Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 19 SEPTEMBER 1984

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 19 SEPTEMBER 1984

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

PAPERS

The following paper, which was laid on the table on 18 September, was ordered to be printed—

Fifth Annual Report of the Brisbane and Area Water Board for the financial year ended 30 June 1984.

The following paper was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed—

Fifth Report by the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal constituted pursuant to section 20 of the Judges' Salaries and Pensions Act 1967-1980.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Orders in Council under the Grammar Schools Act 1975 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982

Statutes under—

Griffith University Act 1971-1983

University of Queensland Act 1965-1983.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Proposed Road, Cape Tribulation National Park

Hon. P. R. McKECHNIE (Carnarvon—Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts) (11.3 a.m.), by leave: Mr Speaker, as this is a fairly lengthy ministerial statement, I table it and seek leave to have it incorporated in "Hansard".

Leave granted.

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

Dr Aila Keto's report on the wet tropics of north Queensland leaves much to be desired. Her qualifications to undertake the report, its conclusions, its recommendations and the Australian Heritage Commission's motives and ethics in engaging her to make the report in the first place, are all in question.

The Daintree controversy has now brought the whole conservation movement into question and, like Aboriginal land rights, the excesses of those promoting preservation rather than balanced conservation have created a backlash.

Several facts need to be stated at the outset. They are—

Most of the rain forest between Townsville and Cooktown already is in national parks;

Much of the rain forest in the area traversed by the Daintree Road is regrowth; and

The road will cause no more damage to the rain forest than the road to Mount Coot-tha or the road to Lamington National Park. The entire controversy has been a text-book example of how to use the media to present a dubious case.

The usual number of single-issue groups and self-appointed spokesmen were marshalled, a confrontation was staged for the television networks; the newspaper letter-writing campaign began and the usual interstate politicians made the usual ritual noises to placate the arm-chair conservationists in the wilds of Sydney and Melbourne. Yet the intense questioning of credentials, size of membership and motives were, as usual,

reserved for those who dared question this whole exercise. Replies to page-one attacks ended up on page 7 or in the late-night news.

There was no questioning of why the two Labor Members for the area, Federal and State, were strangely quiet on this sensitive issue and why the State Labor organisation pointedly ignored the attempts by Brisbane ALP politicians, Deane Wells and the honourable member for Windsor, to appoint themselves as mediators.

But the most serious aspect is the use of compromised and biased consultants by the Australian Heritage Commission in conservation and heritage matters in Queensland. The commission has shown itself repeatedly to be the willing tool of single-issue groups rushing items onto the register of the National Estate so that the Commonwealth can then be persuaded or forced to intervene to overrule democratically elected State Governments and local authorities. It is a case of "The Queensland Government won't do what we want, so you make it"

Canberra, already sensing the backlash against the excesses of the Aboriginal land rights movement, is not prepared to rush to the ramparts on behalf of conservation extremists, most of them in well-paid and secure academic, public service and media positions insulated against the economic reality that faces other Australians. These are the new-class activists working to transfer authority and decision-making from the elected Government to self-appointed elites.

The Heritage Commission paid Dr Keto $15,000 and the Rainforest Conservation Society to prepare the report, despite the fact that Dr Keto is a biochemist—not a botanist or a biologist—and despite the fact that the society has been actively involved in the Daintree campaign.

One does not have to read too far before one comes across some glaring inaccuracies in the report. The preface contains the names of 27 scientists who the author alleges acted as consultants in the preparation of the report. However, eight of these, who are employed by the State Government, denied being consultants. Some were upset and embarrassed at being named as a consultant in this exercise. This report is a blatant misuse of taxpayers' money to prop up friends of the commission.

There are also other examples of research project grants being given to politically active conservationists whose organisations are clouded in secrecy.

There is no guarantee that these grants are being used for the purposes for which they were originally intended.

I stand by my call to abolish the Australian Heritage Commission. It serves no worthwhile purpose and has become a political liability.

Bartlett Property Trust

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (11.4 a.m.), by leave: Readers of the Business section of "The Courier-Mail" of Saturday, 15 September 1984, may have been misled by Brian Hale's comments on the Bartlett Property Trust.

Mr Hale appears to think that there are unanswered questions about the documents registered by the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs. I can assure investors and this House that this is not so, since the documents were fully and correctly examined by departmental officers before they were registered.

Mr Hale, in order to give colour to his story, also contrived to produce a division between the National Companies and Securities Commission and the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs in Queensland. No such division exists and the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs will be replying in detail to the commission's inquiries indicating that all requirements have been met.

However, I would be interested to know how Mr Hale learned of the contents of a letter between the commission and the commissioner, and I will be asking the commission how confidential information of this nature came into the hands of the press.

As for the allegation by Mr Hale that officers of the Corporate Affairs Office are not ensuring that prospectuses come up to standard—I simply comment that the allegation is baseless and not worthy of a journalist of his standing.

Police Investigations in North Queensland; Allegations by Member for Salisbury

Hon. W. H. GLASSON (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police) (11.5 a.m.), by leave: In the House yesterday, the member for Salisbury tabled a document that purported to be a copy of a confidential report by Inspector John Huey, of Townsville police, into alleged cattle-stealing and other matters in north Queensland.

I confirm that such an investigation was ordered by Deputy Commissioner Atkinson because the allegations claimed that a former police officer and a serving officer were involved. However, I point out to the House that the matter is currently under investigation by the Police Complaints Tribunal, and has been for a number of weeks. The tribunal has not yet completed its investigation, which, I understand, is its most extensive to date.

I emphasise that the tribunal is a totally independent inquiry body established specifically to hear such complaints. It is headed by Judge E. C. Pratt, QC, of the District Court and its other two members are Redcliffe stipendiary magistrate, Mr P. J. Rodgers, and the president of the Queensland Police Union, Senior Sergeant C. G. Chant.

A report on the tribunal's findings and recommendations is not expected to be ready for at least another fortnight. As a result, I suggest that any further comment be deferred until the tribunal's investigation is completed, as, obviously, it could have a major bearing on the outcome of this matter.

However, it is a moot point as to how the honourable member came to have such a confidential police document in his possession. Was it given to him by Inspector Huey?

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

Mr GOSS (Salisbury) (11.9 a.m.), by leave: I wish to make a brief reply to the statement made by the Minister for Police that the comments I made yesterday were premature because the matters to which I referred were under investigation by the Police Complaints Tribunal. I point out that the Minister was not in the Chamber when I made those comments.

What I said was that, last week, the tribunal issued statements to the effect that the report had been completed and that the findings had been forwarded to the commissioner. I made my comments on the basis that the matter was not under investigation.

I pointed out to the House that I made the statement because, last Sunday, selected findings were leaked to a Sunday newspaper. Because it has been suggested that that report was leaked to me by Inspector Huey, I remind honourable members that I stated in my speech last night that I had never communicated, either directly or indirectly, with Huey or Hurrell about this matter because I was concerned that they would suffer reprisals from the Police Department.

Mr McELLIGOTT (Townsville) (11.10 a.m.), by leave: Yesterday in this Chamber, the honourable member for Burdekin said that since my election as the member for Townsville I had not been to the Giru area. I wish to have it recorded that I have officially opened the Giru show, attended the Giru Debutante Ball, attended the 50-year celebration of the Majors Creek State School with the Federal member for the area (Mr Bob Katter, Senior) and recently received a deputation of sugar-growers from the Giru area.

I resent the honourable member's reflection on my representations. It appears that his intrusion into my electorate has been for the purpose of raising funds for the National Party. His action has earned the nickname "Boy George"

DEATH OF MR A. MORRISON

Mr BURNS (Lytton) (11.11 a.m.): I rise to draw the attention of the House to the death of Mr Alwyn Morrison, who worked in the Parliamentary Library for many years and who died during the recent parliamentary recess.

When Parliament resumes after a recess, it is usual for honourable members to speak to motions of condolence arising from the deaths of members or former members. In many instances, those motions concern members who were in this House 20 or 30 years ago and who were not known to most of us. As well as recognising the deaths of members and former members, we should ensure that due recognition is given to the passing of members of the staff of Parliament House who were friends of all of us.

Alwyn Morrison came to the Parliamentary Library in 1967 after he had suffered a heart attack. He applied himself very diligently to his job. He was most bipartisan. I never saw him take any political side in anything that he did. He worked very hard, and he was a gentleman in the true sense of the word. He was a kindly person, and he held the respect of everybody here.

I am sure that I speak on behalf of all honourable members when I say that I should like to pass on to his family our sorrow at his death during the recent recess, when most of us were not in Brisbane and therefore were not able to attend his funeral. Nor, of course, were we able to tell Alwyn Morrison's family of our personal feelings for him.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr CAHILL (Aspley) (11.12 a.m.): I rise to support the comments made by the honourable member for Lytton. I came to this place—in the press gallery, not down here in the Chamber—in 1957. I have been here a long time. The honourable member for Lytton has said it all. Alwyn was a top man, and I can do no better than support fully the remarks made by the honourable member for Lytton.

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

Land Zoning, Logan City

From Mr Goss (175 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will ensure support so that land being Subdivisions 1 to 3 of portion 9 Parish of Mitchell—3345-3381 Mt Lindesay Highway, Browns Plains, in Division 7 Logan City, is zoned Residential B.

Musgrave Park, South Brisbane

From Mr Powell (1 020 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will ensure that Cabinet will revoke its decision to give control of Musgrave Park to Brisbane State High School.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

Questions submitted on notice were answered as follows—

1. Commonwealth Funds for Local Authorities

Ms WARNER asked the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer—

(1) Has the funding from the Commonwealth Government to State Governments for local authorities as part of the personal income tax-sharing arrangements increased by 6 per cent over the last 12 months and, if so, why has the Brisbane City Council received only a 4.5 per cent increase?

(2) What criteria does the State Government use when deciding how to pass this funding on to local authorities?

(3) What percentage increases have all other local authorities received under these funding arrangements over the last 12 months?

Answer—

(1) Commonwealth tax-sharing grants to local authorities did increase by 5.92 per cent, or almost 6 per cent, in 1984-85.

So far as the Brisbane City Council is concerned, I am advised by the Local Government Grants Commission that the main reason why the council received a below-average increase in its grant was that it had below-average population growth over the period—Brisbane's population declined by 0.4 per cent, while that of the rest of the State increased by 3.3 per cent.

I would point out also that although the level of grant to each authority is approved by the State Government, it is on the recommendation of the Local Government Grants Commission, an independent expert body that makes recommendations in respect of the State's 134 local authorities. In recognition of its independent expert status, all recommendations of the commission have to date been accepted by the Government, as they were on this occasion.

(2) As pointed out in response to question No. 1, the State Government does not make the assessments. They are made by the Local Government Grants Commission.

The Local Government Grants Commission makes its assessments on the basis of criteria laid down by the Commonwealth under the Local Government (Personal Income Tax Sharing) Act 1976. The requirements of this legislation are twofold.

Firstly, at least 30 per cent of the total funds available (referred to as "Element A") are to be distributed amongst authorities on a population basis, but States may also take into account differences in area and population density. In Queensland, this element is distributed on a five-sixths population, one-sixth area basis.

Secondly, the remainder of the funds (referred to as "Element B" and constituting 70 per cent of the total) are to be distributed on the basis of fiscal equalisation. In this regard, the recommedations of the commission have the object of ensuring, so far as is practicable, that each local authority is able to function, by reasonable effort, at a standard not appreciably below the standard of the other authorities in the State. This is done on a basis that takes account of differences in the capacities of the local authorities to raise revenue and differences in the amounts required to be expended by the local authorities in the performances of their functions.

The commission's annual report provides more details.

(3) The average increase for all other local authorities was 6.2 per cent.

2. Country Ambulance Brigades

Mr NEAL asked the Minister for Health—

With reference to residents in rural areas who are either unable or unwilling to pay an ambulance subscription, and as country ambulances incur heavy costs when conveying such patients long distances for attention and are unable to recoup such costs, what action can be taken to assist ambulance brigades in such circumstances?

Answer—

The Government subsidises the endowable collections of the ambulance brigade on a $1 for $1 basis. The administration of the ambulance services is vested in the State Council of the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade. That council has set aside a sum of money in its budget annually to provide grants to brigades in necessitous circumstances. Any brigade in need of financial assistance should approach the State council direct.

3. **Drought Relief**

Mr BURNS asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

(1) What was the total amount paid as drought relief in Queensland in (a) 1981-82, (b) 1982-83 and (c) 1983-84?

(2) What interest is charged on loans to rural producers for drought relief?

(3) What checks are made to see that this money is used for drought relief and not invested in the short-term money market at a substantially higher interest rate?

(4) Is it an offence to use drought relief money in this way?

(5) Will he give an assurance that loans provided to help farmers in need as a result of drought have not been reinvested in organisations such as the Queensland Graingrowers Association at substantially higher interest rates instead of being used for drought relief?

Answer—

(1) Total drought relief is as follows—

(a) 1981-82	$9,657,904
(b) 1982-83	$58,189,819
(c) 1983-84	$62,555,198.

The following table provides a break-down of those details—

Purpose	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
	$	$	$
(1) Grant Assistance			
Road freight and droving	3,845,900	15,628,928	8,793,264
Rail freight rebate	177,700	2,236,853	1,076,091
Fodder subsidy		6,357,818	1,460,419
Slaughter subsidy		784,438	78,387
Cost of agistment subsidy		2,091,992	6,829,232
Scrub feeding		1,214,544	1,247,230
Total Grant	4,023,600	28,314,573	19,484,623
(2) Loans Advance			
Primary producers	5,485,664	29,594,690	41,736,990
Small business	148,640	280,556	1,333,585
Total Loans	5,634,304	29,875,246	43,070,575
Total Assistance	9,657,904	58,189,819	62,555,198

(2) Four per cent.

(3) Through contact with clients in appraising applications and monitoring their accounts, every endeavour is made by the Agricultural Bank to ensure that drought relief funds are used strictly in accordance with the scheme.

To be eligible for drought relief, a farmer must be drought declared, be in necessitous circumstances owing to drought, unable to finance his essential carry-on requirements in whole or part from his own resources and be unable to obtain assistance through normal commercial channels. Once security documentation is complete, advances for carry-on expenses are made by the Agricultural Bank direct to the borrower to meet eligible expenditure under the Natural Disaster Assistance Scheme. In an emergency situation this is the only practicable approach in large-scale distribution of funds as expeditiously as possible to producers who have suffered major losses from a natural disaster. Should the advance include crop-planting expenses which cannot be incurred

until drought-breaking rains are received, prudent farmers may invest such funds for a short period until required to offset borrowing costs. Where loans are approved for replacement of stock losses or forced sales owing to drought, funds are only advanced to pay specific orders for stock purchases, which eliminates the possibility for any short-term investment of funds.

(4) It is not an offence for a farmer to temporarily invest funds advanced for drought relief until required for this purpose.

(5) It is understood that a small number of growers invested portion of their drought relief advances in organisations such as the Queensland Graingrowers Association until required for crop-planting expenses. In terms of total funds advanced, the proportion temporarily utilised in this manner would be minimal.

The honourable member may rest assured that the Government and the Agricultural Bank, as the administering authority, are very conscious of their responsibilities in regard to the proper disbursement of Natural Disaster Assistance Scheme funds.

4. Overseas Trips by Quango Personnel

Mr BURNS asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

With reference to the Government's inquiry into Queensland quangos and the report to Cabinet which has not yet been made public—

(1) Were any recommendations made to cover matters such as those that occurred in the Queensland Pork Producers Organisation?

(2) How many officers or members of marketing boards have travelled overseas since the Premier announced that no trips would be allowed for marketing board personnel without Cabinet approval?

(3) What are the names of members and officers of marketing boards who have toured overseas since that announcement?

(4) What countries did they visit and what was the reason for, and the duration of, the trip?

Answer—

(1) The honourable member for Lytton should be aware that, following an examination of the operations of statutory primary producer organisations, legislation was passed by Parliament amending the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act to provide for more specific accounting and reporting standards.

(2) Forty-one.

(3) The names of the members and officers of marketing boards who have travelled overseas since 1983 are—The Barley Marketing Board: Mr W. Dalzell, Mr D. Comben, Mr R. Grundy, Mr S. Hunter, Mr D. Harmay and Mr P. Donovan. The Butter Marketing Board: Mr C. Littleton, MBE, and Mr L. King. The Central Queensland Grain Sorghum Marketing Board: Mr J. Teakle, Mr L. Webb, Mr L. Trout and Mr B. Lund. The Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing: Mr A. D'Astoli, Mr C. Carlson, Mr R. Coutts, Mr M. Denzel (partly funded by COD), Mr D. Hartley (partly funded by COD), Mr T. Rossiter, Mr R. Sedgwick, Mr H. Stevens (partly funded by COD), Mr A. Shand, Mr M. Templeton and Mr C. Wellman. The Cotton Marketing Board: Mr A. Brimblecombe, Mr H.Holt, Mr A. Shepherdson, Mr P. Harris, Mr A. Dent, Mr B. MacFarlane and Mr K. Jays. The Egg Marketing Board: Mr R. Hohl (only partly funded by board). The Ginger Marketing Board: Mr J. Ruscoe and Mr P. Browing (funded by the Buderim Ginger Growers Co-operation Association Ltd). The Navy Bean Marketing Board: Mr N. Hancock (only partly funded by board) and Mr K. Campbell. The Peanut Marketing Board: Mr D. Frazer. The Queensland Fish Board: Mr G. Haling and Mr M. Partis. The Rice Marketing Board: Mr K. Rollason (only partly funded by board). The Sugar Board: The Honourable R. Camm and Mr E. White.

(4) The overseas travel involved commercial negotiations. As such, the details are confidential to the authorities involved and myself. Their public disclosure could seriously prejudice the interests of Queensland primary producers.

5. Janitor/Groundsman, Brookfield State School

Mr LICKISS asked the Minister for Education—

(1) Is he aware that the janitor/groundsman at the Brookfield State School is leaving, or has left, his employment at that school?

(2) Is he aware that, under the present circumstances, he would not be replaced as the school student numbers are now below the prescribed level to permit such an appointment?

(3) Is he aware that it is possible and probable for the student numbers to increase again to acceptable levels at this school?

(4) Is he aware that the school, which has a ground area of approximately 12 ha, has had the benefit of a janitor/groundsman for many years and would have retained his services had he decided not to leave the school?

(5) In view of the acute problems of ground maintenance which will be caused by the loss of the janitor/groundsman, will he approve the appointment of a janitor/groundsman to the school?

(6) If not, will he institute a system of a shared janitor/groundsman to service schools with large ground areas and in similar circumstances to the Brookfield State School?

Answer—

(1) Yes. The janitor/groundsman to whom the honourable member refers applied for appointment to the vacant position of groundsman at Corinda State High School and was appointed to that position on the recommendation of the high school principal, taking up duty on 20 August last.

(2) Yes.

(3) My officers, on the basis of demographic studies, believe that enrolment will eventually increase to the qualifying level of 201, but this figure is not expected to be reached for at least another two years.

(4 & 5) The janitor/groundsman scheme approved by Cabinet provides for appointment of such officers to primary schools with an enrolment of 201 or greater. If enrolment falls below that qualifying level, a janitor/groundsman then on staff is permitted to remain. If the position becomes vacant, no replacement may be appointed unless or until the enrolment again reaches 201 or more. It is therefore not possible to appoint a replacement janitor/groundsman to Brookfield State School at present. However, upon the loss of the janitor/groundsman the school automatically became entitled to the receipt of the grounds care component of the administration allowance, currently $400 per annum, which is designed to assist with grounds care and maintenance. Brookfield State School is one of those fortunate to have had a janitor/groundsman. I can find no fairer way of husbanding present resources.

(6) The possibility of employing janitor/groundsmen on a shared or itinerant basis had been under investigation for some time. As soon as I have a report of substance, the present policy will be reviewed.

6. Hand-held Radar Devices

Mr LICKISS asked the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police—

With reference to reports in the RACQ newspaper "The Road Ahead" that the use of hand-held radar devices had been reintroduced to the Brisbane area—

(1) Is it true that, following a conference with RACQ engineers and the receipt of evidence that the JF 100 speedgun was unreliable and could be inaccurate in urban situations, the police agreed not to use these devices in the metropolitan area?

(2) If so, what has changed since that conference when the decision was made and what, if any, improvements and modifications have been made to this equipment to ensure that motorists are not being unjustly prosecuted because of erroneous readings on these machines?

Answer—

(1) The JF 100 speedgun was not withdrawn from the metropolitan area, but its use was restricted to low-density traffic areas to ensure correct vehicle identification by the operator.

(2) There was no agreement that the JF 100 speedgun be not used in the metropolitan area.

7. Laundering of Linen, Cairns Base Hospital

Mr PALASZCZUK asked the Minister for Health—

(1) What was the cost of private laundering of linen at the Cairns Base Hospital for (a) June, (b) July and (c) August?

(2) How does this compare with the operating costs of the previous hospital laundry?

(3) How many staff are still being employed handling linen at the hospital end?

(4) Is private laundering a five-day operation whereas the hospital laundry operated on a seven-day basis?

(5) If so, has this led to an increase in the amount of linen stocks required to be held by the hospital?

Answer—

(1) (a) $38,172.
(b) $39,140.
(c) $39,179.

(2) This cost compares favourably with the operating costs of the previous hospital laundry.

(3) Four staff.

(4) No. The private laundry provides a six-day service.

(5) Yes. A marginal increases in linen stocks was necessary, as anticipated.

8. Financial Assistance, Rural Reconstruction Board

Mr PALASZCZUK asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

With reference to the 1983 annual report of the Rural Reconstruction Board which stated—

> "The Board has sufficient funds in hand to meet the anticipated needs in the aftermath of drought and floods for the coming year, but its ability to fund later requirements has been impaired by the State Treasury's withdrawal of $10m from the board's resources during the year under review to fund other rural industry requirements"—

(1) To which primary industries was this money directed to assist, how much did each industry receive, in what form was the money made available and when was the assistance provided?

(2) Does he agree with the statement made by the board that its funding operation "has been impaired" by the removal of this $10m by Treasury?

Answer—

(1) I understand that the $10m withdrawn from the resources of the Rural Reconstruction Board was used to provide Treasury loans in the 1982-83 year to certain co-operative sugar-mills which were experiencing financial difficulities.

(2) The allocation of the $10m to provide urgent assistance to the co-operative milling sector of the sugar industry has reduced the board's ability to meet the needs of some individual farms but on the other hand the assistance given to the sugar mills has been of substantial benefit to over 1 200 cane-growers.

9. Medical Requirements of Public Patients at Public Hospitals

Mr HAMILL asked the Minister for Health—

With reference to the provision of medical requirements to public patients at Queensland public hospitals—

(1) What criteria are applied by the Department of Health when assessing public patients applying for the free issue of such medical requirements as surgical stockings?

(2) Is a means test, an incomes test, or an assets test applied?

(3) If so, what are the income or assets thresholds applied by the Department of Health to determine eligibility for such assistance?

Answer—

(1 & 2) Various types of splints and calipers are supplied without charge and without application of a means test to both public and private patients of public hospitals on the recommendation of the hospital's medical superintendent or specialist. After the application of a means test, other items including surgical stockings are supplied without charge to persons in proven poor financial circumstances.

(3) For obvious reasons my department does not make public full details of the means test limits.

10. Sunmap

Mr HAMILL asked the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services—

With reference to the administration of Sunmap—

(1) How many Sunmap agencies have been established in Queensland?

(2) What are their locations?

(3) What is the annual turnover from Sunmap's operations?

(4) What criteria are applied by his department in determining the sites for such agencies?

(5) Are public tenders called from prospective agents in a centre where an agency is to be established?

(6) Is a commission or retainer paid to an agent of Sunmap?

(7) If so, what is the rate of commission, or retainer, and what other requirements are placed upon the agent in the exercise of that agency?

Answer—

(1) To date, 48 agencies in two categories have been established. Of these, 18 are at private surveying firms which carry an extensive map range and offer a professional information service to a standard specified by the Department of Mapping and Surveying. The second category at retail outlets, such as newsagencies and book shops, carry only a selection of maps.

(2) Category 1 agencies are located at Aitkenvale, Beenleigh, Biloela, Caboolture, Caloundra, Innisfail, Ipswich, Longreach, Maroochydore, Mundubbera, Mount Isa, Noosa, Redcliffe, Runaway Bay, Samford, Surfers Paradise, Tully and Warwick.

Category 2 agencies are located at Alderley, Archerfield, Beaudesert (2), Beechmont, Cairns, Eagle Heights, Fortitude Valley (2), Indooroopilly, Kingaroy, Mackay (2), Maroochydore, Mooloolaba, Mossman, Nambour, Rainbow Beach, Rubyvale, South Brisbane, Springwood, Stafford, Surfers Paradise, Townsville and Upper Mount Gravatt. There

are also agencies at Sydney (2), Bathurst, Crows Nest and Newcastle in New South Wales.

(3) Total sales of Sunmap products and Commonwealth mapping in 1983-84 were $648,788.

(4) Agencies are established where a public demand for mapping information has been identified. In cases where the department receives more than one expression of interest from a surveying firm in any one area, the following selection criteria apply—location of premises, accessibility, standard of accommodation, staff qualifications and hours of business.

(5) Applications from surveying firms have been invited by advertisements in the appropriate professional journal.

(6) Reimbursement to agencies is by discount on map purchases and commission on aerial photography products.

(7) Generally the discount on map purchases is 33⅓ per cent. The commission on aerial photography products is on a sliding scale proportional to normal commercial photo-laboratory processing charges.

11. Black Sigatoga in Bananas

Mr EATON asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

(1) Is he aware of the reappearance of the disease Black Sigatoga in bananas on some Torres Strait islands?

(2) As grave concern has been expressed by far northern banana-growers should this disease spread to north Queensland banana crops, will he outline what action the Government intends taking to eradicate this disease and stop it having a disastrous and costly effect on the stable, healthy north Queensland banana industry?

Answer—

(1 & 2) Surveys of the Cape York/Torres Strait area by officers of my department in May and June this year again detected Black Sigatoga disease of bananas at Bamaga and Thursday Island and for the first time at Hammond and Horn Islands. The disease was first detected at Murray, Thursday, Moa and Badu Islands and at Bamaga in June 1981.

This serious leaf disease of bananas had previously been reported from other Pacific regions including Papua New Guinea and South America, but not Australia. Because of the possible economic impact of this disease on the Australian banana industry, my department requested the Standing Committee on Agriculture to convene an expert consultative committee to review the situation.

The Committee recommended that an attempt be made to eradicate the disease by eradicating all banana plants in the area for a period of six months.

The program was carried out in the Bamaga area in 1981-82 and on the Thursday, Moa (Kubin Village) and Badu Islands in 1982-83. Replanting material was provided free of charge by the Queensland banana industry and distributed at Bamaga in late 1982 and in the second area in late 1983.

The detection and eradication campaign was conducted by officers of my department. This involved repeated ground and aerial surveys, and extensive advisory and public relations activities in affected communities contributed to the generally good public co-operation that was received. The overall cost of the program was $36,500, excluding salaries, and it was funded jointly by the Commonwealth and those States in which bananas are produced. It was therefore very disappointing to again detect the disease in the replanted crops earlier this year as well as on Torres Strait islands where the disease had not previously been detected.

The consultative committee met again last July and, after investigations, was unable to determine the reason for the reinfections. Causal factors could have included aerial

distribution of spores from overseas, prolonged life of the disease in trash, undetected wild banana plants in remote areas and/or undetected reintroduction of infected planting material. The committee, whose report has been accepted by the Standing Committee on Agriculture, recommended that in view of the results to date there would be little if any hope of success of any further eradication attempts. Emphasis has therefore been given to measures to restrict plant movement from the affected area.

The region has been declared a quarantine area under the Commonwealth Quarantine Act and removal of banana plants and leaves from the area is prohibited. Action is being taken to inform travellers of these restrictions. Road signs are being installed and posters will be distributed throughout the region. Any small, isolated outbreaks which occur south of the quarantine zone will be immediately eradicated.

It is considered that any further attempts at eradication would be costly, severely inconvenience people in the affected communities who use bananas as a staple food, and most probably be unsuccessful. The current approach of attempting to restrict the spread of the disease by quarantine action is therefore considered more appropriate.

Commercial banana growers in north Queensland already spray their plantations to control other leaf diseases. If, despite quarantine action, Black Sigatoga did spread to the commercial areas, the efficacy of these spray schedules would need to be reassessed.

12. Funding of Fire Services

Mr EATON asked the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services—

(1) What were the criteria for determining the proportion to be paid to the State fire services in 1984-85 by (a) the State Government, (b) insurance companies and (c) registered proprietors of homes, home units and vacant land?

(2) What is the percentage cost applicable in each category for 1984-85?

Answer—

(1) The State Government has continued its long-standing policy of sharing the cost of fire protection among all property-owners who received this important community service. Contrary to continuing ALP distortions about these funding reforms, the Fire Brigades Act 1964-1984 specifies that the amount collected is tied to the cost of fire protection and is not to be used as a general revenue source by the State Government.

(a) The State Government has continued its policy of making a direct contribution to cover the cost of protecting its own properties.

(b) The honourable member should be well aware that insurance companies have acted as collecting agencies for the State Government under the old insurance-based fire levy. As this levy is now being phased out, insurance companies will collect the commercial and industrial levies only until June 1985. Commercial and industrial property-owners will continue to meet their fair share of fire-protection costs when they transfer to the new property fire levy on that date.

(c) Following the funding reforms, all residential property-owners, not just those residential property-owners who were prudent enough to insure, will meet their fair share of the cost of fire protection. Fire costs have also been shared, for the first time, among the owners of vacant residential land, which is subject to a high number of brigade calls particularly during the summer months.

(2) The Fire Bridages Act 1964-1984, sections 32 and 34, prescribes the following proportions to be paid to the State fire services—

(1) State Government—one-eighth;

(2) Insurance companies—seven-sixteenths;

(3) Home, home unit, vacant land—seven-sixteenths.

13. Health Department Staff

Mr GYGAR asked the Minister for Health—

With reference to the statement in the 1983-84 State Budget that funds would be provided for the employment of an additional 658 staff in the State Health Department—

(1) What is the break-down, by number, employment category and level, of the additional staff employed under this provision?

(2) At which hospital, facility or office was each of these additional staff employed?

Answer—

(1) It would appear that the honourable member has misread the information. If he would care to check his source it would be noted that the figure quoted relates to the number of additional staff approved for hospitals boards—not the Department of Health—for the 1982-83 financial year.

(2) Should the honourable member have any particular area of concern he should contact the appropriate hospitals board.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Queensland's Economy

Mr WARBURTON: In directing a question to the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer, I refer to the repeated statements by the Minister, by the Premier and Treasurer and by other Ministers, leading Queenslanders to believe that industry was leaving States such as New South Wales to set up shop in Queensland. I refer also to the statements by the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern), who said in Cairns last week that Queensland industry needed to be "revitalised" and that Queensland was in fact "losing industry to New South Wales"

This is the second occasion in recent times on which the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology has been prepared to reveal the true situation about the condition of significant sections of the Queensland economy, the first being through the report of the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development on the State's economic performance and future prospects.

I ask the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer—and I do not want the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology to tell him the answer: Is it not time that he admitted to the depressed state of industry in Queensland, or are we to hear reference by him to yet another secret set of Treasury figures contradicting the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology and his department?

Mr GUNN: There is one thing coming out of this loudly and clearly, and it is that the new Leader of the Opposition will be a bigger knocker than the last one. He has done nothing but knock Queensland.

The statement by the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology to which he refers was taken out of context. It was a statement about the Brisbane City Council driving a certain industry out of this city.

Mr Burns: No, it wasn't.

Mr GUNN: Yes, it was.

Opposition members should not worry about industry coming up to Queensland, because within the next couple of weeks the Premier and I will announce that one of the biggest industries down south will be making its headquarters in Queensland. We will keep that as a little surprise for the Leader of the Opposition. He should not worry about it. In his own interests, he should stop knocking this State.

Job Vacancies in Queensland

Mr WARBURTON: In the light of that answer, I direct a further question to the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer. I refer him to the ANZ Bank's monthly employment advertisement series that appeared in the Business Section of this morning's "Courier-Mail", which showed that, alone of all the States, Queensland recorded a significant fall of 2.4 per cent in advertised job vacancies in August, while all other States recorded an increase. I ask: As the number of advertised job vacancies is a significant indicator of future economic performance, does that ANZ report confirm the view that Queensland is dragging the chain in the national economic recovery?

Mr GUNN: I refute that statement. I refer to one industry, the coal industry, and to two mines down south, Kembla and Clutha. More than 700 miners are being retrenched in those mines.

Mr Vaughan: No, they are not.

Mr GUNN: I inform the honourable member that they are. That statement appeared in "The Courier-Mail" The honourable member accepts reports from "The Courier-Mail", and so do I. That is what happened.

It is ironic that 800 jobs have been created in the coal industry in this State. More than 100 of the miners retrenched from the Kembla and Clutha mines have found employment in Queensland. That is not my statement; that is the statement that Maitland made when he came to see me recently.

I am sorry that I have to correct Opposition members. More jobs are being created in Queensland, and the State's employment rate is far higher than the rate in the other States.

Mr F. P. Luton

Mr BURNS: I am sure that the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police would have been briefed on this matter this morning. I refer him to the Fraud Squad investigation into one Francis Patrick Luton, and ask: Was Detective Vince Mahony taken off that case? If so, for what reason? If he was taken off the case, will the Minister announce to the House the date on which that happened?

Mr GLASSON: Indeed, Mr Mahony was taken off the case, and I would like now to tell the House why he was taken off the case.

I have in my hand a report written by a man who would be very well known to the member for Lytton. I refer to Acting Detective Inspector J. W. Huey.

I will read from the fourth paragraph. The report was sent to——

An Opposition Member: It is made up.

Mr GLASSON: It is not made up; it is an official report.

It was sent to the Detective Superintendent of Police, Metropolitan C.I. Branch, Brisbane. That officer then forwarded the report to the commissioner in these terms: "Forwarded for your information. I concur with the recommendations made by Acting Detective Superintendent Huey, numbered 1 to 4 on pages 2 and 3."

The report reads as follows—

> "(1) Detective Sergeant 1/c Mahony is to be relieved on the investigation involving the Bargara land, Incentive Programmes Pty Ltd and Mr Francis Patrick Luton.
>
> (2) That investigation is to be taken over forthwith by Detective Sergeant 2/c K. D. Salm and Detective Senior Constable A. Dyer.
>
> (3) Detective Sergeant 1/c. Mahony continue as at present attending the District Court trial of Nicholls and others in the current Russell Island conspiracy case, and

that as time becomes available, and certainly when that trial concludes, he commences his investigations into the Londy matter.

(4) Depending on the result of the 'Londy—Russell Island' matter Detective Sergeant Mahony progressively withdraw from land fraud investigations, and move into other areas of fraud cases. He can remain available to advise, with his accumulated expertise in land fraud matters. I feel that with more than 6 years full time involvment in land fraud matters, it would be beneficial for some change in emphasis for him."

On the recommendation of Acting Detective Superintendent Huey, Detective Mahony was taken off the Luton case.

Mr Burns: What date?

Mr GLASSON: The date of the document is 26 October 1982.

Mr F. P. Luton

Mr BURNS: I ask the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing: Has one Francis Patrick Luton ever contacted him about land dealings at Bargara? Has he been involved in any discussions with other Ministers with regard to Francis Patrick Luton's land development at Bargara?

Mr HINZE: I cannot recall having any discussions with Mr Luton. I do recall that, a year or two ago, land development was proposed in the Tara area, which, I believe, is in the electorate of the member for Balonne. It appeared to me that the proposal for the subdivision of 10-acre blocks would need consideration by my department. Because no water or services were available, I indicated at that time that the subdivision would need to be considered carefully. As to any discussions that I may have entered into—I can only say that I noticed that Mr Luton's name was associated with that development.

School-leaving Age

Mrs HARVEY: I ask the Minister for Education: Can he state his views on the suggestion by the Federal Government that the school-leaving age be raised to 17 years? Can he say whether the Queensland Education Department is considering raising the school-leaving age?

Mr POWELL: I am aware of some statements by members of the Federal Government that the compulsory school-leaving age should be raised to more than 15 years, which is the present age. One could cynically suggest that the reason behind that move is to try to make the dole queue for the 15-to-19 age group shorter in the southern States. Queensland has the lowest unemployment figures for that age group in Australia.

I can see no good purpose in raising the school-leaving age from 15 to 17 years or higher. Numerous students who attain the age of 15 years have really reached the end of their intellectual and educational development. It would be counter-productive if those students were required compulsorily to stay at school until they were 17 years of age or older.

What my department is doing is broadening the number of subjects that are available at the upper secondary level, and investigating a closer relationship between secondary education and technical and further education. If the preferred option, which we are examining at the moment and which calls for a senior high school/junior college type concept, is accepted, those students will be better able to obtain an education that they find relevant and that fits them more properly for the work-place. That is the aim of the Government, and that is what we are looking at at the moment. As I say, I see no good purpose in raising the school-leaving age. That would be counter-productive.

Mr F. P. Luton

Mr MACKENROTH: In directing a question to the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services, I refer him to his press conference yesterday, at which he stated that he had made representations to the chairman of the Woongarra Shire Council on

behalf of Francis Patrick Luton and that those representations were made with other Ministers concerning a business development. I now ask: Will he please advise the House which other Ministers were concerned and on what occasion it was that he made those representations?

Mr GOLEBY: It is true that I did hold a press conference yesterday afternoon concerning allegations made in the House by the honourable member for Chatsworth. On an occasion, with Mr Claude Wharton, I received a deputation from the Woongarra Shire Council concerning bores and town water supplies in the area. At the conclusion of that interview, I asked the members of the deputation whether they knew anything about Luton, did the matter have anything to do with land development in the area and what was the situation. Any other dealings that might have occurred with the Woongarra Shire Council did not involve me or, as far as I know, any other Cabinet Ministers.

