashes of defeat—in the cases of two cities, the ashes of nuclear bombs—to make Japan the world's leading trading nation.

Members of the Labor Party are not being racist when they oppose this legislation. We know that, if we are to trade with the Japanese and converse with them socially, we can only do so on the basis of equality. They must be taught that equality relates to more in life than just who has the most money or who has the most power. The egalitarian style of Queenslanders and Australians, whereby Jack is as good as his master,

must be taught to the Japanese. Even if they do not agree with it in their country, they must realise that they must respect it in Australia. When they see that the legislation that is finally brought into this House to punish them for their failure to keep their commercial bond is a paper tiger, they do not respect that. The Opposition does not support paper tigers.

Mr De LACY (Cairns) (4.20 p.m.): My contribution to the debate will be brief. I merely wish to reinforce some points made by previous Opposition speakers. Firstly, I take up the points raised by the member for Stafford, Mr Gygar. He endeavoured to promote the theory that there was something sacrosanct about freehold land; that once land was freeholded it was freeholded in perpetuity and that Governments had no right to do anything with that freeholded land. If that is the case, how would the Government propose to construct the Wolffdene dam? Most of the land that surrounds the proposed site of the Wolffdene dam is freehold land. Earlier, the member for Lytton mentioned the new toll-road to the Sunshine Coast. That road will travel through much freehold land. What will happen to that freehold land? Is the honourable member for Stafford seriously suggesting that, once land is freeholded, Governments do not have any rights to resume the land or to interfere with a person's rights over that land? It is patently a nonsensical proposition. His whole contribution was a nonsensical contribution, particularly the way in which he interpreted the point of view that was put forward by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr Burns. All he was saying——

Mr Austin: He didn't know what he was saying.

Mr De LACY: Yes, he did. Those comments came straight from Mr Burns' heart.

Mr Burns was simply putting the proposition that Iwasaki has signed an agreement with the Queensland Government which he has not honoured. He obtained approximately 8 000 hectares of land and has only developed about 500 hectares. He has not met the conditions of the agreement under which the land was freeholded to him. It is the right of the Queensland Government—in fact, it is incumbent on the Queensland Government—to say to Iwasaki, "You have not used this land. You have not met the conditions. Therefore it will be forfeited. It will be leaseholded. If you do not meet the terms of the leasehold, it will be forfeited altogether." I feel comfortable with that concept and it is something from which the Labor Party does not resile.

At times, the issue of foreign investment amuses me. This morning, I listened with interest to the member for Broadsound pontificating about foreign investment. Somehow or other, he blamed the Federal Labor Government for the problems in Australia over the attitudes to foreign investment. However, it is obvious to me and all other honourable members that what Mr Hinton is saying is out of kilter with what his party is saying. In other words, he is not espousing National Party policy. He is espousing a policy that he sees may help him to retain his seat of Broadsound; it has nothing to do with National Party policy. He is making his own party and his own Government look foolish. If the Premier interprets policy in one way and a back-bencher says something that is quite contrary to that interpretation, it makes the Premier look foolish.

In the six years for which I have been a member of this Parliament, I have had to sit through debates during which member after member of the National Party Government and the Liberal Party has lectured the Opposition about the virtues of foreign investment—and the virtues of Japanese investment in particular—how it is good for Australia, how it is good for Queensland and how it is good for the community.

The greatest "Japophile" or "Nippophile", or whatever word one wants to coin, in Australia was the former Premier of Queensland, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen. At times on a trip to Japan he ran the risk of passing himself on his way back. On his return from Japan, he would tell honourable members how good the Japanese were, how good Japanese industry was and that we ought to be more like the Japanese. He invited Mr

Iwasaki to Queensland and he gave him that block of land on a platter. He told us what a marvellous thing the Iwasaki resort would be for Queensland and what it would do for this State's economy. I ask honourable members: what has it done for Queensland's economy and what has it done for Queensland?

Now members of the National Party are trying to make political capital or to carve a name for themselves by saying that we need to be very wary of Japanese investment. Members of the Labor Party have been saying that for years and years. They have certainly been saying it ever since the legislation that this repealing legislation relates to was introduced in an all-night sitting of the Queensland Parliament 10 years or more ago.

It really does not do any credit to either the member for Broadsound or the National Party for him and others to be carrying on in the crazy fashion in which they are. Nobody knows what the Government's foreign investment policy is. Every spokesman interprets it in a different way. When the Mirage resort was partially sold to Japanese interests, the Premier said, "That's good. We should welcome that." His front-bencher Mr Tenni initially said that foreign investment was good, lectured the Parliament about how good the Japanese are, and was quoted in a headline in the *Courier-Mail* as saying that we must emulate the Japanese. All of a sudden Mr Tenni spoke to some of his constituents and found that what was going on was extremely unpopular, so he had another interpretation of National Party policy.

What is National Party policy? Is that any way to run a Government? What does the Government think the Japanese are doing?

Mr Braddy has referred to the attitudes of the Japanese. They respect people who can stand up for themselves, lay the law down, say what the rules are and what the Japanese can and cannot do. What does the Government think the Japanese think of the Queensland Government when every member interprets policy according to his or her electoral perceptions at the time?

It seems to me that the National Party has adopted the old policy of allowing back-benchers to stand up and say what they like, even to attack their own Government, if they think that they can save their own skin and their own seat.

Mr FitzGerald: Have you cleared this speech with Keating?

Mr De LACY: I will come to that shortly.

Mr Hinton: I have not attacked my own Government.

Mr De LACY: The member for Broadsound attacked the policy of his own Government, or what was the policy until recently. As I said, there is now no policy at all to attack because nobody knows what the policy of the National Party is. The policy of the National Party depends upon who one is talking to.