Mr F. P. Luton

Mr MACKENROTH: My second question is also to the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services. Again I refer to his press conference yesterday, at which he stated that he had met Francis Patrick Luton on one, two, three or maybe four occasions. I now ask: Will he please tell the House whether it was one, two, three or four occasions and what were those occasions? Did he ever have any private meetings with Luton other than the stated meetings at the Garden City Christian Church?

Mr GOLEBY: Like other Ministers and members, I have accepted invitations to social functions such as the official opening of a building. I am not responsible for anyone who comes up to me at such a function and speaks to me. If someone speaks to me at a social function, naturally I listen to what he has to say. That is the only contact that I have had with the gentleman concerned.

Mr F. P. Luton

Mr MILLINER: In directing a question to the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services, I refer to his statement that he made representations to the chairman of the Woongarra Shire Council on behalf of Francis Patrick Luton. I ask: Did he advise Luton of the outcome of those representations? If so, how was that advice conveyed? If not, would it not seem strange that he would make representations and then fail to convey to the person the results of those representations?

Mr GOLEBY: I think that I have fully answered the honourable member's questions. For the benefit of honourable members, I state that I have had no business dealings or any other dealings with Mr Frank Luton.

Mr F. P. Luton

Mr MILLINER: In directing a further question to the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services, I refer to an article in the Bundaberg "News-Mail" of 26 June 1982, in which it is stated that Francis Patrick Luton had approval in principle from the Department of Harbours and Marine for a marina project at Bargara. I ask: Did Francis Patrick Luton ever discuss that proposed marina with him and, if so, on which occasion?

Mr GOLEBY: I did not hear the date referred to by the honourable member.

Mr MILLINER: 26 June 1982.

Mr GOLEBY: I inform the honourable member and the House that at that time I was not Minister for Maritime Services.

Funding of Nurse Education

Mr LINGARD: In directing a question to the Minister for Education, I refer to recent reports in the local media that the responsibility for the education of nurses be transferred from hospitals boards to colleges of advanced education. Those reports

indicated that the Federal Government would discuss the funding of those programs with the State Government. As the funding for CAEs is clearly a Federal responsibility, would the Minister outline the State Government's attitude to that report?

Mr POWELL: It is State Government policy that the training of nurses be transferred from a hospital-based system to a college-based system. The relevant college is the college of advanced education. Colleges of advanced education are funded totally by the Federal Government. That responsibility was taken over in the early 1970s. As a result, it is improper for the Federal Government to believe that any State Government has a responsibility for nurse education funding in this or any other State. If the Federal Government tries to downgrade nurse education by requiring the States to be involved with its funding, I am sure that it will receive complaints not only from the other States but also from nursing bodies. Nurse education funding is a clear responsibility of the Federal Government. Places in CAEs are funded totally from Federal funds, and I expect that practice to continue.

Attack on Circus Operators by Animal Liberationists

Mr WHITE: In directing a question to the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing, I refer to the current unwarranted attack on circus operators by animal liberationists who are intent on placing that well-estabished form of family entertainment in danger. I ask: Will he act to stop the current movement of animal liberationists in getting local authorities to refuse permits for sites, as they have done in New South Wales and Victoria, where already nine local authorities have acceded to the approaches of animal liberationists?

Mr HINZE: All honourabe members may rest assured——

Mr Davis: What about the cruelty to that Shetland pony by you?

Mr HINZE: I will not worry about comments by Groucho Marx.

We appreciate the circuses and those who accompany them to our city. We do everything possible to attract them. They are part of our history; part of our lives. There is no way in the world that we will fall into the same trap as those in other States by giving credence to those who call themselves animal liberationists, or whatever it is. They will not have any effect on us here at all. We will continue to have circuses in Queensland. We extend an invitation to all circuses to continue to come to this great State.

State Government Assistance to Sugar Industry

Mr STONEMAN: I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: In view of statements by the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin) about the State Government's assistance to the sugar industry, reported in yesterday's press, can he indicate the true position?

Mr TURNER: I thank the honourable member for giving me the opportunity to tell the truth about assistance to the sugar industry.

In the last two years, the State Government has contributed financial assistance of $30m to the sugar industry, whereas the Commonwealth has contributed $10m. The State Government has paid $175,000 towards the cost of an internal review.

It is regrettable that the Federal Government has seen fit not to come to the party with additional assistance of $5m in Rural Assistance Scheme funding for the sugar industry this year to match the $5m that the State Government has made available. My request is not for a gift; the industry is seeking a loan. Last year, the Federal Government saw fit to match Queensland's $10m with another $10m. The industry was in serious difficulty at that time. With prices on the world market being further depressed, the position is even more serious today.

The industry is of national importance. The Federal Government has derived a tremendous amount of export earnings and taxation from the sugar industry over a long

period. In my opinion, it has a responsibility to the sugar industry now—a responsibility that it is presently abrogating. I call upon it to give the industry the assistance it needs and not to call on the industry to complete its internal review in a matter of months. That is a request that it would be impossible to comply with.

Computer Access and Training in Primary Schools

Mr STONEMAN: I ask the Minister for Education: Can he indicate his attitude towards primary schoolchildren having computer knowledge and access, and whether or not parents are placing unnecessary financial burdens on themselves and p. and c. associations by providing computers, photocopiers, video units and so on?

Mr POWELL: I am very happy to attempt to clarify the issue. There are people in the community—computer salesmen, in the main, I suppose—who think that everybody in the community ought to have his own personal computer and be able to program it and play with it. It may be desirable for everybody to understand computers. As a result, the Government has a policy of thrusting computers towards secondary education. After a fairly short course, most people with even a modicum of intelligence can work out how to use a computer in a fashion that allows them to put information in and retrieve information accurately. There is no need for an understanding of how a computer works or of programming for a person to understand how to effectively use a machine within industry. Consequently, our thrust is in secondary education.

I have been advising parents and citizens associations at primary schools to hasten extremely slowly. The time may well come when the Government believes that computers in primary schools are necessary. So far, however, the software that has been developed for computers in the primary field is very rudimentary.

Although some very good programs have been made, they have not yet reached the stage that a computer could be regarded as a necessity for the education of primary schoolchildren. Consequently, so that they are not overburdened by this demand, the department is advising parents and citizens associations in primary schools to go very quietly and hasten very slowly in regard to computers.

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

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Daintree Rain Forest

Mr De LACY (Cairns) (12 noon): I wish to raise the matter of the so-called Daintree Freehold Rainforest subdivision in the greater Daintree area of far-north Queensland. At the outset I ask members not to confuse it with the Cape Tribulation road, which is a separate issue, though they both prove the same thing, namely, that development is taking place in this State on a piecemeal basis. The Government is dismantling the State's valuable assets without any understanding of planning or any semblance of a land use strategy. I might add that developments of this nature have fuelled the fires of the Cape Tribulation debate because a number of people who are not violently opposed to the road per se see it as an opening of the floodgates. When I outline the history of this scheme, honourable members will see that the fears of those people have very real foundations.

The issue has now been simmering for a few years, but what has caused it to flare up has been the aggressive marketing campaign launched by the developer, Quaid Real Estate of Cairns. Many people, myself included, find that campaign provocative and obnoxious. Advertisements have appeared in the provincial and the national press all over Australia. I have in my hand an advertisement contained in "The Cairns Post". What most people initially find offensive is the language used to attract potential investors. I have been informed that the company carried out market research to find out what would make people buy these blocks. The research group came up with the language of the conservationists—the words, the images, the appeals to nature and those nobler

motives of the conservationists. The company, in an effort to seduce people into buying land and thus destroying the very same forests, is invoking the language used to defend and conserve the rain forests.

The headline of the advertisement reads—

"Life in the Daintree is healthy. Some inhabitants are over 1 000 years old."

If this development goes ahead, they will not get much older. Another part of the advertisement reads—

"Indeed, there is a wider variety of trees to be found in a couple of hectares of Daintree than in all of Europe or North America."

That will not be the case for much longer.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber. Would members resume their seats or leave the Chamber.

Mr De LACY: The advertisement continues—

". . probably your last chance of being admitted to Paradise."

I suggest that it would be more a case of paradise lost than paradise gained. Probably the most obnoxious claim of all is that—

". . . this stretch of land will be compared with that other area of spectacular beauty, the Franklin River."

The greatest insult of all is that the area is unspoiled, untouched and unmatched.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Cook to resume his seat or leave the Chamber.

Mr De LACY: Can any honourable member imagine an advertisement for 1 000 one-hectare residential blocks slap bang in the middle of the most valuable virgin rain forest in Australia? Yet the company claims that the area is unspoiled, untouched and unmatched. Its cynicism knows no bounds.

The matter goes much further than that. The people of Queensland are used to developers overstating their case. However, the claims made in these advertisements are misleading and fraudulently misrepresent the truth of the matter. Queensland is quickly gaining a national reputation for land scandals, which are again in the news, and this one can be added to the list.

People attracted to this residential subdivision who are looking for their "last chance of being admitted to Paradise" will be bitterly disappointed. The fact is that one hectare of rain forest is a contradiction in terms. One hectare cannot exist by itself and, to live there, a man would first have to cut down the trees. I do not know what the rest of the people in Australia know about rain forests, but they are no place for human beings to live in and were never intended to be. They are hot, humid, dank, musty, without breeze, and full of leeches and insects. Mildew grows on walls. I am led to believe that even marijuana will not grow in a rain forest. The only way that people could live there would be to cut down the rain forest.

The second point is that one hectare of rain forest is not a viable entity. The 1 000 year-old tree referred to in the advertisement would not last six months if the surrounding vegetation were knocked down. A rain forest is an integrated whole, it sustains itself and it is viable only in relatively large blocks of 50 to 100 hectares. Can honourable members imagine 1 000 one-hectare blocks carved out of an area being called paradise? I should say that the area would be more like a rural slum, particularly because the rezoning plan provides no designated land or any plans at this stage for community services such as power lines, water, sewerage, garbage disposal, schools and playing fields. If the sales go through as they are being promoted there is a potential of 3 000 to 4 000 permanent residents.

Another comment was in these terms—

"Daintree's rich volcanic soil grows healthy food faster than you can eat it."

That is false and totally misleading. The supposed fertility of a rain forest is an illusion. The nutrients are locked up in the trunks of the trees and the forest feeds off itself. If the trees are removed the fertility is lost. The only thing that people will grow is old—and they will grow old before their time.

I warn the general public in the strongest possible terms not to be conned by this misleading advertising. The land is not a good investment, and people are starting to wake up to that. People will be buying an illusion, a cleverly packaged and promoted recipe for disaster. They would do the rest of Australia and future generations a service if they were to leave these marvellous forests alone as a national assest. If they did that, they would not see them the victims of short-term greed.

Apart from the misleading advertising and the gross insensitivity of the developers that is symbolised in the development, there are three other reasons why we should oppose this type of development. Firstly, it is a rip-off. The developers have been required to put in none of the infrastructure normally associated with such schemes. I have referred to the type of infrastructure services that should be provided. The developers are providing only dirt roads, which will not last in that area. I am advised that developmental costs are in the vicinity of $3,500 a block and the blocks are on the market for $25,000. Eventually the residents and other rate-payers in the Douglas shire will have to pick up the tab for the provision of the ordinary, normal services that the people who buy the blocks will come to expect.

The second reason relates to the nature of the development, the lack of planning and controls, and the damage that it will be doing to the area as a whole. A significant portion of the rural residential development, which I am advised takes up as much as 40 per cent of the area, is on slopes steeper than 12½ degrees. The clearing of vegetation in these areas will cause, and is causing, soil erosion and land slippages. That will result not only in the loss of significant areas of rain forest but also in myriad other associated problems such as soil and nutrient loss into streams, waterways and recreation areas, and onto coral reefs. All of this area and the surrounding areas are currently being degraded.

The third reason is that the manner in which this development was allowed to proceed is a national disgrace. The rezoning of this vast tract of virgin rain forest as rural residential is one of the sorriest episodes in the whole sorry chapter of land subdivision in Queensland.

Mrs Chapman: Which local authority is involved?

Mr De LACY: I am coming to that.

Even the much-maligned Douglas Shire Council, which is not famous for its conservation sympathies, opposed it in the first place. It recommended that it be zoned rural general farming. That would at least have restricted subdivision to 100-ha lots.

Then it started—the old familiar pattern that we have come to know so well. George Quaid prevailed upon the Minister, and the Minister instructed the Douglas Shire Council to incorporate rural residential zoning, allowing it to be carved up into 1 ha lots. The Douglas Shire Council initially objected bitterly to that instruction, as well it should, but it eventually threw in the sponge, and from then on there has been a series of sordid meetings and dealings between the developer, the council and the Government, from which all other interested parties have been excluded, and which has culminated in the disaster situation that I have outlined today.

In conclusion, let me say that a future society will no doubt reflect with horror that the Government has been party to such a wilful and pointless desecration of Queensland's valuable assets simply by being unable to make even the most basic of straightforward, responsible decisions.

Time expired.

Tourism

Mr SIMPSON (Cooroora) (12.11 p.m.): It is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to make some observations on a recent study tour that I made relative to the tourist industry and, in particular, international tourism that has great potential for this State and for Australia.

I do not think that people realise how big the international tourist market is. There are about 300 million potential international tourists, and fewer than one-third of 1 per cent of them are coming to Australia.

It is true that in the last 10 years, the number of tourists coming to Australia has increased by 100 per cent, but I believe that in two years, with proper promotion and the injection into tourism of the sort of money that is being made available under the Commonwealth Employment Program, that is, funds in excess of $400m, that figure could be doubled. That would create 10 times the number of permanent jobs that are being created under CEP.

In economic terms, international tourism is a $96,000m business, and Australia is getting a little more than $1 billion of it. I have studied the impact overseas of Australian tourist promotion programs, including the promotion programs of our flag carrier, Qantas, and the few other airlines that are allowed to enter Australia under reciprocal arrangements. Once one reaches a destination one flight from the international airports in the countries that those airlines service, one finds that the Australian tourist promotion programs have an impact of less than 1 per cent. It is essential that those promotion programs are provided directly into the market-place.

Qantas provided cheap fares for tourists flying into Cairns, and achieved tremendous success. Those satisfied tourists returned to their homelands and spread the word. There is an expansion factor of about 100. In other words, if the tourists are satisfied they tell 100 other people. They spread the word back into their home communities, and that gives the multiplier factor.

Of course, the other way to promote tourism internationally is on television, which is the modern medium for getting a message to as many people as possible. Television promotion has been very effective. Of course, there was a problem, particularly on the West Coast of the United States of America, when the booklets mentioned in the television programs were three weeks late being distributed. Those responsible for promotion have to get their act together.

If those sorts of promotions are successful, the expansion of the labour-intensive tourism industry could provide the answer to the creation of jobs in the future for young people not only in Queensland but throughout Australia.

It is only fitting that this sort of promotion should begin in Queensland, which starts off with some pluses in terms of people in other countries knowing where it is. Most people have little idea of where Australia is.

The Great Barrier Reef is one of Australia's major attractions, and is probably the best known. Another major attraction is Australia's unique flora and fauna. The koala is the most popular native animal, closely followed by the kangaroo. On the international scene, the koala is increasingly being recognised as Australia's emblem rather than the kangaroo. In Europe, Canada, the United States and Japan, the enthusiasm for koalas has almost reached fanaticism. People in those countries are extremely enthusiastic about belonging to koala clubs. The use of the koala emblem has become a very effective tool for the promotion of Australia as a tourist destination.

It is very important that the needs of our international tourists are satisfied. If that happens, those tourists can then sell Australia as a tourist destination to another hundred potential tourists.

I have spoken with a number of tourist operators and other people who prepare package tours for the international tourist industry. Many of them have been to Australia. However, some of them commented that they did not have a favourable impression of

the Barrier Reef. Instead of singing the praises of the very thing which attracted them to Australia, they went home dissatisfied. Most international tourists have limited time in which to visit the Barrier Reef, and the weather may not always be favourable. It is important that most is made of the opportunities to view the reef at the best possible time, which is probably between 8 and 9 in the morning when the tide is not flowing, and when the water is not murky. Of course, the same problems do not arise for tourists viewing Australia's flora and fauna, and most of them are turned on by what they see.

The bottom line for Australian tourism is ensuring that our attractions are well promoted. I was surprised to learn that people overseas are not inspired by our beaches, but that is because thay have no conception of how attractive the beaches are. They think that their own beaches are good, and it is very difficult to tell them that Australian beaches are much better. Many beaches overseas are not sandy but consist of pebbles and stones, and to many people, a beach with small, smooth stones is a very good beach. Of course, every Australian knows that our beaches, with their long stretches of white sand, are very much better. To successfully promote Australia as a tourist destination, the positive aspects must be emphasised.

Australia is the third, fourth or fifth destination on an international tourist's list. The part of the world that has the greatest tourist potential is the northern hemisphere. People living there can holiday at beaches that are much closer than Australian beaches and, of course, are much cheaper to get to. Our major tourist attractions, such as the Barrier Reef, our beautiful beaches, Ayers Rock and our unique flora and fauna, must be promoted together. People in the know are already doing that. It must be explained to potential overseas tourists why it costs more to get to Australia. They must also be told that they will go home with more money in their pockets than they would after visiting other countries. For example, Australia does not have tipping, and I hope that that remains the case always. Of course, many countries have VAT as well.

Whereas Australian hotels and motels provide tea and coffee for their guests no matter what time they arrive, many overseas hotels and motels do not.

Hotels and motels right round Australia provide clean water. Australian's public water supplies are second to none. Tourists to Australia realise and appreciate that. Furthermore, whereas public toilets in Australia are free, in other places, especially on the Continent, people have to pay to use them. All those little things are of concern to tourists and visitors. We should sell the amenities and the facilities that Australia has to offer tourists.

One feature that we should sell perhaps more than anything else is security of travel in Australia and our solid Government. Our potential to create employment should also be sold. Over the last three and a half years, 110 000 additional jobs were created in Queensland alone. We should do everything we can to attract tourists to come to Queensland through either Cairns or Brisbane. Whilst I was overseas I looked at package tours. Tremendous potential exists in Australia for such tours.

Time expired.

Petrol-retailing; Take-over of Amoco by BP Australia

Mr VEIVERS (Ashgrove) (12.21 p.m.): I rise to speak about two aspects of the oil industry, one of which has been in the news over the last two or three days. I shall speak first about a report submitted to Cabinet by the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester) concerning petrol-retailing in Queensland, and later about BP Australia's take-over of Amoco.

Some time ago, the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs initiated an inquiry into all aspects of petrol-retailing in this State. Sources have informed me that the industry co-operated to the fullest, that every degree of co-operation that was asked for was given. Approximately 300 service stations throughout Queensland opened their books freely to the survey that was conducted and answered the questionnaires that were sent to them. As a result of that, the audit report was completed.

The industry asked that it be consulted before the Government made any decision in relation to petroleum-retailing in Queensland. It was advised verbally that it would be. I am also informed that towards the end of last month the industry wrote to the Minister seeking a copy of that report before the Government arrived at its decision. The industry's requests, which are more than reasonable, have been totally ignored. The industry first read about the matter in an annoucement by the Goverment after a Cabinet meeting yesterday.

What is the Government up to? What is going on between the Government and the oil industry? What is going on between it and the large oil companies? If anyone has any doubt about this Government's Big Brother attitude, the recent events in relation to the oil industry should dispel such doubt. In other words, the Government is saying to the petrol-retailing industry, "You shall do what you are told, and you shall not ask questions." That is what the matter comes down to.

I now quote from a report in today's "Courier-Mail", under the headline "Service station average $6,842", as follows—

> "Brisbane service stations had a net profit average of $6842 in 1982-83, according to a report on petroleum retail marketing considered yesterday by Cabinet.
>
> But sites in north Queensland earned nearly three times this figure, with an average of $17,928.
>
> The Employment and Industrial Affairs Minister, Mr Lester, said the report showed the industry was on a generally sound footing."

A generally sound footing! The average net profit of Brisbane service stations was $6,842 in 1982-83. What a joke! I am sorry that the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs is not in the House.

A married, unemployed man receives unemployment benefits of $7,753.20 per year. In addition, he receives $12 per week for each child. The Minister said that the industry is on a sound footing. However, service station proprietors are earning only $6,842 per year. The Minister does not know what he is talking about.

Mr Davis: Working 72 hours a week.

Mr VEIVERS: At least 72 hours a week. What a joke that is!

The Minister further stated that price control has never been part of the Queensland Government's policy. That was a comment in relation to the tiered price structure operating within the retail marketing section of the industry.

On page 8 of today's "Courier-Mail", one sees the headline "Cabinet bars bread 'cut' " The article states—

> "Bread manufacturers will be prevented from giving a 5 per cent discount to retailers selling more than 3 000 loaves a week through individual outlets. The Primary Industries Minister, Mr Turner, said yesterday that Cabinet had vetoed this recommendation from the Bread Industry Committee."

If that is not price control, what is it? There is price control in the bread industry, although the Minister claims that it does not exist in this State. On the very same day the Minister said that there is no price control in Queensland. What a joke!

I shall refer now to the take-over by BP of Amoco that occurred on 3 July this year. In the Brisbane metropolitan area, 14 Amoco dealers were advised that their sites would be closed down by 31 December. Some of those sites are in prime locations, with the lessees conducting very successful businesses. The usual leases are 3 x 3 x 3. An example of a good site held by a lessee would include employment for the proprietor and his wife, perhaps four or five staff, an apprentice and casuals at busy times, such as peak periods in the afternoon and Christmas-time.

Mr Davis: Seven people will be dismissed from the one at Windsor.

Mr VEIVERS: They will be dismissed.

A notice to the lessee indicated the company's intention, but the company offered to buy the franchise before the expiry of the lease. From the lessee's point of view, he could continue in the business until his lease expired. That would be debatable. It would give him additional time, for example, if his lease had 12 or 18 months to run. However, he is put in a catch-22 situation. If he opts to continue in business, he is really putting himself at the mercy of the company. The offer to buy the lease at its termination would probably be at a much lower figure.

Of course, because of the prime real estate value of the property, most dealers would not be able to buy the whole site. I have been advised that some sites could be worth $350,000. Therefore, the dealer has no real option to buy the site and to operate a service station on it. A service station proprietor has virtually no incentive to develop and improve his business if he desires to operate for the full term of his lease, because at the end of the lease he will find himself in an impossible position.

Some of the other issues in connection with BP's take-over of Amoco need to be raised and considered. There is no guarantee of help or placement within the industry to the proprietor or his employees. The price offered is determined on internal sales only—in other words, the oil company bases its price on the sale of petrol and oil only. The valuation criteria have not been based on the dealer's other sources of income within his business—for example, car services, maintenance and sales of accessories.

No consideration has been given to any equipment expenditure undertaken by the dealer during the term of his lease. That has been ignored. That is ridiculous, as those improvements on site would also have increased the sales of petrol and oils. No reference has been made to any goodwill built up in the community by the dealer. How can BP make, or even pretend to make, an offer without consideration of the total sources of income of the business? The offers that have been made are not even half the money that is required to buy a franchise at a comparable site.

Early in the year, rumours emanated from within the industry that sites would be closed if BP took over Amoco. The Queensland Motor Industry Association was advised of that. However, until BP executives arrived on the sites to drop the axe on the respective dealers, no real information was given on what the terms of take-overs would be or what sites would be involved.

The proprietors and their employees have no protection whatever with that Big Brother, like-it-or-lump-it attitude. I severely criticise the State Government for its involvement in that matter. Earlier this year, service station proprietors and dealers were excluded from the operation of the retail shop leases legislation that was passed by this Assembly. That was a disgrace and, as honourable members will recall, the Opposition pointed that out continually during the debate on that toothless legislation that the Minister now seems proud to promulgate. We see his smiling face in advertisements all over the place. Service station proprietors, their employees and their families would have had some protection if they had not been specifically excluded from the legislation by the Government. If they are put out on the street and are not fairly recompensed, the Government must accept the full responsibility. It will have to wear it. The Government is interested in big business monopolies, hypermarkets and the multinationals. What hypocrisy it is for the Government to claim that it is concerned about small business and the workers and employees within the oil industry.

"Getting on with the Job"

Hon. D. F. LANE (Merthyr—Minister for Transport) (12.31 p.m.): I should like to take a few minutes in today's Matters of Public Interest debate to report on the progress of my campaign of "getting on with the job". That job, which was given to me some years ago, was to be the full-time elected representative for Merthyr and to discharge my responsibilities as the Minister for Transport in the Queensland Government. It is a job which carries with it enormous responsibility.

As the Queensland Minister for Transport, I am involved in the daily public administration of departments whose annual budgets total more than $839.5m. Those

departments are funded by Queensland tax-payers through rates and charges, levies on the transport industry, rail freights and fares, and from consolidated taxation and revenue. It is my major responsibility to reduce, to the maximum extent possible, the financial burden that those departments place on Queenslanders.

Because Ministers are accountable to the people through Parliament, they should report regularly and be prepared to face questioning on the administration of their portfolios. This is something that I have adopted as a rigid policy since I became a Minister, and I am proud to say that my administration has been generally well received by members of the Parliament.

The Queensland Railway Department forms by far the largest section of my portfolio. I have been fortunate to be deeply involved in Queensland Railways during a period of opportunity for unparallelled modernisation and development. During my term as Transport Minister, I persuaded the Government to adopt a positive and far-sighted scheme to electrify and equip approximately 1500 km of rail line in the vast coal-fields of central Queensland. This $700m project will see the haulage of 50 million tonnes of coal per year to power stations and ports on the coast.

The new electrified lines will run from Blackwater and the surrounding mines via Rockhampton to Gladstone, and from the Goonyella mines in the Bowen Basin to Hay Point and Dalrymple Bay near Mackay. Electrification of those rail lines will save the Queensland tax-payers 90 million litres of diesel fuel each year and will almost halve the annual maintenance cost on the locomotives—a saving of about $13.5m per year. The diesel fuel saving will represent about half of the Queensland Railway Department's annual consumption.

Already contracts have been let for the manufacture and supply of 146 electric locomotives, 76 of which will be built by Commonwealth Engineering Pty Ltd in Brisbane at a cost of $98m, and a further 70 will be built by Clyde/ASEA-Walkers in Maryborough at a cost of $91m. The locomotive contracts will create 107 800 man-weeks of employment in Queensland. Contracts and commitments totalling more than $70m have also been let for overhead wiring and traction equipment.

The letting of those contracts will see Queensland gain the invaluable overseas technology required to see this project through to its completion. I have been deeply involved in the exhaustive assessment of tenders for all the contracts. It is considered that this project will create at least 9 000 man-years of employment as well as transfer new skills and technologies to Queensland manufacturers. The main-line electrification project is the biggest single current railway project in the world today.

Last year, the State Government accepted the finding of a consultants' report carried out at my instigation by PA Australia into the efficiency of Queensland Railways. Implementation of recommendations in this report in the past year have resulted in a direct saving of $30m to the Queensland tax-payer, with more to come. This has been done through the introduction of—

New industrial relations policies involving elimination of unregistered agreements, which have resulted in an annual saving of $10.4m;

Productivity improvement projects, for an annual saving of $5.8m;

Manpower planning, involving staff reductions, representing an annual saving of $6.5m;

and other measures.

It is my firm intention to continue with a policy of making Queensland Railways the most efficient and financially viable system in Australia.

The staging of Expo 88 has provided me with a unique opportunity to transfer the interstate standard gauge rail line across the river to Roma Street. That will give train travellers the chance to make an unbroken trip across the continent from Cairns to Perth. As part of that project, a $34m redevelopment of Roma Street Railway Station

will incorporate motel accommodation, office space, restaurants, parking and a co-ordinated transport facility including a comprehensive bus terminal and rail interchange.

Similarly, a multimillion dollar development will take place in the air space above the Toowong Railway Station. To provide better facilities for railway employees, in the last financial year the Queensland Government has spent $10m on railway housing throughout the State, whilst several million dollars was spent on workshops and modern staff amenities.

Under my administration, a more aggressive marketing and sales team, coupled with a new corporate image based on the "Take It Easy, Take A Train" theme, has seen Queensland Railways become more competitive in both freight and passenger services. Record haulages of coal and grain, together with additional general freight, have given the railways estimated record total receipts of $853m for this financial year. The operating deficit for the previous financial year was reduced by approximately $107m—a further significant saving to the Queensland tax-payer.

Extension of the $380m suburban electrification scheme to Beenleigh this year and to Caboolture in the near future will service thousands of new homes and families. The new electric trains in Brisbane have proven tremendously popular, and patronage of the passenger rail system has increased by approximately 30 per cent since the first electric trains were introduced in 1979.

My responsibilities in the Transport Department include the licencing and regulation of all commercial vehicles in Queensland, from passenger buses and taxis to trucks, driving schools and towing services. At my instigation, the Transport Department was reorganised and now willingly provides a service function to the industry as well as its regulatory role. The incorporation of motor vehicle mechanical safety inspections within the department, as well as regulation of the carriage of dangerous goods by road, guarantees the general public that their safety interests are being looked after continually by my Transport Department officers.

Regulating the internal air services within a State as vast as Queensland represents another extremely important part of my ministry. With the enormous distances involved, it is essential that regular, stable routes be maintained. This is carried out under my supervision through a licencing and permit system. My negotiations with airline operators have achieved that necessary stability.

The construction of 63 park-and-ride stations, which have been built by my department, providing about 6 000 free car-parks at suburban railway stations, gives far greater access to the modern electric train system.

As Chairman of the Queensland Road Safety Council, I have been able to expand its education programs throughout the State. The very popular defensive-driving course is now staffed by 110 volunteer instructors who, together with full-time staff, have helped 91 000 drivers since the course began. Other programs, such as the motorcycle training scheme and the high school driver-education course, together with the school safe-cycling courses, have all helped to reduce the annual road toll in the last three years.

The advertising theme of "Road Safety—Finally it's up to you", which stresses individual responsibility, has received wide acclaim. In attempting to grapple with the serious problem of drink driving, after exhaustive investigation it was decided that the introduction of a blood alcohol limit of .05 was a necessary, positive means of reducing alcohol related accidents without imposing general roadside screening on all motorists. Results so far have shown this to be successful.

A scheme of school crossing supervisors, or lollipop people, as they have become known, was introduced by me throughout the state. They man school crossings before and after school, and 646 supervisors are now on duty at 388 schools in Queensland. I am delighted to say they are doing an excellent job and have the respect of a majority of motorists.

I have continued with my policy of total accessibility to the people and maintain my electorate office at 88 Merthyr Road, New Farm, and I am also available at my

home. I have no occupation other than that of parliamentary representative, which therefore means I can provide full-time representation to the electorate of Merthyr. My regular contact with schools, welfare organisations, community service groups and sporting bodies in my electorate has continued over the 14 years I have represented the district.

There has always been a high demand for housing assistance in Merthyr. In the last 12 months alone, I have had three new accommodation blocks built in New Farm. In the same period, the Housing Commission, through my representation, has purchased an additional block of existing flats at Wooloowin, which will serve as pensioner/welfare units for local residents.

The planning of significant extensions to the Ascot State School is currently under way, and I recently arranged for the New Farm State School to be newly painted internally. Through my efforts, an all-weather bus/ferry terminal has been constructed in Brunswick Street, and an extended car-park for train travellers is being built at Wooloowin.

I have endeavoured to outline something of the job I have been doing in the last 12 months. I can give this House an assurance that I will continue with this task with enthusiasm in the future.

Transfer of Detective Sergeant Mahony from Fraud Squad

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (12.39): In the House yesterday, I raised very serious allegations against the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services—basically, he has failed to reply to those allegations—that he intervened in a police matter and asked that a Fraud Squad detective be removed from an investigation. That Fraud Squad detective is Detective Sergeant 1/c Vince Mahony. He is acknowledged to be one of the best Fraud Squad detectives in Queensland in dealing with land cases. Why was he taken off the case when he is recognised as being a person who knows how to deal with land fraud cases?

Probably the most disconcerting part of this affair is what was revealed on Channel 0 news last night, namely, that a police source had said that some pressure had been brought to bear to stop the Fraud Squad investigations. In my opinion, that verifies my statement yesterday, that pressure had been brought to bear on the police to have Vince Mahony taken off the case. The police have now stated that that is so.

The Minister for Police should tell Parliament much more than he told it this morning, because it seems that some pressure was applied. I should like to know where the pressure came from to have Vince Mahony taken off the case and at whom it was directed.

The only public statements made by the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services were made in a press conference that he held yesterday afternoon. I have some comments to make about that press conference, because during the conference the Minister made a number of very contradictory statements. Part of the transcript of the press conference is in these terms—

> "REPORTER: It was also suggested that, in fact, you made representations to the Shire Chairman of the Woongarra Shire Council to greet Mr Luton with open arms and in fact try and support and encourage him as much as possible?
>
> Mr GOLEBY: Now, that's a figment of imagination.
>
> REPORTER: You deny that totally?
>
> Mr GOLEBY: As a Minister, we meet scores of people. This afternoon I have had interviews the whole afternoon. I have still got more interviews to follow, that is meeting various people, local government, and everything else, on behalf of people. Sure, we meet time to time. Every Minister today would be doing just that."

The Minister said then that he had not made any representations to the Woongarra Shire Council; but today, in answer to a question that I asked him, he said that he had

met the chairman of the Woongarra Shire Council. That is the first misleading reference in the statement he made yesterday.

Later, the transcript of the conference continued—

"REPORTER: Has he ever been to see you to talk about his business dealings?

Mr GOLEBY: I spoke to Mr Luton socially, and I am sure many other people have done that also.

REPORTER: But in your capacity as a Minister, has he ever been to see you about his business dealings?

Mr GOLEBY: Not directly, no. I am not aware——

REPORTER: Would you describe the circumstances in which you met him?

Mr GOLEBY: Well certainly. We have met on occasions socially, at his own church. I was there at the opening of it, and as far as that is concerned, like anyone else whether you meet at a social function or otherwise, and you talk about the topics of the day and the things you are doing. But I have certainly not been involved in any——

REPORTER: At these functions, did he raise his business dealings, his land with you?

Mr GOLEBY: I can't recall that at all. He has spoken generally about his various business enterprises, but certainly nothing like what is involved here."

This morning, the Minister said that he made representations to the Woongarra Shire Council on behalf of Mr Luton; but at the beginning of the press conference, the Minister was trying to deny that he had spoken to Mr Luton about any of his business dealings.

I shall now refer to further discrepancies that appear in the transcript of the press conference, which continued later in this way—

"REPORTER: Well, you have had phone conversations with him?

Mr GOLEBY: Well, I had an invitation to attend the opening of his church, yes."

A little later, the press conference transcript continued—

"REPORTER: Have you ever made any representations as a Minister on behalf of Mr Luton in any sphere at all?

Mr GOLEBY: No. No. Only in general terms."

First it was, "No"; then again it was, "No"; and finally it was, "Only in general terms" It should be remembered that this morning the Minister confirmed that he made representations to the chairman of the shire council on behalf of Mr Luton.

The press conference transcript continued—

"REPORTER: And what are those terms?

Mr GOLEBY: Well, that was with other Ministers concerning a business development.

REPORTER: And what exactly happened there?

Mr GOLEBY: I don't know the outcome whatsoever at all."

I suggest that any competent Minister who, on behalf of a person, made representations to a shire council or to a Government department would certainly have to find out the outcome of those representations. Otherwise, what would be the sense in making the representations? This morning, Mr Goleby refused to answer that question when it was put to him.

Referring to the land development, the transcript continues—

"REPORTER: Well, can you tell us where it was? You can tell us the location, surely?

Mr GOLEBY: It was a local government problem, yes.

REPORTER: Whereabouts? Was it at Bundaberg?

Mr GOLEBY: Yes.

REPORTER: It was at the Bargara estate then?

Mr GOLEBY: Yes, and general terms.

REPORTER: He was having problems with the roads. What sort of problems?

Mr GOLEBY: I think it was construction problems. Other than that, I can't recall."

I wish to refer to a statement made earlier in the press conference. Mr Goleby was asked a question by the reporter about his land dealings, and he said—

> "I don't know of Mr. Luton's land at Bargara. I have never seen it. I know that he has supposed to have had land there. He said so in the declaration made to the House today by Mr. Mackenroth. I know nothing of the land in question at all."

Mr Goleby stated that he knew nothing about the land, yet five minutes later he told the reporter that in fact he had, on behalf of Mr Luton, made representations to the Woongarra Shire Council. So the Minister was certainly backtracking and making different statements. He also stated that he thought there were construction problems.

Earlier in the interview he was asked—

> "What were the representations that were made?"

He replied—

> "It was concerning one of his problems that he had in regard to road construction. That was all. And that has been resolved, I understand. I haven't heard anymore about it."

A little further on in the interview the Minister said that he did not know what the problem was.

Those discrepancies in the Minister's press conference yesterday show that in fact he must have had something to do with Luton. In his statement to the House today he refused to state where he had met Luton and on what occasions. At his press conference yesterday he stated on perhaps four occasions that he could not remember where he had met Luton. He has had 24 hours in which to recall the place at which he had met Luton. Maybe he can tell us on how many occasions he met Luton. During his press conference he alluded to the fact that the only places at which he had met Luton were church socials. If honourable members read the Minister's statement closely they will note that he does in fact state that he met Luton only on social occasions.

He has refused to answer those questions. I challenge him today to tell us where he met Luton and the background of those meetings so that we can look further into this case. I believe that it warrants investigation by the Justice Department and the Police Department.

Attack on Member for Mulgrave by Federal Minister for Primary Industry

Mr MENZEL (Mulgrave) (12.48 p.m.): What I am about to say today will probably not be of great interest to honourable members.

Whilst I was overseas with a parliamentary delegation, the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin), under parliamentary privilege, hit back at me, I guess, because on many occasions I have drawn to the attention of this Parliament, the people of Queensland, the people in my electorate and the sugar industry the promises that the Labor Government has broken. The Minister made certain comments in reply to a question by the Federal member for Leichhardt (John Gayler), who can be easily found in the Great Northern Hotel in north Queensland, because that seems to be his office.

I refer to Mr Kerin's gutter tactics. That is the only way in which I can describe them. Some of the things that he said about me need to be answered, and I certainly intend to answer them.