Just after Mr Hinton spoke, the member for Mount Gravatt spoke about pollution in the Brisbane River. He made a speech on conservation of which I am sure the member for Windsor would have been proud, but it represented a massive indictment of the policies of the Government and of the party of which he is a member. Exactly the same applies to Mr Hinton.

I was asked a question about Mr Keating and his attitude. It is probably fair to say that many people in the Labor Party in Queensland do not fully agree with the policy espoused by the Federal Labor Government. However, I have said it before and I will say again: the Federal Government has to deal with the macro-economic problem. The Federal Government has to look at the big picture. Australia has horrendous economic problems. Nobody is running away from that. The causes of those problems I would debate with members of the Government. However, I do not think anybody in Australia would deny that this country has tremendous problems, particularly the size of our international debt and our current account deficit.

Every foreign investment in Australia helps to service the overseas debt and takes some pressure off interest rates and a variety of other things. The Federal Government is looking at that big picture. It is the responsibility of the State Government to look at the way in which foreign investment impacts at the local level, and that is an area in which the State Government ought to be laying down guide-lines. If honourable members wait for guide-lines to be laid down by this State Government, they will be waiting for ever. Somebody said, "What's the Labor Party policy?" The policy of the Labor Party in Queensland has been announced. It has been spelt out in this Chamber, in public and in the media on a number of occasions. If members of the Government have not seen it, obviously they are not reading the press. I am told that many members of the National Party no longer read the press because they cannot ever see any good news in it.

Mr Smith: They can't read.

Mr De LACY: My colleague is perceptive and points out that many of them cannot read, to start with.

If attitudes towards foreign investment were to be divided according to the left/right axis, it would be seen that it has been the conservatives, the right-wingers, who have prostrated themselves before foreign nationals and invited them to invest in this country. I suggest that the Federal coalition policy on foreign investment is to abolish the Foreign Investment Review Board lock, stock and barrel; in other words have no controls, no impediments, no surveillance at all of foreign investment. That is in Mr Howard's Future Directions—or backward directions, or whatever it is.

An Opposition member: They want to hang out the "For sale" signs.

Mr De LACY: Exactly. The Federal coalition wants to hang out a sign which says, "Australia for sale".

Mr Hamill: The Federal Opposition has had a face-lift since then.

Mr De LACY: I understand that it has had a face-lift and is examining that policy.

I have read in the newspapers that the local Liberals, who are finally starting to tune in to public opinion in Queensland, are going to do something about their Federal policy. Members of the Opposition will wait with bated breath to see what they are going to do. Knowing the members of the Liberal Party over the years, I know what will be done when it comes to selling off Australia; they will still hang out the "For sale" sign.

The fact that the State National Party Government has no policy on foreign investment has been highlighted by the Iwasaki fiasco. Over the last 10 years, farce has been built upon farce. Today, we are acting out not the final chapter in that farce but merely another chapter in that farce. Some sort of policy needs to be spelt out to the Japanese. As we are debating the Iwasaki legislation, we are talking about Japanese investment. Mr Braddy referred to the book *Yen!*, which I have read and which I urge all members of this Chamber to read because it will make the hair on the back of their heads stand up—--

Mr Austin: What hair?

Mr De LACY: It will make the hair on those people who have hair on the back of their heads stand up.

The book is written in a way that is easy to read. The author touches so many responsive chords. It contains so many lessons that Australians ought to take notice of. Every responsible politician ought to read it.

The Japanese accept guide-lines, rules and regulations. In fact, they work on the basis of rules and regulations. They do not and will not respect Australians any more

if we do the old prostrating in front of them as Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen used to do. Every country in the world has a different set of guide-lines when it comes to foreign investment. I have just returned from China, which has its foreign investment guide-lines written out in very strict terms. The Japanese are investing in China and they are honouring the foreign investment policies in that country.

Mr Austin: That's not right.

Mr De LACY: Yes, they are.

Mr Austin: I was at a seminar on investment and trade, and that is not right.

Mr De LACY: What is the Minister saying—that the Japanese are investing in China in a way that the Chinese Government does not accept?

Mr Austin: No. If you want to invest in China, they are prepared to negotiate.

Mr De LACY: All right. But they do it by negotiation.

Mr Austin: That is not policy.

Mr De LACY: China has spelt out where it wants foreign investment and the sectors of the economy in which it will accept foreign investment or in which it is looking for it. In many areas it is absolutely taboo. That is the way in which the Chinese are doing business, and the Japanese accept that. Of course, they will negotiate.

What is happening in Queensland is not negotiation; it is just carte blanche. Queensland ought to be negotiating, but it ought to lay down the guide-lines. The Japanese have always operated in that way. They have never opened up their markets or deregulated. When they deregulate and succumb to this theoretical pressure from the rest of the world, particularly from the United States, and make some adjustments to their long-held policy, they only make those adjustments when they are in a position of strength. Then, of course, they will make the theoretical adjustment to their policy. In other words, they have opened up their capital markets to the West. But, of course, there are so many cultural barriers that the West cannot get in there, anyway. It is still not possible for Westerners to buy shares in Japan's biggest companies. In a variety of ways Japan will break down its barriers when it is in a position to advantage itself, but before that time it will never do it. For instance, foreigners are now allowed to buy land in Japan at a million dollars a square metre. That is the going rate. The rest of the world cannot buy that land. Japan has decided to open up its borders and to say, "It is free for the rest of the world." But the rest of the world cannot buy it. That is the way in which Japan operates and the Japanese will only respect those people who operate that way, too.

I accept that there is a need in Australia for foreign investment to be encouraged, particularly because of its economic problems. However, in Queensland, areas need to be laid down in which Queenslanders perceive that foreign investment will be of benefit to them. I do not believe that selling off our real estate to the Japanese, to the Germans, to the Americans or to anybody else is in the best interests of Queenslanders. I have said this before so I will not elaborate on it, except to say that the Japanese investment in real estate around the Cairns region caused horrendous problems in the city's real estate market, which was pushed through the roof. The investment also caused great resentment, which is another factor in this whole issue. One cannot deny that when a community feels resentful, reactions occur which are not always in the best interests of either of the countries involved.

Members of the Labor Party cannot support the way in which this Iwasaki legislation is being rescinded. We think that the Government has handled it in a very sloppy way from the word go. It is indicative of the Government's whole attitude to foreign investment. Until Queensland has a Government that is prepared to address this problem and to lay down guide-lines, to face up to the matter and to have a policy right across the board, awful problems will be experienced in Queensland and in Australia in the future.

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (4.37 p.m.): The whole argument about the Queensland International Tourist Centre Agreement Act Repeal Bill centres on land and the failure of an agreement. I emphasise the land aspect as the most important one that should be considered in a debate on the Bill. The legislation has caused problems for many industries. The whole crux of the argument is centred on land. In Queensland, despite the land shortage for honest Queenslanders, there is no shortage of land for the powerful, the mighty, the rich and the greedy. I shall refer to instances in which land is bought and sold without the Lands Department having any input, influence or say whatsoever in those sales.

Criticism is levelled at overseas companies that are headed by businessmen who have great expertise in the business world and want to buy land in Australia. Because those businessmen are too smart for Queenslanders, the public is upset. Many people are concerned about the way in which land dealings in Queensland degrade Queenslanders, create a shortage of land and price young Queenslanders out of the opportunity to settle on the land. Those companies remove the incentive and the opportunity for many Queenslanders—not always young people but ordinary Queenslanders with families—to settle on the land.

This Bill refers to a total of 9 276 hectares of which 5 200 hectares were freeholded and the remainder were special leases and perpetual leases. The Government is concerned about the breaking of the agreements. This Act allowed Iwasaki to get a foot in the door.

Many years ago when the Act was introduced, Mr Iwasaki wanted to obtain large areas of land in Australia. All honourable members would be aware of the present world economic situation and the power of the almighty yen. The Japanese are lending money to Australians and to many countries throughout the world.

For the life of me I cannot see why Mr Iwasaki, who is a Japanese businessman, could not have obtained finance in Japan to complete the project on schedule. He is now years behind with the project and wants an extension of time. With the availability of funds to a businessman such as Mr Iwasaki and the low interest rates that are available in Japan, if he had wished to do so Mr Iwasaki could have completed that project well ahead of schedule. However, he was not so much interested in creating tourist attractions as he was in getting a foot in the door. In common with many other businessmen, Mr Iwasaki saw Australia's bright future, which is fading fast because of the economic circumstances throughout the world.

This Government's relaxation of land-ownership rules is forcing Queenslanders and other Australians out of the scene and allowing in entrepreneurs and fast-buck merchants. When I talk about fast-buck merchants I am referring not solely to foreign investors. Queensland and Australia have plenty of them.

In an endeavour to overcome these problems, I have spoken to people in the Department of Land Management. I was told that while those companies do nothing illegal there is nothing that that department can do about them. When one continually comes second and third in the race, one has to change the rules. This Government is the custodian of the assets of Queenslanders. Land is an asset of all Australians, not only Queenslanders. From when we were very young we were told that land is our heritage. However, it is now a pipe-dream to own one's own home. Mr Gunn tried to help young home-buyers by making land available by ballot at what he considered were very good terms. However, because of high interest rates, not all of the offers were taken up.

Mr Gunn: We had the lowest interest rate in Australia.

Mr EATON: Yes, but the price still was not low enough to allow people to take up all the offers.

The system is being manipulated. That is why this legislation is before the House. Mr Iwasaki got the land in the first place by manipulation. I am sure that if that land

had been offered for public ballot with certain rules and conditions attached to it, the Government would have been inundated with applications. However, not only Mr Iwasaki but also many other foreign businessmen who come to this country do deals with the Government and force up the price of land. They enter industries in which they can produce goods at prices well below those of the poorer producers who are battling, paying their way and trying to make a success of their businesses. I could cite many instances of that.

Queensland is entering a phase which this Government will have to face up to in the very near future. Many entrepreneurs and fast-buck merchants who are operating in Queensland are buying up large tracts of land. Sometimes they form husband-and-wife teams or companies through which land is bought. The first that the Department of Land Management hears about a change of ownership of that land is when the deal has been completed, the stamp duty has been paid and everything has been finalised. In many cases, although the department does not agree with that practice, nothing in the present legislation allows the department to exercise its authority over those deals.

Those companies are now taking over large aggregations of freehold land in Queensland or taking two-year options on it. That land is then being sold for three or four times the price that was quoted in the options. There is nothing that the Department of Land Management can do about that. It is time that this Government started to act.

Under this legislation, although the Government has given concessions and played it straight down the middle in dealing with those companies, those companies have fallen by the wayside. During the past 10 years much land in Queensland has been sold to big companies. Some of that land was vacant Crown land and some was leasehold land that was converted to freehold. The system is being manipulated in order to maintain a high price for land. However, the Government is not participating in any deals to develop land in many cities, communities and small townships outside the major cities so that residential land can be offered cheaply on a perpetual lease basis.

Many years ago I opposed the repeal of the perpetual lease section of the Land Act. Because the Government's argument is now different from what it was when that section of the Land Act was repealed, that section should now be reintroduced. The Labor Party asks the Government to take note of that.

In many ways this Government could do a great deal to improve the opportunity and incentive to young Queenslanders to own their own land and to establish a life for which they are trained. Many young Queenslanders would make great land-holders in Queensland in terms of production and benefits to the State.