I call for the resignation of the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin), because the things that he said about me are far worse than those said by the Federal Leader of the Opposition (Mr Peacock) about the Prime Minister. A lot of fuss has been caused by Mr Peacock's comment that the Prime Minister was a little crook. I would say that Mr Kerin must have spent some time in a hotel and must have had too much to drink before he made those comments in Parliament.

His attacks on me were made to divert attention from the real issues and the let-down of the sugar industry by the Federal Government.

Mr Davis: What did he say? I didn't read the article.

Mr MENZEL: One of the things that he said was that, when I was chairman of the board of directors of the Babinda sugar-mill, the cane-growers used to hide in the cane and in the drains.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr MENZEL: It is laughable that the cane-growers used to hide from me. I am pleased that the honourable member for Wolston laughed at that statement of one of his Federal Labor colleagues. Mr Kerin's comments were ridiculous. The only person who is hiding in the drains or the gutters is Mr Kerin.

He claims that he was quoting from a letter that had been sent to him by a Babinda cane-grower. However, he was not prepared to table the letter in the Federal House. It was rather spineless and gutless for Mr Kerin to make allegations about somebody who was not even in the country at the time and to quote from a letter that he would not table. Mr Kerin even had the hide to not name the person who made the allegations. Everybody should hear the name of that person.

I am alleged to have held 43 proxies. Of course, I did not. Because no specific rules are followed at the Babinda sugar-mill, a model rule is used, and no more than five proxies can be held by any one person. The present deputy chairman, Mr Ted Rodman, probably holds the most proxies, but he does not hold 43 proxies.

Mr Prest: How many does he have?

Mr MENZEL: I have not counted them in recent times, but he certainly would not have held 40 proxies.

It is ridiculous to suggest that I have chased proxies and that people were hiding in drains and in the cane to avoid me. As I said, the only person hiding in the drain or the gutter is John Kerin, because he has failed to carry out the promises of the Government. He is running scared of me and people such as the member for Mirani and the member for Burdekin who have attacked him for the inaction of the Government.

When Mr Kerin was in Innisfail recently, he had a very rough time. In fact, it was the first time that I can remember in the history of the sugar industry that cane-growers demonstrated against any Government.

Mr De Lacy: He wasn't even there.

Mr MENZEL: Even if Mr Kerin was not there, his name was mentioned. The growers were after him. Chris Hurford was there.

The Federal Minister for Primary Industry said many things, including—"It is this example of National Party thuggery and paternalism that has the sugar industry in so much trouble." It is obvious that he does not know what he is talking about. The sugar industry is in dire straits simply because of low world sugar prices. I have heard members in this place claim that Rocky Point sugar-mill should not have received a temporary peak increase. I also do not agree with that. Nevertheless, because it was in such dire

financial straits, Rocky Point applied to the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board and its peak was increased by 10 000 tonnes. But from what Mr Kerin said, one would think that the Babinda sugar-mill is the only one in financial trouble.

I would remind him that growers right throughout the sugar industry are in financial trouble. His comment was totally irresponsible. He quoted from a letter written by some faceless person who is not prepared to give his name. A letter written by a person who is not prepared to give his name and to have it published is not worth two bob.

I want to refer briefly to the ABC's "Country Hour" on Monday, 23 July 1984, in which Russ King reported that on past occasions, Mr Kerin had promised aid to northern cane-growers, but had met strong criticism from central growers, who claimed that their plight was worse. According to the Mackay cane-growers, their plight is far worse than that of the growers in far-north Queensland. That is debatable. Everywhere in the cane industry the situation is bad.

Something positive should be done by the Federal Government, which is the only Government in Australia that has the financial resources to enable it to give any decent price support. Loans alone are not the answer. In 1965, the then Federal Government gave the sugar industry a $19m loan. The Federal Government has the resources to do that. It is about time that it stopped ducking the issue and got on with the job of providing some sort of assistance, otherwise many jobs in the industry will be lost. That will have a detrimental effect not only on the cane-growers but also on their employees.

Health Clubs

Mr SMITH (Townsville West) (12.58 p.m.): I rise to draw attention to the spread of villainy in the health club industry in Queensland. Unfortunately, the ubiquitous credit card has now become an added instrument of aiding and abetting dishonest operators.

In Townsville, a fellow named Ian Spouse—a nasty piece of work—is doing his utmost to fleece the innocent by this means. That fellow's particular tactic has been to sign up young people for long-term membership of his so-called health club, the Nautilus Club, which is located in Kirwan.

His rort is that he convinces the young and inexperienced that the painless way to finance their membership is to pay by Bankcard, and he helpfully arranges that facility on their behalf. In fact, what the victims are induced to sign is not only an application for Bankcard but also an account for between $400 and $700, which, of course, attracts interest of 18 per cent whether they need to borrow the money or not.

The victims do not realise that they are signing up for a long-term contract from which they cannot legally obtain a release if they decide to discontinue their association with Mr Spouse's club.

In some of the instances of the fraud that he is perpetrating, the victim is under the legal adult age of 18 years, and I am hopeful that the full force of the law can be brought in to effect a proper remedy.

The particular bank that arranged the Bankcard facility for Spouse—naturally, it shall remain nameless—has now withdrawn from that arrangement. No doubt he is looking for new financial accommodation.

In the brief time at my disposal today, I want to relate a little more of Spouse's behaviour. In a recent incident, this creep—I say that quite deliberately—this smart alec, this recent arrival—he is certainly not a north Queenslander—chose to use most abusive and foul language in reply to the mother of an 18-year-old girl who was in her first job after having left school.

In response to representations from this very respectable mother who was concerned about her daughter's financial obligation, this rorter Spouse made most outrageous remarks about the woman s character and smugly advised her that she should have

brought her daughter up to be wiser in the ways of the world—in other words, how to deal with con men such as Spouse.

I hope that this expose plays some little part in further focusing public attention on the perils of association with many of the so-called health clubs in Queensland.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 3 April (see p. 2390, vol. 294) on Mr Harper's motion—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (2.15 p.m.): The Bill before the House is a relatively simple piece of legislation. The Evidence Act Amendment Bill basically seeks to amend the definition of an "approved person" to allow a wider class of persons or officials to be "approved persons", that is, persons who are able to approve certain documents for copying under the Evidence Act.

The Opposition has no objection to the intent of the legislation. It believes that the legislation is a change for the better; in fact, it is quite happy to support it. However, in supporting this important piece of legislation it is most opportune for me to use this occasion to bring to the attention of members of Parliament and the people of Queensland some of the skulduggery that continues to go on concerning the notorious Dr Shrian Oskar. As I go into this whole sordid and extremely untidy affair and take, to the nth degree, this definition, which deals with evidence on oath, what the breaking of that oath means in court, and swearing false evidence—the appropriate word for it is "perjury"—the gross inadequacies of both the Government and the Premier and Treasurer will become evident to honourable members, to the general public and, I hope, to the media so that the public is made aware of the situation.

It was with some alarm that I picked up today's "Telegraph" On page 3 a photograph of Dr Oskar appears next to the headline "Qld police want to quiz Oskar". The article reads—

> "The Queensland police wish to question Paraguayan businessman, Dr Shrian Oskar, following his arrest by Scotland Yard detectives in London."

Lo and behold, it can be seen that he was arrested at London's Hilton Hotel on 17 August and later appeared in Bow Street Magistrates Court charged with fraudulently reporting the loss of travellers' cheques worth $9,300. The article contains some very important and relevant words. Oskar was charged with fraudulently reporting the loss of travellers' cheques worth $9,300.

It is ironic that in this Chamber tomorrow a gentleman on the Government side of the House, namely the Premier and Treasurer, will introduce the State Budget. He is a gentleman who is responsible for millions of dollars of tax-payers' money in this State. A short time ago he was prepared to go in to bat publicly for Dr Shrian Oskar to the extent of $6m worth of tax-payers' money to finance his proposal to construct an oil-seed plant at Port Alma. Mr Deputy Speaker, I will show you where a conflict exists. I will demonstrate why it is so important to the Bill before the House.

Reference is made in the "Telegraph" to Dr Oskar's fraudulently reporting the loss of travellers' cheques worth $9,300. He was the same person who came to the Queensland Government to obtain a $6m guarantee from the Premier and Treasurer of this State for the oil-seed plant that he wished to establish at Port Alma. Dr Edwards was one person who fought very strongly in Cabinet to ensure that the Queensland Government would not fall into line with what the Premier wanted at that time.

The deal fell through and Oskar was unable to obtain the guarantee for $6m. It might not be well known, but at that time he owned plant and equipment. We talk

about devaluation of the dollar on the international monetary market, but cop this. This has to be the best example of devaluation that could be imagined. When he failed to obtain the Government guarantee of $6m, he went into liquidation. The plant and equipment for which he wanted $6m was sold by the mortgagees for $600,000. Eventually it was taken to New Zealand, where the National Bank of New Zealand sold it for $147,000. What a dramatic devaluation—from $6m to $147,000!

It is interesting to note that Dr Shrian Oskar, whom the Premier and Treasurer was prepared to support financially, presently has accumulated debts in Australia, Fiji and New Zealand amounting to the princely sum of $28.7m, which does not take into account the accidental loss of travellers' cheques to the value of $9,300, about which he appeared in the Bow Street Magistrates Court in the United Kingdom yesterday morning, Australian time.

That leads me to a number of other points that are extremely disturbing. First, I refer very briefly to today's "Telegraph", which carries this item—

> "The police spokesman said today that despite the warrant for Dr Oskar's arrest, the Police Commissioner, Mr Lewis, would not be sending detectives to Britain to bring him back to Queensland."

Here we have shades of the matter raised just a few weeks ago by my colleague the honourable member for Salisbury, when a former employee of the RACQ popped up in Switzerland with travellers' cheques to the value of $120,000, if my memory serves me correctly. However, the Queensland Police Force, obviously without any direction from the Minister—perhaps it was upon the direction of the Minister; perhaps it was upon the direction of the Premier—was not prepared to take immediate action by serving extradition papers. The Attorney-General, now sitting in the Parliament, who will reply to this debate on the second reading, then failed to take appropriate action.

Today's press carries a report of history repeating itself. The Government is saying—let us face it; the Commissioner of Police (Mr Lewis) is little more than a tool of the Government—that nobody will be sent to England to extradite Oskar to Australia. The "Telegraph" report continues—

> "However if he is brought back to Australia by the West Australian police or the Federal Police, we'd be very interested in talking with him."

What sort of Shylock system of justice do we have in this State when we have a Commissioner of Police who lacks direction from his Government? He says, "We will talk to him, provided another Government—the Western Australian Labor Government—or the Federal police, under the auspices of the Federal Labor Government, is prepared to pick up the bill to extradite him to Australia." The Queensland Government will then take appropriate steps to do something about this criminal, this crook, this charlatan who is presently walking free in the streets.

The nefarious business background of Dr Oskar was exposed by the Channel 9 "Today Tonight" program, which clearly established some time ago that Dr Oskar operated an airline in Malaysia. Sworn evidence supported that report. Later in my speech I will read a number of statutory declarations made by very prominent and honest people in the community supporting what I am saying.

Dr Oskar disputed that he had any involvement in a Malaysian airline and sought to take out a Supreme Court injunction against the program "Today Tonight", but he was unsuccessful. The point that is so relevant to the legislation under debate is that in that writ Dr Oskar swore on oath that he had never been in Malaysia or Singapore and that he had never had a connection with a Malaysian airline. That is a very clear example of a person's deliberatly perjuring himself, which is very relevant to the Bill now being debated. Dr Oskar has committed what I believe to be one of the most serious and heinous crimes that any person can commit against the legal system, that is, the crime of perjury.

However, the Commissioner of Police—I assume that he had the support of the Minister for Police, but I would hope not the support of the Minister for Justice and

Attorney-General—has said that he is not prepared to set in train moves for the extradition of this criminal, this person who has perjured himself, and in a moment I will prove that perjury beyond any dispute or doubt. I am very happy to see that now that I am about to mention the investigations by the Queensland Police Force, the Premier is skulking into the back room.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I ask the member for Wolston to withdraw his comment that the Premier is skulking into a back room. That is an unparliamentary comment.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I will withdraw the term "skulking". He is standing there, listening; he is not prepared to come onto the floor of the Chamber and debate the matter. Because of his involvement with an international criminal of such wide repute, he is severely embarrassed.

The quite broad-ranging investigation by the Queensland Police Force into the activities of Dr Shrian Oskar resulted from information that came from the British Broadcasting Commission. That information demonstrated clearly that Oskar had operated in the countries that I mentioned earlier. My information is that, because at that time he was floating around on the international monetary market under several aliases, there was some difficulty in tracking him down, even with the very good resources of Interpol. Nevertheless, it was shown quite clearly in the injunction that he sought to have taken out against Channel 9 that he had perjured himself.

The Queensland Police Force has spent thousands of dollars of tax-payers' money investigating Dr Oskar. He has committed perjury and that was referred to the former Minister for Justice and Attorney-General and former Liberal member for Kurilpa (Sam Doumany). He returned it to the police for investigation. Two senior detectives from the Woolloongabba CIB were assigned to investigate Dr Oskar. As I said before, hundreds of valuable and expensive police hours were spent on the investigation.

I am told that, all along, the investigating police were extremely concerned that, because of the backing of the Government, the Premier and other prominent people within the Queensland National Party who had come out so strongly in support of Dr Oskar, their investigations would come to absolutely nothing. They believed that there would be a political direction to ensure that no findings or charges were made against the man whom the Premier said he trusted. Although that interference came from somewhere within the National Party, let there be no mistake about the fact that six left-overs from the Liberal Party should hang their heads in shame because at that time a Liberal——

Mr Innes interjected.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: Is the honourable member dissociating himself from it?

Mr Innes: No, I am saying that you are a socialist leftover.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: The honourable member should dissociate himself from his former associates.

The former Attorney-General, the honourable member for Kurilpa (Sam Doumany), was the person responsible at that time for ensuring that action was taken to have charges brought and heard, but he did nothing. It is relevant for this Parliament and the people of Queensland to ask why no action was taken. I suggest very strongly that it was because of political interference from up top in the National Party. Political interference, political weight, political pressure or political influence in some form was brought to bear on the then Minister for Justice and Attorney-General to ensure that he did not proceed.

In this case, the Queensland media performed a very valuable public service in investigating Dr Oskar, who virtually fled the State and country because of media speculation. The exposure that that was getting was far too hot.

Only a couple of weeks ago, the member for Southport mentioned in this Chamber the name of the former doyen of the National Party, Sir Wallace Rae. Once again, his name emerges in this tarnished affair. He was the Queensland agent—the Queensland financial tart, if I may use that terminology—for Dr Oskar. Sir Wallace Rae wined him and dined him. He took him all over Queensland and introduced him to some of Queensland's most prominent business people. He took him to the Queensland Club, that great bastion of the establishment, where he dined him among the so-called blue bloods of the community. What an embarrassment he must be to them today! He also wined and dined Dr Oskar in many of the prominent restaurants in Brisbane.

It is an absolute disgrace that that former member of the Queensland Parliament, who trots around the State with a knighthood to his name, should be allowed to continue the extremely doubtful business and company associations in which he is involved. Having in mind the recent case involving the Southport company with which Sir Wallace Rae was involved, I suggest that if the Queensland Government had acted with propriety it would have moved in and recommended that he be stripped of his knighthood.

When Dr Oskar left Queensland, he left behind him a trail of debts; he owed millions of dollars. The Western Australian police want him for questioning about perjury. In fact, a perjury charge is pending against him in that State. Although he committed a similar offence in Queensland, the Queensland Government is not talking about any charge of perjury. It simply wants him here to question him. That is the position, in spite of the fact that a warrant has been issued for his arrest in Western Australia. Without doubt, a prima facie case of perjury exists in Queensland.

Dr Oskar has been arrested in Great Britain, a country with which we have enjoyed an extradition treaty for years. There would be no problems.

Sir William Knox: It is with Australia.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I accept that interjection from the honourable member for Nundah. Under the acknowledged procedure, the Federal Attorney-General is required to make those moves. Surely there is a responsibility on this State's Attorney-General to initiate some formal approach to the Federal Attorney-General for extradition proceedings to be set in train. Again that has not happened, despite firm evidence that a charge of perjury should be laid against Dr Oskar in this State. Today I am calling on the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General to co-operate to the utmost with both the Western Australian and Federal police to ensure that steps are taken immediately to serve extradition papers on Dr Oskar. Once he has been dealt with under the British system of justice, he should be extradited to Australia and charges should be laid in this State.

Dr Oskar faces charges of perjury in Western Australia. He is also wanted for questioning in Queensland. In addition, he has committed fraud on an international scale. He owes $2m to the tax-payers of this country—in fact, the Federal Government. He fraudulently took that money out of the Federal coffers. In other words, he cheated the tax-payers of Australia. Mr Acting Speaker—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I am Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: Mr Deputy Speaker, you must excuse me for referring to you as "Mr Acting Speaker." I think that probably I am predicting future events a little early.

This afternoon, I propose to read a number of sworn statutory declarations. The first is from a Mrs Kamirah Dorward of Unit 20, King Road South, 18 Commodore Drive, Paradise Waters, in the State of Queensland. She is a housewife, who states on oath—

> "1. I have resided at the above address with my husband and son for approximately one year having come to Australia from Malayasia in approximately February 1982.
>
> 2. I recently viewed a television news programme on which was shown the face of a man whom I recognised as one Oscar Shrian, the person who had been in

charge of a company with whom I had earlier been employed in Malaysia, namely Southern Cross Airways (Malaysia) Berhad. I cannot now recall whether such person was named in the television news programme, but I subsequently saw him named in a newspaper as Doctor Shrian Oskar which newspaper stated that he had never been in Malaysia. Through my husband, I subsequently contacted the Television Current Affairs Programme 'Today Tonight', to inform that programme that I had recognised such person, and that he had previously lived in Malaysia and been involved with Southern Cross Airways.

3. I was employed by Southern Cross Airways (Malaysia) Berhad from approximately July 1971 to February 1972 as a Telex Operator. Its business was conducted from the 8th Floor of a building known as Wisma Damansara at Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, and shared an office with a company which, as I remember, was called Power Industries, or Power Telecommunications Industries.

4. I understood Mr. Oskar Shrian (as I knew him) to be the Manager of Southern Cross Airways (Malaysia) Berhad during the period for which I was employed by that company."

It is important to bear in mind as I read these sworn declarations that Osker stated on oath that he had never been in Malaysia and that he was never associated with any company in Malaysia. The Premier of this State was prepared to go in to bat for him to the tune of $6m of tax-payers' money. The statutory declaration continues—

"I recall seeing Mr Shrian on approximately ten occasions during that period and, whilst I was not personally introduced to him, I and the other staff employed by the airline always paid particular attention to him on those occasions on which he was seen, because of the very fact that he always appeared to avoid attention, and appeared never to communicate with his employees, other than his Secretary and Senior Staff. Likewise, none of the staff other than Senior employees, entered his office. For these reasons, he was regarded as something of a mysterious character, and this in itself promoted much interest on the part of the general staff on the occasions on which he was observed.

5. During the period of my employment by the airline, Mr Shrian's Secretary was Won Kit Wan, and I understood that one Carl Wheatley was the Director of Operations. His Secretary referred to him as 'Oscar' and his name was on the door of his office. Upon the termination of my employment with the airline I was furnished with a reference, which was signed by Mr Wheatley and dated the 22nd day of February 1972. A true and correct copy of such reference is now shown to me and marked with the letter 'A'."

That reference is attached to the statutory declaration. It continues—

"6. Although it has been approximately 11 years since I ceased working for that airline, I clearly remember Mr Shrian's features. I readily recall that he was somewhat stooped, or round shouldered, and had a short neck. Whilst his face appears from the photographs which I have seen, to be a little fatter now than it did when I knew him, it has not changed much during the intervening years.

7. Now shown to me and marked with the letter 'B' are two newspaper photographs which are stated to be of one Doctor Oskar and which I am informed by the Solicitors for the Defendants and do verily believe were recently published in newspapers circulated in Brisbane. The person shown in those photographs is the person whom I knew as Mr Oscar Shrian, as I have deposed to therein.

All the facts and circumstances herein deposed to are within my own knowledge save such as are deposed to from information only and my means of knowledge and sources of information appear on the face of this my affidavit."

That affidavit was signed. However, to that woman's credit, she showed much courage when she confronted this man in a Brisbane motel. She walked up to him, shook hands with him and clearly and positively identified him as the same Dr Shrian Oskar that she had known in Malaysia approximately 11 years ago. That is very damning evidence.

Another statutory declaration reads as follows—

"I, BOEY BENG KEAT otherwise known as KIT BOEY (Identity Card No. 4131370) of H6 Ukay Heights, Ampang, Selangor, Malaysia do solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:—

1. I am presently employed as the Retail General Manager with Alfred Dunhill of London (Malaysia) Sdn. Bhd., a company incorporated in Malaysia.

2. In 1971 I was employed by Southern Cross Airways (Malaysia) Berhad, an airline company incorporated in Malaysia in the capacity of Director of Sales in Kuala Lumpur and my employment with such company lasted six (6) months.

3. During my employment with Southern Cross Airways (Malaysia) Berhad I did in the course of my employment personally know a man by the name of OSCAR SHRIAN and knew him to be associated with such Company.

4. I first met OSCAR SHRIAN in 1967 whilst I was employed with Harper Gilfillan, a travel firm in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

5. Subsequently I knew OSCAR SHRIAN for a number of years when we were both associated with Power and Telecommunications, a company incorporated in Malaysia and carrying on business in Kuala Lumpur and Oregon Industries, a company incorporated in Singapore. I was a director of both these companies and Oscar Shrian was a consultant to both such companies.

6. The copy of the photograph attached hereto and marked 'C' recently shown to me by Mr John Barton of Channel Nine, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia and said to have been taken in Brisbane is that of the man known to me as Oscar Shrian and I am in no doubt that such person shown in such photograph is the same person as I knew as Oscar Shrian in Kuala Lumpur during the period 1967 to 1972."

That gentleman made other statements in that affidavit that I do not propose to read to the House.

I will read from another statutory declaration made by a Mr Jack R. W. Abrahams, identity card 3913926, of 9, Jln. Tempinis Empat, Lucky Gardens, Bungsar, Kuala Lumpur. He declared as follows—

"1. I am presently employed as a Sales Executive with Hume Industries (Malaysia) Berhad, a company incorporated in Malaysia.

2. In 1971 I was employed by Southern Cross Airways (Malaysia) Berhad, an airline company incorporated in Malaysia, in the capacity of Operations Executive and my employment with such company lasted six (6) months.

3. During my employment with Southern Cross Airways (Malaysia) Berhad I did in the course of my employment and at private social functions meet a man by the name of OSCAR SHRIAN whom I knew to be the Vice President of the Company.

4. The photograph annexed hereto and markled 'A' was taken at the Merlin Hotel, Kuala Lumpur in the latter part of 1971. The gentlemen in the centre of the photograph with his head turned towards the lady is the man known to me as Oscar Shrian.

5. I am the person on the extreme right of the photograph with the man on the extreme left being one called Kit Boey a former general manager of Cathay Pacific Airways in Kuala Lumpur and the other gentleman being one called Chooi Mun Sou, a Solicitor practising in Kuala Lumpur."

He goes on to make further statements concerning his very clear identification of Shrian Oskar.

I also have a statutory declaration made by a woman who came from Malaysia to Brisbane. She recognised Dr Oskar on television. Her story is exactly the same as the others.

Even though the Bill is a very small one, it is of tremendous importance. It is fundamental to good and fair justice for every person in the community. It impinges on one of the most important aspects of court procedures, namely, that persons who, upon entering the witness-box, swear to tell the truth do not perjure themselves by telling lies.

I have outlined a very clear case concerning a person who has fraudulently engaged in international activities involving millions of dollars. That very gentleman was wanted in Western Australia for having committed perjury. It is not disputed that in Queensland he gave sworn evidence that he was never in Malaysia and was never involved with any company in that country. Yet I am able to produce sworn affidavits from people who say that that man can only be described as an excellent liar.

Why no action from the Queensland Government? Who is covering for this fellow? Who is protecting him? Why was no action taken initially by the Minister for Police to have Oskar detained in Queensland and to prevent him from leaving the State at a time when charges could have been laid against him? Why is it that today the Commissioner of Police made a statement that police will take some interest in the matter if the Western Australian Government and the Federal Government try to secure the extradition of that criminal from London?

Why is it that we see this ongoing involvement of Government members with charlatans and crooks? Remember the Premier's involvement with Milan Brych, who is now serving 20 years' imprisonment in California for fraud? He held himself out as having a cure for cancer. He was a medical fraud and a charlatan.

How long will this sort of thing be allowed to go on without responsible Government members taking action? I make a call to the Attorney-General to look at the case that I have outlined. Clearly, he has a responsibility to do so. However, having seen the way in which he was mauled publicly yesterday by the Premier—for the fourth time—I doubt whether he will take action. I can understand that he would be loath to take any action that his mentor, the Premier, would not wish him to take.

I believe that it is a slight on the system of justice. It is a slight on the system of law in Queensland. It is pertinent to recall the comments made in this Chamber a couple of weeks ago by the member for Lytton. It seems that there is one law for the rich and one law for the poor. If somebody has money, he is looked after. If he is a battler and does not have very much money with which to defend himself, he finds himself in a great deal of trouble when he seeks equal legal representation. I believe that the Government has a very clearly defined responsibility to ensure that the law is upheld. The Attorney-General has a responsibility to have discussions with the Federal Attorney-General to ensure that when the British authorities have finished with that criminal, Dr Oskar, extradition proceedings are instituted so that he can be brought back to this State to answer some of the questions that the Queensland Police should be asking him.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (2.50 p.m.): We have just been treated to another chapter in the B-grade crime and scandal column that passes for an Opposition policy in this Chamber. It is probably the fourth or fifth time that we have heard about it this week. The honourable member rehashed the Dr Oskar affair. I venture to suggest that there would not be one person in this Chamber who would class Dr Oskar as anything other than a con man.

Mr Milliner: What about the Premier?

Mr INNES: I suppose that people in positions of authority are prime targets for those who specialise in flattery or dishonesty. Such persons would not bother with the likes of the member for Wolston or me. They would make for the mark.

The honourable member's litany of poorly constructed evidence failed to state that Dr Oskar was not successful in Queensland. He might have been successful in Western Australia, in New Zealand, or in Malaysia. Apart from a few personal debts, he was not successful in Queensland. I am pleased to say that my leader and other Liberal members

were Ministers at the time that the approaches made by Dr Oskar were rejected. The full story must be completed by the disclosure of all the facts. If a story based on perjured evidence is being told, let us have all the evidence. The evidence is that in Queensland Dr Oskar's greasy or oily tactics did not culminate in success. Thank goodness that no-one at any official level was taken down.

I agree with the member for Wolston that there appears to be a case against Dr Oskar regarding his private actions and the allegation of his giving false testimony. However, that is another matter. Money should not be wasted on extraditing a person on the basis that other people have falsely sworn affidavits. It might be a different matter if that person happens to be in Queensland or Australia. The people who would have to pay to extradite Dr Oskar are the people who lost millions of dollars. I refer particularly to the people in Western Australia and to the law enforcement authorities in that State.

The matter of evidence is important. It is important for people to give honest evidence. It is important for that evidence to be sworn evidence. It is that part of the speech made by the member for Wolston with which I agree.

I shall deal briefly with a few matters raised by the Bill and by the member for Wolston. As to extradition generally—it is clear that one cannot afford to extradite people for every misdemeanour, criminal or otherwise. I believe that reform of the law of extradition should take place. However, I do not believe that the circumstances surrounding Dr Oskar's activities in Queensland would justify the spending of tens of thousands of Queensland dollars to bring him back for questioning about the swearing of an affidavit in some private litigation that he had with another party.

There should be a reform of our extradition laws to encompass a list of offences which automatically would raise the issue of publicly funded extradition. There are serious crimes, quite clearly, in regard to which the Government would extradite. That range of crimes should be extended to include serious crimes of dishonesty such as fraud and misrepresentation. In the instance of the fraud carried out on the RACQ, the public law of Queensland was broken. Therefore, the enforcement of the public law was in question. Public money can properly be used in such circumstances.

Public money ought not to be wasted on petty, lower-order offences. The best way of approaching the matter would be to reassess the category of offences for which public moneys should be made available. We should not revert to the nineteenth century hangover of police in this and all other States being required to call upon banks and private individuals to raise very large amounts of money to fund extradition. That simply adds insult to their injury of losing property or funds in the first place. That matter could well be looked at. I repeat that that was not so in the case of falsely swearing an affidavit in civil proceedings in Queensland. It is a different matter for the people in Western Australia.

I turn now to the subject of evidence generally. The Liberal Party supports the measures embodied in this simple and short piece of legislation. I add that there are still matters of evidence that could usefully be considered.

The recent spate of commissions of inquiry into organised and serious crime in this country, together with the experience in Queensland in what might be broadly termed white-collar crime, does bring the law of evidence into question. Our existing law of evidence is the result of evolution throughout the last century and the early part of this century, before the extreme sophistication of documentation, before the sophistication of electronic means of communication and before the enormous boom in transactions of great complexity within aggregations of companies the like of which we had never previously seen—companies which themselves can transcend jurisdictional and national boundaries. Those modern, sophisticated developments give cause for the whole law of evidence to be reviewed with regard to the criminal prosecution of people.

I allude now to the disclosures contained in "The Age" tapes. The Federal Leader of the Opposition, by highlighting and putting his finger on the extent of organised crime in this country and its tentacles, is performing a public service. Clearly, there are

enormous tentacles of organised crime in this country, whether in the racing industry, tax evasion industry or the drug industry—or a combination of all three. It is reminiscent of the things one reads about in the development of organised crime in the United States.

An Opposition Member: It hasn't happened in the last 18 months.

Mr INNES: No. It takes a long time to happen. It takes a long time to surface. When it comes to the surface, however, it should not be buried. Something ought to be done about it. Quite clearly, the Costigan inquiry is disclosing matters reminiscent of the Lansky days and the Mafia days following prohibition in the United States.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr INNES: My word it throws up New South Wales—Sydney, the crime and gay capital of Australia—Mr Wran's jewel in the premier State! The American experience showed that it was extremely difficult to penetrate to the master-minds of organised crime. They created a facade of legitimate operations. They always used underlings at the work-face—at the crime-face. In fact, it was the immigration and taxation laws that first allowed some attack to be made on what was known to be the extent of organised crime in the United States. In this country it is the taxation laws and, to some extent, the immigration laws that provide a chance for prosecution.

What all these investigations have revealed is that the complexity of the transactions in which these people are involved—the web that they weave—is so sophisticated and extensive that it in itself creates a barrier against successful prosecution. At a very much lower level, some of the cases that have been prosecuted in this State—I do not suggest they are part of the web of totally organised crime that was disclosed in the Costigan report—are minor examples of the enormous complexity that faces the investigator and the prosecutor. In the case of the Russell Island trial, which was the creation of the member for Lytton (Mr Burns), two years of judicial time was taken up at enormous cost to the people of Queensland. Enormous complexity was involved in what was really an allegation of false pretences surrounding very localised land dealings. The Comfin Charters Towers trial, which led to convictions, involved the expense of three months of court time, apart from all the investigative time spent before that, merely to prove that accounts were false.

The time has come—one would have hoped that the Law Reform Commission's recent three-year exercise might have been a little bit more productive than it was—to consider permitting an extension of the use of expert evidence. That would allow investigators to use experts with appropriate qualifications to look at sets of accounts and company structures and relationships. After sighting the schedules and the documents that they have examined and after highlighting matters that they rely upon, they could then give their expert testimony. They would thus be able to depose to those matters in a much shorter time than three months. If the defence wants to attack that evidence, it can do so. It can attack the points made by the witness or even go beyond the matters that have been relied upon by the expert witness.

The extent of expert evidence is becoming too much for the human capacity of the tribunal and the human capacity of jurors. Far greater use will have to be made of expert witnesses. The law of evidence will have to be constantly reviewed to ensure that courts can accept evidence, properly collected, tabulated and presented, that is derived from modern electronic means of communication and the enormously complex documentary bases for modern company negotiations and transactions. The review must be carried out constantly.

Although this amendment is a very small matter in itself, I hope it indicates a willingness on the part of the Minister's department to constantly review the matter and to keep in mind the local experience and the sorts of developments that have become clear from the Costigan inquiry, the McCabe-Lafranchi report and others and to support any attempt to keep law enforcement abreast of the extension of law-breaking. Perhaps

much of the demand for national crime bodies and royal commissions comes out of that problem of gathering evidence. In those inquiries rational, legally trained people can arrive at a conclusion upon evidence which, in itself, in a court of law would be attacked as not being properly based. However, given the broader ambit and greater powers of inquiry, which are not strictly confined to the traditional bases of evidence, people frequently accept the findings of royal commissions and special commissions of inquiry. Perhaps it is that crucial basic difference between what is admissible as evidence in one and what is provable or admissible in a court of prosecution that really provides some of the pressure for special types of vehicles of inquiry.

Organised crime is extremely serious. White collar crime is also extremely serious. It must be tackled on all fronts and the prosecutors must be equal to the law-breakers.

Mr FITZGERALD (Lockyer) (3.6 p.m.): The speeches delivered this afternoon, particularly that of the Opposition spokesman, made it very clear that although a Bill may contain only two clauses, the debate can be wide-ranging so that an honourable member may refer to a number of his pet subjects that have little connection with the Bill.

The Bill is designed to facilitate the authorisation of a person to copy local government documents and for the documents to be admissible in court. It will facilitate justice, and local government officers will not be tied up by appearing in court. This is a simple Bill which, I am sure, will receive the support of the House.

I do not wish to refute or rebut any of the points made in the far-ranging discussions that have taken place, particularly those relative to affidavits sworn by certain persons.

If anyone swears an affidavit that is not true and correct, he may face the full weight of the law. Any such person who returns to the State will be dealt with accordingly, but I agree that, unless such a person has cost the tax-payers money, officers should not be charging round the world attempting extradition just to satisfy the whims of those who believe that every petty crook should be brought to justice.

The Bill is very short. It will enable a nominated local authority officer to be declared as an approved person for the purpose of making certified reproductions of official documents which shall be admissible in evidence without further proof. I am sure that it will receive the full support of the House.

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (3.8 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions. The honourable member for Wolston referred to Dr Shrian Oskar. I am quite sure that the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police, and the Commissioner for Police will take appropriate action in that case. It might be more appropriate for the honourable member to make his points to his Western Australian and Federal colleagues of his political ilk, who appear to have a far greater need than we do to have Mr Oskar questioned before their courts. When all is said and done, extradition must be initiated by the Federal Attorney-General.

The honourable member also referred to Land Bank Estates Pty Ltd, to which I referred recently in the House, and the part played in that company by Sir Wallace Rae. The honourable member is simply unable to claim, nor did he make the suggestion—and I thank him for that—that I, or the Government of which I am a member, acted with other than total responsibility in that matter. I am very mindful of my position as the State's chief law officer and of the responsibilities that that office carries. I can assure the honourable member and the House generally that appropriate decisions will be made by me, without fear or favour, about Dr Oskar, Sir Wallace Rae or anyone else. That is not only an assurance but a fact.

The member for Sherwood drew attention to the question of extradition and, although he has now left the Chamber, I point out for his benefit that recently I had a personal discussion with the Federal Attorney-General when I spent a couple of days with him. I discussed with Senator Evans the question of extradition and the possibility of hastening the procedures. It must be appreciated that it is a matter of international

agreement and, rightly, each nation reserves its right to determine whether a person should be extradited by another nation. I am sure that Australians would not want to find themselves in the position of having to agree to the extradition from Australia to a country which has philosophies that are totally different from ours of a person for actions in that country which would not stand up to the test that justice demands should be applied in a democracy such as Australia.

The honourable member for Sherwood also referred to the aborted Russell Island trial. Although he is absent from the Chamber, I inform him that the Law Reform Commission is looking into the problems of long jury trials, particularly those trials in which complex evidence is given. I expect to receive a working paper on that subject within the next few months.

It is obvious that advantages will be afforded to local authorities by the amendments in the Bill that is before the Chamber. In short, those advantages will be afforded to the community generally.

Motion (Mr Harper) agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

NATIONAL COMPANIES AND SECURITIES COMMISSION (STATE PROVISIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 4 April (see p. 2461, vol. 294) on Mr Harper's motion—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (3.14 p.m.): I propose to speak very briefly to this Bill. The Opposition is quite happy to accept it. It contains an important amendment. On numerous occasions in this Parliament we have discussed legislation relating to the National Companies and Securities Commission. On occasions, lengthy amendments have been made to the legislation, and on other occasions minor amendments have been made to it. This piece of legislation is complementary and has been drafted to dovetail into the legislation passed by the Federal Parliament. The Opposition has no objection to it.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (3.15 p.m.): I commence by saying that I agree with the Bill. However, as the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General said in his second-reading speech, the Bill raises the question of achieving uniformity across the nation in the administration of the National Companies and Securities Commision.

Mr Davis: Even you would be in favour of that.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I am not necessarily in favour of it for the sake of uniformity; and that is the point that I wish to make.

Some years ago, the State and Federal Attorneys-General faced a formidable task in trying to sort out the complicated arrangements that existed in the administration of corporations and companies. Three of the States, despite the protestation of the Federal ALP Government at the time, set about that task in a responsible manner. The States believed that they were entitled to undertake that responsibility.

The alternative course of action was that one piece of legislation from Canberra, which would have been framed in accordance with the philosophy of the socialist

Government of the day, would have been imposed upon Australia. A number of States, including Queensland, objected to that course. I am pleased that the States objected and that that one piece of legislation was not introduced, because a much better understanding of the administration of corporations in Australia resulted. It demonstrated quite clearly that, when the States work together in any particular area, problems can be solved for the benefit of the whole nation. As the Minister said, this Bill, and the next one to be debated, were drafted in an endeavour to keep in step with the philosophy that began some years ago when the States and the Commonwealth worked together. The Commonwealth eventually became involved in the preparation of legislation.

However, I warn the Minister that uniformity of legislation for the sake of uniformity has to be watched with a degreee of caution. Because of the Minister's public utterances of recent days, I am sure that he shares that view.

Mr Davis: One thing about you, Sir William, is that you are a flat-out old conservative.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I am not ashamed to be a conservative. I do know that the member for Brisbane Central is ashamed to be a socialist, because every time a raw nerve in the socialist cause is touched, he becomes very ashamed and walks away. So many of the ilk of the member for Brisbane Central do the same.

The correct operation of a Federal system under which the States contribute is illustrated in the development of this type of legislation in which the State and Federal Attorneys-General have worked together. Recently, however, the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General recommended that the remuneration of senior company executives should be made public. That information should remain private. It is rightly available to the Taxation Commissioner without reservation, and I am sure that all honourable members agree with that. However, that information is available to the Taxation Commissioner on the understanding that it remains private. That information is not available, through the Taxation Commissioner, to the Federal Minister. It remains private and secret and is a privileged communication between the tax-payer and the Taxation Commissioner. This proposal is a gross invasion of privacy and means the unnecessary publication of information that is of no benefit to the public at all. It is detrimental to the people whose affairs will be published. Because of the competitive nature of the fields in which these people work, it is also detrimental to the interests that the executives serve. This move by the socialist Governments to draft uniform legislation through the provisions of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General is very devious.

I am pleased that the present Attorney-General is resisting these changes. As Queensland has objected, I hope that it will not be forced to pass legislation to conform to uniform legislation. A stand must be made. When a policy decision contrary to the wishes of the majority of members in a State Parliament is arrived at, that State Parliament should object very strongly indeed. The fact that members of the Opposition, in line with their political philosophy, want something in particular is no basis for saying that this Parliament should adopt it. Indeed, the very fact that Opposition members want it is a very sound reason for our being wary of it.

Mr Davis interjected.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Aren't we in this country lucky that a couple of States do stand up for individual rights and for the freedoms of the individual? Aren't we lucky that a couple of States do not want to see everything handed over to one centralised Government? If that were done, members of the Opposition would be wiped out, because their philosophy is that this nation should not have State Parliaments, anyway. They would abolish both the Senate and the State Parliaments. They would take away the rights and privileges of people as fast as they could. Opposition members would be just the people who, if given an opportunity, would vote themselves out of office. Labor Party members did that once before, in 1922, and I am sure that they will do it again.

Mr Simpson: And after the people in a referendum said no.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: That is right.

I voice some words of caution about uniformity for uniformity's sake. I suggest that the Government and Parliament of Queensland should not go along with proposals that go far beyond the need for uniformity and intrude into traditional State affairs. I hope that companies that are registered in this State will not have to conform to those iniquitous provisions that the socialist States are anxious to insert into companies legislation.

Mr Davis: Why didn't you stand up for the share-holders in Weedmans? I had to stand up for them.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Is that right? Apparently the honourable member did not do a very good job. He cannot even have his wife elected as president of the ALP. She should change her campaign director.

This is not the first time that concern has been expressed in relation to companies. When the Queensland Parliament and Government agreed to go along with uniform legislation in relation to companies and securities, other people and I sounded a note of warning that we should beware of the uniformists, who quite often try to make uniformity a virtue. This great country can continue to go along without uniformity. In fact, one of Australia's great virtues is that on many matters there are differences of opinion. Some areas of Australia go ahead more rapidly than others because they do not wait for everyone else to catch up with them. Queensland is one such area; we do not have to wait for the heavy hand of socialism to catch up with us. Queensland can go ahead on its own without help from other States.

I should like to hear an expression of interest from the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General on this matter, I hope that he will resist this move by his fellow Attorneys-General, and I hope that he will indicate that this Parliament will not accede—nor, if it is only an administrative matter, will the Government accede—to this new proposal by the Attorney-General. I regard it as a gross invasion of privacy.

Mr SIMPSON (Cooroora) (3.24 p.m.): I rise to support the Minister in the presentation of this Bill.

Mr Davis: What would you know about companies?

Mr SIMPSON: Opposition members want to get rid of the States. Again this afternoon we heard that cry from them.

Mr D'Arcy interjected.

Mr SIMPSON: The member for Woodridge does not believe in the States.

A sad state of affairs exists. There are various ways in which uniformity can be achieved. Uniformity is important to trade, commerce and company law throughout the Commonwealth of Australia, and particularly in Queensland. However, it brings with it some undemocratic problems. Half a dozen Ministers will make a decision as to what changes ought to be made to the Companies (Administration) Act. The Queensland Parliament does not have the right to stop changes to the regulations. The Federal Parliament is placed in a similar position. The whole matter gets back to those Ministers making the decision.

I voice concern that, although the Opposition has no understanding of the operations of companies and how essential companies are for the smooth running of business in this country, Opposition members would be the first ones to propose such ridiculous amendments to uniform company law. The last speaker in this debate highlighted that matter. He referred to the benefits that directors might gain.

Sir William Knox: It is not just the directors they are talking about; it is all the senior executives.

Mr SIMPSON: The honourable member is correct.

Earlier this week, an honourable member remarked that that would not happen in Russia. In the first place, that would not happen because the companies would not exist.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr SIMPSON: The dictatorship of the Soviet Union, with which the honourable member and his comrades would agree, is something that worries me. I am worried that extremists in Canberra are governing this country. To see how extreme their views are, one needs only to examine the way in which they handle taxation matters. It is the envy of those who are successful. They believe in the Robin Hood theory of taxation—take from the rich and give to the poor.

One often hears from Opposition members remarks indicating their dislike of business, companies and success. That worries me. While those persons express such extreme views, uniform company legislation is at risk. The Minister is fully aware of that. I urge him to be mindful of the fact that Queensland should not agree to such uniform company legislation whilst those extreme views are expressed.

The public ought to be told what is going on. Everyone knows about the great con trick that took place in Canberra. As Marx said, they are the useful idiots to the cause who would agree with the consensus of opinion. They have been found to be foolish in what they have done. Opposition members should realise that that has not proved to be of benefit to the community. They need only look at the editorial in yesterday's "Australian"——

Mr Davis: What does it say?

Mr SIMPSON: The honourable member should read it.

Free market forces do not exist in the labour market to the detriment of the unemployed. Opposition members are not worried about the unemployed; they are worried only about the employed.

Mr Fouras: What do you want? To pay them $2 a day for odd jobs?

Mr SIMPSON: I know that the Opposition is a party to international agreements under which a person who is receiving unemployment benefits should not do any work for the money that he receives. The problems in this country are bound up with that attitude.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr SIMPSON: I know that it is hurting them. They would agree tomorrow with international agreements that would change our Constitution in the interests of achieving centralised government. That is the sort of uniformity they want. We will not have a bar of it in Queensland. We are fiercely private enterprise, not centralist socialist. We will carefully monitor this uniform company legislation to ensure that those who do not have the interests of business and productivity at heart will be brought to task. Otherwise, they would bring the structure of effective company business down in the gutter, which is where many of them came from.

The Bill provides for a simple amendment to be made to the legislation. It is straightforward and sensible. I am surprised that it was not corrected in the first place. In this instance, we intend to maintain uniformity. We hope that the socialists respect it, too.

Mr D'ARCY (Woodridge) (3.31 p.m.): Some weeks ago I was rather critical of the operation of property trusts in Australia. As an investment medium, property trusts cannot match the extravagant claims that have been made for them by their promoters and the investment advisers who sell shares in them.

Property trust profitability relies directly on the management and the quality of the property held. All going well, no reasonable investor can expect a return any greater than 8 or 9 per cent. That is the very top. In fact, some of the more responsible property

trust prospectuses, such as those of the National Mutual Property Trust and the Hooker Property Trust, which have recently been marketed, show that these are the real, expected returns from investment in property trusts.

I was rather disappointed this morning to hear the Minister attack "The Courier-Mail" financial writer, Brian Hale, over his handling and questioning of the listed Bartlett Property Trust. If, as Mr Hale has claimed, the Minister and his department have had a detailed number of questions from the National Companies and Securities Commission for the last four months and have failed to reply to the NCSC, it is indeed a serious charge. According to Mr Hale's information, the NCSC had requested detailed information on the Bartlett prospectus which was passed and authorised by the Minister's Corporate Affairs Commission. That being so, surely the Minister would have no difficulty answering the NCSC if all was above board and the CAC in Queensland was happy with the Bartlett prospectus.

The Minister's attack this morning on Brian Hale did nothing to answer the real problems raised. The Minister, in fact, put his own credibility in jeopardy when he stated that cordial relations existed between the NCSC and Queensland's CAC, and then attacked the leak that allowed Brian Hale to write his article.

The real problem for Queensland investors to which the Minister should be addressing himself is the long-term viability of the Bartlett Property Trust. Mr Bartlett may state that investors do not have to invest money in his trust, but Queenslanders should be able to trust the vetting of his prospectus by the Corporate Affairs Commission, and to my mind there are still many questions unanswered about the establishment of the Bartlett Property Trust.

Mr Bartlett's major property holding is in hotels. I have it on reliable information that, at the time of the formation of the Bartlett Property Trust, the Bartlett group of hotels owed the Queensland Government a substantial amount of money in unpaid licence fees. In fact, the amount mentioned—and the Minister might enlighten the House on this—ran into many millions of dollars.

Mr Davis: How would they get away with that?

Mr D'ARCY: I am aware that many hotels in this State pay the Licensing Commission a certain amount of money as interest on unpaid licence fees. However, it ought not be allowed to accumulate into millions of dollars. Mr Bartlett was virtually able to refinance his operation by listing a property trust on the stock exchange with a prospectus vetted by the Corporate Affairs Commission in Queensland.

Mr Veivers: That is incredible.

Mr D'ARCY: It is absolutely incredible. I would like the Minister to let us know the total amount owed prior to the trust's being formed.

The trust has already indicated that it will pay its first dividend of 2.14c per share for the first three months of trading, but I believe that will not be paid for many months—probably in October or November. A strong rumour is that a buy-back clause secures the current parity of the Bartlett group on the exchange. Bartlett's shares were over-subscribed at the time of launching and press reports at the time indicated that the Bartlett group held a very substantial number of those shares to ensure that it was over-subscribed on the market at the time of listing. It is strange that, with all the guarantees from that group, it can only maintain market parity, particularly as it is rumoured that there is a buy-back clause within the Bartlett organisation. One wonders what the true parity value of many unlisted stocks might be if they had to be tested by sale on the current market.

Brian Hale posed some interesting questions in the "Australian" on 31 May 1984 regarding the Bartlett Property Trust and posed some very serious questions for the Bartlett group which, according to its prospectus, used approximately $4m from the issue to buy land for redevelopment and resale. According to the prospectus, that investment was to return 35 per cent even in the first year. One wonders how unspecified

property developments could be bought, developed and sold for a profit of 35 per cent all in the first year. The buying and selling process alone takes a great deal of time, not to mention the time for the development stage. Having been involved in development, with all its delays and pitfalls, I wonder what miracles Mr Bartlett and his group can perform to make that result possible.

In the prospectus in question Mr Bartlett also states that, calculated on costs, the capital growth will be approximately 8.1 per cent per year for the first 10 years on the five properties that are to be held initially.

That does not take into account the $1.2m-odd establishment costs to be borne by the trust. Even on the group's own figures, the capital growth would be only 7.36 per cent and not 8.1 per cent.

The management fees of the trust must also be questioned. The manager receives an incentive fee of 50 per cent in excess of the 14c per unit per year and 20 per cent of the capital profits on the sale of any trust asset. The performance incentive might have been reasonable if such high establishment costs had not already been charged but if, as I suspect, the Bartlett shares are being held up on the market, one wonders whether the group will be able to meet its guarantee for the full five years. I now urge the Minister to quickly answer the queries raised by the NCSC regarding the Bartlett prospectus.

I will now turn to property trusts in general. From information available to me, in the next six to 12 months I expect a major collapse of some of the more questionable, unlisted property trusts. All the signs are there. It is not as if financial journalists in responsible magazines and newspapers throughout Australia have not been warning people; they have. In fact, in the last month or so there has been a crescendo of criticism of property trusts. For 12 months or more, Paul Coomb from "Rydges" has been crusading against the most fashionable of recent investments, the property trust. On Monday in "The Courier-Mail" Brian Hale stated—

> "This column's crusade against what initially appeared to be the excesses of some unlisted property trusts and advisers seems to have become more of a quixotic quest.
>
> Frankly, it's probably time to remove the 'some' from phrases about the number of questionable investment advisers in the total pool and simply state the reverse . . . some of them are honest. That doesn't necessarily mean that they are good—just that they are honest."

He went on to say—

> "The best bet for any would-be consulter of advisers is to shop around. Seek advice from a number of quarters, insist on written suggestions and, before accepting the advice and committing any funds, demand a written, signed and dated resume detailing just why the adviser feels money should be committed to specific investments."

The problem still relates to the Government's licensing of investment advisers. Some investment advisers seem to be hell-bent on improving the status of used car salesmen. These licences to plunder have done much more damage to the investment industry than anybody could ever have imagined. The lure of big commissions must colour the advice given by investment agents.

It is ridiculous for people to believe that investment advisers can be totally immune from such massive commissions. I know of one case in which an investment adviser recommended a single portfolio in a property trust for an investment of $150,000. The fees involved were—

$50 for the initial interview;

$100 for the portfolio advice; and

$9,000 for the agent as commission.

In that instance, the latter payment was received unbeknown to the client. The National Companies and Securities Commission and the Corporate Affairs Commission must recommend an end to this ridiculous licensing of investment advisers.

Valuation should also be of tremendous concern to the NCSC and the CAC. It is absolutely ridiculous to allow property valuations to form the basis of future profits. Even the Australian Institute of Valuers is disgusted with the performance of some trusts and companies that seem to be able to come up with a valuation that suits them but bears no relation to the sale price of the property.

In recent days, rumour and speculation have been abroad in Queensland about the property trusts in which Greg Chappell and Barry Maranta have been involved. It is a Queensland property growth trust managed by Northern Securities, of which Dr Llew Edwards is chairman.

It will be found that some underarm things are happening in property trusts. Queenslanders investing in property trusts with which some of these gentlemen are concerned should look very closely at them. I repeat that Dr Edwards is the current chairman of Northern Securities. Any responsible investor reading the "Business Review Weekly" from 8 to 14 September about the troubles of that property trust—that is the magazine which had on its front page the words "Trouble in Greg Chappell's property trust"—should have some idea of the problems involved. The investment adviser for that trust is United Capital. Responsible investors, after reading the "Business Review Weekly" would soon realise that Maranta, Chappell and Edwards, by breaking away from the more conservative Gunn and Stone, put at risk the future of that property growth trust.

Mr McPhie: Go on!

Mr D'ARCY: I am sure that the honourable member does not have much of his money invested in it.

Mr McPhie: You do not understand the business.

Mr D'ARCY: I do understand it.

Some serious allegations have been levelled at the modus operandi of Barry Maranta. The article in the "Business Review Weekly" stated that further tensions arose in April 1984, when Maranta wanted to make a bonus issue in Northern Security Management based on the valuation of the properties in the trust. The bonus issue would have increased the trust management income.

In all fairness, I must concede that it was a poorly organised trust. The matter would have had to go through the Minister's office, and the trust could not have operated successfully on the narrow margin on which it was operating. Obviously, the money was coming through United Capital. Stone and Gunn objected to the bonus issue because it was based on revaluations taken, in some cases, just one month after the buildings had been bought. No wonder Stone and Gunn, the more conservative gentlemen, objected to the modus operandi of Barry Maranta in wanting to revalue the businesses.

Stone and Gunn have taken over United Capital and have no direct links with the Queensland Property Growth Trust. "Business Review Weekly" believes that United Capital, the biggest provider of funds to the Queensland Property Growth Trust, will slow down its provision of funds to the trust. Stone and Gunn believe that any revaluations should be conservative and infrequent.

Dr Edwards, Mr Chappell and Mr Maranta must be asked just how much of the business in the property trust area is based on real economic growth and wise investment. Some of the rumours are horrific.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr D'ARCY: Dr Edwards could only refer to paper profits. Look at Evans Deakin Industries and certain other dealings. Is the property trust based on real economic growth and wise investment, or only on unsaleable property at valuation?

As all honourable members know, the property market has been falling for some time. It is still fluctuating wildly. It is a fact of life that property being bought by many trusts can return only 3 per cent to 4 per cent after rates, charges, management fees and gearing costs are met. Costs are involved with changes of tenancies and reorganisation of buildings, and time also takes its toll.

In fact, it is my considered opinion that unsound property trusts are going out backwards. People would be wise to look at all facets of development in property trusts before investing in any of them. If there is to be a collapse in the property trust markets, guarantees of resale or re-buys by the trust, on which the CAC and the NCSC have insisted, will not be worth the paper on which they are printed. No real provision has been made for a mass exodus from that area of investment.

I have tried to warn investors about the current ills within the property trust market. Financial journalists throughout Australia have been doing the same thing. It is time that investors were given fair warning about the problems facing the property trust industry.

I do not think that anybody wants a panic in the market, and that is not what I am trying to achieve. After all, about $3,000m is invested in the property trust market in this country. I am pointing out that it is the small investor who is in jeopardy, the white-collar sharks being the only real beneficiaries.

There are plenty of solid investments in the market, and investors should learn to spread their portfolios. That is a fair warning, and it should be repeated by the CAC and the NCSC.

I must look also at the roles of the NCSC and the CAC in the whole matter of property trusts. I am thankful that both bodies are concerned about the investor and have continued to strengthen their regulations. Many of the new regulations and those that are pending will do a lot to drive the unscrupulous operator out of the market.

The tightening by the NCSC last April of prospectuses and the curtailment of extravagant claims was welcome. The pending amendment, under which investment advisers can be sued where advice is not based on factual information, will also be welcome.

I have spoken privately to the Minister. I appreciate the fact that he is concerned that any collapse in the market would affect the small investor. He has been very helpful in pushing and supporting changes in the NCSC. He is fair dinkum in what he is doing, and praise should be given where it is due.

I am concerned also about one other area that comes under the CAC, and that is time-sharing as an investment. Time-sharing is one of the most dangerous investments. In fact, it is no investment at all. Because this is a fairly new area, the CAC has had difficulty in dealing with some of the prospectuses. Time-sharing as an investment has worked in some areas, but only for a very limited period.

One property that was developed for time-sharing was bought for $10m. Under the time-sharing arrangement, the total sale price was $30m. The benefits went to the management company, not to the time-sharing investors.

I am concerned about two time-sharing developments in Queensland. This week, a full-page prospectus for the Tangalooma development has appeared in the press. The prospectus has been passed by the CAC. Recently, I visited Tangalooma and inspected the dining-rooms and bars. They are very old facilities; they have been there for a long time. I question some of the claims in the prospectus. It refers to a 99-year commitment. That is valid only if the Government renews some of the leases.

There are massive problems. What happens when the property has to be refurbished? That is very costly in the tourist industry. For example, carpets do not last longer than

18 months. Those costs will be borne by the time-sharer, the person who, in real terms, owns the property. As time passes, those costs will increase considerably. The ordinary investor in time-sharing does not know what he is getting himself into.

I sought the prospectus for the Voyager development on the Gold Coast. The management company has built extra facilities, such as restaurants, for that development; but they are the property of the management company, not of the time-sharers. That must worry everybody associated with these so-called investments. They are not investments as such.

I have with me the so-called propectus for the Voyager project on the Gold Coast. Although I thought that I was writing away for a prospectus, what I received was not really a prospectus at all. I notice that it is called an information kit rather than a propectus, and it is full of goodies, propaganda and glossy photographs. It is an example of the rubbishy packages that investors are receiving; it is not what they need in order to invest properly. The Corporate Affairs Commission has approved the prospectus, but it is not being sent out to prospective investors.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr D'ARCY: I am saying that it is not an investment. In a vast majority of cases, some aspect of the propectus is not in conformity with normal business practice.

It is a bit difficult to say that all property trusts are rorts; one cannot put them all under one umbrella. The industry needs to be looked at very closely, and I do not envy the job of the CAC which has to sort out the sheep from the goats in the industry. Most of the property trusts are run by operators and managers who have set out directly to make a profit for management and no profits, but, in the long term, drama, for the investors.

Another concern of mine in the time-share industry is the suggestion that an investor's holiday can be spent anywhere in the world by a transfer arrangement. That is just not so. In most cases the cost of transfers cannot be met by ordinary Australians. The companies offering those packages do not have the link-up that is claimed; it is only a telex arrangement in a total tourist package. That is just not acceptable. The transfer arrangement can be made only if the investor's time-sharing week can be sold for a week in the other unit of the investor's choice. What happens is that the company charges commission on the overseas holiday package that the investor has bought and, at the same time, takes the rents and the commission out of what the investor has paid on his own unit. In real terms, very little money is left for the time-sharer.

I know, having spoken to the Minister, that he is aware of the problems in the industry. I agree with the point made by the member for Nundah and the member for Cooroora that some of the problems occur because of the centralised nature of the industry. Every Government in Australia has an input into the National Companies and Securities Commission and, at times, moves are made only as fast as the slowest member of the commission allows. I will not make political comment, because Queensland is not, and has not been, the only State in which problems have arisen. I am well aware of that.

These abnormalities must be cleared up from the Australian business scene, because they are pretty rough on small investors. Both property trusts and time-share arrangements can be unsafe investments, and many small investors are putting their money in jeopardy. They must be warned. There will be failures in the industry in the next six months, and I will not be surprised if some of the big property trusts fail. Recently, one property trust—I will not mention its name—picked up a failure in Western Australia. As a financial adviser commented, it would be like being picked up by the Titanic on its maiden voyage.

Hon. W. D. LICKISS (Mount Coot-tha) (3.55 p.m.): I rise to support the Bill, because it expands a provision that was rather narrow beforehand. The Bill is a worthy

one, because previously the legislation's scope was too narrow and it applied only to answers to questions.

I wish to cover a slightly wider field, because some criticism has been levelled at the National Companies and Securities Commission. Some honourable members have felt that the State, by entering into this arrangement, has given away some of its sovereignty. However, it must be remembered that Australia is a federation comprising States and Territories and Federal and State Governments and it was necessary to develop a national companies and securities regulatory system.

As the Minister responsible for four of the years of the formative stages of this legislation, I believe that honourable members might like to know some of the problems that were faced before this scheme was conceived and was seen through the various Parliaments in legislation.

For some time during my term as Minister for Justice and that of Sir William Knox, we worked on a system of mirror legislation. Not all States were participating States. Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland were the participating States, and the other States played along somewhere in line with what the eastern States were trying to do. However, we were nowhere near uniformity in relation to the corporation and securities industry.

Largely as a result of agitation in the Federal Parliament to play a role in the corporate field, it was decided that a national outlook should be adopted towards this industry. Unfortunately, the early indications from the Federal Government were that it ought to legislate under its corporation powers and virtually go it alone. If that had happened, the Federal Government, as the Government that was solely responsible, would have controlled the corporation and securities industry in Australia.

As corporation law had always been the prerogative of the States, the State Attorneys-General met with the Commonwealth and decided that a better system must be introduced. So it was decided that a form of co-operative federalism be evolved—in my view, for the first time—to see what could come out of it. Under the circumstances, the result has been very satisfactory.

As an indication of the bona fides of the Federal Government, it decided that it would legislate not under its corporation powers but under its territory powers. Therefore, it would virtually place itself in a parallel situation with that of the States, with it looking after its Territories and the States looking after themselves. Therefore, the Commonwealth would legislate under its Territory powers and the States would legislate under their sovereign powers. That would result in a uniform system known as the national companies and securities legislation.

We have seen an exercise in co-operative federalism. It should indicate to Australia that common sense can prevail to make the federal system work. Those people whose political philosophy is that the centralisation of power is the way that Australia should go might learn something from what can be done and what has been done with this co-operative scheme, this national companies and securities legislation. The manner in which the State Ministers, with their varying political backgrounds, were able to sit down with their Commonwealth counterpart and work out the system was indicative more of the way in which statesmen should meet than of the way in which politics should be played.

I agree with the attitude that the Minister has adopted. He wants to see the federal system work. He does not want to see creep in those socialist or other political outlooks that would run counter to a scheme that I believe is working very well. So I support the Bill. Given the chance to work, the system will work, and it will be for the benefit of Australia.

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (4 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions. I was pleased to hear the honourable member for Nundah support the stand that I took recently at the ministerial council meeting relative to proposals supported by all other States. It was with a great

deal of concern and, I suppose, displeasure that the proposals in that regard were supported by all other States, including Tasmania. I thought that that was most unfortunate.

The members of this Assembly can rest assured that I will not make recommendations to my Government for the adoption of legislation to achieve unformity merely for the sake of uniformity. I assure the member for Cooroora that I am aware of his concern about the radical initiatives being developed by the Opposition's Canberra colleagues, or Canberra comrades. Decisions at ministerial council meetings are made by State Governments, through their ministerial representatives, and that has given me faith in the system.

The member for Mount Coot-tha alluded to the fact that we are able, particularly in closed sessions of ministerial council, to sit in a room together as Ministers representative of all political factions throughout Australia and come to agreement and understanding. I pay tribute to the other Ministers involved. I have found those meetings to be extremely beneficial to an understanding of each other's point of view.

The member for Woodridge referred to property trusts. I record my appreciation of his interest in, and his understanding of that area of business. He is probably aware that I initiated discussion on this particular subject at the recent meeting in Darwin of the ministerial council. As he mentioned to the House, he has had previous discussion with me at a personal level. I understand his concern and he understands my attitude to it. So it was that I initiated discussion by the other Ministers. At that meeting it was agreed that strong action should be taken and implemented by the National Companies and Securities Commission. Instructions in very clear terms were given to the NCSC by the Ministers comprising the ministerial council. At the time of the meeting I issued a media statement.

The honourable member for Woodridge referred also to the Bartlett Property Trust. I state clearly to the House that the statement that I made this morning was not intended to be a personal attack on Mr Hale. It is not my policy to attack people. The statement was more a denial of Mr Hale's suggestions. I did not respond in a like vein to a previous article by him a short time ago. However, when that particular article was again published and his theme was expanded, I considered that I had an obligation to correct the incorrect inference being made by a journalist of quite justifiable repute.

The honourable member for Woodridge also referred to time-sharing. Time-sharing is a new industry that has more importance to Queensland than some other States. As was suggested by the honourable member, perhaps that is one of the reasons why the NCSC and the ministerial council has tended to move more slowly than I and Queensland would wish. However, all Governments throughout Australia have been grappling with the problems of ensuring that prospectuses for time-sharing arrangements adequately explain the rights and responsibilities of investors.

Queensland, though, because of its interest in the subject, is moving towards the preparation of its own legislation in this field, which will act as a model for the rest of Australia. Because of the complexity of the problems that have to be tackled, it is neccessary that all factors be given careful consideration.

Through the NCSC the ability exists to take urgent action to control improper time-sharing promotions, and on that matter I invite the honourable member for Woodridge, any other honourable member or any member of the public to bring to my attention infringements of the law relating to prospectuses or—and the honourable member for Woodridge referred to this—any form of information kit being issued in lieu of a prospectus. I assure the House that, when any type of infringement is identified, the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs will take appropriate action on the available evidence.

The very purpose of this amendment is to give the commission power to summons witnesses and to take evidence.

Motion (Mr Harper) agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

COMPANIES (ADMINISTRATION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 4 April (see p. 2474, vol. 294) on Mr Harper's motion—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (4.8 p.m.): Once again, I will speak very briefly to the amendment. A series of amendments has been made to the Companies (Administration) Act over the years, some of which were important. Others, though important, were basically only complementary legislation. The amendment before us provides that the Minister will be able to designate in writing which deputy commissioner shall act as the commissioner, on a part-time basis, in the absence of the commissioner, through illness or perhaps even through death. It also aims at reducing or waiving fees on security documents executed in connection with loans made under the industry and small business flood-relief schemes.

The Opposition has no objection to the proposed amendments, and intends to support them.

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (4.10 p.m.), in reply: I thank the Opposition for its support of the Bill.

Motion (Mr Harper) agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 4, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

IMPERIAL ACTS APPLICATION BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 4 April (see p. 2475, vol. 294) on Mr Harper's motion—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (4.12 p.m.): I will be fairly brief, but I should make a couple of comments. When I first read the legislation, although it did not excite me in any shape or form, it rather intrigued me, and that led me to undertake some research. I was intrigued to find out what type of documentation covered such things as crimes by Governors of colonies, the Criminal Jurisdiction Act of 1802, the Commissariat Act of 1821 and the Slave Trade Act of 1824. I obtained a copy of certain sections of the Slave Trade Act and if I really wanted to make a full speech I could probably say that it is just as well that this legislation still exists because, knowing the attitude of the Queensland Government, without it one would not hold much hope for the Aboriginal people of the State. The Act covers such areas as penalties in relation to slaves and deals with slaves on the high seas and other matters.

If my understanding is correct, because of laws that go back many centuries, an Act of the British Parliament would be required to amend these pieces of legislation. I find it very archaic in this day and age that the people of Queensland do not have the right to amend any of those pieces of legislation.

I also took the trouble to look through the legislation that will be left in operation, such as the Habeas Corpus Act. I do not think that anybody has any significant arguments about the Magna Carta or its historical significance.

One of the matters that we are dealing with appealed to my sense of humour. I refer to the Princess Sophia Precedence Act which, I understand, will remain in force. That Act was passed to preserve the rights of precedence of Princess Sophia, her sons and the heirs of her body. It relates to marriage and areas of succession, which I find quite intriguing to read. I read it with some mirth in the knowledge that a certain amount of paranoia seems to exist on the Government side about historical connections with the Crown, heirs of the Crown and the United Kingdom which I do not think have much relevance to matters that we should be discussing in this Parliament.

If I wanted to I could deliver an hour's speech on this matter because it has historical significance, but I prefer to use the time of this Parliament and my party to talk about issues such as unemployment and the cost of living. With that thought in mind I indicate that the Opposition will accept the amendments.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (4.16 p.m.): This is very significant legislation, although the Opposition spokesman tended to discount it. However, it is not surprising that the socialists should try to discount such legislation. They are always very reluctant to admit that we owe anything to the House of Commons, the Parliament which virtually founded the Parliaments in this nation. I do not know why Opposition members should be reluctant to admit that we owe a debt to the Mother of Parliaments. We are indeed fortunate that the colonies as they existed, and the States as they became in 1901, had the benefit of existing legislation.

The Minister told us in his opening remarks that it was necessary, for historical purposes, to reinforce our support for some of the legislation that existed prior to Queensland's becoming a State. However, the matter goes a little deeper than that. The schedule relating to the legislation that is to remain in force refers to Magna Carta and the Petition of Right. They were famous documents which resulted in major reforms in ultimate parliamentary democracy.

We are very fortunate in this country that we did not have to re-invent the wheel so far as parliamentary democracy was concerned. It was there because of the legislation that we inherited from another place and embraced. We are not the only country in the British Commonwealth to have done so. Many others acted in the same way. Our neighbouring country, Papua New Guinea, did exactly the same. Papua New Guinea was saved enormous time and research. It adopted Imperial Acts which this State had adopted, and it also adopted legislation that this State created. Sir Samuel Griffith created our Criminal Code, and Papua New Guinea adopted it. No doubt it amended the code to suit its circumstances in the same way as we have amended the Criminal Code to suit changing circumstances.

Although it may be so many words to many people and although the socialists prefer to discount the debt that we owe to the Mother of Parliaments, it should not go unnoticed that when we make rare changes of this type, we have a chance to acknowledge the great heritage of legislation, principles, rights and parliamentary democracy that has been ours almost as of right since the foundation of the State and the foundation of this Parliament. We have been able to build on that legislation and amend it to meet the circumstances of the day, for ever being able to preserve the rights of individuals in the community because other people discovered what was necessary and legislated for it.

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (4.20 p.m.), in reply: I thank the honourable members for Nundah and Wolston for their

contributions. The repeal of the Imperial enactments detailed in this Bill will significantly progress the revision of statute law in Queensland.

The member for Wolston is quite correct when he says that we on this side of the Chamber are jealous of our direct association, as a sovereign State, with the Crown of England. We resist, and we will continue to resist to the best of our ability, the attempts by the Opposition's comrades in Canberra to turn our great nation of Australia into a socialist republic.

Motion (Mr Harper) agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 14, and First to Third schedules, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

REVOCATION OF STATE FOREST AREAS

Hon. W. H. GLASSON (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police) (4.24 p.m.): I move—

"(1) That this House agrees that the proposal by the Governor in Council to revoke the setting apart and declaration as State Forest under the Forestry Act of:—

(a) All those pieces or parts of State Forest 561, parish of Bribie described as Areas 'A', 'B', 'C', 'D' and 'E' as shown on plan FTY 1079 prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the office of the Conservator of Forests and containing in total an area of about 130.775 hectares; and

(b) All that piece or part of State Forest 1239, parishes of Kenilworth and Maroochy described as Area 'A' as shown on plan FTY 1255 prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the office of the Conservator of Forests and containing an area of about 200 hectares; and

(c) All those pieces or parts of State Forest 451, parishes of Coloola and Womalah described as Areas 'A' and 'B' as shown on plan FTY 1245 prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the office of the Conservator of Forests and containing in total an area of about 89.8 hectares; and

(d) All those pieces or parts of State Forest 168, parishes of Bendidee and Moongoon described as Areas 'A' and 'B' as shown on plan FTY 1254 prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the office of the Conservator of Forests and containing in total an area of 325.4 hectares; and

(e) All that piece or part of State Forest 229, parish of Domville described as portion 64, parish of Domville as shown on plan Dy. 1055 deposited in the office of the Department of Mapping and Surveying and containing an area of 5.823 hectares; and

(f) All that piece or part of State Forest 28, parishes of Bailey, Bingmann, Clonmel, Coominglah, Coppin, Rawbelle and Selene, as shown on plan Rw. 859 deposited in the office of the Department of Mapping and Surveying and containing an area of 560.1 hectares; and

(g) All that piece or part of State Forest 18, parish of Moultrie described as portion 13, parish of Moultrie as shown on plan Lr. 110 deposited in the office of the Department of Mapping and Surveying and containing an area of 1 174 hectares; and

(h) All that piece or part of State Forest 242, parish of Widgee described as Area 'A' as shown on plan FTY 1248 prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the office of the Conservator of Forests and containing an area of 2.308 hectares; and

(i) All that piece or part of State Forest 608, parishes of Japoon and Mourilyan contained within stations 3-4-5-6-7-8-9-10-11-3 on plan Mr. 7084 deposited in the office of the Department of Mapping and Surveying and containing an area of 4.512 hectares,

be carried out.

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

Notice of the revocations from these State forests, numbering nine in all, was given in this House on 28 August 1984. They relate to parcels of land that are used for various purposes by adjoining private land-holders who have grazing rights. Some revocations are for additions to national parks and some cover areas in which water storage facilities have been built. An explanation of the changes to the nine parcels of land was provided with the proposal for the revocation. I have nothing to add at this stage.

Mr GOSS (Salisbury) (4.25 p.m.): The details of the proposal were given to me earlier today by the Minister, and I thank him for that. Speaking for myself and for other Opposition members, I say that I place considerable reliance and weight upon the recommendations that have been made by the Conservator of Forests. I do that because of what I perceive as his genuine interest in responsible forest management.

It is difficult for anyone who does not know of the properties and sites in question to really assess the proposal. The Opposition feels that, with confidence, it can place reliance upon the recommendation of the Conservator of Forests and upon the information that has been put before the House by the Minister. Notwithstanding that, from the maps, the reasons that have been advanced for the revocation, and the history of the properties involved and the adjacent properties, it would appear reasonable that these proposals be agreed to.

The first two parcels of land dealt with in the proposal will be inundated by the construction of dams, including the Ewen Maddock Dam. The Minister, in a brief explanation of the proposal, indicated that the Forestry Department felt loath to consider releasing State forest land, but I am sure that all honourable members would recognise that the public interest must sometimes overcome such feelings. The need for a viable and reliable water supply for the rapidly growing areas covered by the proposal is obviously something that cannot be ignored, and great heed must be paid to it.

The third parcel of land referred to is to be included in the adjacent Cooloola National Park. That is a positive and worthwhile step. It is important, given the interest in these precious forest areas, to have information centres to cater for park visitors. I can see no basis on which anyone could object to that proposal.

It is also reassuring to note that the recent program of zoological research into the rainbow lorikeet population will be safeguarded, and appropriate arrangements will be made to ensure that that research continues.

As to a number of the other parcels of land in the proposals, it appears to me that the moves are generally reasonable and that appropriate arrangements have been made between the respective applicants and the Crown as to their various rights and the costs involved. Generally, of that land which is to remain in leasehold tenure, the timber resources will remain in the Crown estate. As I understand the proposal, agricultural development is the preferred usage for these particular properties.

It is on the basis of those comments and the material and the assurances given by the Minister and the conservator that I do not oppose the motion. I accept the arguments that have been put forward by the Minister.

Mr COMBEN (Windsor) (4.29 p.m.): I support the comments made by the shadow Minister about the revocation proposal. The short time available to realistically appraise the proposal has meant that members of the Opposition, who would have otherwise checked on the comments made by the Conservator of Forests, have been unable to do so. I must accept on face value, as did my colleague, the word of the Conservator of Forests.

I cast no aspersions on him. In fact, I compliment the Minister for the quality of his staff in the forestry areas. He knows that recently I wrote to him thanking him for the trip that I had to the Downey Creek area, where I was taken round by the district forester, Tom Just. He did an excellent job in representing the Forestry Department's viewpoint and that of the Minister. Although he and I agreed to differ on a substantial number of issues, I compliment him and other officers of his calibre under the control of the Minister.

Without having had time to visit the areas concerned, it is difficult to comment on some of the specific proposals outlined in the motion.

Generally speaking, the reasons put forward by the Minister in support of his motion seem to be sound. However, it is very hard to understand the reasons for the revocation dealt with in paragraph (c) of the motion, which deals with the revocation of two areas, of a total area of about 89.8 ha, in State Forest 451, parishes of Cooloola and Womalah. Much was made of the fact that zoologists have been researching the rainbow lorikeet population in that region. Trees within the proposed excision area, because of their sheltered location, are used at times by flocks of those birds for roosting purposes. I find that to be a rather odd reason for protecting this area. It contrasts sharply with the policy adopted in areas such as Downey Creek and the platypus frog area, in which forestry operations have continued. The flora and fauna of those areas will be affected substantially. Suddenly, the effects on one of the largest rainbow lorikeet populations in the State are taken into account. I find that to be somewhat inconsistent with the Government's policy in relation to other areas.