But what is happening? They have been forced off the land. The Government has put "Australia for sale" signs up everywhere and overseas developers are given encouragement.

I can cite a couple of occasions on which I have asked the Government to allow an area of Crown land—in many cases only a few acres—to be added to a farmer's freehold block or his leasehold block to allow him better access to water or to overcome some other problem with access to the block, and the Government has knocked me back. Yet outsiders are allowed to come in. I cite as an example a case in Innisfail in which the Government made an offer to the Emmanuel group of companies, which are not much more than land-dealers. The Government gave that group 13.5 acres of riverfront land for $12,300. It is not possible to buy a residential block of land in Innisfail for $12,300.

I rest my case there. I have made my point. I just hope that in the future the Government will take notice.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (4.47 p.m.): I rise to speak on this legislation dealing with the repeal of the Iwasaki franchise agreement to put right some of the things that were said by the member for Broadsound. It is very important that we look back in the history of providing some of Queensland's coastal land—very important land to Queenslanders—to overseas interests for development.

It is interesting that the reason why the Act is being repealed is that there was a threat of a second franchise agreement by the State Government. Really, why would a second franchise agreement worry Iwasaki? He had 11 years in which to fulfil the original agreement. It was not fulfilled in that time. So why would he expect the National Party now, and in those days the National/Liberal Parties, to impose any more stringent conditions than those applying in the past? It is important to consider that this was a franchise agreement between the Government, the Parliament of Queensland, and this developer.

Does anyone in this House believe that an Australian developer in Tokyo would ignore a Japanese parliamentary agreement in the same way as Iwasaki has and get away with it as he does in Queensland? That is the key element to it. We are not asking for anything special. It should be considered that a special agreement was made with this Government, the conditions of which were not fulfilled, and no action has been taken against that person. Any franchise agreement—and that is basically what is being spoken about—always contains provisions which state that if a person does not fulfil his side of it, penalties will be applied. The penalties proposed by the Labor Party, and outlined by Mr Braddy, the member for Rockhampton, are adequate to fulfil, support and protect the interests of Queenslanders.

In this situation, a developer has been allowed to come into Queensland and not fulfil his agreement with the Parliament and the people of Queensland, yet effectively nothing is done about it. I suggest that not even in Japan would an Australian developer receive the same consideration. If an Australian developer did not comply with the conditions laid down, it is probable that the land would be taken away from him.

In actual fact, this is probably the longest-running development proposal in the history of Australia. Any person who has been responsible for a development for more than 11 years and has not fulfilled the requirements has no right to retain the conditions that applied to the land in the past. Apart from that, the Act contains no provision for him to be fined in any way—and I use that word in its most general term—for not fulfilling the agreement. It is very important to remember that, in order to help this developer, Parliament sat until 6 o'clock one morning to rush the Bill through, and 11 years later he still has not fulfilled the agreement. That is the contradictory aspect of this legislation.

The member for Broadsound attacked on many bases things that the member for Lytton said about the grand plan. If everything that had been proposed for that land had been developed, there would be two or three storeys of different developments. Back in 1982 it was proposed to establish a senior citizens holiday village. That was one of the extras that were to be thrown in after the company could not fulfil its requirements from 1978 to 1982.

Iwasaki Sangyo Co. (Australia) Pty Ltd wrote to Mr Schubert, Co-ordinator-General, Executive Building, stating—

"Dear Mr Schubert,

Enclosed please find a document describing the proposed Retirement or Senior Citizens Holiday Village for your information and perusal."

Nothing was done about it. It was another proposal about which nothing was done. It was another one of those grandiose ideas getting into the realms of Disneyland.

On 12 February 1978 a newspaper article was written about the airport. The headline stated, "Airport in Iwasaki's planning". It was proposed that Boeing 747 jumbo jets would fly in on a weekly basis. In 1979 another newspaper headline stated, "Airport growth waits on Iwasaki". In 1989 we are still waiting for the jumbo jets to come to Iwasaki's development. It is important to remember that nothing like that has occurred.

All of the problems that the Opposition said would occur in relation to that development were also referred to in the committee's report on the Iwasaki tourist resort concept at Yeppoon. That report was tabled in the Legislative Assembly on 5 March

1975. The committee was chaired by Sir Charles Barton. Dr Harvey, the Director-General of the Department of Primary Industries, was also a member of that committee. The conclusions that that committee reached were in accord with the problems that the Opposition said would occur. Some of the things that were said have been denied by the member for Broadsound.

It was said that no land was subject to flooding, yet paragraph (9) of the committee's conclusions states—

> "The area which has been suggested for development is subject to flooding."

Paragraph (10) states—

> "Water availability to the resort in the Yeppoon area requires further investigation."

What happened years later? One has to go to the local authority to determine whether a water supply will be provided.

Paragraph (11) states—

> "Development of the Concept in its present form may cause environmental problems, in particular to the fresh water, man-made swamps, and in the mangrove areas about the mouth of Fishing Creek, which includes a Fish Habitat Reserve."

All those problems were outlined by the Government's committee before the project even started.

Although paragraph (8) stated that sand dunes on the Capricorn coast are unstable, particularly near Sandy Point, what happened? The Government gave Iwasaki the sand dunes.

Paragraph (12) states—

> "More information is required on the use and management of land owned by Iwasaki-Sangyo Company which lies outside the boundary of the proposed resort."

It is needed even 11 years later because nothing has been done. The report states in paragraph (13)—

> "Foreign ownership of land, particularly ownership of beaches is of concern to Queenslanders. Provision for substantial Australian equity would increase support for the project, both locally and throughout the State. The Committee noted that the Government is examining the question of foreign ownership of Queensland land."