Governments should be creative Governments in all aspects, including their attitude to natural, renewable resources. Therefore, there is a need to examine the question of whether the Forestry Department should be revoking any parts of any State forests, whether or not they have already been cleared. Certainly, no question arises if State forests are about to be inundated by water. However, simply because a State forest area has already been grazed or because the worth of its timber is fairly low is not sufficient reason for revoking it. A good deal of creative work can be done.

I do not have to remind the Minister of the Federal Government's allocation in its last Budget to the re-greening of Australia, which is tree-planting. The reasons why there need to be trees have been well documented. Farmers have for a long time been under considerable economic pressure from people trying to convince them that the best thing to do in any sort of resource management is to remove all the tree cover. It is necessary to convince farmers that it is, in fact, profitable to plant trees. Farmers always have a good deal to contend with. Obviously, with modern machinery, it is easier to work large areas of cleared land than small patches. However, large tracts of land are more at risk than small areas surrounded by trees. Wind speeds across large tracts of land are higher than those across small areas, the soil in large tracts dries out more quickly and, when it is dry and unstable, it blows away easily.

The Forestry Department should be using areas such as those referred to in the motion to show farmers what they should be doing. That is a creative task that the Government could take upon itself to carry out, and it is one that the Forestry Department should be performing.

Many wooded areas of Queensland are under threat. Besides the Conondale Range, Daintree and Downey Creek areas, massive areas of the mulga and gidgee country in the west are being cleared for farming or grazing purposes. When in the 1960s I worked as a labourer on the land, brigalow was the constant scourge of the land-holder; it was

everywhere. A few months ago I went back to central Queensland, and I found that no stand of brigalow anywhere in central Queensland exceeds 20 000 acres.

The economic benefit or benefit to the natural environment of those areas is not fully understood, so Australia should be re-greened as much as possible to show the farmers that trees are a valuable asset. I hope that, in future, forestry areas will be used as experimental plots to make farmers aware of the importance of trees.

Whilst I am referring to experimental plots and the excision of some areas, let me say that it would surely be of benefit to the Forestry Department to consider the planting of rain forests. I know that some experiments were carried out in the late '40s. However, we haved moved a long way from those times. I ask the Minister to look at some stage at some of the more modern experiments and suggestions.

In general, it is obvious from the reasons given and the trust vested in the Conservator of Forests that the areas, which are mainly small areas, should be revoked. As the Opposition spokesman on forestry matters said, it is not something that the Opposition would necessarily do in those particular areas. It would look at forestry overall, the future of forestry in this State and the future of forested areas in general.

Motion (Mr Glasson) agreed to.

MOTOR VEHICLE DRIVING INSTRUCTION SCHOOL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 28 August (see p. 263) on Mr Lane's motion—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (4.36 p.m.): At a time when road safety is of great worry and concern to all within our community, even minor amendments to Acts that have any relationship whatsoever to that subject should be closely scrutinised. In this case, the proposed amendments make sense. Penalties should be regularly upgraded to ensure that they are a proper form of deterrent.

The other two changes to the Act make sure that there is flexibility to cope with changing standards and that those standards are properly incorporated into vehicles used for driver instruction. It also gives powers of inspection to authorised officers of the department, which seemed to me to be a major omission from the Act. For this reason, Parliament has a responsibility to examine the operations of this legislation controlling motor vehicle driving instruction schools in this State since it was introduced almost 15 years ago.

One of the most common accusations that members of Parliament hear from their constituents is that of collusion between some owners of driving schools and officers of the Transport Department or police officers who conduct driver's licence tests. A driving school in a major provincial city was, and may still well be, owned by the wife of a Transport Department testing officer.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr CASEY: I realise that the Minister for Transport is not present. I know that the Leader of the House is looking for him. I wish him luck. The Minister has been used to getting up hollow logs for most of his life, and the Leader of the House will experience some difficulty in finding him. If I were the Leader of the House, I would send my scouts through the main entrance to look for him, because I think that is the direction in which he headed.

As I said, a driving school in a major provincial city was, and may still well be, owned by the wife of a Transport Department testing officer.

Allegations have been made of special payments in return for a favourable test for certain driving school pupils. As usual, it is very difficult to get the persons who have made those allegations to come forward and to present convincing evidence as most of them do not want any trouble with their licence. They usually claim a fear of retaliation.

Mr Kaus: It is hard to prove.

Mr CASEY: As the member for Mansfield said, it is hard to prove. People are fearful that they will get into trouble with their licence. All honourable members know how easy it is for a member of the police force to cause the loss of a person's licence if he is down on that person.

For the reasons that I have mentioned, the department should appoint special inspectors to investigate and report on motor driving instruction schools prior to their licences being renewed.

The Minister has finally entered the Chamber. I told the Leader of the House that he would come from the direction of the main entrance. The Minister has some good officers who have been taking notes while he was absent.

Some driving schools virtually guarantee their pupils a licence after a specified number of lessons irrespective of the standard of the pupil and his or her ability to comprehend the laws and rules governing the operations of a motor vehicle. That must be examined very closely.

I believe that the operation and maintenance of a motor vehicle should be a compulsory school subject for, at least, all Year 11 and 12 students. Seventeen has become the magical age for young people—the time they yearn for, when they can get behind the wheel and out on the roads. Half a dozen driving lessons really only equip them with the skills necessary to undertake a driving test. They certainly do not enable them to understand all of the complex problems they will meet before they become experienced drivers. Driving schools do not teach their pupils about maintenance of a motor vehicle; yet knowledge of what can go wrong and the use of the senses of smell, hearing and feeling in the early detection of vehicle problems are most important for every driver.

The control that a driver must have over a motor vehicle in all classes of road and weather conditions is another important skill that all drivers must attain. Who has ever heard of an applicant for a driver's licence being tested at night? No-one! Most drivers operate as much by night as they do by day, yet in the main they receive no real night driver training before they are licensed to go out on the roads with the full authority to drive at night.

If the Government intends to get fair dinkum about road safety, these are some of the matters that have to be addressed. Everyone knows that the highest proportion of deaths on the roads is in our 17 to 25 year-old age group, yet they are still taught in the same way they have been for years. That is why there ought to be emphasis on education through the school curriculum. Driver training ought to be a compulsory subject, because all students will become drivers.

The Government skites about the way in which the education system has been modified to include modern technology. Our children are taught the skills to operate computers, yet when they leave school most of them will use those developed skills only to play video games. However, every one of them, as soon as the magical age of 17 is reached, will be behind the wheel of a motor vehicle with as few as six driving lessons.

I call upon the Government to set up a special group comprising representatives from at least the Transport Department, the Police Department and the Education Department to prepare a curriculum for schools on operating, driving and maintaining a motor vehicle, as a compulsory subject. It would be a first that Queensland could be really proud of and one that would help to provide a long-term solution to some of our road-toll problems.

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (4.42 p.m.): I could not allow the occasion to pass without commenting on driver instruction schools and courses. The member for Mackay, who preceded me, referred to that subject. I reiterate that Gympie has a driver education centre. It was originally established and operated by rotary clubs, which went to a great deal of trouble and expense to teach young people how to handle a vehicle and to assess their capabilities as drivers in an off-road location.

I join the member for Mackay in advocating that the concept be expanded through the Education Department. I realise the problem encountered by the department in attempting to include too many courses in a curriculum. However, in my opinion, pre-driver education is imperative. Such a course could be operated successfully at a TAFE college.

Mr Lee: You have a very good driver training centre in your electorate.

Mr STEPHAN: I thank the member for Yeronga. It is particularly good. The concept has been expanded. An administration block has been constructed and a permanent instructor/organiser is on the pay-roll. As well, there is a part-time instructor. If ever there was a time for the registration of driving schools, it is now.

Even if one life can be saved through improved driver training, that is a tremendous benefit. The saving of lives on the roads brings untold benefits to the community at large.

Both younger and older people can be instructed to better control their vehicles. People must realise that instruction for young people can commence in the school system. I am encouraged to learn that recognition has been given to the fact that driving schools should be registered and need to operate under guide-lines that ensure that pupils are instructed in a reasonable manner.

I must again point out the benefits of the off-the-road training that is provided at the driver training centre that has been constructed just outside Gympie. At the moment a passing lane approximately one kilometre in length and a skid-pan of over 100 yards are being constructed.

Driver training instruction must be given to drivers of heavy vehicles, which tend to take up a large part of the road. The number of heavy vehicles that use the State's roads is increasing, and I wonder how many drivers of heavy vehicles have ever had any real instruction before getting behind the wheel of a semi-trailer or a truck with a number of "dogs" behind it.

The drivers of heavy vehicles must know their handling characteristics, such as the length of road needed to stop them. A great deal of concentration is required to drive a heavy vehicle.

Those who have been convicted of driving without due care and attention sometimes need to be instructed on how to handle their vehicle. Off-road training centres and registered driving schools help in that regard and the community knows full well that the instructors are able and willing to pass on their expertise. An encouraging fact is that those who have breached the road laws can be asked to attend the driver training centre at Gympie and receive some benefit from the courses. Even if the people concerned know how to handle their vehicles, the course will still benefit them.

I compliment the Minister and the Government on their initiative in relation to the registration of driving schools in an effort to ensure that there is a uniformity of standard of instruction throughout the State. Hopefully this is yet another step towards reducing the road toll, which is currently causing so much concern in the country.

Hon. D. F. LANE (Merthyr—Minister for Transport) (4.48 p.m.), in reply: The comments of both honourable members have been sound in their content and I am happy to acknowledge their correctness.

In speaking about a full and comprehensive driver training scheme for high school students as part of the school curriculum, the honourable member for Mackay is merely

echoing something that has been said many times before. Of course, that is the ultimate and most desirable way to teach young people to drive. Obviously, one of the most important things needed to maintain good standards of driving with emphasis on road safety is a proper and well structured driver training course with high quality instruction. An ideal way to do that is to include driver training in the school curriculum. It is the most desirable way to go. However, it would be enormously expensive and time-consuming. It would demand a large structure and administration to establish it. I am sorry to say that it is beyond the capacity of the Government to manage such a comprehensive course at this time. That is not to say that no courses are available for students. Courses are conducted by enthusiastic volunteers and keen schoolteachers who give their time when the facilities are available to implement ideas along the lines suggested by the honourable member.

One place where that happens was mentioned by the honourable menber for Gympie. He spoke about the training track and scheme of instruction conducted in his district. The Gympie scheme is excellent. It is assisted and funded by service clubs. Teachers from the schools are involved in the training program, and the students benefit greatly from it. It is one of the few places in the State where a track of such high standard is maintained and made available to students. The people of Gympie are to be complimented on the good example that they have set to the rest of the State.

I acknowledge quite readily what was said by the two honourable members. It would be pleasing if, in return, they both acknowledged the sound work carried out under the defensive-driving course. It is run comprehensively throughout the State by volunteer instructors working under the supervision of officers of the Queensland Road Safety Council. For people who are interested in perfecting their driving and behaviour in motor vehicles, the defensive-driving course adds the finer touches. It is acknowledged in Australia and around the world as one of the best schemes of driver instruction available. I invite the many honourable members who are interested in it to maintain their interest, and to encourage others to take the course provided by the Queensland Road Safety Council.

The Bill provides for a better system of supervision and inspection of driving-instruction schools—that is, the commercial enterprises—which teach so many people good driving habits. Basically, it is straightforward legislation designed to protect and enhance the standards of the driving-instruction schools. I am pleased to note that it is supported by honourable members.

Motion (Mr Lane) agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 3, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

CARRIAGE OF DANGEROUS GOODS BY ROAD BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 28 August (see p. 266) on Mr Lane's motion—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (4.55 p.m.): It has been estimated that there are more than 50 000 chemicals on the world's commercial market, and that about 1 000 additional new products enter that market every year. Most of these have meant a widespread improvement in the standard of living of our modern industrial society, and the improvements effected by them have transformed the everyday lives of every Australian.

However, in their pure state, many of these chemicals are hazardous in nature and very harmful to human beings and to the natural environment. Consequently, it has become very necessary to invoke strict legislation to control their handling, transportation and distribution.

The Bill before the House goes part of the way towards achieving such controls; therefore it has the full support of the Opposition. However, the Opposition believes that much stricter controls are necessary in this State to ensure that dangerous and toxic chemicals cannot harm either the current generation or future generations, either directly or through changes to the environment.

Publicly available information on chemical hazards is poor. In Australia, there is no register of branded chemical products listing their constituents or their harmful or hazardous properties.

This even applies in the work-place for those who are engaged in handling such materials throughout their working lives and also for emergency services personnel whose very lives may depend on their knowledge of chemicals being stored or transported and the dangers that those chemicals, particularly combustible ones, present.

As an example of the need to be more aware of occupational safety and health problems created by work-place hazards, one has only to look at the asbestos industry. It took 50 years from the time of first recognition before proper safety regulations were introduced to protect the health and well-being of workers engaged in that industry from the acute dangers of lung cancer. Voluntary and self-regulatory standards and controls implemented by the industry itself failed to prevent an unjustifiable and unforgivably high toll of asbestos-induced illness and death.

As legislators, we must face the stark fact that the public at large are unaware of the dangers they face because of hazardous goods that are being either manufactured, transported or stored in every community area in this State. Certain of those chemicals may affect the central nervous system; others may affect the respiratory system or the kidney function; and others may cause cancer, birth deformities or genetic damage.

Toxic materials give particular cause for concern, for not only is there a risk of widespread community poisoning if a severely toxic substance is released on a sufficient scale, but, more insidiously, they may have hidden effects on people's health that only appear many years after the incident.

Most people have a very poor appreciation of the hazards that exposure to those chemicals poses for their health. Therefore, a more effective education program and legislative enforcement of safety measures are urgently needed.

This legislation does introduce necessary controls and changes to current practices. However, having taken the opportunity to study the extent to which other States have already gone in this matter and the degree of research and monitoring that they have undertaken, I must say that Queensland is way behind again.

Firstly, anyone examining the Bill has no idea of what dangerous goods are covered by it. An examination of the definitions section refers to those specified in a certain section of "The Code". The definition of "The Code" refers to those goods listed in an Australian Government Gazette. In the Parliamentary Library, I looked at the code in the Australian Government Gazette of 24 February 1982, and I found that it ran into over 500 pages. It was as long as that great book "Gone with the Wind" The code has been amended since that date.

The Bill does not provide for radioactive substances, explosives and liquid petroleum gas, which probably are the three most dangerous products carried by road. Each of those substances is controlled by a separate Act. In most of the other States, the legislation has been consolidated to include those substances, and the old Acts have been repealed. The same should be done in Queensland. After all, a standardised code for the whole nation is being sought. Queensland should standardise the format of its legislation.

I assume that, following the passage of the legislation, regulations will be gazetted in Queensland setting out the full schedule of chemicals and other goods that will be covered by the legislation. I noticed that, in his second-reading speech, the Minister made no comment about regulations. It is necessary that they be gazetted, because both the Act and the regulations should be available to the people of Queensland at all times. A proper monitoring service with back-up research facilities has not been provided for in the Bill. That service is necessary so that an accurate picture can be formed at all times of changes that may occur in various localities because of the constant transportation of dangerous goods.

Queensland does not have accurate statistics relative to the number of hazardous incidents resulting from accidents that have caused public danger. The results of one such survey conducted in the United Kingdom show that almost 60 per cent of such incidents are caused by accidental mishandling, insecure loads, poor storage or defective plant. A survey conducted in the United States produced similar results, but also indicated that more than 50 per cent of accidents involve flammable liquids and an additional 33⅓ per cent involve corrosives.

One has only to drive along Ann Street in the city during morning peak-hour traffic or visit industrial areas of Brisbane, such as the area between the airport and the river, to be aware of numerous potential disasters. If honourable members have ever followed a semi-trailer tanker onto the Breakfast Creek bridge near the Breakfast Creek Hotel, they will recognise the problem to which I am referring. The accident results in surveys conducted in the United States and in the United Kingdom could apply to Queensland. The northern approach to the Story Bridge is another good example of a potential disaster area.

It is not sufficient to have good legislation and carefully framed regulations. That must be backed up by an adequate and expert inspection and enforcement system. Any degree of compromise will only result in a less than adequate level of safety and protection for the community and the environment.

The first consideration must be the adoption of what is known as the Hazchem Code, which is already being used by many manufacturers of dangerous goods. It is prominently displayed on containers and vehicles. Its main asset is that it is readily recognisable and easily deciphered by emergency services personnel.

Presently, in most States, it is compulsory for that code to be displayed only on vehicles transporting liquid petroleum gas and flammable liquids. However, such labelling or identification should also apply to buildings in which explosives, flammable liquids, radiation hazards, and toxic and corrosive materials are manufactured or stored. I am sure that all honourable members have heard of cases in which fire-fighters have been at considerable risk when attending a fire because chemicals are stored in a building and the fire causes explosions. When some chemicals become wet or catch fire, they emit highly toxic fumes. The Bill does not provide for that.

The Bill does not give powers to emergency authorities to undertake the evacuation of unwilling citizens or workers from adjoining areas when a potentially hazardous incident occurs. Only last night such an incident occurred in Melbourne. A similar incident could happen any day in any community anywhere in this State and nation.

I recognise that it is not the direct responsibility of the Minister for Transport to administer many of the matters that I am putting forward. However, it is the responsibility of the Government. If it is serious about the need to introduce proper controls over the use and handling of dangerous goods, it will consolidate all of its legislative framework into one Bill. That will make the legislation easier to handle, easier to administer and, most importantly, easier to understand by those who work within its framework.

Such a consolidated Bill should cover the manufacture and industrial use of chemicals. Town-planning is supposed to cover that aspect, but it does not. All members receive complaints about toxic substances, flammable substances and potentially dangerous situations in factories.

Such a consolidated Bill should also cover the siting of chemical plants and their design, which should be strictly controlled. As I said previously, special provision must be made in relation to the storage of chemicals.

A consolidated Bill should cover the labelling of all chemicals in general use. That is not the case at present. A vast number of potentially dangerous chemicals should be labelled. Many citizens may not be aware that squeeze packs of shaving cream, insect repellents and so on are very dangerous, particularly if they are put into a fire. The transportation of chemicals is covered by the Bill under debate.

A consolidated Bill should provide for a centralised information source on the hazards of chemicals. I have pointed out that such a facility does not exist either in Queensland or in Australia.

A consolidated Bill should provide for safety in chemical laboratories including laboratories in schools. I am sure that all honourable members can recall an incident that occurred a couple of years ago in a Brisbane suburb, in which dangerous goods exploded in a class-room, causing the death of one person and severe injury to others.

A consolidated Bill should also cover chemical wastes, their storage, their transportation, their cleaning up and their disposal, which poses quite a problem in this city. I am sure that some of my Brisbane colleagues will go into that aspect later.

A consolidated Bill should make provision for a plan to combat chemical emergencies and incidents, and it should provide for the proper training of industry personnel as well as make special provision for emergency service personnel.

Of particular importance is an expert and adequate inspection service. A consolidated Bill should provide for such a service. I have stressed the importance of that matter before, and I will continue to stress it.

I could go on and detail several other aspects that should be incorporated with those that I have already listed.

One matter that is of great importance is the implementation of a system of prescribed routes for hazardous goods. Such routes should avoid high-density population areas. Such a system should be written into the Local Government Act or, alternatively, into the consolidated legislation that I propose. Vehicles that transport potentially dangerous toxic chemicals and explosives should be kept well clear of motor vehicles driven by the general public. Major routes for all trucks, not simply those transporting hazardous goods, should be clearly defined.

Mr Davis: An example can be found in the main streets in the city and Fortitude Valley.

Mr CASEY: Earlier I referred to Ann Street. Probably it is a classic example. On any day of the week heavy trucks can be seen driving along Ann Street, particularly in the morning. A similar problem arises in the Breakfast Creek area, which I think is in the Minister's electorate. Almost every week, a load falls off a truck near the Breakfast Creek bridge, or a truck overturns. Quite often, that occurs right at the intersection near the bridge.

An Honourable Member interjected.

Mr CASEY: I believe that when National Party members pass through that area they do not like to dwell near Labor House lest Joh's spies spot them, so they speed up. Consequently, problems are experienced.

Special consideration should be given to smaller consignments. Earlier I mentioned that many dangerous goods are sent in small consignments to chemist shops and medical facilities, so that if any spillage occurs on the road or a consignment is dropped, and highly toxic and dangerous materials are released, the problem is not as great. The special consideration for smaller consignments should be tightened up.

There needs to be a degree of licensing for transport operators, and a proper examination of the break-down and consequences of incidents involving the chemicals that they are hauling and the necessary precautions to be taken. That should be spelt out in the rules and regulations on which drivers are examined before they are given a licence to carry dangerous goods or toxic chemicals.

The use of buffer zones in planning the location of dangerous and hazardous chemicals is also necessary. That is one matter that probably does not come under the Minister's jurisdiction, but it does come under the Government's jurisdiction. That is something that is necessary for the protection of the community. It is needed to provide a safe environment for people in residential areas.

Finally, road authorities should select safe stockade areas in which drivers can lay up their vehicles for overnight stops on long journeys. I will deal further with that matter at the Committee stage. It is all very well to compel drivers to make sure that their vehicles are secure. Under the transport regulations, drivers must stop their vehicles for a certain number of hours during their journey. Those provisions are very necessary. If a driver must leave his vehicle for some time to go for a meal, to shower, to change or to relieve himself, some type of stockade area should be provided in which those toxic chemicals and dangerous goods can be made secure so that there is no access to them by thieves, larrikins and vandals. If a truck is loaded with explosives, a potential problem exists. Stockade areas could be located on the major highways in this State to make sure that those vehicles can be secured properly.

The comments that I have made apply not only to transport vehicles but also to railway vehicles. Most of the major marshalling and shunting yards are situated in the heart of residential and industrial areas in most of the major and provincial cities of Queensland, including Brisbane. Certain sections should be set aside in those yards in which dangerous goods on lay-over trains can be stored. The carriages should be shunted to a particular area where they can be stockaded until they are ready to continue their onward journey or until they are picked up by the consignee. Both rail and road stockade areas will provide the necessary security for the safe passage of such goods to all parts of the State.

As I stated initially, the Opposition believes that the Bill is not comprehensive enough. However, it is a beginning. When the original legislation was presented in this Chamber in January, it was found to contain a major anomaly. The Commissioner for Railways was virtually being given dictatorial powers regarding licence suspensions or cancellations. There was no right of appeal whatsoever.

I clearly pointed this out to the Minister in private conversation and I prepared amendments which provided a right of appeal against a show-cause decision by the commissioner. This was never intended as a criticism of the fairness or impartiality of the present commissioner. However, I do not believe in the erosion of anyone's rights in law. A driver has rights of appeal under the Traffic Act, the Motor Vehicle Driving Instruction School Act and the Tow-truck Act, to name just a few. It would therefore be a gross miscarriage of justice if he was denied such a right under this Act.

I made the Labor Party's views on this matter known in several other areas. It accepted that a change was required and that was indicated to the Minister. Thank goodness he does act reasonably on some occasions and has been prepared to insert appeal provisions in the modified Bill.

I am concerned also at the exemption provisions of the Bill. Firstly, there should be no exemption from the insurance provisions, which are the only real means by which innocent victims may receive anything like adequate compensation. My second and real concern, however, is that I can visualise the usual queue of National Party members trying to get an exemption for their local carrier. Country people need the protection of this legislation just as much as city people. Exemptions should be granted only in very special and serious circumstances. They should not be granted lightly.

Ironically, one of the most tragic accidents I can recall in connection with the carriage of dangerous goods involved two brothers in a truck near Taroom several years

ago. No-one really knows the full story, but they and another person were blown to pieces while carrying a load of ammonium nitrate, which is normally harmless to handle but, when mixed with distillate and detonated, is a very effective explosive.

I would like the Minister, in his reply, to give some indication to the House of the types of exemptions which he anticipates will be granted, and the reasons why they will be granted. It is also very easy to place a clause in a Bill stating that every reasonable precaution should be taken to prevent access by unlawful persons to loads of dangerous goods. The practical application of such a measure can only be carried out, as I mentioned earlier, if a system of stockade areas or safety parking areas is established all over the State. There would also need to be safe areas set up in railway goods yards for the same purpose.

Many chemical incidents involving fire, spillage of toxic or flammable materials, or sometimes explosion, occur while the chemicals are in transit by road, rail, sea or air. Such incidents can be serious in themselves and they usually result in considerable disruption to traffic and other inconveniences. The evacuation of residents may be necessary. Prevention of such transport incidents is therefore a high priority.

I have already indicated some weaknesses in the Bill. Quite clearly, it will only be as effective as the ability of the Department of Transport to support its intent and police its provisions. That has to be carefully considered by the Minister and his department. With the department's current strength, I seriously doubt that it can police it successfully.

Mr COOPER (Roma) (5.17 p.m.): I commend the Minister on the introduction of the Bill. I agree with its contents. Most members of the Opposition do as well. As most honourable members would know, a number of incidents have occurred in which vehicles loaded with dangerous goods have been involved in accidents. Police, fire brigade and other emergency services personnel have been disadvantaged in their efforts to maintain public safety by the absence of reliable information about the dangerous goods and the risks involved.

I am sure that all honourable members can recall instances. I certainly can. In November 1981 several tonnes of the dangerous chemical substance nitroprill spilt onto the road following an accident near Miles. It was regarded as highly dangerous, particularly when it was discovered that diesel had contaminated some of it. In 1972, three men were killed when a truck exploded in the Taroom area. I remember that distinctly. Again, the explanation was that diesel had contaminated the load and an explosion resulted. In 1982 an incident was reported in the Australian Capital Territory in which 30 people were treated for cyanide poisoning after a semi-trailer carrying a mixed load of industrial fibreglass chemicals jack-knifed and burst into flames. Firemen at the scene were not aware that the truck was carrying drums of highly flammable and poisonous chemicals. As there was no documentation of the contents of the load, quite naturally, water was used to try to extinguish the fire. It reacted with escaping chemicals to create a large volume of fumes. The firemen and police who attended that fire required medical treatment.

I am sure that honourable members would know of many other instances of accidents involving vehicles carrying dangerous goods and flammable liquids. Because of its uniformity, the Australian code, which has been established by a special advisory committee consisting of Commonwealth and State Ministers, as well as the Australian Road Transport Federation, the Australian chemical industry and the petroleum industry, has been accepted by most States in Australia. Therefore, the code referred to in the Bill will permit the interstate and intrastate travel of dangerous goods to be controlled to ensure maximum safety for the lives and possessions of the public and enforcement officers.

In addition, the Australian code for the carriage of dangerous goods provides for the labelling of vehicles and packages and for emergency procedure guides to be carried in the cabins of vehicles. That documentation will describe the nature of the dangerous

goods and the emergency action to be taken. In the interest of public safety, that is imperative.

The Standards Association of Australia has published a series of standards dealing with the safe storage, transport and handling of hazardous materials. Information cards must set out essential information and also summarise procedures for dealing safely with emergencies. These standards should help to reduce the incidence of personal injury and property loss and should provide a greater understanding of the requirements for safety in storage, transport and handling.

In formulating this important legislation and particularly in regard to driver training programs and the emergency procedures to be adopted, the Minister adopted the commendable attitude of seeking the suggestions and comments of interested organisations that are directly involved in the industry. In the case of an accident causing death, bodily injury or damage to or loss of property, the Bill provides for ample insurance cover.

Another very important part of the Bill is the provision for an appeals tribunal. A person aggrieved by a decision of the Commissioner for Transport relating to the cancellation or suspension of a licence may lodge an appeal, which will be heard by a stipendiary magistrate, an officer of the Department of Transport and a holder of a licence nominated by the Minister.

An important fact is that the Bill provides a defence for an employer if he has no knowledge of an offence being committed by an employee.

Penalties for offences are substantial. However, considering the importance of the legislation and concern for public safety, I feel that they are fully justified.

Because many substances can be dangerous, their safe transport is the reponsibility of all concerned—the manufacturer, the transporter, the distributor, the agent and the Government. However, the primary consideration is the safety of the public, the person handling the substances and the drivers of the vehicles.

I congratulate the Minister on his efforts to ensure that the transport of dangerous goods by road is conducted in a manner that has regard for public safety. I support the Bill before the House.

Mr BURNS (Lytton) (5.23 p.m.): For some time community concern in my electorate has been increasing about the question of the carriage of dangerous goods by road or by rail. My electorate contains the new port of Brisbane and a major oil refinery at the mouth of the river. From time to time I discover that large amounts of explosive or other dangerous material are transported into the area, because it is designated for hazardous or noxious industries. For example, recently I discovered that 2 000 tonnes of ammonium nitrate was stored in the old Borthwicks building, which is in the centre of the electorate. I do not know how it was transported there and I really do not know how or when it will be transported out of the area. What I would like to know for certain is that it will not stay there too long. I do not want it stored there at all; I want it out of the area.

It is all very well for people to give assurances that unless some diesel oil, carbon or other material gets to it or unless the bags are stacked one on top of the other, there is a 99 per cent chance that it will not blow up, or that if it catches fire it will not generate so much heat that it will explode, but the plain fact is that it is only 99 per cent certain and the people of my electorate are worried about the 1 per cent chance. We would like to make certain that it is stored away from the port, away from residential areas, and preferably outside the Lytton electorate.

Many new substances are causing concern. Yesterday the Minister was reported in "The Telegraph" as saying that in future, because of the threat involved if they should be involved in an accident, vehicles operating on LP gas will have to carry a sticker indicating that they are gas-operated. I do not know why nothing was done about this matter before.

I was pleased to note that after a country Cabinet meeting in Beaudesert on 1 November 1982, the Minister announced that legislation covering the carriage of dangerous goods by road and contingency plans for dealing with spillages had been approved by State Cabinet that day. Today is 19 September 1984. Almost two years had to elapse before we could debate the legislation, which has been amended and weakened in a number of ways. Progress has been too slow and deliberate. The 1973 Australian Transport Advisory Council Model Code for the Transport of Dangerous Goods by Road was intended to provide for the uniform regulation of road carriage of dangerous goods. In 1973 the ATAC model for the transport of dangerous goods was first produced and a later code was produced in about 1980, but in Queensland we have to wait for anything that might cost the boss a deener. In the meantime, people who live in areas adjacent to where goods are transported or stored take chances with their lives.

I take the point made by the member for Mackay that transport routes and times for the carriage of dangerous goods should be set. We would like to know that the transport of ammonium nitrate and goods of that nature, including major oil stocks, will be carried out with the least possible danger to children attending school or workers in the area.

The major port for the whole of Queensland is being established in the electorate of Lytton. We are told that because of the depth of the water and the type of tankers that can be brought into the port, most of the explosives for south-east Queensland will be brought to Brisbane. The roads used to transport the explosives pass a number of schools and highly developed residential areas. That creates an ever-present potential for a major catastrophe if something should go wrong. If such goods have to be brought to the port and transported by road we should ensure that they are transported at the safest possible time and in the safest possible way.

I have a copy of the House of Representative Standing Committee Report on Environment and Conservation dealing with the handling of hazardous chemicals and the storage of hazardous chemical wastes. Those reports made specific recommendations to the national Government and to all State Governments to take specific action to protect us all. But nothing happened.

The Minister told us in his speech that the State Transport Act has been used as a method of controlling the road movement of hazardous substances in Queensland. However, for the carriage of such substances, the Act is inapplicable to interstate movement and those intrastate movement and journeys not in excess of 40 km in competition with rail.

After the proclamation of this legislation, six months will elapse before people who carry in excess of the quantity specified in section 3, table 3.1, of the code without a licence will commit an offence. We should be told what that means. Is it half a tonne? Is it 500 litres or 10 gallons? What is specified in the code? The Parliament that is passing legislation to protect the people concerning the carriage of dangerous goods on the road should be acquainted with the quantities involved.

Later in his speech, the Minister referred to the mingling of items. General transport trucks travelling up the Toowoomba range carry fuel, diesel oil, kerosene, bags of sugar, loads of rice and metal. Drivers should be trained to understand that a small amount of ammonium nitrate mixed with half a gallon of diesel oil can cause a substantial explosion. If they do not know that mingling is a cause of concern they might throw the two items onto the back of a truck. Surely we should know how much is not covered by the provisions of the Bill. How small or how large an amount has to be carried before it is covered by the Bill?

There is talk about training transport operators to become familiar with the various requirements and procedures contained in the code. There is something more important than that. Over the years, it has been discovered that people handling chemical wastes and the chemicals themselves must know the dangers of mixing and the dangers that might arise if mixing takes place after an accident.

In most cases, the ordinary contractor is employed to carry goods because he tenders the cheapest possible price. I do not know how he will become expert enough to know that he will not be creating some kind of a hazard when he picks up a load of material from one firm and a load of material from another firm. I am arguing on the basis that we do not know the quantities involved. If the quantities are very high, it will be possible to carry small amounts in mixed loads. If the quantities are low, my argument will fall by the wayside.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister said that vehicles which are not suitable for the carriage of goods, having regard to the relevant commodity to be carried, or which are not the subject of a current certificate of inspection under the Motor Vehicles Safety Act, will be prohibited from transporting dangerous goods. What does that mean?

Thousands of convictions are recorded against people in this State for using overloaded trucks that are dangerous. For example, on 24 March 1984, the following article appeared in "The Courier-Mail"—

> "Transport Department inspectors ordered a 36-tonne prime mover and trailer off the road in Brisbane after describing it as a lethal weapon.
>
> The Transport Minister, Mr Lane, said yesterday: 'The vehicle had 33 mechanical and safety faults, including flat and bald tyres, four-inch cracks in three sets of brake drums, a disconnected brake, several trailer springs not secured to rear axles, no rear cabin window, faulty trailer lights and incorrect coupling.' "

That vehicle was on Queensland roads, and the driver was charged with 33 offences.

People engaged in the hazardous waste industry will hire the driver who tenders the cheapest price. That is private enterprise; that is the system that operates. The driver whose lowest tender is accepted is generally the one who carries out the least maintenance on his truck and who drives day and night. That is a fact of life. Reports received from committees that have investigated the transport of hazardous wastes have shown that to be a fact.

The overloading of trucks is another matter. There is a law against overloading, but on 13 July 1984 the Minister for Transport said—

> " . . the high priority given to enforcement against overloading was further proof of the Government's desire to make the State's highways as safe as possible.
>
> In the last financial year, vehicles of more than two tonnes tare checked for compliance with the regulations on weight and loads numbered more than one million.
>
> 15,700 breaches were detected.
>
> . . fines amounted to almost $1.3 million."

There were 15 700 breaches of an Act that we passed in this Parliament. That shows the irresponsibility of some sections of the transport industry.

The Minister also made a brief statement on the illegal carriage of petroleum products in Queensland. An inspectorate service is needed to man the roads fully, especially in areas such as ports, from which such goods are transported. If the Minister has to make press statements about the illegal carriage of petroleum products, the illegal carriage of other goods, over-loading, and people who drive in defiance of the Act, surely a sufficient number of inspectors should be provided to police the provisions of the Act and regulations.

I am concerned also about what happens when an accident occurs. The last accident, which occurred near East Brisbane, involved a truck carrying chemicals from the port of Brisbane. The chemicals were washed by the fire brigade down the drain into the river. A newspaper article stated—

> "Chemicals washed into Brisbane waterways after a fire on Friday could take years to dissipate, according to a Brisbane environmental chemist, Mr Greg Miller."

Then a different story appeared in the press. That article stated—

"Poisonous chemicals washed into Brisbane waterways after a fire yesterday were dangerous to people and animals who came in contact with the contaminated water, police said yesterday.

Arson squad detectives are investigating the fire . .

Police said chemicals, including agricultural pesticides and herbicides had been washed into Rocky Water Holes Creek . . ."

What provisions have been made for the handling and disposal of dangerous goods after an accident? Are the dangerous goods to be washed into the waterways? The Minister for Transport and his colleagues have been promoting the Riverside Ferry Co. and have been building additional ferry landings. The Brisbane Development Association has been inviting people to make more use of the river. Because of the lack of provisions in this Bill, dangerous and toxic materials will be squirted into that river.

Mr Lane: All of these good things take a bit of keeping up with.

Mr BURNS: I do not know that the Minister for Transport has done any good things yet. I would be only too pleased to be informed of a couple of them, and that would be a credit to the Minister. I am waiting with bated breath to hear them. If I had held my breath from 1 November 1982 when this Bill was promised until today, 19 September 1984, I would be as red in the face as the Minister for Transport is tonight.

The point that has been made by various committees considering the road transport industry is that people tend to work with the lowest cost operator. I am sure the distribution of hazardous waste will be of greater concern than the transportation of chemicals such as ammonium nitrate. The decision of the Government to force the city council to keep the Willawong dump open means that more and more people are illegally dumping waste, and they will not be licensed carriers under this legislation.

Dangerous goods do not include only those that will be used by a commercial enterprise in the near future. Many dangerous substances are created as a result of the manufacturing process, or become a waste product. Radioactive substances, for example, are a by-product or a result of certain processes.

I look forward to reading the regulations. I also look forward to the appointment of a large number of inspectors to oversee the provisions of the Bill. I am concerned, because I live in an area in which I know that the transport of hazardous goods will increase. The decision has been made to build a big port at the mouth of the river, and the decision has been made to bring large tankers into that port. I have been told that most of the explosives for south-east Queensland will be brought in through that port. Money has been spent on the port, and there is no doubt that the goods will come in through there. It will then be a question of how the goods are transported from Fisherman Islands to the Darling Downs, mining areas or other areas in which chemicals and explosives are used. The people who live in my area are very concerned. For many years it has been a quiet, residential area. Their wishes were overtaken by the 1972 decision to build the port at the mouth of the river. This Bill, as it relates to road safety and the close proximity of the port, will be of utmost importance to them.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (5.38 p.m.): I welcome the introduction of the legislation, as do other members, because it brings Queensland into line with the other States and reduces the possibilities of accidents in the carriage of dangerous goods by road.

However, a couple of practical aspects must be considered. The legislation will result in a large increase in the freight costs for farmers. One carrier has estimated that the increase will be in the range of 20 to 25 per cent. The costs will increase because of a number of factors.

Under the Bill, drivers and vehicles must be licensed. Because of the short time before the Bill becomes law, it will be difficult to get drivers licensed. Similar legislation

has been implemented in other States. In New South Wales, it was difficult to train drivers and get them licensed even though a period of 12 months' grace was provided for. Every driver of vehicles carrying dangerous goods in Queensland will have to be trained within six months so that he can get a licence under the provisions of the Bill. That is almost an impossibility, and is impracticable. It means that unlicensed drivers will be carrying dangerous goods in contravention of the law.

In addition to that, they will be fined up to $10,000. It will not be the drivers in Brisbane; it will be the transport-carriers out at Charleville, Cunnamulla and Mount Isa who will not have the appropriate vehicle, training or the time to meet the requirements of the Bill.

Mr Lee: Do you think there will be any inspectors out there?

Mr CAMPBELL: There will not be any inspectors; so why have this provision? That is a very important point. When an accident does happen, a driver will be fined $10,000, not through his own fault but because the facilities have not been provided by the State. I do not know how a State that is twice the size of New South Wales and probably carries the same quantity or even a greater quantity of dangerous goods will be able to implement similar legislation in half the time. It just will not be done, because the real problem lies in the country areas.

Mr Lee: You have to start somewhere, though, haven't you?

Mr CAMPBELL: That is right. I am just trying to point out the shortcomings. The first is that there should be at least 12 months' grace, not six months' grace. That change should be made to allow the country areas time to come into line with the provisions of this Bill.

What will happen in an area that is unable to provide a carrier who is licensed or who has the appropriate vehicle? Take, for example, a small country town in which one carrier brings all the general merchandise into that town. If he does not have the appropriate vehicle and is not properly trained, how will he get those goods into that small town? He cannot do so unless he breaks the law. The alternative is that no service will be provided. A situation may arise in which farmers have to go to the nearest major town and collect the goods themselves. Will they be allowed to do so, or will that be in contravention of the minimum requirements? We do not have any idea of the minimum requirements.

Two aspects arise. One concers the farmer and how much he can carry, because he does carry goods from the closest agent to his own farm. Will the minimum requirements allow him to carry a suitable quantity of goods? The second aspect concerns people who are dealing with their tools of trade. Will they be exempted? I can speak from my own experience as a research officer when I was carrying from 20 or 40 litres of dangerous goods or what I regarded as a dangerous chemical. Would such a person still be allowed to carry that quantity in his vehicle, or will he not have that right? Chemicals are part of the tools of trade of many research workers.

As to training—in this magical period of six months, will these drivers be trained? Even police or fire brigade officers cannot be trained in what to do with such chemicals when an accident occurs. I know that in the Bundaberg area very few people know what is going on.

Mr McPhie: They know more about it than you do; that's for sure.

Mr CAMPBELL: That is interesting. The last occasion on which a major problem arose down at Newcastle, the fire brigade did not know how to handle it; and the last time a major spill occurred in Brisbane, the fire brigade did not know. In addition to that, the police officers did not know what was going on. Now they have taken out law suits because they did not know they were handling a dangerous chemical, and they are now suffering the effects of it.

People in country areas where most of these situations are likely to arise will not have the training to deal with them.

The other aspect is split loads. Because the Bill provides that all drivers will be licensed and all vehicles will be registered, a great deal of paperwork will be involved. Suddenly, carriers will go through Queensland and will drop parts of a load off in one town, pick up another part, and drop off another and pick up another. The problem arises with the licensing, because the Bill provides for different classes of licences—too many different classes. I would like to know whether the categories of licence that apply in Queensland are the same as those in some other States. A problem could arise when a driver is licensed to carry so many goods or classes of goods making up half a load. When he gets into a country area he might pick up some more, without even knowing whether he will be able to carry that load.

Firstly, we will not know whether the driver is licensed to carry the different classes of dangerous goods. Secondly, I ask: Will he be able to identify those classes of goods? That will be one problem that will arise.

If there is a prime contractor who is responsible for the carriage of dangerous goods, who will be the prime contractor when the load is carried for a section of the journey by rail? If a load of chemicals is being transported to someone in a remote country area, it could be railed to a major centre. Will the Railway Department have to make certain that the contractor it allows to continue with the carriage of the goods is licensed? If that carrier is not licensed, who will be the prime contractor? Will the Railway Department or the contractor be held responsible? What happens when the contractor takes the goods from the railways and splits up his load and another smaller, unlicensed carrier takes over?

I do not believe that those practical aspects have been examined closely. Those questions should be answered before the Bill is passed, otherwise the people in country areas will be deeply concerned. It will mean an additional freight cost on the goods. It will also mean that some services will not be provided to country areas.

Although the Bill is welcomed, I believe that a certain provision will take effect too quickly. The six months' grace should be changed to at least 12 months. If the period is not changed, many people who provide a service to country people will be breaking the law. That should not happen. I urge the Minister to change the provision in the Bill that provides for a period of six months. A period of 12 months would be a fair and reasonable time to pass before the operation of that provision. Other States have not been able to introduce such legislation in six months; it has taken at least 12 months. Even then, problems have been experienced in carrying out the necessary training.

Hon. D. F. LANE (Merthyr—Minister for Transport) (5.47 p.m.), in reply: Once again, I am pleased to acknowledge the general support of honourable members for this legislation. Of course, there has been the usual spate of dramatics and extravagant examples that are trotted out on an occasion such as this. Eventually, it will be necessary to give an actor's award of the year to one member or another. It is very pleasing that there has been general support for the Bill.

All honourable members would acknowledge that if we are to enjoy the benefits of modern society with all the dangerous substances and commodities, such as chemicals, that have to be carried and used to maintain the standards that we all like to enjoy, we must to some extent live with those commodities. In an endeavour to do so in a safe way, legislation such as the Bill before the House must be introduced to achieve that end. Obviously, it would be impossible to set out in legislation a list of all the commodities and substances to which this legislation would apply. For example, the code lists about 3 500 different substances.

The honourable member for Mackay asked me for an indication of the type of exemptions that would be expected and, presumably, the type of commodities and substances to which this legislation would have application. I inform him that those commodities and substances will generally be in accordance with the code for the

transport of dangerous goods by road or rail. They can be found in a book that contains an extract from the Government Gazette of the Commonwealth of Australia, the latest edition of which is dated 9 April 1984. I have the book in my possesion. It is as lengthy as "Gone With The Wind". As it may help to enlighten honourable members as to the vast list of commodities, I table the code for their information.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the document on the table.

Obviously, the code is being called up under the legislation and, except for those specific exclusions that may need to be made from time to time—and members will be kept informed of them—that is the code that will apply in this instance.

The honourable member for Bundaberg expressed reservations about how the legislation would apply in rural areas. I was interested in his comment that we were being too hasty with the legislation. That, of course, brought him into direct conflict with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who thought that we were being too tardy. I have no doubt that they can sort out their differences on the matter in a gentlemanly fashion, observing the Marquis of Queensbury rules. Suffice it to say that the legislation has been introduced twice into the Parliament.

I have accepted submissions from the law bodies of the State. All submissions put forward in a sensible and constructive way have been incorporated into the consolidated Bill. We even accepted a few amendments put forward by the Opposition's spokesman on this matter (Mr Casey) and I was pleased to hear his acknowledgement of our approach to open government and our forthright manner of delivering legislation in the Parliament. It is pleasing to receive a compliment from him occasionally.

We have before us legislation that is the best that can presently be refined. It has sufficient flexibility to allow adjustments to be made, either by regulation or by special exclusions or inclusions in the Act, of which all honourable members will be given due notice and opportunity to comment in the usual way. Little else need be said. I thank all honourable members for their support of this essential piece of legislation.

Motion (Mr Lane) agreed to.

Committee

Mr Booth (Warwick) in the chair; Hon. D. F. Lane (Merthyr—Minister for Transport) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 5, as read, agreed to.

Clause 6—Licence to carry—

Mr CAMPBELL (5.53 p.m.): I refer the Minister to subclause (2) (c) which reads—

> "the dangerous goods or the class or classes of dangerous goods that he is, by the licence, authorized to carry".

Can the Minister tell me how many classes of licence there will be?

Mr LANE: The classes are in accordance with the code as set out. If the honourable member peruses it, he will have no difficulty with that provision.

Mr CAMPBELL: I am still concerned. People will be caught through the need to have different licences. That should be clarified. My second point is: Who will issue the licences in country areas and what type of test will there be?

Mr LANE: Basically, there will be nine classes of licence in all. I hope that that settles the nerves of the honourable member.

Licences will be issued through the administration system of the Commissioner for Transport, who is responsible for the issuing of taxi licences, hire licences and various others. I assure the honourable member that the department's desire is to serve the public. There will be no difficulty with that matter at all.

Mr CAMPBELL: Who will train these people? Will they be given any test and, if so, will it be verbal or written? Who will train people in the country areas and tell them about the different classes of chemicals and things like that?

Mr LANE: The intention is to set a minimum quantity below which the legislation will not apply. I am sure that those in rural areas about whom the honourable member is concerned will find that in one way or another they are excluded from these licensing provisions. The honourable member has little to worry about and should wait to see what happens in the fullness of time.

Clause 6, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 15, as read, agreed to.

Clause 16—Unlicensed carriage an offence—

Mr CAMPBELL (5.57 p.m.): The clause deals with a point I made previously, that is, the aspect that the legislation will come into operation after six months. I see no reason why it could not be delayed for 12 months. Even the Minister has admitted that at present no training facilities are available to get the message through to the public, especially those in country areas. That training will not be completed in six months and the time should be increased. Although an assurance had been given that everything will be all right, to date nothing has been done to educate drivers. I do not see how the departments will be able to get the relevant information to a general carrier in the west of the State and then have him pass a test to confirm that he will know what he is carrying. What happens if the driver has to know how to tie down a load properly or that he cannot carry certain combinations of goods on his truck? The Minister cannot tell me that he will be able to read it from a book; many drivers cannot even read. In six months not even the departmental officers will be able to understand what is going on, not to mention getting that information to those in the country who will be involved with the practical application of the regulations. The period should be amended to 12 months. The Queensland Government will not be able to do it any quicker than any other State Government.

Mr LANE: The period of six months will apply from the date of proclamation of the Bill. Staff will be put into place before the legislation is proclaimed. When everything is arranged in that way, providing the necessary training will be no problem. The legislation will apply to licence-holders who will be carrying fairly large quantities of chemicals. I have already received assurances and guarantees that the department will be supplied with additional staff to set up a section for the administration of the Bill.

Mr Scott: Where did you get the money from to do that?

Mr LANE: I wish members of the Opposition would make up their minds. Do they or do they not support the Bill and think that it is a good thing, or do they want its implementation delayed?

They do not seem to have their act together. Suffice to say that I have an undertaking that staff will be provided to administer this section and that all the machinery will be set up. When that is in place the Bill will be proclaimed and six months from that date it will have application. The Queensland Transport Department is very efficient; honourable members are not talking about departments of the Commonwealth Government, which need long lead times. The Transport Department is quite close to the people of the State. It has already had discussions with those who are involved in the commercial transportation of such goods as these. I do not expect any trouble.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.

Clause 16, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 17 to 20, as read, agreed to.

Clause 21—Unauthorized access to goods—

Mr CAMPBELL (7.16 p.m.): A few words in this clause are fairly important. In part, the clause reads—

> "A person carrying dangerous goods shall at all times take all reasonable precautions to prevent access to those goods . . ."

What is meant by "all reasonable precautions"? If a charge is laid for not taking all reasonable precautions, I cannot see how it will be enforced, because there is no proper definition of "reasonable precautions"

Mr LANE: The honourable member should be aware of many examples of similar statements in legislation. It is a matter for a discretionary decision by a magistrate at the time of the prosecution. People who launch prosecutions are aware of their responsibility to believe on reasonable grounds that an offence has been committed before bringing someone before a court. The matter really takes care of itself in the legal process. I am sure that the honourable member would not want a Bill of this nature relating to the carriage of many of the dangerous commodities listed in the Australian Code not to include a stated obligation on the licensed persons in charge of such goods to take reasonable precautions. The whole Bill would be nonsense if the obligation was not there.

Clause 21, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 22 and 23, as read, agreed to.

Clause 24—Exemption from complying with Code—

Mr CASEY (7.18 p.m.): I draw the Minister's attention to a point on which he may be able to enlighten honourable members. It concerns the relativity of this clause to clause 17, which deals with the need for the carrier to be indemnified by insurance. That provision is necessary. The level of indemnity should be set at a high figure, as is instanced in the Bill. I support the concept.

As I understand it, this clause relates to a person's getting exemption from certain provisions in the legislation. At the same time, that person will still be carrying dangerous goods. He may be carrying toxic, flammable or explosive materials. The clause or the regulations should spell out clearly that although a driver gets an exemption relating to the carriage of goods, there is no exemption from the indemnification insurance. The Minister will agree that, in some circumstances, a small load of dangerous goods in a small country town could cause just as big a problem as the carriage of a major load in a major town.

It is a little late to do anything about the matter in the legislation, because it could change the whole context. However, there is room within the approvals and the exemptions, and within the regulations when they are framed, to ensure that the necessary indemnity will be provided. I should like an assurance from the Minister along those lines.

Mr LANE: This clause gives the Commissioner for Transport a discretion to exempt people from the provisions of the Act under certain circumstances, and some of those circumstances are outlined in the clause. I assure honourable members that the commissioner will use his discretion sparingly. Nevertheless, because of the large and diverse State in which we live and the development that is taking place in industry, particularly in the mining industry and in some sections of rural industry, it is necessary to provide that discretion in this clause. It is important that the commissioner have this discretion so that he can give people relief from the provisions of the legislation. I give an assurance that the discretion will be used sparingly.

Mr CASEY: I am not so much concerned about the commissioner using or not using his discretion in a proper way. Clause 24 (1) states—

> " . . exempt him from compliance with all or any of the provisions of this Act . . "

If I had disagreed with the proposal to give the commissioner this discretion, I would have spoken on the exemption clause. But the Minister should give consideration to the fact that one provision that should not be dispensed with relates to indemnification insurance. An exemption would allow people to carry dangerous goods not under the provisions of the legislation. Therefore, there would be no cover for indemnification

insurance. If people are to carry dangerous goods they should insure themselves against any injury to other persons and/or damage to their property.

Mr LANE: The honourable member will notice that the clause contains the words "all or any of the provisions". Therefore, as I see it, the commissioner could exempt a person without necessarily exempting him from the insurance provisions. If the honourable member accepts that the commissioner should have a discretion—and I have said that the discretion will be applied selectively—he should not be concerned about this provision.

Mr CAMPBELL: It is good to provide these exemptions in the legislation, but if the commissioner is to allow exemptions, there should be uniformity. A person should not obtain an exemption because of favoritism or because he has the ear of the commissioner. Therefore, the discretion has to be applied uniformly. Favouritism should not be shown to any person.

Mr LANE: The honourable member is overly suspicious. He has not been in the real world of politics long enough to have got rid of the myth that is in some people's minds that discretions are applied against people on political grounds. In practice, that does not happen. It does not happen in the real, grown-up world of today. I am sure that on occasions the honourable member for Bundaberg will approach the Commissioner for Transport and ask for exemption on behalf of a constituent. If the grounds for the application are sound, as set out in the Bill, I am sure that the discretion will be exercised in favour of that person, in the same way as it will be applied to a constituent of a member who has been in this House for a little longer than the honourable member for Bundaberg.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr LANE: The honourable member for Brisbane Central is quite familiar with the discretion of the Commissioner for Transport under the State Transport Act. That discretion is used to police taxi-drivers and people in the transport industry generally. I do not think that he could point to many instances——

Mr Davis: I didn't say the commissioner.

Mr LANE: I suggest that the member for Brisbane Central let me finish before he does his square-off.

I do not think that the honourable gentleman could point to many instances in which the discretion of the commissioner has been exercised unfairly. I am not suggesting that the commissioner is Solomon, but people who exercise the powers that have been given to them by Parliament tend to be very mature, level-headed and sensible. I am sure that the member for Brisbane Central had the discretion of the Commissioner for Transport exercised in his favour more than once when he was in the taxi industry. After all, the honourable member was given a licence.

Clause 24, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 25 to 28, as read, agreed to.

Clause 29—Liability for offence by servant—

Mr CASEY (7.26 p.m.): That there is a need for uniformity in legislation has been one point that has come across not only in the Minister's second-reading speech but also in my speech and the speech of the member for Bundaberg at the second-reading stage. That point has even been made by the member for Brisbane Central by way of interjection, and he is very skilled in repartee. The lack of uniformity in the various transport Acts is a problem of which many honourable members, especially the member for Brisbane Central, are aware.

Clause 29 (2) sets out quite clearly that there is a liability on the employer. It reads—

> "A person is not liable to be convicted of an offence against this Act committed by him as a servant if he satisfies the court that the offence was committed while the business of his employer was being conducted under the personal superintendence of the employer or of a manager or any other representative of the employer and that the offence was committed with the knowledge of the employer, manager or representative."

It is very pleasing to see that clause written into the Bill.

Under this Bill, drivers will need to be licensed to drive vehicles carrying dangerous goods. Under the Transport Act a licensed driver driving a vehicle that is overloaded is liable to a penalty, because the onus is not on the employer.

I draw that anomaly to the attention of the Committee. It has been fought in the courts, through the Transport Department and in this Chamber. I know that, on a number of occasions, the member for Brisbane Central has argued about it. As a former official of the Transport Workers Union, he understands this anomaly that has existed for years and years.

It is important to note that this clause at long last places an onus on the employer if the goods are being driven at his direction or under his management, supervision or control. That does not happen if the vehicle is overloaded. The Minister should take cognisance of the anomaly. He has been prepared to write into the Bill appeal provisions against the Minister's cancellation of a licence. Those provisions have been drafted along exactly the same lines as other appeal provisions in legislation under his control and under the control of other Ministers. Because he has permitted clause 29 (2) to be drafted, I ask that he take a very close look at amending the Transport Act as soon as possible so that the same type of defence can be implemented for truck drivers.

Mr CAMPBELL: I have read this clause with interest, because it seems to be inconsistent with other Government policy. The Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer is on record as saying that there is no way in the world that company directors should have to accept liability for tax evasion on the part of their companies, yet this clause provides that employers will be responsible for the actions of their servants.

Mr LANE: I do not wish to debate the tax laws, the State Transport Act, or even the ability or otherwise of the honourable member for Brisbane Central, which were the three matters canvassed by members of the Opposition in the debate on this clause. Not one of those matters is relevant to the Bill; therefore, there is no point in commenting on them.

Clause 29, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 30 to 32, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

JUDGES' SALARIES AND PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General), by leave, without notice: I move—

> "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Judges' Salaries and Pensions Act 1967-80 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (7.33 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

In 1980, a Salaries and Allowances Tribunal was established for the purpose of determining judges' salaries. The determination of that tribunal is made between 1 July and 31 August each year. Variations to judges' salaries are adjusted and fixed by the Governor in Council by Order in Council in accordane with the tribunal's determination.

The object of this Bill is to enable any number of reports to be furnished by the tribunal from time to time and for judicial salaries to be adjusted in accordance with those reports. It will, however, still be mandatory for the tribunal to report at least once in each calendar year.

Section 29 of the Act requires the tribunal to have regard to the salaries and allowances payable to judges of the Commonwealth and all other States and internal Territories of the Commonwealth. It is the experience of the tribunal that adjustments of salaries in other places, particularly in relation to judges of the High Court, the Federal Court and of the Supreme Courts of New South Wales and Victoria, are usually made in or around October or November. The result has been that the tribunal, in making its determination, has not had the advantage of the knowledge of what is occurring in other jurisdictions.

The tribunal should also have some regard to salary movements within the State. The present requirement to furnish its report by 31 August has resulted in the tribunal's reaching a decision prior to alterations being made in salaries payable to Ministers of the Crown, members of Parliament and senior public servants. There does not appear to be any particular reason to justify the necessity for the submission of the tribunal's report by 31 August each year.

I believe that this Bill will therefore enable the tribunal to more efficiently discharge its duties in determining judges' salaries.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr R. J. Gibbs, adjourned.

SMALL CLAIMS TRIBUNALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Small Claims Tribunals Act 1973-1982 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (7.37 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

The objects of this Bill are, firstly, to make provision for the oral examination of judgment debtors before a referee of the Small Claims Tribunal and, secondly, to allow disputes between traders to be determined by the tribunal. The Act provides that, if an order of a referee is not complied with, a copy of the order may be filed in the Magistrates Court and then enforced as a judgment of that court.

Under the Magistrates Court rules, a judgment of the court may be enforced by the issuing of a warrant of attachment or by a garnishee order. However, before such action is taken it is common for the judgment debtor to be orally examined in order that the judgment creditor may ascertain the judgment debtor's means and the likelihood of recovering the amount of the judgment. These proceedings have been costly and, of necessity, somewhat complicated.

Where an order of the referee has been filed in the Magistrates Court, the Bill transfers the oral examination and enforcement procedures from the Magistrates Court to the less formal atmosphere of the tribunal, thereby saving the parties time and reducing their costs. To further assist the parties, the Bill provides that document filing costs and other expenses associated with the oral examination and enforcement processes shall be met by the Department of Justice and not by the parties.

In addition, the Bill provides that an oral examination shall be conducted near where the debtor resides and that the registrar may conduct the examination on behalf of the judgment creditor. This ensures that travelling expenses to the place of an oral examination will be kept to a minimum.

The Bill also extends the provisions of the Act to cover disputes between traders. At present, a dispute, no matter how small, arising out of a contract between traders, must be resolved in the court at considerable expense and inconvenience to the parties. Such a dispute cannot currently be determined by the tribunal because the Act provides that only private persons may refer claims to the tribunal.

The Bill expands the definition of "claimant" so as to accommodate claims by a trader against another trader. Any such claim must, however, be for an amount not exceeding the $1,500 maximum provided for in the Act.

This amendment to the Act will give traders the same access to inexpensive and rapid settlement of small claims as is presently available to consumers. A trader such as a small-businessman, who is unsatisfied with the standard of work performed under a contract, will be able to refer his dispute with the contracting party to the tribunal. Similarly, a trader such as a primary producer in dispute with the supplier of faulty goods or equipment will be able to avoid expensive litigation by having the matter determined by the tribunal.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr R. J. Gibbs, adjourned.

LIQUID FUEL SUPPLY BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 30 August (see p. 464) on Mr I. J. Gibbs's motion—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr VAUGHAN (Nudgee) (7.40 p.m.): I begin my response to the Minister's second-reading speech by commenting that it is not before time that such legislation was introduced.

I have conducted research into developments from the mid-1970s until the late1970s, when this country was affected in the same way as most other countries in the world by a shortage of liquid fuel. During my research, I came across a news release that I issued on 2 August 1979. That dealt with the circumstances then existing. I referred to the shortage of diesel fuel over the length and breadth of our State. I then referred to the lack of action by the Government and, in particular, by the then Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr Camm) because of his close association with the sugar industry, which was most adversely affected by the diesel fuel shortage. The then Minister for Industry and Administrative Services (Mr Lee) issued a statement that 20 million litres of distillate had been siphoned from the market by hoarders and had been stored in tanks other than at refineries to beat the anticipated price rises.

The Bill seeks to implement measures designed to overcome problems that may arise in this State—in fact, in this nation, because the legislation is complementary to legislation passed in the Federal sphere—if circumstances similar to those that occurred in 1979 again occur. At that time, the middle east countries—in particular, Iran—decided that it was time the world realised that there was not an unlimited supply of liquid fuel. Possibly they taught us a valuable lesson. Those countries cut back on their production, with the result that the price of oil increased greatly. The price of petrol increased from about 16c a litre in 1973 to about 20c a litre towards the end of the 1970s. Of course, it is now 47.9c a litre.

The point I made in my statement released on 2 August 1979 was that there ought to have been an investigation into the production and distribution of all pertroleum products in the State with a view to planning—and I emphasise "planning"—for the future requirements of the State to avoid further shortages and to ensure the continued supply to essential industries. It is now 19 September 1984—more than five years later—and finally honourable members have before them legislation providing for exactly the same steps that I proposed at that time. The Bill proposes an assessment of the liquid fuel supplies of this State and lays down guide-lines to be followed in any contingency plan. It sets out the procedures to be followed for supply to bulk suppliers.

The Bill also lays down the procedures to be followed for essential industries, rationing and for those who choose to enter into the black-marketeering of liquid fuels when they are in short supply. I repeat: It is about time this legislation was introduced.

In 1979, this State, this nation and the nations of the world were shocked when Iran decided to limit its output of oil. For quite some time there has been a continuing war between Iran and Iraq, which could very well jeopardise world liquid fuel supplies. Despite all of those things, it has taken five years for the Government to introduce this legislation.

Mr Davis: Not really fast, are they?

Mr VAUGHAN: No. It took a Labor Government in Canberra to get things moving. Immediately the Labor Party was elected to Government, it got the thing off the ground and now legislation has been introduced in this State.

In the mid-1970s the prediction was that, although Australia was then 70 per cent self-sufficient in its liquid fuel requirements and needed to import only 30 per cent of them, by the mid-1980s—that is now only a year away—those percentages would be reversed and the nation would be only 30 per cent self-sufficient and would need to import 70 per cent of its crude oil requirements. The action taken at that time has been proved to have been reasonably effective. Because of it, further oil discoveries have been made in this country. I am pleased to comment on the oil discoveries on the Jackson oil-field and the other more recent discoveries in the south west of this State. Because of those discoveries, the prediction that was made in the mid-1970s will not become a reality.

In the 1970s, import parity pricing, which was primarily designed to increase the price of locally produced crude oil, was introduced. The Government's aim was to encourage liquid fuel consumers such as motorists to conserve their use of liquid fuel. If the nation's use had continued without that conservation, the liquid fuel supplies would have been in danger of being exhausted.

Mr Davis: LPG is getting dearer.

Mr VAUGHAN: Liquid petroleum gas became a fashionable source of energy, and rightly so. Unfortunately, at that time very little encouragement was given for people to change over to LPG, of which Australia had such a large supply that it was exporting it. The only encouragement to change to LPG was given to those who could use it efficiently.

The revenue from the import parity pricing policy was used to bolster the coffers of the Federal Government. That policy injected thousands of millions of dollars into the Federal Treasury. Instead of being used to encourage the search for more oil and

the development of alternatives—the member for Brisbane Central has mentioned the use of LPG—the money went into the Federal Treasury. At the time that the oil crisis hit the nation, as part of a propaganda campaign the Government went through the exercise of stating that it would convert the State's huge resources of coal to oil in an effort to overcome the liquid fuel supply problem. The Government said that it would develop the State's vast oil-shale reserves.

At that time, announcements were made about the many projects that were to get under way. In 1979, when Mr Camm, the then Minister for Mines, Energy and Police, returned from a week's visit to Japan, he said that a coal-to-oil conversion plant would be operating in Queensland by the early 1980s. This is 1984, and we all know that the statement was made simply to impress the people of Queensland that the Government was on the job and intended to do something about overcoming the liquid fuel problem. I could say that the Government was smoking opium, but it was really gazing into a crystal ball. Its projections did not eventuate.

Not to be outdone by that Minister, the Premier announced in October 1980 that a $3,000m coal-to-oil conversion plant would be built at Millmerran. A report appeared in "The Courier-Mail" that a consortium was to build a $3,000m coal-to-oil plant on the Darling Downs. The Premier said that the plant would be completed by mid-1986 and would employ 12 000 men. That statement bolstered the confidence of the Millmerran people. It was a sop to them for their loss of the power station to Tarong. However, it is a fact of life that that proposed coal-to-oil plant at Millmerran is as far down the track as it ever was.

Not long afterwards, on 24 November 1981, the people were told that a second coal-to-oil plant was to be established in Queensland. They were told that billions of dollars would be spent on a coal-to-oil plant at Wandoan. They were told firstly that a $3 billion plant was to be built at Millmerran and that a $1 billion plant was to be built at Wandoan. Allowing for inflation the price 12 months later was $4.3 billion.

Mr Davis: What about Rundle?

Mr VAUGHAN: I intend to mention Rundle. In April 1980, the Rundle Oil Shale Agreement Bill was passed after it had been debated at length. At the time I expressed my concern about the propaganda associated with that legislation. The price of shares in Central Pacific Minerals and Southern Pacific Petroleum increased from about 77c and 20c to about $65 and $14 respectively. In my speech on that legislation in April 1980 I said that I thought it would be another Poseidon.

The Government made use of a great deal of propaganda about how much shale oil would be produced. The shale is still in the ground at Rundle and the project is a very long way down the track. At the time, the Minister, (Mr Camm), acknowledged that it all depended on the Arabs. If they manipulated the price of their oil so that it rose and fell depending on world demand they could control the progress of the shale-to-oil plants.

I take this opportunity to speak about liquid fuel supplies and the price of petrol throughout the country. In August 1980, the member for Rockhampton asked the Deputy Premier and Treasurer a question about the price of fuel in country areas. The question referred particularly to the price of fuel in country areas compared with the price in the metropolitan area, having regard to the fact that a petrol subsidy scheme was designed to ensure that the price of petrol landed in country areas should be no higher than 0.5c a litre than that paid by city people. In reply, the Deputy Premier and Treasurer said—

> "I am sure, the Federal Government does provide funds to the States for subsidisation of the transport of petroleum products. This scheme was established in 1978 and its object is to ensure that the price of motor spirits, power kerosene, aviation gasoline and automotive distillate in country areas includes no more than .5c per litre of freight differential costs."

He went on to say that the funds paid out by the Queensland Government on behalf of the Commonwealth amounted to $14.7m in 1978-79 and $23.6m in 1979-80. Then the Deputy Premier and Treasurer said—

> "The principle in this scheme that must be recognised is that all it purports to do is limit the additional cost which arises from freight cost differences. It has no effect on price differentials arising from other factors such as differing wholesale prices and differing retail margins."

I might point out that that differential was increased from 0.5c to 1.1c per litre from 1 January this year. So the price of liquid fuel in country areas, because of transport costs, should be no more than 1.1c per litre above the price in city areas. That is the extent to which distributors in country areas should be able to mark up their price.

The price of petrol in Brisbane is 47.9c per litre. In a price war, it can drop to 45c or 44c per litre. Although a tax is applied to petrol in New South Wales, petrol is cheaper over the border than it is in Brisbane.

In May of this year I travelled round the central Queensland coal-fields. I think that I paid about 52c per litre in Blackwater and 53c per litre in Emerald, Middlemount and Dysart.

Mr De Lacy: In Cairns it is 52.9c, and it is a free port, yet the Minister says that the industry is on a sound footing. How do you explain that?

Mr VAUGHAN: The industry certainly is not on a sound footing. The fact of life is that the retailer is pocketing the extra money provided under the subsidy scheme.

I shall look at how much this so-called subsidy scheme is costing. As I have said, the scheme is designed to ensure that the people in the country areas of this State, the people who are supposed to be represented by Government members, pay approximately the same price for petrol as people in Brisbane. Let us look at the extent to which the tax-payers of this State and nation have contributed to this subsidy scheme. The figures that I am about to give apply only to Queensland. They are not the amounts contributed by tax-payers throughout Australia. As I say, this subsidy is provided for the transport of petroleum products to country areas to try to ensure that the people in those areas do not pay through the neck for their petroleum products.

The subsidy in Queensland amounted to $14.7m in 1978-79, $23.6m in 1979-80, $35.5m in 1980-81, $41m in 1981-82, $38.4m in 1982-83, and $37.7m in 1983-84. A total subsidy of $191.05m was paid between 1978-79 and 1983-84 yet, as I say, the price of petrol in country areas is substantially higher than in Brisbane—far higher than the 1.1c per litre, which is the maximum differential to cover transport costs.

It is time that something was done about this matter. If tax-payers are to be asked to contribute $191m to subsidise the supply of petrol to country areas, it is time that the people in those areas benefited from the scheme instead of being ripped off.

I said earlier that it is time that this Liquid Fuel Supply Bill was introduced into this Chamber. It is time that the State had a mechanism by which it can control the supply of liquid fuel if the 1979 situation arises again.

I turn now to discuss how the legislation came about. I read the Minister's second-reading speech very carefully. He mentioned the Australian Minerals and Energy Council, on which Queensland is represented. I recognise that the Government does participate with the other States in that council, and it is one of the few areas in which this State co-operates with the rest of Australia. Every day in this Chamber the knockers on the other side of the House castigate everybody south of the border, including the Federal Government. So it is pleasing to realise that Government members are not complete hypocrites. It is good that the Government co-operates with the rest of Australia on the Australian Minerals and Energy Council.

Mr Menzel: We always co-operate.

Mr VAUGHAN: Cut it out! The member for Mulgrave should not try to kid me. However, I am very pleased to be able to recognise the extent of the co-operation of the Queensland Government in that council.

In September 1979, the Australian Minerals and Energy Council, after considering the position that had developed as a result of the liquid fuel supply problem, decided to form a committee called the National Petroleum Advisory committee. That committee was representative of a whole range of industries and organisations. The agricultural, fishing, manufacturing, mining, shipping, transport and oil industries were represented, as were the Australian Council of Trade Unions, Australian motorists and Commonwealth and State Governments.

In October 1981, that committee brought down a substantial report that dealt with the management of a national liquid fuel supply emergency. The report was considered by each State and was tabled in Federal Parliament. It is interesting to note that the Federal Labor Government moved very quickly to introduce the Liquid Fuel Emergency Bill. It did not muck about; it moved straight away. In March 1983, just after it was elected, the Government introduced the legislation, and I have taken the opportunity to read the debate. The Bill was passed through both Houses after substantial amendments were made to it in the Senate. The legislation before the House tonight complements the Federal legislation.

I have perused this Bill very carefully and, as far as I can see, it contains the measures that are required to ensure that, if a fuel shortage develops, Queensland, in conjunction with the rest of Australia, will be able to implement a plan that will enable the Government to handle a crisis.

Although this Bill falls within the province of the Minister for Mines and Energy, I would like a little more information on which Government department will handle the machinery and implement the provisions of the Bill should the necessity arise.

Contingency planning is provided for in Part III. It is very important that the Government does not wait flat-footed for the 1979 situation to develop again. Plans must be laid down early, and the Bill sets out such plans. Under those plans, the Minister will seek information on the extraction, production, storage, supply, distribution, sale, purchase, use or consumption of liquid fuel. That covers the whole range of the liquid fuel supply industry.

A provision in the Bill deals with prescribed businesses. That provision, which I think is contained in clause 10, intrigues me. It provides that prescribed businesses will be required to provide their name, address and telephone number, particulars of the kinds of liquid fuel that they can store and particulars of the quantity of liquid fuel that they can store. However, when I tried to find the definition of "prescribed business" I found that "prescribed business" means a business prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of clause 10.

The Bill also contains references to essential or high-priority users of liquid fuel. If a plan is to be developed to control the distribution of liquid fuel in Queensland in the event of an emergency, it is most important that the Government know who are the essential or high-priority users. If it does not, essential industries will miss out.

I refer again to the situation that arose in August 1972 when Queensland suffered from a shortage of diesel fuel. Fishing boats could not go to sea, and the sugar industry was having difficulty in harvesting cane.

Furthermore, the railways ran short of fuel. It is most important that essential or high-priority users be clearly identified, and the Bill lays down guide-lines to be used for the purpose of identifying them.

The Bill refers also to bulk customers. It lays down guide-lines to be used in their identification. That provision, too, is very important.

The Bill provides for the quantity to be supplied to bulk customers. It is not simply a matter of identifying them; it is also necessary to know how much they will use in the event of the implementation of the contingency plan.

The Bill makes provision for the regulation or prohibition of supply of liquid fuel, and for the maintenance of reserves. It is no good laying down a contingency plan and saying that essential or high-priority users and bulk customers will be supplied, unless the source of the supply is known. The Bill provides for the maintenance of reserves, the quantity to be held in reserves and the location of reserves.

Queensland is a big State and it contains many provincial centres, such as Bundaberg, Gladstone, Rockhampton, Townsville and Cairns. It is very important that the Government be aware of the location of the reserves in order that liquid fuel can be supplied in the event of an emergency.

The Bill provides also for the direct release and sale of liquid fuel. Again mention is made of quantity and locations.

A provision in the Bill empowers the Minister to control the price of liquid fuel. Whenever a commodity is in short supply, its price goes up. The Bill provides that, if no agreement is reached between the purchaser and the supplier at a particular point, the Minister will move in and set the price. And rightly so! No-one would want to see any black marketing in relation to the supply of liquid fuel. The Bill is aimed at controlling any black marketing that might be engaged in.

The Bill mentions rationing. I recall the situation that arose in the 1970s when petrol coupons were produced for distribution. When a shortage of liquid fuel occurs, it is not desirable to have people grabbing as much fuel as they can and storing it. That happened with diesel fuel, when farmers bought as much as they could and stored it in tanks on their farms. When essential industries wanted liquid fuel, none was available. Plenty of fuel was held in country areas, but it was all hoarded. I believe that rationing is the only answer.

The Minister, in his second-reading speech, referred to a situation that arose in another State when shortages of liquid fuel occurred as the result of a domestic problem, not an international one. To meet that situation, a system of using motor vehicle number-plates was adopted.

People who drove motor vehicles with odd-number registration plates could obtain petrol on one day and people who drove motor vehicles with even-number registration plates could obtain petrol on the following day. That is one way of distributing petrol; the other way is to ration it.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr VAUGHAN: It is a pretty sensible way to do it. As the Minister indicated in his speech, the whole aim of the legislation is to make sure that everybody receives a fair share of the liquid fuel that may be available in an emergency. That is advisable. The Minister indicated also that it is desirable to know before the emergency occurs——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber. Too many members are on their feet. I ask the Chamber to come to order. I intend to remain on my feet until the Chamber comes to order.