When this matter is looked into carefully, it will be noted that, in spite of the fact that all these questions were raised, effectively nothing was done for 11 years. The same issues in relation to development of beachfront land are important issues not only in Yeppoon but also along the length of Queensland's coast.

I turn now to mention the other Japanese interests that have taken over a development on Queensland's coastline. A grand scheme was devised by Qintex and Christopher Skase. The outrage that occurred 11 years ago associated with Japanese interests taking over coastline land has been avoided in a very devious manner, supported and abetted by the Ahern Government. Japanese ownership of the Qintex Mirage resort has been accomplished in a way that I believe is more sinister than what was proposed for the Iwasaki resort. In the days when the Iwasaki resort was proposed, Bjelke-Petersen was so brazen that he thought he could get away with it. Now the same type of arrangement is being devised behind closed doors. This is being done with the support and guidance of Queensland Government organisations such as the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation.

It is obvious when one examines the transactions relating to the Mirage resort at Port Douglas that the public interest was not protected by the Queensland Government. A special arrangement was entered into in relation to Queensland Government land—Crown land—that was provided for the development of the Mirage resort at Port Douglas.

The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation was allocated five million trust units at a value of $2 each for the value of that land.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I must bring the member back to the Bill, which is about the Iwasaki resort, or the Queensland International Tourist Centre Agreement Act. It has nothing to do with Skase.

Mr CAMPBELL: Mr Speaker, I am just pointing out the differences in agreements now being negotiated by the Queensland Government in tourist development projects such as the Iwasaki resort.

Mr SPEAKER: I suggest that the honourable member be brief about that point.

Mr CAMPBELL: Land on the foreshores along the Capricorn Coast is now owned by Iwasaki and, in spite of the fact that he has not fulfilled all the conditions, he still owns it. Land at Port Douglas has been handed over to other Japanese interests at a market price of $45m. The Queensland Government received $13.5m. The situation now is that Iwasaki retains control of the land and other Japanese interests can control land that has been purchased at a price far below market value. I believe a case could be mounted for questioning the two Qintex companies involved about the manipulation of share prices that resulted in unit trusts being sold for $2.70 that were later sold to the Japanese for $9, with profits going to those two companies. The public interest in land used for that development was sold out at a loss. It was not protected in either the Iwasaki project or the Port Douglas development.

I believe this is a very important matter because the Government now seeks to change the rules that apply to the Iwasaki resort to restore public interest. In spite of that, as recently as last March the same public interest was sold out by the Ahern Government.

Nothing has changed. The obligation to protect public interest has not been fulfilled by the Ahern Government.

Debate, on motion of Mr Harper, adjourned.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Primary Industries) (5 p.m.): I move—

"That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Wednesday, 7 June 1989, at 2.30 p.m."

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Primary Industries) (5 p.m.): I move—

"That the House do now adjourn."

Redevelopment of Roma Street Goods Yard Site

Mr HAMILL (Ipswich) (5.01 p.m.): I wish to discuss the fate of a significant 21-hectare site located in the inner-city area of Brisbane. This land is owned by the people of Queensland and they are concerned that their interests are to be mortgaged to the whims of development interests closely associated with the Queensland Government. I refer to the proposed redevelopment of the existing railway goods yard at Roma Street.

It is rare that an opportunity to reshape the face of a city arises, but Brisbane is now experiencing its second such opportunity in a short space of time. The other instance is, of course, the Expo site redevelopment. Do honourable members remember Expo? Do they remember the public outcry at the manner in which the Ahern Government handled the sensitive issue of the Expo site redevelopment? One of the first decisions of the Ahern Government was the announcement that the River City 2000 consortium

would be the preferred developer of the valuable 20-hectare site located on the south bank of the Brisbane River. No sooner was that decision made than controversy erupted over the financial arrangements of the deal and what in fact was to be included in the tender. Honourable members would recall that River City 2000 included a casino in its tender and other tenders did not. As a result of public outcry, the Expo redevelopment went back to the drawing board and River City 2000 went out the back door—or did it?

I turn now to the Roma Street story. In 1984 disgraced former Minister for Transport, Don Lane, announced a redevelopment of the Roma Street Station. The successful developer was the Roma Street Development Group in association with F.A. Pidgeon and Son Pty Ltd. The result of that decision was the Brisbane Transit Centre. Minister Lane made successive statements that the adjoining goods yards would also be redeveloped, but it was only last week that the shape of the redevelopment was revealed, not by the Minister, but as a result of a leak to the *Courier-Mail.* This leak gave details of a consultant's report from MacAllister and Associates Pty Ltd—a report which the Minister has now claimed he had for some months.

The people of Queensland, and in particular the people of Brisbane, are demanding answers to the following questions—

- What is proposed for the Roma Street site?
- What is the status of the report of MacAllister and Associates?
- Who is pushing for that redevelopment?
- Who would be involved in such a redevelopment?
- What would be the return to the Railway Department and its owners, the people of Queensland?
- Why has this Government shrouded the project in secrecy?

The people of Queensland are entitled to know the answers to those questions.

The people of Brisbane would recall that the details of the River City 2000 consortium's proposal for the Expo site became public only when the Ahern Government announced that it was the preferred developer. Only then did Queenslanders discover that the consortium was headed by one of the National Party's knights of the realm, Sir Frank Moore. The same Sir Frank Moore also has a keen interest in Roma Street. He headed the Roma Street Development Group, which was responsible for the Brisbane Transit Centre. Furthermore, last Thursday the Minister for Transport told listeners to the Haydn Sargent program that the Brisbane Transit Centre recently acquired additional railway land and that further expansion of the transit centre would be necessary in the future. Obviously planning for the Roma Street site is further advanced than the Minister or his Government would have us believe.