Mr VAUGHAN: As I said, it is very important that liquid fuel be distributed equitably. The Minister indicated that plans will be laid down. It is to be hoped that, should a liquid fuel supply problem develop in this State, the industry itself will regulate that situation. However, if it does not, action must be taken. The legislation provides for the proclamation of an emergency and for the various provisions of the Bill to be put into effect.

The Bill also encompasses the situation that might develop with black-marketing. It refers to the unlawful sale and purchase of liquid fuel other than by a business trading

in that particular fuel. Honourable members know what happened when there was a shortage of liquid fuel during the war years. Although some people had to rely on coupons to obtain fuel, other people who had the money and the know-how could obtain liquid fuel on the black market. I notice that, should people decide to embark upon that course, the Bill provides for penalties.

I perused the Bill, and it is wise and timely legislation. It ought to have been introduced a long time ago. Over the years, we seemed to become complacent and think that everything was rosy. I hope that the situation that developed in 1979 will not recur. With the introduction of this legislation, the necessary machinery will be in place to handle any future situation that may develop.

As I said, I believe that the legislation is good legislation; it is certainly timely.

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Condamine) (8.13 p.m.): It was interesting to note that the member for Nudgee (Mr Vaughan) recognised the need for this legislation. I give him credit for that. He spoke at length about the various procedures that could be enacted to make sure that the shortfalls about which we are worried do not occur and that the contingency planning that is needed is carried out. He referred also to other matters relative to the fuel industry.

I wish to speak to the intent of the Bill. Honourable members would be aware that there are different types of fuel in Queensland. This State is fortunate in having large deposits of coal and natural gas. The Bill delas with liquid fuels. It must be appreciated that liquid fuels are extremely important to the whole fabric of our society, hence the need for the legislation.

The State Transport Act was enacted in 1893. The emergency powers invested by that Act are applicable only during a state of emergency. A state of emergency need not be proclaimed when there is a shortage of fuel. Hence this Bill. The present legislation did not cover all of the contingencies about which the Government was worried.

As the first member from the Government side to speak to the Bill, I will outline its objects and touch on a couple of matters relevant to my part of Queensland. Subsequent speakers from this side will speak at length about various aspects of the legislation.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: What side of Queensland do you come from? The right side of the left side?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: The better side.

The purpose of the Bill is to provide a legislative basis for the management of any liquid fuel emergencies that occur in Queensland. A report by the National Petroleum Advisory Committee, which has been supported by Government, industry and unions, recommends a unified legislative approach to liquid fuel emergency management in Australia, with responsibility for Governmental action being shared between the Commonwealth and State Governments. That is important. This legislation is complementary to legislation already enacted by the Commonwealth Government and other State Governments.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: They made some mention about diluted petrol, too. I am not quite sure what the member for Brisbane Central said.

The Bill proposes the basis for equitable distribution of liquid fuel between essential, high-priority and ordinary users within the State during any sustained period of liquid fuel shortage, irrespective of whether the shortfall has international or domestic origins. It is important to note that the origins may be international or domestic. In fact, the Bill caters for shortfalls within regional areas of Queensland. One could envisage circumstances in which Cairns, because of a natural disaster or a shipping mishap, ran short of fuel. The Bill enables the Minister to use his power.

Mr De Lacy: Don't pick on me.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I could have referred to Cunnamulla. The same observation would apply. The Bill enables the Minister to ensure that shortfalls in any areas are sensibly managed.

Three legislative principles are involved. The Bill caters for contingency planning, shortfall management and enforcement. I will speak first about contingency planning. Once a shortfall has occurred, it is essential that there be some basis upon which to act. It is more important that there be pre-planning. That is what contingency planning is all about.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: With all of these dramatic pauses, how did you ever teach your kids at school anything?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I was quite successful at that.

The points raised in contingency planning are the power to acquire information about the source of fuel, where it is stored, the type of fuel and all other such information; the power to develop guide-lines for action in the event of a sustained shortfall; the power to take precautionary action in the event of an anticipated shortage of liquid fuel; the power to acquire from any person who is in a position to supply it information relative to liquid fuel contingency planning and the specific power requiring information in respect of prescribed businesses, which are envisaged as being wholesalers or retailers of liquid fuel. It is important that we understand the definition of those people.

Mr Davis: Why don't you get off that committee? It's the wrong one for you.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: The member for Brisbane Central has his opinion; I have mine.

It is important for the public to realise that, once fuel has been bought by a consumer and is on his property, it cannot be seized. It is his property. The Bill is all about controlling supplies of fuel at the wholesale and retail levels. For that reason, the Government is interested in the location and ownership of such businesses, the output or offtake of those businesses and their storage facilities. I am led to believe that the department has the capability to accumulate all the data it needs and gradually to build up a data bank of all the storages in Queensland, who own them, their capacity and the state they are in. It is the department's intention to ensure that the information is kept up to date. As storages go off line or become obsolete, obviously they will be taken off the list. It is also proposed that guide-lines be developed for the indentification of essential and high-priority users of liquid fuel.

The identification of the people and the services that are essential is important. The Minister, in consultation with the industry, his department and the Cabinet, will work out which people have the highest priority. That could lead to the situation mentioned by the member for Nudgee—that ordinary users may well be rationed. However, the list of priorities is important.

Another important point is that guide-lines are developed for the identification of bulk customers, the calculation of allocations to bulk customers and the procedures for the bulk allocation of liquid fuels. There also has to be regulation or prohibition of fuel supplies. Of course, when a crisis arises because of a shortfall of supplies, there must be prohibition. In that regard, it is important that the Minister has the necessary power.

The guide-lines will indicate the manner in which critical aspects of fuel supply will be managed in any protracted period of shortfall. In the process of the development of the guide-lines, it is envisaged that an understanding of the proposed management on the part of the suppliers and users of liquid fuels will be realised, resulting in both an orderly and equitable manner of distribution and a greater sense of logistical independence and responsibility on their part.

The member for Nudgee spoke about people who, in panic, bought fuel and stored it on their farms. I do not quite agree with that.

Mr Davis: They sold it at a profit, too.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: The member for Brisbane Central could not prove that. People in the country do not bother with reselling their fuel. They purchase fuel for a specific purpose. Perhaps the honourable member does not realise the importance to primary producers of having huge amounts of fuel stored on their properties.

I should speak about what happened in 1979 when the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries created a shortfall of fuel. Many people in the agricultural belts of Queensland went to great expense to erect on their properties bulk fuel storages of from 5 000 to 20 000 litres. Because they did not wish to be caught short of fuel at times of harvest or land preparation, they filled those storage tanks. They then found that there was no real shortage of fuel. Those additional supplies created problems of waxing of fuel and deterioration of the fuel quality.

The Bill will go a long way towards curbing the fear that crept into society at that time and caused some people to spend large amounts of money unnecessarily. Now that those people are aware of the powers and the framework of the Bill, they will need to purchase only the amount of fuel that they need for the immediate future.

The Bill makes provision for a number of precautionary powers to be used in the event of an expected shortfall of liquid fuels. The first is the power to direct oil companies to release sufficient quantities of liquid fuels of a particular type to meet the expected shortfall. Honourable members know of the various types of fuel. I understand that at different times refineries have an over-supply of petrol, distillate or fuel oil. The distribution of those reserves will come under the direction of the Minister.

The Bill also gives the power to direct refineries to vary their output of refined products in order to meet the type of liquid fuel shortfall that is expected. Sometimes when refineries are extracting distillate from fuel oil, they get an over-supply of petrol. The Bill gives the Minister the power to say to the owners of oil refineries that a certain shortfall is expected and that they should balance out the refinery's production.

The Bill also provides power to transfer liquid fuels from one place in the State to another in order to meet regional shortfalls. A moment ago I spoke about Cairns, and the honourable member for Cairns (Mr De Lacy) took exception to that. I was only using Cairns as an example. When a natural disaster or something of that sort occurs, the Minister will have power to direct that fuel be taken directly to any part of the State that may be suffering from a regional shortfall.

Mr De Lacy: I was only joking.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I will accept that.

In actual shortfall of liquid fuels, the abovementioned powers and others are necessary. The other powers include power to proclaim a state of emergency, powers of the Minister during a liquid fuels emergency, and power to allocate liquid fuels by permit.

A little while ago mention was made of petrol coupons and of people getting petrol on odd or even days of the week. Those powers will be vested in the Minister. There are also powers to give directions regarding allocations of liquid fuels to bulk customers, to regulate the supply of liquid fuels generally, and to fix a maximum price for liquid fuels in order to prevent profiteering.

I note that the member for Brisbane Central has left the Chamber. Probably he has gone to buy some fuel.

Further powers will be used to recompense service station proprietors for loss of income and as a fuel conservation measure. There will also be power to control liquid fuels imported into the State during an emergency.

The Bill contains enforcement provisions. It is proposed that the provisions of the Act will be enforced by authorised people who will have the power to inspect premises, vehicles, vessels, aircraft and receptacles contained thereon. The authorised persons will be the police and other persons listed by the Minister.

I see that the member for Brisbane Central has returned to the Chamber. He did not go out to buy fuel.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I thank the honourable member.

Other miscellaneous provisions in the Bill relate to the protection of oil company trade secrets. Some of the oil companies expressed concern that if their records were thrown open to the Minister and the powers that be, they could lose some of their advantages in the commercial sense. The Bill ensures that the companies will maintain their trade secrets.

Provision is made for the authority to seek injunctions, but not against the Minister. The Minister will be all powerful. He cannot be stopped in an emergency. People must have faith in the Minister, knowing that he will be acting in the interests of the State.

Provision is made for penalties for the use of false documents, and for limited compensation in the event of the acquisition of property or for damages as a consequence of complying with directions given. If someone has his fuel supplies confiscated or damage is done to his property, the Bill ensures that compensation will be paid.

The Bill also provides exemption from an action for breach of contract as a consequence of complying with directions given. If someone had a contract to supply 30,000 litres of fuel a week to a customer and a state of emergency was proclaimed, the Minister might say that the customer does not have a high priority and his fuel will not be delivered. In those circumstances, the supplier cannot be sued for breach of contract. Honourable members will understand the wisdom in that.

Provision is made for exemptions from the operation of the Act, and other provisions relate to averment, the service of documents and the head of power for making regulations.

The Bill covers contingency planning before an emergency occurs, shortfall management and enforcement actions that are required.

I will now speak about developments in the liquid fuel industry in Queensland in recent times. I am sure that the Minister and others who will be using this legislation are well aware of the developments in the south west of Queensland with the recent discovery of oil in the Eromanga Basin and the Cooper Basin.

For more than 20 years, oil has been flowing from the Moonie Fields. The Alton Field has also been opened up. They have been providing a certain percentage of the State's liquid fuel needs. It seems that the oil available in Queensland will provide a much larger percentage of the State's needs. The Jackson Field is on line and the Government had the foresight to have the pipeline built. That decision has been vindicated by the very exciting discovery made recently.

Queensland is now the largest on-shore producer of oil. That being so, the provisions of the Bill may have limited use. However, it should be remembered that the Bill is designed to cover regional shortages. In those circumstances, its provisions may have to be used from time to time. I certainly hope that the Bill will not have to be used in times of war or civil disputes.

I am sure that other speakers will expand on various aspects of this important measure.

Mr PRICE (Mount Isa) (8.30 p.m.): Mr Deputy Speaker, I would like to follow the line taken by previous speakers in this debate and request that you apply your powers liberally as I wander through the Bill. Firstly, I shall address the Bill directly and then wander a little into other areas that are remotely connected, but at least connected, with the subject under discussion.

I understand that a number of Australian States have some form of emergency legislation, and I imagine that their experience would have been sought in framing this

legislation. Whether that is the case or not, certainly a lot of information has already been gathered by various Government sources.

As far back as March/April 1981, oil companies supplied the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development with information about inland storage points and storage capacities, distribution networks, seaboard terminal inventories, average weekly offtakes by location, and essential users. The department also had discussions with Queensland refineries about capacities and flexibility.

In February 1983, the oil companies supplied the Department of Mines with lists of retail outlet supply points for essential users, and in March 1983, they updated for the department the list of all depots within their marketing territory. In December 1983, the Government advised of the creation of the Liquid Fuels Branch within the Department of Mines, and it was supplied with information about the average monthly offtakes of various classes of customers; for example, mining, agriculture, health and welfare, and local government. February 1984 saw an update of the list of all oil company retail outlets in Queensland.

An important function of the Petroleum Marketing Operations Committee is to make recommendations to the Liquid Fuels Branch from time to time. For example, in June of this year a recommendation was sent for guidance in distillate allocation, essential community services, production and supply of most essential goods, etc. That, hopefully, gives some background to the exchange of information that no doubt would have been considered in the framing of the Liquid Fuel Supply Bill.

The member for Nudgee asked the Minister about the way in which the machinery will be handled. I must admit that that is my deepest concern and the main point that I wish to make. As regards any implementation of an emergency situation—it would be my strong recommendation that once the parameters of the emergency distribution rules have been set by legislation, any emergency situation should then be administered by the industry. I say that in the knowledge that, firstly, the industry has experience in this area, and honourable members would remember the allocation plans in 1979, which was in fact a world-wide exercise; secondly, it has the distribution network to implement or police any emergency; and, thirdly, it has key union participation, particularly with the Transport Workers Union and the Australian Workers Union, to ensure individual location controls.

If I could now wander from the Bill, I wish to comment on the fuel situation in Queensland and to refer to several recent press reports. This is an ideal opportunity to raise this matter in the Parliament.

"The Courier-Mail" this morning carried an article in which the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs was reported as saying that Brisbane service stations earn a minimum average net profit of $6,842 a year and northern service stations earn $17,928 or almost three times that figure. The Minister is reported as saying that, based on these figures, the industry is on a generally sound footing. That ludicrous statement was highlighted this morning in this place when the member for Ashgrove (Mr Veivers) said that a man on the dole would earn more than the net profit of a Brisbane service station operator.

Mr Lester: What about wages?

Mr PRICE: It is a net profit.

Mr Lester: His wages have been taken out of that.

Mr PRICE: That is right; it is a net profit. I admit that. Perhaps the Minister has never been to a service station.

Mr Lester: Next minute you will be saying that they charge too much in north Queensland. Make up your mind.

Mr PRICE: The Minister should wait and find out what I intend to say. Perhaps what I say will make more sense than he does.

I have an article from the "Sunday Sun" which states that petrol prices in Queensland vary to the extent that some motorists pay 14c per litre more than the lowest price. The article reported that the RACQ claimed that there was no justification for the wide price difference and that motorists from interstate found it difficult to understand why Queensland petrol prices were so high, given that this State did not have a petrol tax. The article went on to say that service station operators and the RACQ made it clear that, because petrol taxes apply in other States, oil companies must be using Queensland to carry the rest of the nation. Dealers, as well as motorists, want to know why the retail price of petrol should vary so much in coastal towns when the wholesale price is the same. It was also reported that profit margins set by retailers were unfair and unnecessary and that their costs were not as high as claimed. The article reported that the Mackay manager of the RACQ called on the Government to intervene to regulate prices.

In the same article, an economist was reported as saying that Queenslanders have been taken to the cleaners for the last 50 years, and that there was no reason for petrol companies to change things now. Although the Australian dollar was revalued at the beginning of 1983, many people do not realise that there has not been a corresponding drop in petrol prices. The article claims that oil companies have taken advantage of the situation and kept prices up. I could go on at great length.

Following the line of the argument put forward by the member for Nudgee, and taking heed of the comments by the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs, I take this opportunity to examine the pricing of petroleum in Queensland. Although the State Government claims that Queensland is a low-tax State and makes claims about the interference of other State Governments in petrol-pricing, the price of petrol in Queensland is still higher than in the other States. No explanation has been forthcoming from the Government.

Mr Lester: That is wrong. For the last 18 months, we have been the cheapest in Australia.

Mr PRICE: I beg to differ, and I will explain.

The Government has not given the people of Queensland an explanation, and its simplistic view that the market-place will decide the price does not take into account the decentralised nature of the State, its vast distances and the number of retailers available in remote areas. The Government fails to realise that greed is the driving force in business, and that if a rein is not placed on retailers who have no competition, or who are in collusion with others, market-place philosophy is useless. The loudest cry is heard from retailers in the market-place in Brisbane and, at the moment, in Townsville.

At present, retailers in Townsville are selling petrol at less than they pay for it. Most depend upon a special survival rebate of a couple of cents per litre to stay in business. Many of them have lease and rental commitments to major oil companies, which have to protect their investment and their hard-working dealers. Those dealers who, through no fault of their own, invest all their money in small businesses, and who form part of our largest employer group, are caught up in a competitive spiral which more times than enough has been started by the oil companies themselves.

In Australia, oil companies fight one another for their share of Australian crude oil. As was highlighted during the world oil crisis in the late 1970s, Australian crude was the cheapest in the world. The privilege of purchasing it belonged proportionately to the Australian market-holders.

Crude oil could be purchased by the oil companies according to the percentage of the retail market that they held. To increase that percentage, oil companies encouraged price-cutting among retailers. They even attempted to enter the retail market by getting rid of retailers who would not or could not compete. They pushed out retailers as leases fell due and went into direct competition with each other.

That was great for the customers; it is what private enterprise and competition are all about. However, before the Government could gloat over what the market-place was

doing, the hue and cry from the debris of the move—that is, the broken, battered and bankrupt retailer—was heard. Thanks to a vociferous outcry from members of the Opposition, the Federal Government listened and was obliged to act. The outcry slowed the oil companies, but the price-cutting continued.

Now obliged to protect their dealers, the oil companies bore the brunt of the system and that culminated in the major losses that were experienced by the majority of the oil companies in 1982-83. The monster that they had created had turned on them. Price-cutting had become a recognised form of obtaining market share. Retailers' service went out the window. Self-serve became the new service station approach. If the companies had not been stopped, all service stations throughout Queensland would be self-serve outlets today.

In the sale of every litre of petrol that the motorist buys there are four participants. The first participants are the Governments. I stress the plural, because although the Queensland Government lambastes the Federal Government over petrol prices it also takes some of the cake. The Federal Government imposes an excise duty and some States have a fuel tax, a road levy, royalties and pipeline royalties. All those charges account for more than 60 per cent of the price that the motorist pays and account for the lion's share of the profit. If a motorist is paying 46c a litre, 27.6c goes to the Government.

The second participants are the oil companies. They have production, manufacturing and marketing costs. They get 24 per cent of that mythical 46c, which is 11.04c for each litre that is sold.

That is the area that the oil companies were getting into before regulation and before the plight of the retailers was recognised. The mind boggles at what the results would have been if the market forces had been allowed to continue. Of course, the oil companies, surrounded by the debris that I mentioned previously, including their own workers as they were shed when profits fell, would reduce the price. The market would then reach a point at which petrol would be in minimum demand, and the oil companies would turn to the Government to subsidise them in their efforts to stimulate use and to recommence marketing to customers that they had lost through market forces and their own greed.

The third participant is the distributor, who looks after the local transport and marketing. He is the depot man, the area wholesaler, who causes his own wars when he enters the retailing arena either by retailing illegally from his wholesale establishment or by legally purchasing his own service station and combining both margins, that of a wholesaler and that of a retailer, to undercut his opposition. He gets 8 per cent, or 3.68c of the 46c per litre.

I was happy to see that the Government audit included an examination of the role played by the distributor. I still think that that is an area that requires examination. As no definition exists as to what makes a retail sale, it is extremely difficult to police this usurper of the retail role. He opens his gates to friends and increases his volume by word of mouth. He allows his customers credit on low-margin low-volume sales so that his monthly account will show increased litreage. The fourth participant, the retailer—a victim of the system along with the public—accounts for the remaining 8 per cent, or 3.68c. He legitimately sells to the public. He legitimately buys his small business ready to contribute hard work and long hours. He welcomes legitimate, fair market forces. He expects a good return for his labour and his investment. He wants to compete with service and hard work.

Most problems in the industry seem to appear at the level of involvement of the third participant. The wholesale price of fuel is established by the Prices Surveillance Authority, and in Queensland it is currently 42.42c per litre. All retailers can purchase from their distributor at that price. Distributors can sell to the retailers for less if they want to cut into their own 3.68c margin, and sometimes competition or volume purchasing demands that they do so. The distributor, in turn, can purchase from the oil company at less than the wholesale price if his volume usage or competition so demands.

Independent persons can also purchase direct from oil companies for less than the wholesale price, if they so desire, or for the reasons already mentioned. Some people, who are called jobbers, do just that and, in turn, sell their purchases at a cut price to independent service station operators in the field. The results of their activities are fairly obvious.

With retail price-cutting, independent retailers can purchase fuel where they wish, whilst bonded retailers, that is those operating under company brand names, must accept the Prices Surveillance Authority price or purchase drops—that is fuel drops—surreptitiously round the back or late at night when oil company officials are least likely to spot them and perhaps revoke their leases.

Petrol is distributed throughout the State on a free interport basis. Petrol landed in Townsville, say, is sold to distributors and retailers at the same rate as their peers in Brisbane. That freight cost is covered by the Federal Government. From a port to an inland destination—I will take Mount Isa as an example—the fuel is shipped compulsorily by rail at a cost of 7.32c per litre. That is a cost to the oil companies. However, in keeping with legislation that petrol prices throughout Australia should not vary by more than, as an honourable member said earlier, 1.1c or the difference between the rail freight and the Federal subsidy for that freight, the Federal Government subsidises that rail cost to the extent of 6.5c per litre. So from Townsville to Mount Isa the oil companies can only pass on a transport cost of .82c per litre. For some obscure reason, the Federal Government based its subsidy on the journey from Darwin to Mount Isa and not from Townsville to Mount Isa. However, I shall not be side-tracked. I do not want to confuse the issue. However, additionally, the Queensland Government Railways provide six or seven block trains per month to service Mount Isa. Those block trains are for stock orders and are guaranteed loadings for the railways. If they are used, a substantial saving can be gained, so most oil companies use them. The cost of transporting petrol on those trains is 4.35c per litre, a saving of 2.97c per litre, which is quite substantial. I ask honourable members to keep that in mind because, as my compatriot from Mackay (Mr Casey) mentioned some time ago, the retail price in Mount Isa has not yet reflected the step taken by the Queensland Railways earlier this year.

In other words, the oil companies themselves are absorbing that saving. If the wholesale price in Queensland is 42.42c a litre and the oil companies passed on the block-train savings, the wholesale price in Mount Isa should now be 39.5c a litre. That would make it less than the purchase price for Brisbane, Townsville or Cairns retailers.

Private jobbers came into their own with the advent of Federal legislation which attempted to regulate the industry by restricting oil companies to ownership of service stations commensurate with their Australian market share of the retail trade. In order to comply, one company had to sell off over 200 service stations throughout Australia. That had the effect of ensuring a selling price for individual operators—and good on them. It gave them a sense of ownership and something to sell; but it also introduced the jobber. Sufficiently capitalised individuals purchased one or more of the stations on the market. In two major coastal cities, jobbers control or help to control the price of fuel because of the number of service stations they own. One operator in a central Queensland city actually owns 10 stations. Those individuals buy so much better. Consequently, they are controlling the trade in the same way as the oil companies used to. The cycle continues.

Australian crude is being dumped on the Australian market by some oil companies. Forced to purchase their share in a depressed market, it is cheaper for them to discount it on the Australian market than to pay the cost of exporting it and selling it on the depressed world market. Because of the rationalisation that occurred after the last world shortage, some oil companies have surpluses of distillate or diesel fuel in this State. As it is cheaper to discount and dump locally than to dump worldwide, the price of diesel in Townsville is 40.75c per litre. The wholesale price in Townsville is 43.15c. In the Burdekin area, sugar-producers are enjoying buying diesel at 39.5c per litre. Who says the cane-growers receive no subsidies?

Surpluses upset the market, jobbers upset the market and so-called market forces upset the market. Fuel purchased for 42.42c per litre in Mount Isa—it should be 39.45c—retails at 54.9c In the Burdekin area, diesel fuel for the cane-farmers sells at 39.5c per litre. There seems to be nowhere to go.

I return to the issue. In general, retailers are struggling to make a dollar. Because of the price control in the market-place occasioned by discounting forces, they are volume orientated. The forces are mainly the major oil companies and the jobbers. The marketing policies of major oil companies are fixed on market percentage. My message to them is that they should expeditiously organise their rationalisation plans with other oil companies, distributors and retailers so that survivors can return to making a profit as well as to being competitive.

I again quote from the "Sunday Sun" of 6 November last year—

> "Mr David McGill, chairman of the service station division of the Queensland Motor Industry Association, says price discrimination is the destructive force in the oil marketplace.
>
> 'It is our biggest problem; get rid of it and you rid the industry of many troubles,' Mr McGill said.
>
> 'Oil companies should sell their product at the same price to everyone. Jobbers, or individual depot owners with their own tanker, should not be sold petrol more cheaply than the standard wholesale price.'
>
> Why should dealers in some coastal towns in Queensland be allowed to sell petrol as much as 10c a litre dearer?
>
> 'All I can say to that is good on them—prices are determined by the marketplace,' Mr McGill said."

I ask that the Government fix a non-negotiable wholesale price for retailers so that competitiveness can return to service stations. Consequently, jobs would be created and customers would be undoubted winners.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (8.55 p.m.): With the introduction of this Bill the multinational oil companies and the oil industry in general must be saying to themselves: Is this Government the bastion of free enterprise in Australia? Is this the Government that is the bastion of incentive and the bastion of letting the market decide? The Bill provides more regulation and more control than would be implemented by any socialist Government in any country in the world.

The Bill not only provides for total regulation and control whether or not during a period of liquid fuel supply emergency, but it also, at the will of the Minister, controls essential and high-priority users. Whether or not there is a fuel emergency, the Minister can decide who will be the bulk customers, what their allocation will be and the development of that allocation. That is true industry regulation and control.

The Bill also provides that the Minister can direct that reserves in Queensland should be created or maintained and has the power to direct the release of those reserves.

Mr Menzel interjected.

Mr CAMPBELL: I hear the member for Mulgrave, whose competence at controlling a sugar-mill was mentioned by Mr Kerin. In a sugar-mill a poor tradesman blames his tools, a poor farmer blames the weather and a poor manager blames the unions. However, a poor sugar-mill director blames the unions and the weather. If he is in trouble, he will even blame the farmers as well.

The output of refineries and their distribution of liquid fuel is also controlled by the Bill. In other words, the Bill provides total control and total regulation. I do not think the Labor Party could have done a better job. When the Government can introduce legislation like this, it must find it difficult to say that it is the bastion of free enterprise.

One aspect of the Bill is price control of fuel supplies. The Government already has the power to impose fuel price control. The Minister for Employment and Industrial

Affairs can decide that at any time. Because the provision is already in the statutes, there is no further need to provide for price control.

I wish to examine some of the aspects of price control. The member for Condamine said that the Bill would enable the control of fuel supply to essential services and to bulk users. Because the Government will have power to control fuel supplies from the point of production right through to the retailer, it can force supply to anyone it chooses. However, in practice, the Government cannot even do that now. There exists at present a permit system under which the Government can direct to where fuel can and cannot be transported from Brisbane. Despite that, private jobbers can deliver fuel to Bundaberg at approximately 5c a litre less than the wholesale price at the port. The irony is that the Government says that it supports small business in country areas and decentralisation. Agents in Bundaberg with tankers are not allowed to bring fuel to Bundaberg, but private jobbers bring fuel in illegally and nothing is done. That has not happened once or twice; it has happened regularly for years and years.

One jobber who works from Goomeri is able to obtain a permit to take fuel back to Goomeri but he takes it to anywhere in south-east Queensland, although it is against the law to take it into those areas. The jobber buys the fuel for 32c to 33c a litre, gets a rebate of a couple of cents a litre for supposedly taking it to Goomeri, and sells it for about 37c a litre to the non-leased petrol stations. He makes at least 3c a litre clear profit on 30 000 litres. That is about $900 in addition to the rebate he gets. That is not a bad profit for free enterprise. That is typical of how free enterprise is working. People are allowed to act illegally to make profits. That is happening more and more often.

If a private jobber can bring fuel into Bundaberg at 30c a litre, sell it at about 37c a litre, and make a bloody good profit, why is that not permissible for the small business people of Bundaberg?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I consider the word "bloody" to be unparliamentary. I ask the honourable member to withdraw it or change it.

Mr CAMPBELL: I will substitute the words "excessive and illegal profits".

I am interested in why the small business agents in Bundaberg should not have the same right as the private jobber to act illegally and with total immunity. We have been told that the Government will be able to enforce the new rules, but it cannot enforce the conditions of the present Transport Act. The Government has told us that it intends to regulate the fuel industry from top to bottom. I agree with the idea; we could not do it better. However, I believe that the Government is overestimating what it can do. If it thinks it can enforce this legislation, it should be able to enforce the present legislation, and if it can, I do not know that we need the new legislation.

It is interesting to note that, in the name of free enterprise, the Government intends to direct, control and regulate the whole industry. I only wish that the Government would regulate it presently to give decent wholesale prices to all fuel users in Queensland.

Mr KAUS (Mansfield) (9.4 p.m.): I am pleased to enter this debate. The Minister said that the Bill is necessary because of the uncertainties of the future supply of liquid fuel. The problem emerged in mid-1979. I will trace some of the reasons for the introduction of this measure, which I support. It was interesting to trace the history of the need for this measure. I managed to gain an insight into it when I was overseas on a parliamentary conference.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr KAUS: The less I say about that conference the better.

I am sure that all honourable members are worried about the future of fuel supplies. In the closing years of the twentieth century mankind has arrived at what someone has called the "hinge of history" We are witnessing tides of change surging through human society, an unparalleled growth in man's numbers, coupled with the seemingly irresistible

trend to an urbanised world, a revolution in communications and information technology the implications of which we perceive only indistinctly, an equally portentous evolution in the biological sciences and the proliferation of unprecendented means of mass destruction. They are mighty words. It is truly a time for hope and a time for despair.

Another revolution in thinking is occurring round the world, and it concerns energy, the engine of development and a basic determinant of human condition. Reaction to what is commonly called the world energy crisis has, however, been remarkedly diverse. To some observers, our energy difficulties are a harbinger of approaching physical scarcity in the supply of energy. Others look upon these problems as signs of encroachment on environmental limits. Of course, as I shall indicate later, there are people who worry about the environment and environmental problems.

Others ascribe today's energy problems to economic and political factors whose roots lie in institutional failings.

That is one of the reasons why the Government has introduced this Bill. It is very good that Ministers have got together to talk about those matters.

When I was in the Bahamas, I visited a place called Freetown. I have never seen such a big supply of fuel. It must have been a depot for the world. The tanks were 10 or 20 times the size of the tanks in Australia.

Mr Davis: How many tanks were there?

Mr KAUS: About 100. As I say, it was a big supply of fuel.

Mr Vaughan: What was the reason for it?

Mr KAUS: I do not know. It was just a supply of fuel for the world.

The designation "energy crisis" may be misleading, not because the situation is not serious but because the term suggests a well-defined turning point of a critical stage at which emergency measures must be taken to salvage the situation. In reality, world energy affairs are considerably more amorphous than that. There is no pivotal development to which one can refer and, correspondingly, no quick or easy solution to the energy problems.

Although people are concerned about the availability of petrol, their main concern is being able to obtain petrol at an affordable price. That is the concern that is uppermost in the minds of people today.

It must be remembered that oil is one of several essential components of the world's energy supply and that, for many of the world's inhabitants, the accelerating shortage of fuel wood constitutes a grave and immediate threat to their well-being. Nevertheless, a fifteenfold increase in the price of crude oil within a decade has been a remarkably effective means of drawing attention to energy matters.

It is less frequently acknowledged that this tumultuous period has opportunities as well as dangers. Planners and strategists are being forced to consider energy development in a different light. Today, there is a willingness to look beyond traditional approaches, and mankind is already the beneficiary of new and exciting thinking. Many of these fresh ideas centre on alternatives to the conventional pattern of energy exploitation. New sources of energy are being utilised, novel energy technologies are being introduced and non-conventional fuels are being employed.

How society uses energy must be analysed. A set of guide-lines should be drawn up for prospective energy development and an outline of a range of energy alternatives that may help to shape the future should be developed.

Although the modern energy era corresponds to the spread of the industrial revolution, the explosion in energy demand is essentially a post-World War II phenomenon. Over the last quarter of a century, the growth in energy use has averaged approximately 5 per cent a year, substantially outstripping world population growth.

The benefits of the burgeoning energy use have, however, been far from equally shared. Of particular concern is that per capita energy consumption in the developed nations has increased more rapidly than in the developing countries. The gulf between those who have and those who do not have has widened to the point at which three-quarters of the world's people must be satisfied with a one-quarter share of the energy consumed.

At the end of World War II, coal was the dominant commercial energy form. Petroleum represented less than 25 per cent of world primary energy output in 1950; but, by the mid-1960s, it had drawn equal to coal production and then rapidly pulled ahead. Today, oil accounts for almost half of world energy production.

There are excellent reasons why the demand for oil increased so rapidly after the war. Until 1973, oil was a comparatively inexpensive commodity. It is cheaply, easily and safely transportable by a variety of means at a small cost in energy. Petroleum has a high energy content, and, because of its complex hydrocarbon chemistry, oil refining can be tailored to produce highly specific fuels for a broad range of applications. No other energy commodity affords such advantages in its use, especially in transportation, and one can safely predict that it will prove much more difficult to stop using oil than it was to begin using it.

The awareness that there were limits to petroleum supply developed as demand accelerated. Within a time span of a century, man threatens to consume most of the recoverable deposits of oil that nature has taken several hundred million years to accumulate. Although the depletion of the world's natural gas and coal resources lies further in the future, increasing scarcity in these commodities, as well as oil, gas and coal, which are highly valued for their chemical and energy application, can be visualised.

Largely unnoticed in the industrialised world, a parallel energy crisis has been developing in the non-industrialised nations. Nearly half the human race depends upon fuel wood, charcoal, animal dung and agricultural wastes for cooking and heating. Although those materials represent less than 10 per cent of the global demand for energy, fuel wood alone supplies an estimated one-fifth of the developing world's energy needs and, in Africa, is thought to represent 60 per cent of total energy consumption.

Unfortunately, according to the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, there are already more than 100 million people who cannot obtain sufficient fuel wood to meet even the basic requirements of heating and cooking. A further 1 000 million people are estimated to be affected by wood shortages, and that number could grow by an additional billion or more by the turn of the century.

At the same time, Third World countries that are attempting to modernise their economies are discovering, as the industrialised nations did before them, that petroleum is a particularly suitable energy commodity for this purpose, but the high cost of oil now prevents those countries from making a similar transition.

Even with the depressed petroleum market of last year, total OPEC revenues from the sale of oil in 1981 are calculated to be about $225,000 million, which represents an enormous transfer of wealth to a very small group of countries. As oil prices have risen, so has the indebtedness of the developing countries, to more than $500,000 million today. Some nations are now unable to cope even with servicing of that debt. Caught between a dwindling supply of fuel wood and the high cost of petroleum, many nations of the Third World face a grim future unless new approaches to energy development can soon be brought to bear.

Mr Casey: What effect does this have on exploration for shale-oil?

Mr KAUS: I am not really interested in that.

For various reasons, it has become apparent that future energy development cannot proceed in the largely unguided fashion of the past. The availability and affordability of energy is so closely linked to man's welfare, and the problems are so pressing, that the expansion of any country's energy system requires efficient and effective planning. In its

recent report to the Canadian Parliament, the House of Commons Special Committee on Alternative Energy and Oil Substitution listed seven guide-lines in directing the evolution of Canada's energy system. Those principles are paraphrased and introduced here because of their more general applicability.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I remind honourable members that there is a limit to the amount of levity that I will allow in the Chamber.

Mr KAUS: If they do not want to learn anything, Mr Deputy Speaker, that is their problem. I am just retracing history and relating it to the Bill.

An overriding consideration in energy development, in either an industrialised or a developing nation, should be to use the least amount of energy possible to perform the required task effectively.

Energy conservation is typically less expensive and more environmentally benign than simply searching for new sources of energy to exploit. Doing things with improved energy efficiency means reducing rates of growth in energy demand in the long run, thereby making it easier to balance supply and demand.

Another concern in energy development is achieving diversity in energy supply. The activities of OPEC have made abundantly clear the dangers of depending too heavily upon one source of energy whose supply lies wholly or in part beyond a nation's borders. Flexibility should, therefore, be a key element in designing the energy system of any country to accommodate the surprises which will inevitably occur.

The supply of and demand for energy across the world is seriously unbalanced. The geographic distribution of crude oil, natural gas, coal, uranium and hydraulic resources is far from uniform. This inequality has constituted a major strain both on peaceful relations among nations and upon the world's economic system; a major objective must, therefore, be to pursue a better regional balance between energy supply and demand. Just as a nation benefits from taking advantage of its best opportunities in trade with other countries, so can each region of the world benefit by developing alternative energy sources and technologies which exploit its particular advantages. This is not to advocate that each country strive for total energy independence—such independence may be neither feasible nor a wise use of capital resources—but a better balance than exists today in the supply of energy from region to region would promote economic and political well-being.

There are also strategic concerns which must be addressed in energy planning, especially as the world petroleum and market is so susceptible to manipulation, as we have seen in the past. Oil is not merely an economic commodity. It is a source of enormous political leverage in the hands of the major oil producing nations. Any realistic assessment of the cost of oil must include not only the price in dollars and cents but also the price in terms of political, military and other concessions which producing countries can extract as a condition for supplying oil. Virtually all the OPEC producers, particularly those in the Middle East, have used their oil at one time or another to pursue non-economic objectives. Oil has been used to influence the foreign policies of consuming countries, the most significant example being the Arab boycott during the Arab-Israeli dispute. Oil has been used to induce the United States, France, Germany, Italy, Japan and Brazil to trade advanced weapons systems and technologies, which have military applications, to the Middle East. Oil has been used to obtain other economic concessions, including assistance in building refineries, petrochemical plants or other industries which otherwise would not have been granted.