Therefore, I pose the obvious question: are Queenslanders in for a repeat of the opening scene of the Expo bungle, when the views of the public were ignored and the developer cronies of the National Party were given free rein to reshape the face of Queensland's capital city? According to Minister McKechnie, the Railway Department has not decided what to do with the Roma Street goods yard site. The Minister has claimed that the consultant's report was merely giving the department options to consider. Who is he trying to fool? The Government has resolved to redevelop the site and the MacAllister report is a blueprint. Is it a case of examining the options for redevelopment or not? The answer is, "No." It was a blueprint for redevelopment. It was one option with a casino and one without.

The Government's preferred option contained a casino, convention centre, three hotels, 300 residential units, a 60-storey office tower and parking for 5 300 cars. This leaves me with a sense of deja vu, because River City 2000 proposed the following options for the similar-sized Expo site: casino, exhibition and convention centre, two hotels, 250 apartments, a 56-storey office tower and parking for 6 000 cars. As I said, the MacAllister report is not an options paper; it is a blueprint. What is more, the

consultant wants to stay on as effective site manager, no doubt bringing its Expo expertise to bear on a development which has an uncanny similarity to the River City 2000 development. So similar are the concepts, that MacAllister puts forward River City minus the river and the island, but with a lake instead.

It is time for the Government to come clean. The decision has been made. The Government must not tell this House that it spent $96,000 on a report to tell the Railway Department that its Roma Street site need not be a goods yard! I ask the following questions—

- Why has public money been spent in this fashion?
- Why haven't expressions of interest been called?
- Why haven't the people of Brisbane been consulted?
- Why hasn't the Brisbane City Council been consulted?

All the options must be considered. This Government should not rush in to offer a consolation prize to those who would foist a concept on Brisbane; a concept which has already received a massive thumbs down.

Last week Mr McKechnie told Haydn Sargent that under Mr Ahern "cronyism is dead now". I wonder if that is true, Mr Speaker.

Land Care Committees; Introduction of New Oat Varieties

Mr BOOTH (Warwick) (5.05 p.m.): I notice that the Minister for Primary Industries is presently in charge of the House and I wish to raise two matters concerning primary industries.

The first matter relates to land care committees, and I congratulate the DPI on their establishment. The people who will be associated with those committees possess the necessary expertise and know-how, and if the committees do not function efficiently it will not be through lack of expertise. Recently I attended an annual meeting and was impressed by what the committees hope to achieve. The people who have accepted responsibility by taking office on a number of other committees are people of excellent standing who will have an input into and a favourable effect on the outcome of the committees. I am happy with the $250 establishment grant for these committees, but I am disappointed with the $100 operating grant. I hope that the Minister will consider this $100 grant further, but I believe if the committees are to operate effectively they should be allowed to draw up to $250 per year. I am not criticising the Minister, but simply draw his attention to that matter.

The second matter I wish to raise relates to the performance of Queensland's oat varieties. The most important crop grown in Queensland is oats. This is not reflected in the number of bushels or tonnes produced in Queensland, but in the number of cattle fattened by being grazed on oats. It is difficult to calculate exactly the total production of oats because many paddocks of oats are used quickly and ploughed up. This leads to the impression that oats is not an important crop.

For the past 25 to 28 years, since the stout variety was introduced—I could be wrong by a year or two—Queensland has not introduced any decent oat varieties. The majority of other oat varieties are up to 50 years old. The Minister has not ignored the problem but is inclined to ask the meat industry to provide money for the development of the crop. Queensland cannot wait long enough to get money from the meat industry, but the money has to come from somewhere; it cannot be pulled out of the air. It is possible that other areas will have to go without, but two or three people could be employed to inquire into the breeding of oats so that Queensland can catch up with the other States.

Because of the wet winters of this year and last year, some might say that I am being too critical. We have not had a good year for growing oats for about three years and the last two wet winters have caused rust in the crops and have probably shown

the oat varieties up in a bad light. However, I think I would be right in saying that most people are very disappointed with the performance of oats, so much so that some people are thinking about planting barley instead of oats. We do not have too many varieties of good feed barley, because the Cape barley does not perform as it did many years ago.

The Government should start spending a substantial amount of money and time to see if the State can catch up on the breeding of oats. The Minister has informed me of what is ahead for two or three years. Although I do not suppose it is ever too late, I think that action is a bit late. I would like to see more done. Some of the old varieties that have been used for a long time were bred down south and some were bred in Queensland. The Hermitage Research Station in my electorate successfully bred several varieties of oats and also tested many varieties of oats brought in from the USA.

I make my final plea: yes, by all means bring some more in from the USA and test them, if that can be done, but I would like to see some breeding of oats done in this State, and the Hermitage is an ideal place for that.

Morale of Teachers in Education Department

Mr SCHUNTNER (Mount Coot-tha) (5.10 p.m.): The quality of work or performance in any area of activity is affected by the level of morale. It does not matter whether it is a sporting team, a small-business enterprise, a large business enterprise or a large Government department, the level of morale has a major effect on the work done in that area of activity.

I have never seen morale in the Queensland Education Department lower than it is at present. What is needed is competent, fair leadership that demonstrates an understanding of the difficulties faced by the thousands of teachers working within the Education Department. This also applies in tertiary education. At present that is caused mainly by the conflict associated with the amalgamation proposals. The uncertainty generated from that has caused enormous anxiety. I recognise that the Federal Government and the actions of the Federal Minister, Mr Dawkins, had a lot to do with the problems now confronted by tertiary institutions, but I must point out that in an institution such as the Brisbane College of Advanced Education, which is the subject of a great tug of war between the two competing Governments, the uncertainties experienced by lecturers are very harmful to their quality of work.

I now turn to secondary and primary education. Many members may be aware that a couple of weeks ago the Liberal Party Leader and I made public announcements about morale problems. At that time we were talking about secondary schools, but the comments I make now relate to both primary and secondary schools.

There is a growing cynicism amongst principals. There is a feeling that promotions and transfers are unfair. Our own political and departmental leadership is not perceived as being aware of the difficulties in the schools. Teachers received a letter telling them not to make public comments critical of the department or the Government. That was seen as being unnecessarily threatening. There is a reluctance to speak out to senior officers about the problems experienced in the schools. We are not seen to be attracting the best students into teaching. There is a feeling that we are accepting those whose abilities are probably dangerously mediocre. There is a feeling that the authorities encourage the write-a-letter syndrome. Rather than sitting down and talking about the problems, the department encourages people to write a letter, which can then be dispatched to a waste-paper basket or some other place where it will not be dealt with.

There has been massive departmental reorganisation, which is not seen to have changed the quality of teaching in any positive way. Teachers feel that they are being subjected to verbal, and even physical, abuse and vandalism. There would hardly be a high school principal in a large urban area—and probably this applies to primary principals, also—whose phone number is not unlisted. That is a result of the abuse to which they are subjected. Schools are too often blamed for all the problems of society.

There is no high-profile public relations section within the Education Department to promote and protect the interests of our schools. There is a proliferation of statements, directives, programs and documents. The teachers have to read, digest and implement this plethora of material that comes out to schools.

Rarely is any significant in-service education provided for teachers to cope with all these changes. They have to bow to every wind of change. As one teacher has said, "It was cuisenaire, sets of logic and then whatever it was that we just tossed out." There are so many extraneous activities. They are frustrated in chasing up source materials and equipment. The problems are smoothed over in a superficial way.

Are our children any better off for all this time, effort and worry? I do not think so. There is a wide range of ability that teachers are trying to cope with in the class rooms as we assimilate mildly intellectually handicapped children into classes and through the policy of not holding back youngsters who are able to go on to the year above without having to grasp the fundamentals of the lower level. Teachers are given lectures on how to deal with stress, but would it not be better if the problems themselves were removed?

I make a plea for action to be taken to eliminate the gap between the top levels of educational leadership and schools.

Child Care

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (5.15 p.m.): I wish to spend some time speaking about child care, whether it is in child-care centres or in the home. This has certainly become a target for privatisation, but I wish to go back a little further than that and highlight the fact that at the moment more than anything else children are looking for care and attention from their parents. Time and time again one hears from youngsters the comment, "All I want is five minutes of your time." All that young children are looking for is that little bit of care and attention that is missing in so many segments of society at the moment.

When one of Australia's biggest toy companies asked 400 children what gave them most pleasure, it was staggered by its findings. The answer was not more toys but more time with Mum and Dad. One girl said—

> "The most favourite thing I would like my dad to do is colour in with me."

She required only a short time with him using a book and a pencil. A boy of six said—

> "I like the whole family having tea together because you don't have to worry about each other because you're all there together."

The family unit emerged as children's priority, and togetherness was of paramount importance. The findings of that toy company are important. At special times such as Christmas Day and birthdays the kids love to get their goodies—special gifts and presents. However, in between those times, they want five minutes of their parents' time.

The toy company found that some of the games that children pretended to play were the things that did not happen in real life but which they wished did happen. The sort of family activities that children found very enjoyable were little picnics, going for walks, barbecues and watching television together. It was important that they were together as a family unit.

One aspect that came up many times related to the family simply eating meals together. Those very simple, pleasant and nice little things may seem incidental to adults, but perhaps they are very important to children. Suggestions were made that parents could be a little closer to their children and that they should spend more time with them and show interest in things that give the children enjoyment in their everyday life.

More and more women are now in the work-force, which leaves less time for them to spend with their children. In those circumstances, child care should be given high priority.

Many people have a misguided idea about what constitutes a child-care centre. Claims have been made that, because quality in private child-care centres is low, there are waiting-lists at subsidised centres and vacancies at private centres. In fact, no study has ever been conducted to support that claim. All centres are subject to the same State regulations for the quality of care provided, so the basic premise is wrong.

Claims have been made that child care, like school, should be provided free by Governments. Child-care centres, on one hand, want to be more independent and, on the other hand, they ask for more support and hand-outs from Governments. However, if that is to be provided, the Governments must increase taxation. Child care is different from school in many respects. Importantly, child care is not compulsory. Whether or not child care is provided free depends on the priorities. Where the private sector is more cost effective, savings to the tax-payer will be made if that method of delivery is used. The private sector is a user-pays sector. It may cost $100 or less a week to send a child to a child-care centre. If parents are prepared to pay the prescribed fee, there is no reason why they should not send their children to those centres.

Flooding of Ipswich Road, Oxley

Mr PALASZCZUK (Archerfield) (5.20 p.m.): The matter that I wish to raise this evening concerns the State Government's failure to implement plans for eliminating flooding on Ipswich Road at Oxley. Over the past year, that section of Ipswich Road, namely the outbound lanes near the Mirage complex, has flooded not once but two, three, four, five and six times. That has caused incredible inconvenience to tens of thousands of motorists who travel that route daily.

Mr Sherrin: You can count well.

Mr PALASZCZUK: The honourable member's attitude is typical of the attitude of the Government when it comes to attempting to solve the problem that exists at that section of Ipswich Road. As I continue my argument, he will stand condemned for interjecting in the frivolous manner in which he has.

Ipswich Road is the main arterial road to Brisbane, the connecting road between Ipswich and Brisbane and also the main entry for southern tourists to Brisbane. When the outbound lanes outside the Mirage complex continue to flood it is not good enough for the Government to say that the problems with Ipswich Road were fixed by the opening of the Oxley Road/Blunder Road/Ipswich Road interchange, and also the current construction of the Granard Road interchange.

It seems that every time a cloud passes over, Ipswich Road is cut, usually for days on end. When one considers the fact that the Minister for Main Roads would use that road on his daily travels to and from Brisbane, it is surprising that something has not been done to overcome the problem.

It is even more galling when the Main Roads Department admits to having a plan drawn up to alleviate the flooding at that point, but claims not to have the money to put it into place. That excuse is a blatant nonsense, as the original plan for the Oxley Road/Ipswich Road/Blunder Road interchange was originally costed at $4m and then has blown out to $13m. If the Main Roads Department were serious about alleviating the problem, enough money could have been found in the petty cash tin to rectify the problem at that trouble spot. For almost five years I have been pleading with the Government to rectify this most serious problem.

Finally, for the information of the Minister for Family Services, I point out that, as a result of the Government's inaction, a 17-year-old youth, Chris Hall, while entering Ipswich Road via the $13m interchange, was killed in a head-on collision with a truck. If the Main Roads Department had done its job properly, Chris Hall would not have died.

Mr Sherrin: You blame the Government for every road accident in your electorate.

Mr PALASZCZUK: I am blaming the Main Roads Department and the State Government directly for the death of that young fellow.

All motorists who travel along Ipswich Road are sick and tired of being told by the Main Roads Department that there was and is no money available to solve the problem, even though a plan had been drawn up at least two years ago. What is the point in spending millions of dollars of tax-payers' money to fix two bottle-necks along Ipswich Road when every time there is heavy rain the section of road between these two areas is reduced to two lanes. It is stupid and downright dangerous and, even worse, it has proved to be fatal. The death of Chris Hall proved that.

I might add, on the record of this Parliament, that in relation to the fatal accident involving Chris Hall, both Chris Hall and the truck-driver were completely blameless. The Oxley police had for days prior to the accident made repeated requests to the Main Roads Department to have installed flashing amber lights and adequate signage on Oxley, Blunder and Ipswich Roads. The requests fell on deaf ears. All the Main Roads Department said in reply to the requests was that the police should have officers stationed at both ends of the trouble stretch 24 hours a day. That is not exactly a reasonable response.

The final response from some petty officer in the Main Roads Department just hours before this fatal accident when the Oxley Police Station repeatedly asked for more signage was, "Get stuffed."

Rectification of Damage Caused by Soil Subsidence at Palm Beach

Mr GATELY (Currumbin) (5.25 p.m.): I wish to raise two issues that affect the electorate of Currumbin. I want to thank the Premier and the Cabinet for their decision recently in relation to the subsidence of homes in the Palm Beach region, a matter about which I have spoken on a number of occasions in this House. I have mentioned in particular a solicitor named Peter Collas and his failure to properly and adequately look after the needs of the people making a legitimate legal claim against the Gold Coast City Council, the developer and the builders in relation to their homes crumbling and falling apart.

I want to state today that this Government has taken a very responsible stance, even though the local alderman has failed to make any impact on or convince his own council that it ought to live up to its responsibilities and help the people who are so affected.

Mr Sherrin: What is this alderman's name?

Mr GATELY: Alderman Trevor Coomber.

Mr Sherrin: Is he a political candidate?

Mr GATELY: Yes, he is a political candidate, who misuses his position on the Beach Protection Authority for his own political purposes.

I wish to thank the Government for putting in place an urgent inquiry by the officers of the building section of the Department of Local Government, who will report to a working committee, which will submit a report to Cabinet so that this matter may be dealt with properly.

This matter goes back to 1983 and before that. People through no fault of their own have been placed in a position in which their homes are crumbling. Quite frankly, in a despicable act on the part of a council, it has tried to pass the buck to this Government. It is something that is not in keeping with the best interests of the rate-payers. As the local member of State Parliament, I am certainly not prepared to see the matter rest at that.

I might add that since I last mentioned in this House the lack of work on the part of Mr Collas on behalf of the people so affected, not only has the case in the name of

Barnett been removed from his office but also the Legal Aid Office has given instructions to the solicitor concerned to hand over all the papers associated with the case in the name of Mrs Weeks. I am pleased that that has happened, because the case should have ended long, long ago.

I think it is a sad indictment on that solicitor that he would try to use me, as the local member, to intervene on his behalf with the Chief Justice to gain a speedy trial when in fact he should have done his work properly. He should not have tried to use me as an intermediary with the Chief Justice. I am pleased with the part that I have played to bring matters to the point at which they are today. This Government is looking into all aspects of the matter, and I am hopeful of an early end to the satisfaction of all the residents concerned.

I also want to thank the Government for the part that it is currently playing in relation to the sand replenishment on the Gold Coast. Honourable members may recall that in this Chamber I called upon the Premier to give an unequivocal undertaking to organise an urgent meeting between the Premier, myself, Don Neal and a departmental officer, the New South Wales Premier or Deputy Premier and local member for Murwillumbah, Mr Don Beck, to try to overcome the problem of lack of sand on the southern end of the Gold Coast.

Honourable members may also recall that in my maiden speech I spoke about the need for New South Wales to replace where possible the sand that had ceased flowing with the installation of the rock walls at the Tweed River entrance. It is pleasing indeed that next Friday we will be meeting with the Deputy Premier of New South Wales and Don Beck and departmental officers from New South Wales with a view to trying to overcome a long-standing problem so that the sand on the Gold Coast that has been stopped from coming from the southern end through the north littoral drift can be replaced. Again, it is something that can have an adverse effect on the economy of the Gold Coast and the residents whose homes have been affected.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.30 p.m.