Oil is an essential component of the energy system of every industrialised nation and is becoming progressively more important to developing countries. Of course, developing countries cannot pay for it. Petroleum powers the transportation sector and has mechanised agriculture and conventional military machines round the globe. Approximately half of the oil involved in international trade passes through the Strait

of Hormuz at the entrance to the Persian Gulf. Honourable members know what is happening there at present.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr KAUS: The honourable member for Wolston would not know. He would not know what a little private war is.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr KAUS: Ships entering the Persian Gulf to obtain oil supplies are being destroyed, and that is creating problems for most nations. If the Russians took control of the area, the supply of oil to western countries could be cut off. There would be another war and Australia would be fighting the old reds.

Mr Prest: Mr Kaus—

Mr KAUS: I am not answering any more questions.

Approximately half of the oil involved in international trade passes through those straits. Approximately 90 per cent of Japan's oil requirements, 60 per cent of western Europe's oil imports and 30 per cent of the imports of the United States is shipped through that narrow passage. The defences of almost all nations against interruptions in the supply of crude oil are limited and weak.

Similarly, another aspect of national security has not been accorded much attention. Large and complex energy installations are vulnerable to natural disasters, to the ravages of war, to terrorism and to sabotage. One of the appealing features of alternative energy options is that many of the new sources and technologies lessen the dependence upon large, centralised energy units. Such development thus promises a more secure energy supply at the level of the individual.

The social impact of energy development is a final consideration. Energy supply is closely linked to standards of living. The energy infrastructure should help provide the necessities of life. We do not yet know enough about the energy alternatives to be able to conclude definitely how much energy each alternative will be able to supply and at what cost—economic, environmental, social and otherwise. It is, therefore, particularly important that the options be investigated thoroughly to avoid the creation of a new set of problems in attempting to overcome the old ones.

It must be firmly kept in mind that most of the alternative energy sources represent diffuse as opposed to concentrated sources of energy. For instance, the average heat flow over the earth's continental regions is little more than 60 mW—that is, 0.06 watts—per square metre, whereas a barrel of crude oil contains chemical energy approximately equivalent to 23 000 hours of sunshine on a square foot of surface perpendicular to the sun's rays in the temperate regions of the world.

Mr Casey: What is the equivalent of that over water?

Mr KAUS: If the member for Mackay can master the mathematics of that, he is better than I. The gentleman who conducted that research certainly put in a great deal of time to arrive at that conclusion.

The new sources typically require systems to concentrate and store these diffuse energy flows, adding to their cost of exploitation. Given such characteristics and given the long lead times which are required to deploy new technologies, even in a technically sophisticated society, it is apparent that Australia is looking at a blend of conventional and alternative options for many years to come.

Mr DAVIS: I rise to a point of order. We enjoyed the address by the member for Mansfield so much that I will move an extension of time.

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

Mr SCOTT (Cook) (9.29 p.m.): I do not believe in conspiracy theories, but I am sure that there has been one here this evening. All I can assume is that it is being done to extend the time of the House.

Mr Casey: He is breathing down Vince Lester's neck for Cabinet.

Mr SCOTT: Then perhaps we are standing on the threshold of history.

If a plot of this nature is conceived again, perhaps the public servants should take the words out of a children's encyclopaedia, because the member for Mansfield could pronounce only half of the words, let alone know their meaning.

In spite of the levity, the subject is a very serious one. I am very pleased at the way that the ramifications of the legislation were canvassed by the members on this side of the House. The member for Nudgee gave a very full dissertation on this legislation, on the need for legislation of this type and on the history of fuel supplies. He was adequately supported by the members for Mount Isa and Bundaberg. I must say that they did a very good job. From the Government side the House has heard nothing but waffle. I do not know why the member for Mansfield had to carry things to extremes, to the nth degree, as he did.

In my brief speech on this very important piece of legislation I wish to say that I have been involved in the rationing of energy. When I worked for the Far North Queensland Electricity Board, I was required to pull the circuit-breakers that disconnected consumers, who became fairly angry.

Government Members interjected.

Mr SCOTT: That was not because of strikes. One can almost predict when Government members, like Pavlov's dogs, will come in.

Electricity rationing occurs for a number of reasons. The spinning reserve may not be as high as it should be and there are all sorts of other technical reasons. An important point is that often it is not possible to tell exactly what the reserves are. A person working in a substation in Cairns who is responsible for distributing power that is being supplied by a major substation in Townsville has no way of checking whether the people in that substation do not like Cairns. When the Townsville operators state that only a certain number of megawatts are available, the operator in Cairns must believe them because he cannot see the meters in Townsville. All he can do is watch the meters in front of him and keep an eye on the power that is going out of his substation.

The aim of that little dissertation was to try to emphasise the difficulties in exercising control over the flow of energy in an emergency. One thing the Bill will not do is achieve that. I must say that for the time being I am pleased that we have a kind-natured Minister for Mines and Energy because I am quite certain that if he decided that an emergency existed and some control was needed over the supply of fuel and other forms of energy, his good nature would prevail. However, he would not have the efficiency to control the system. Even a whole room full of public servants would not have the ability or the efficiency to control the system that the legislation seems to imply can be set up. In emergencies it is just not possible to exercise that sort of control.

The member for Nudgee mentioned the distillate shortage in 1980. Early in 1980 I was involved to a small extent in a shortage of avgas and I know of the problems that that shortage created in far north Queensland which, to a very large extent, relies on the services of light aircraft which use avgas. At that time certain aspects of society in the area ground to a halt or, to change the metaphor, were unable to get off the ground. However, I do not believe that this legislation would have been used under those circumstances. This quite draconian legislation will not be used under any circumstances in Queensland. I do not think that any Minister would be game to implement all of its provisions.

If the legislation was not so draconian, it would be the type of legislation that we on this side of the House would admire. An interesting point is that legislation of this

sort seems to appeal to the group of National Party members who entered this place after the last election. They seem to be very much in favour of this sort of harsh, controlling type of legislation. As has been said from this side of the House, what about free enterprise? What about laissez-faire? When Government members start thinking of legislation, they do not know when to stop and those terms go out of the door.

During the very long reading by the member for Mansfield, I had the opportunity to glance at the Liquid Fuel Emergency Act, to which the member for Nudgee referred. That Commonwealth legislation does not contain the onerous provisions that are contained in the Bill now before the House. Legislation similar to the Commonwealth Liquid Fuel Emergency Act of 1984 would be quite adequate to control any situation. It would only have to relate to Queensland. The Minister has gone too far in preparing the legislation. We seem to have public servants in Queensland who are unable to control themselves, knowing that they have National Party Ministers who do not worry about such things as democracy in most situations, let alone in an emergency situation.

Government Members interjected.

Mr SCOTT: That is a simple fact.

I ask Government members to read the Bill. I challenge them to undertake a public reading of its provisions anywhere in their electorates. I am sure that they will go to water. They will not be game to undertake a public reading or a public debate on it. If they were merely to read the headings of the clauses, they would be thrown out of any hall in their electorates. They will say, "We brought in necessary legislation to control an emergency situation.", but they will not spell out the provisions. They will lose the vote of any fleet truck-owner who learns of the provisions in the Bill.

I am prepared to give the Bill a little praise because parts of it are good. Contingency planning is certainly needed, and it is provided for. Does the Minister envisage the whole scheme being set up on a computer? A fairly large computer will be required to cover the whole of the State and take into account all the sources of fuel, the people and agencies that transport fuel, and all the users of fuel—even those whose need is greatest in times of emergency. I am worried that this could be another possible avenue for computer crime. Perhaps there will be no reason for those who supply fuel to try to get sticky fingers onto the computer controls, but that may not be so. With fairly heavy competition in the fuel industry in years to come, the information acquired by the department in implementing this legislation could lead to computer crime. However, I do not believe that it will ever be implemented.

The Bill is very specific in relation to the type of information that will be required from people who supply fuel, those who carry fuel and those who use it. Provision is made for the notification of address of prescribed businesses and for information about essential or high-priority users of liquid fuel. I visualise a great deal of time being consumed by the various agencies that provide the fuel, carry it and use it, in supplying all that information. I also visualise public servants taking a great deal of time to collate the information or to punch it into a computer or card system.

The provisions in the Bill are very draconian, in that a great deal of information is to be acquired by the department. A reference is made to confidentiality. It is very easy to pay lip-service to that, but how far will it go? The Bill provides that a person shall not disclose information obtained in connection with the administration or execution of the provisions unless the disclosure is made under certain circumstances. I have referred to the notification of the address of prescribed businesses and those that cease to operate as such. Fines of $1,000 and $10,000 are bandied around freely in the legislation. I cannot imagine the present Minister for Mines causing fines of $1,000 to be levied.

The Bill refers to bulk customers, the development of bulk-allocation procedures and varying guide-lines. I can read into the provisions of the Bill the possibility of the Minister's shifting bulk customers from one supplier to another. I visualise the resultant chaos. I ask honourable members to project their minds to an emergency situation.

I am pleased to see that the Minister is paying attention to what I am saying. I know that he would be worried about the creation of a situation in which he had to use this legislation.

My mind goes back to the period of electricity rationing. It was a time of great worry. People need fuel for vital operations during the day and night. If that energy source is not available, a lot of money may be lost.

The Bill provides for the maintenance of reserves of fuel. I ask the Minister what sort of magic wand he will wave that will enable him to maintain reserves of fuel. The obvious answer is that he will stand there not with a magic wand in his hand but with an orchestra conductor's baton in his hand. He will wave it and a little fuel will be provided here and there. I really cannot see that system working. In so many ways, the introduction of this Bill is a waste of the time of the House.

The Bill is a lengthy document. It contains much stronger provisions than the Federal legislation. It refers to price-fixing. We on this side of the Chamber might look at this provision with a favourable eye; but I find it strange that Government members did not bat an eyelid when the legislation was introduced. There is no doubt that price control is necessary. No-one would want to see scalping tactics used during an emergency situation. Government members have always criticised price control. I do not think that they are fair dinkum about implementing any sort of price-fixing, even during an emergency situation.

The inspectors will have strong powers. The Bill refers to the powers of authorised persons. Government members just love to see powers being given to authorised persons. An authorised person—it does not say "inspector"—will have an authorised person's badge on his lapel. That will empower him to enter any premises, inspect all parts of those premises, and require the occupier or person apparently in charge to do certain things. It will empower him to examine in that person's presence the contents, being in his opinion liquid fuel. It will also empower him to require the occupier or person apparently in charge to produce all documents relating to the business carried on at such premises; to examine and take extracts from or make copies of documents; to break open any compartment or receptacle that has not been opened in response to a requisition; and to examine the contents and to seize and retain. So it goes on.

The Bill also provides that at any time while anything seized is retained or secured, the Minister may, by instrument in writing, authorise its release to the person from whose possession it was seized. Does that mean that the Minister will be able to sell the things that have been seized and apply the profits to consolidated revenue?

There are so many provisions in the Bill about which the Opposition is not happy. Other provisions relate to the obstruction of the Minister or an authorised person and to assistance being provided to authorised persons. Any authorised person may call on people standing round to provide all reasonable assistance to him and to all persons acting in aid of him for the purpose of the exercise of his powers under the Act.

It is fairly stiff legislation. It has taken quite a while for the Government to introduce it. A major fuel emergency occurred in Queensland in 1979 and again in 1980. So, four to five years on, the Government has finally got round to introducing the legislation.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister said—

> "It is clear that, during a period of shortfall, particularly during an emergency period, both suppliers and users of liquid fuels will look to the Government to implement its powers in a firm but fair manner."

I do not think that this legislation is designed to implement powers in a firm but fair manner. I would use the word "firm" and then add a string of adjectives to indicate just how firm it is.

The Minister continued—

> "Put precisely, these provisions will give authorised persons the power to inspect premises, vehicles, vessels, aircraft and receptacles contained thereon. These provisions will have their major impact in the prevention of black-marketeering."

I do not think that the fines that can be imposed under this legislation will stop black-marketing. It should be noted that an authorised officer will not have the power to enter a dwelling-house. Thank goodness for that.

The Opposition supports the legislation and has stated its reasons. I certainly support it. However, I believe that the Bill should be less stringent than it is because it confers too many powers on the Minister and requires too much of the public servants who will have to administer it. It also requires the collation of far too much information. It will add to the work-load of people who are already overworked.

I was interested to hear the comments of the Minister for Transport in an earlier debate this evening. He said that the number of public servants would be increased to administer one section of the Transport Department. I asked him by way of interjection where he was going to get those public servants and who had authorised their appointments. Whenever I ask that things be done, I receive the stock answer from Ministers or members on the Government side of the House to the effect that the money is just not available. I now ask: Where is the money coming from that will allow the Minister for Mines and Energy and his department to administer this legislation properly?

Mr COOPER (Roma) (9.46 p.m.): Although the member for Cook said that he would be brief, his loquaciousness is such that the House could not really expect him to be brief. Nevertheless, I was interested in his comments.

The member for Bundaberg has also spoken in this debate, and I notice that he is not in the Chamber. I have a pretty fair idea where he is. He constantly whinges and whines. He is well known for his bad temper, and his language is to be deplored. It is unfortunate that he has brought them into this place.

I commend the member for Mansfield on his most erudite speech. Although there was much laughter in the Chamber at the time, I did feel that he knew his subject pretty well.

The member for Cook began his speech by saying that he felt that this was important legislation. I must agree with him; it is important legislation. He described it as draconian legislation, but it must be remembered that it has been introduced to cope with emergency situations. It will not apply across the board. The rules must be more stringent in emergency situations. The member for Cook asked Government back-benchers whether they would be prepared to debate the clauses in a hall out in the bush. I would be very happy to do that because this Bill is what we have been asking for. Although it has taken since 1979 to be introduced, it is better late than never.

The Bill has been introduced as a result of the uncertainties of the past and the Middle East crisis in 1979. As a result of that crisis, Commonwealth and State Ministers came together to form the National Petroleum Advisory Committee. Its function was to advise all Governments in Australia on the appropriate arrangements and priorities for the allocation of fuel during a supply shortage. That is what the Bill is all about.

A commonsense approach was adopted, and that is very necessary. A fuel shortage emergency can be caused by national, international or domestic occurrences and the Government must know where fuel supplies are at any given time so that they can be rationed and distributed when necessary. This legislation is complementary to Commonwealth legislation, and the other States have passed, or will pass, similar legislation.

Under the Bill, forward planning will be possible, so that a state of emergency need not be declared. The Bill will enable measures to be in place if and when required.

It is interesting to note that the Roma area does have a refinery. I give full credit to the private enterprise group that constructed it five or six years ago. The refinery employs eight to 10 people and uses the condensate from the natural gas in the area, which is supplied by tankers. Crude oil from Moonie goes through the refinery to most of the Roma district, west to Charleville and east to Dulacca. It is nice to know that there is a supply there but, in an emergency, the supply will be severely taxed and the provisions of this legislation will not have great bearing. That is reassuring to Queensland,

particularly if the problem has arisen in this State as the result of strikes, disputes or other incidents that create an emergency. It is far better if Queensland can cope itself instead of giving total power to the Commonwealth. Other States that do not already have similar legislation will be introducing it to complement the Commonwealth's legislation.

The beneficiaries will be the consumers, the businesses and the general public. They will be given a greater degree of protection from blackmail tactics adopted by either unions or big companies. Both groups have adopted such tactics in the past. The Minister will be able to decide when an emergency exists, and the Government will be given far greater flexibility to act. Speed could be essential, but the whole idea of the legislation is that the measures that will be taken may need to be taken only gradually, depending entirely on circumstances.

The Government needs to know where the fuel is at any given time. That aspect is of paramount importance. The Bill will give the Government power to seek information for planning purposes prior to any emergency that might develop. That is a sensible provision. The Bill will also give the Government authority to delegate such powers, and it will allow the regulation of the disposal of liquid fuel that is brought into the State during an emergency. The Bill will also prevent profiteering and ensure the protection of individual rights by way of confidentiality of information that is obtained and appeals. Under the Bill, warrants will be required for entry to a property, trade secrets will be protected and compensation will be allowed for in any acquisition of property that may be effected. The effects of this legislation will be to provide the basis for a graduated response to regulating the supply of liquid fuel during a shortfall or expected shortfall. However, regulation would be introduced only if the market-place failed to allocate supplies in a rational and reasonable manner or if the non-emergency provisions in the Bill failed to provide for the allocation of supplies in a reasonable and rational manner in the event of any deterioration in supply.

The Australian Institute of Petroleum and the Queensland Motor Industry Association have given written support to the concepts that are embodied in the Bill. It will afford the Queensland public far better consideration, in that disruptions to work schedules and the effects on businesses and primary producers will be lessened. Businesses will not face the disruptions that have occurred in the past.

The importance of liquid fuels in the economic and social structure of the people of this State cannot be denied. For whatever reason, shortfalls will occur again just as they have occurred in the past. Now, however, the State will be better able to manage distribution, because of less panic buying and reduced costs to the economy as a whole. That was particularly evident in my area in 1979 when primary producers felt that they were forced to engage in panic buying. They thought shortages would occur and, in addition to buying excessive quantities of fuel, they purchased massive containers in which to store it. They were holding far more fuel than they required because they were worried. I do not blame them for doing that. They bought up very heavily at that time, with the result that shortages were far more severe than they would have been if the primary producers had not bought large quantities of fuel.

This Bill incorporates the best principles of similar legislation introduced in other States and in the Commonwealth. It could well be a model for other States to follow. I support it.

Mr MILLINER (Everton) (9.55 p.m.): I endorse fully the remarks made on this Bill by my good friend and colleague the member for Nudgee (Mr Vaughan). As the member for Roma just indicated, this Bill could have some influence in stopping panic buying of liquid fuel. A number of shortages in the supply and distribution of fuel have obviously been created. One can only wonder why those sort of situations would be created. One only has to go back to the late '70s and to the speculation at that time on how the world was running out of oil. At that time people were told that there was a need for fuel conservaton. There was a fair amount of hysteria in the debate at that

time. As the member for Nudgee pointed out, Queensland experienced some problems with the oil-shale project.

Tonight I propose to raise the problems that I hope that the Bill will overcome. I refer particularly to the problems confronting the aviation industry. Honourable members might recall that in the late '70s there was a dramatic shortage of aviation fuel, and therefore its cost increased. It gets back to the old supply and demand situation. Those persons who wished to purchase the fuel that was available did so at a price above the normal retail price.

The cost of avgas has risen dramatically during that period. In fact, its price has increased far in excess of that of motor spirits. Today, avgas costs between 56c and 57c per litre, which is far in excess of the price paid for motor spirit. The increase in the price of aviation fuel is forcing up the cost of general aviation. In a State as vast as Queensland, general aviation plays a very significant part in communications. When one examines the current cost of operating an aircraft, it can be seen that the cost of transportation is being made a great deal more expensive. The end result is reflected in increased prices that must be paid by the consumer.

When one looks at the component costs of operating an aircraft, it can be seen that the cost of fuel constitutes approximately 30 per cent. That is way out of proportion with the cost of operating a motor vehicle. The cost of fuel is one area in which operators cannot reduce their costs. In the aviation industry it is essential that a constant supply of fuel is available. I would not like the shortage of avgas that occurred in the late '70s to recur, because at that time the price increased dramatically.

As the member for Roma pointed out, the Bill provides for emergency situations. I ask the Minister to explain what he would regard as an emergency situation. As I understand it, in the late '70s a break-down occurred in one of the refineries and there was difficulty in supplying replacement parts.

I hope that the provisions of the Bill do work. The member for Nudgee pointed out in his speech that in the late 1970s he foreshadowed problems concerning the constant supply of liquid fuel. At that stage he advocated that something should be done to relieve the problem. I am pleased to see that the Minister has obviously taken the advice of the member for Nudgee and introduced this Bill.

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Mines and Energy) (9.59 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their general support of the Bill. The member for Nudgee (Mr Vaughan) referred to the shortage of fuel that occurred in 1979. The Bill really is the result of the fuel crisis experienced in the 1970s. Many members, including the member for Nudgee, referred to the shortage of fuel in the Cairns area. That was one of the main problems encountered at that time.

Planning for this legislation commenced in 1979. A tremendous amount of work has been carried out to enable the introduction of the Bill. The Australian Mineral Energy Council established the National Petroleum Advisory Committee, which handed down its report entitled "Management of a National Liquid Fuels Supply Emergency". That Commonwealth document is dated 1982. A great deal of thought was given to the subject by a number of experts from almost all sections of the community. The document was studied by the Queensland Energy Advisory Council, which formulated the basis for the Bill now being debated. The Department of Mines is well advanced with its work. It was necessary to introduce the Bill subsequent to the Commonwealth legislation so that, as far as possible, it reflected the intent of the Federal legislation.

The Bill centralises responsibility. Several departments had various aspects of responsibility in this sphere. The Transport Department retains its power to act in times of emergency declared under the State Transport Act. However, this Bill basically gives an overriding and centralised control within the one department.

Reference was made to the conversion of coal to oil and the oil-shale deposits at Rundle—the synthetic fuels, as they are generally referred to. A tremendous amount of work has been carried out in those fields. A study commissioned by the Governments

of Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria and the Commonwealth, together with the Federal Republic of Germany, into the liquefaction of coal was carried out by a group under Professor Imhausen. Most of that work was based on the Wandoan seam, which has excellent coal for liquefaction. It was estimated at that time that the cost of taking that project through its full development to the refining stage would be approximately $4.5 billion. Professor Imhausen has since died. His company continues and it has tremendous expertise. We asked about a smaller complex and were told that a single-unit complex could be designed for $1 billion and that it could be added to. It is quite an expensive process.

The threat of emergencies that could create the need for synthetic fuel from either shale-oil or liquefaction has dissipated. The work, however, is being continued. We have the documentation. Further research into the liquefaction process is being conducted in many other countries. Improvements have been made to the original Sasol process used by Germany during the last war. It is now operational in South Africa. However, there is no oil like the oil we know—the oil out of the ground. The synthetic product is far more expensive.

Another oil crisis will be needed to engender that sort of accelerated activity again. A tremendous amount of work is still being done in the various oil-shale areas in Queensland. Approximately $25m has been spent at Rundle and approximately $20m in the Condor area. On a world-wide basis, progress is being made with oil-shale. Honourable members can feel comfortable and happy that progress is being made in the production of synthetic oil. That work is still a result of the emergency that occurred some years ago. If another emergency arises, that work can be accelerated without too much trouble.

Mention was made that the legislation was initiated by the present Federal ALP Government. That is quite incorrect; it was initiated by Senator Carrick, who was a member of the Fraser Government. The Queensland Government is very pleased that the present Federal Government continued with the findings of the committee of the day and brought down the legislation. The Queensland Government could have introduced this legislation much earlier, but it thought it best to wait until Senator Walsh had introduced the Commonwealth legislation. The Queensland Government is very pleased to have been a part of the entire process.

The local oil-shale studies that were proposed by the Queensland Government are still relevant, so nothing has been wasted. The Japanese are still testing Wandoan coal and seeking more samples. Germany is still undertaking many detailed studies into Condor and Rundle oil-shale. Nobody is underestimating the importance of having the technical expertise developed. On many occasions I have suggested that the Commonwealth Government should encourage the construction of a liquefaction process for oil-shale in one of the States. Even though the product would be more expensive than ordinary oil, out of the enormous amount of money that the Federal Government gains from the import parity pricing policy, the exercise could be subsidised so that at least Australia would have the technology. In some future time of need that technology could be expanded without too much work. Australia would have the expertise and the people trained in the work, and things could develop from there. There is a great deal of logic in all of that.

One honourable member tried to rubbish Southern Pacific. Irrespective of any other thing, that company has been responsible for pushing forward the shale-oil project. It has never let up and deserves an A for effort. That company will ensure that the technical side of the development is continued.

Mr Vaughan: But round that time there was too much enthusiasm, which pushed share prices up.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: At that time there was a great deal of enthusiasm throughout the world for anything to do with energy. I do not blame anybody for being enthusiastic at that time. Had the crisis continued for an extended period, because of the need for oil,

that enthusiasm would have been continued. I do not think that the honourable member should say that the enthusiasm peaked and went off. It went up with the crisis and came down when the crisis was over. If the crisis was still with us today, shale-oil would have been a most important aspect of our energy sources. A liquefaction study, based on the present usage of fuel in Queensland, has shown that the Wandoan area alone contains 100 years' supply of fuel if the natural resource is put through a total liquefaction set-up. A resource of that size is not to be sneezed at. If another crisis occurs at some time in the future, everybody will be pleased that the enthusiasm did peak and that there has been a continuation of that enthusiasm to spend money on a high risk project that may not show a profit for many, many years. It is nice to know that it is there on the back-burner awaiting a crisis that we hope never comes. The quantity of oil being found here puts Queensland in a very good position.

Reference was made to the far cheaper fuel available in north-eastern New South Wales. It is available but only because Mr Wran had to do the right thing by the traders from the Queensland border as far south as Murwillumbah and remove the fuel tax.

If any honourable member were to go to Melbourne tonight—it is pretty cold down there and I would not advise it—and drive up to a bowser, he would have to pay 50.9c a litre for fuel. It is not available for the 40-odd cents that has been referred to. Honourable members will hear more about that from the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs at a later date, because it has been properly investigated and documented. The Government feels very comfortable about the State's synthetic fuel reserves. Although there is no crisis in fuel supplies, and knowing that synthetic fuel would cost $15 to $20 a barrel more that the current price of $36 a barrel for natural oil, people are spending on investigation and development money that they might not be expected to spend.

Much has been said about the price of liquid fuel in country areas. There was to be a .5 cents a litre difference, and currently the difference is no more than 1.1c a litre. The only price that is fixed is the maximum wholesale price, and it is fixed by the Commonwealth. It is not a minimum fixed price. From there on market forces take control.

Cut-price fuel is available here and there. It is very difficult for country people to accept that cut-price fuel is available in city areas. They can only say, "There is a bigger difference in the price than there should be." However, if all the fuel was charged out at a recognised price there would be a real price differential. I do not know that that situation will ever prevail, but this Government certainly will not be fixing the price of fuel on a general basis other than in times of emergency when the price can be fixed under this legislation. The price will be fixed in those circumstances only to control black-marketing and hoarding. The Government can impose fines and thus exert control.

Reference has been made to the price of fuel in other States. It is hard to accept that, even though the 2c to 3c a litre tax imposed by the other States is taken into account, quite often fuel over the border is still cheaper than in Queensland. It appears that the fuel companies are absorbing some of the tax themselves and not passing it on into the system.

This legislation is designed to conserve fuel stocks, control hoarding and introduce rationing.

I thank the honourable member for Nudgee for his contribution. It showed that he had read and studied the Bill in greater detail than a number of his colleagues, who seemed to be suffering from athlete's mouth, in that they kept running off.

The honourable member for Condamine (Mr Littleproud), who is a member of my committee, talked in general terms about the essential parts of the legislation—the contingency plan, the power to obtain information and the guide-lines that will be laid down. He also referred to the accumulation of data. Of course, the co-operation of all companies and of all people involved in the industry is most important. As I have said, we are a long way down the track towards documenting on computers a great deal of the information that we have obtained.

The honourable member mentioned the fuel crisis in 1979. He represents the Dalby area, which is an important primary production area. If the farmers in that area experienced problems with fuel at harvest-time, a tremendous loss would be incurred. At that time there was a shortage of diesel fuel in Cairns, and I think that some had to be obtained from the naval storage tanks.

Mention was also made of the shortage of avgas at that time. At that stage, virtually no-one in Australia was producing avgas to any great degree. There was a panic to produce avgas and to distribute it in order to overcome shortages in the remote areas that rely so heavily on its use in small planes.

The honourable member for Condamine also said that after Australians got over the fright of the world fuel shortage, extra storage capacity was provided on many farms. Weather conditions at certain times of the year affect the consistency of diesel. If it is stored for a long time in varying weather conditions, waxing problems can occur.

Mr Davis: Some of those farmers made a profit. They resold some of that diesel.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: I was told that the honourable member bought it for his petrol-driven taxis but that it did not burn too well.

The honourable member for Condamine mentioned a state of emergency. The powers provided in the Bill relate basically to the extent of the emergency. They can be used to suit the particular emergency. Let us hope that no Minister will ever have to use the provisions contained in this Bill. It is nice to know that they are there. They provide a bit of an insurance policy. Let us hope that we will never have to use any of the powers in the Bill and that we will not face an emergency similar to the one that occurred a few years ago.

The honourable member referred to the intent of the Bill. Of course, he is a member of my committee. My present committee is one of the best committees with which I have been associated since I became a Minister.

The honourable member approaches matters in a logical and practical way. He has a tremendous knowledge of the background to the legislation. He stressed that it will not interfere with legitimate stockpiling. It is important that the people and the industry be protected so that the normal course of events is not interfered with by unnecessary legislation.

The honourable member for Roma also spoke about the Jackson-Moonie pipeline and the Jackson oil-fields in the region. He mentioned the importance of the pipeline that comes through the Roma electorate to the refineries.

The honourable member for Mount Isa showed a good understanding of the retail side of the fuel supply industry. Although service stations do not relate directly to the Bill, they are an important part of the overall structure of the industry. The honourable member spelt out the enormous amount of work that had been done by the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development and the Department of Labour and Industry under the administration of the member for Nundah (Sir William Knox). All of the information that those departments had accumulated was centralised in the Department of Mines and Energy. That is particularly important for the centralisation of responsibility in an emergency situation.

Mention was made about the participation of unions such as the Transport Workers Union in an emergency situation, and I would think that all organisations would be called upon for support. Although it would not be the role of unions to be at the centre of the administration in an emergency situation, there must be co-operation from everyone—the Government, oil companies, retailers, and people involved in the transport industry. I believe that, in an emergency situation, the Government would receive full co-operation from the unions.

The member for Mount Isa said that a man on the dole would earn more than a service station operator. I think that the figures released by the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs have been used incorrectly. Those figures are net profits after wages

and expenses are paid. I know that the service station industry is a tough one. There are enormous fluctuations in prices as the oil companies compete against each other. But that is the market-place; everyone fights for his share. Many successful people run service stations, too. It is a tremendous place for small business, but it involves long hours and hard work. If the service stations are worked properly, there are many rewards.

Mr Davis: Some are shocking.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: The honourable member for Brisbane Central said that some of them are shockers. I am told on good authority that his service station was the biggest shocker of them all. The member for Brisbane Central would probably deny that. A number of honourable members would agree with me that the service station operated by him was a shocker.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: I do not think that the honourable member for Brisbane Central ever charged the prices that his Victorian counterparts charged. They were asking 50.9c a litre for petrol, and I am sure that the petrol sold by the honourable member was much cheaper than that.

The service station industry and the fuel industry as a whole show how private enterprise works at its best. There are no fixed prices, other than the maximum wholesale price that is fixed by the Commonwealth Government.

A great deal has been said about royalties. It is interesting to note where every dollar goes. It must be said that oil is a resource that belongs to the people of the State, and they are entitled to receive their share of the royalties. Sometimes the taxation that is applied to alcohol, cigarettes and petrol may be a little high. Those three commodities seem to be the ones that cop the rises all the time. However, the levy of 2c a litre that was imposed by the Fraser Government for the Australian Bicentennial Road Development Program, and continued by the present Government—which I was very pleased to see—has brought good results in all States.

Mr Lee: Would you like a few interjections to help you?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: If the honourable member for Yeronga could do a bit better than the honourable member for Brisbane Central, I would appreciate it.

Mr Davis: What about that broken-down used car yard down on the Gold Coast?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: It is a very good place. The community could not do without places such as that. I am told that when the honourable member for Brisbane Central drove taxis and used to get full, he sold his taxis to that car yard after he had finished with them. Is that right?

Mr Davis: I am a teetotaller.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: I apologise to the honourable member; it must have been someone else in another taxi company.

As I said before, the oil industry is an example of private enterprise at its best. I am surprised that the honourable member for Brisbane Central is a member of the ALP, because I have been told that, in the days when he was in business, he was the greatest capitalist in Brisbane. I believe that he is still a very wealthy man.

Mr Vaughan: He is a wheat-farmer, too.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: He is a wheat-farmer, too, is he? As a good friend of mine used to describe himself, he is a socialist engaged in capitalist activities.

Mr Davis: For your benefit, I would mention that the ALP caters for all classes of people.

Mr I. J. GIBBS: I am very pleased to hear that, because Mr Hawke is catering very well for them, isn't he? He takes about 80c in the dollar from most of those people to whom the honourable member for Brisbane Central is referring. I am told that, as well, he has taxed superannuation.

Enough of this frivolity; I return to the Bill. The honourable member for Mount Isa showed how thoroughly the Mines Department had done its homework in preparation for the Bill. He asked the question: How will the machinery be handled? That will involve calling on the resources of the relevant Government departments and acting in co-operation with all industry, unions and local authorities.

A few honourable members asked how the department would find sufficient staff to implement the provisions of the Bill. The staff have been in place for over a year and are well on the way to getting the job completed. No problem arises in relation to staff. When the responsibility was centralised, it was recognised that my department had the expertise within it. With the help of three additional persons, the department has been able to apply itself thoroughly to the task. Things are well under way at present.

The remarks made by the honourable member for Mount Isa were soundly based. I know that he understands the fuel industry. Australia is well off when its petrol prices are compared with those in the rest of the world. If the honourable member were unlucky enough to live in Russia, he would have no trouble with fuel because he would not own a motor vehicle.

The member for Bundaberg has athlete's mouth. He has to be awarded the Elizabethan Trust award for being the greatest actor of the evening. He opened his mouth and some things came out, but I know not what. If he had a shot gun inside a barn and he pulled the trigger, he would not even hit the wall. He must be an embarrassment to the ALP. He even knocked the Bill. The Opposition spokesman, the honourable member for Nudgee, did his homework. His colleague tried to knock down what he had set up. If the member for Bundaberg is on the back bench now, he will soon be put on the back-burner, and that will save fuel. He referred to price control and jobbers. He referred to the poor people of Bundaberg being able to buy cheap fuel. I am glad that he is not my representative. He is trying to stop reasonably priced fuel reaching Bundaberg to stabilise the price of fuel in Bundaberg. I believe that the people of Bundaberg will learn that he is trying to stop the legitimate small-businessman whom he no doubt represents from receiving an A for effort in his attempt to get some cheap fuel and to make a dollar. I assume that the small-businessman would be employing some staff and keeping the tyre companies in business. I wish him good luck. I hope that he is making a dollar.

It was suggested that the jobber was operating illegally. I can assure the honourable member that the Transport Department officers in this State are a very efficient group. Not too many matters of that nature escape them when it comes to jobbers working illegally and working in areas in which they should not be working. The member for Bundaberg should be given three gongs for being the best actor in the House tonight. He is no doubt replenishing his energy now.

The member for Mansfield has a tremendous grasp of the fuel industry on a world-wide basis. He made a very eloquent speech. He gave a summary of the fuel history of Australia and the world. He referred to general fuel problems, including those relating to Third World countries.

Mr Innes: How much oil would be needed if that measurement was taken in the oblique rather than the perpendicular?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: I am not too sure. He was really referring to a comparison with solar heating. He said that a square foot of solar heating would not heat much water.

Nevertheless, his speech provided a great deal of very good information. He referred to an enormous number of problems. He cited the example of the huge storage that would be needed in certain countries which do not have any fuel of their own and are completely reliant on imported fuel. Of course, those countries need great storage facilities,

particularly in the light of what is happening in the Persian Gulf and round Iraq and Iran. Ships are being sunk. It is the current practice for companies to hire ships and hope that they get out, rather than send their own ships to that area. I am sure that there are many nervous people in the shipping industry.

The honourable member alluded to the fact that those countries that are completely reliant on imported oil are forced to have extensive storage. He broadly outlined many facts relating to the value of planning for the correct use of fuel, which is one of the most important matters that must be faced up to today. For example, South Australia is burning gas in a power station. That is a great waste of a prime fuel, even though it was cheap in the days when the power station was designed. Coal should be used for that purpose so as to conserve precious gas for other uses.

The member for Cook spoke about avgas and the problem at Cairns with diesel shortages. He said that the legislation mirrored Commonwealth legislation, but that we have gone too far. It must be understood that the legislation lays the foundation for a graduated response in times of emergency. Obviously he has not had time to study the Bill. We have the people capable of doing the job efficiently.

The member for Roma (Russell Cooper) lives in an energy-rich area. It is noted for its primary production as well. It contributes an enormous amount to the economy. He spoke about the gradual implementation of the Bill's provisions, depending on the circumstances. He emphasised that it protects the right of the individual.

The member for Everton spoke about aspects of avgas also, stressing that we ought to ensure that we have adequate supplies of that product. Although we had such a problem at one time, it has not recurred. The legislation is being introduced to provide for the equitable distribution and pricing of all petroleum products in times of emergency. The member for Everton asked what an emergency would be. Depending on the nature and cause, it could be national, State or local. Local problems can be handled just as expeditiously as national problems.

Finally, I refer to the recent oil discoveries in the Cooper/Eromanga basin in south-west Queensland. The No. 2 appraisal well at Tintaburra recently flowed at about 2 500 barrels a day, suggesting that it is a commercial field. The consortium is led by Hartogen Energy. The No. 2 appraisal well at Bodalla South flowed at almost 6 000 barrels a day. That field will certainly be commercial. Reserves are tentatively estimated at from 10 million to 20 million barrels. The flow was an onshore record for Australia. It is extremely important for our future self-sufficiency in oil.

The pipeline construction from Jackson to Moonie involved expenditure in excess of $100m. Recent discoveries will probably require a new 170km pipeline from Bodalla South through Tintaburra to Jackson.

I thank all honourable members for their constructive remarks. I hope that never in our life-time are we called upon to implement any emergency part of the legislation.

Motion (Mr I. J. Gibbs) agreed to.

MORTGAGES (SECONDARY MARKET) BILL

Suspension of Standing Orders

Hon. Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer), by leave, without notice: I move—

> "That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would otherwise prevent the immediate introduction of a Bill to facilitate the operation of a secondary mortgage market in Queensland and for related purposes and the passing of such Bill through all its stages this day, as follows—the second reading: by midnight, the report from Committee: by 1 a.m., with the remaining stages put without further amendment or debate."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (10.43 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

I thank all honourable members for their co-operation and patience.

This Bill makes possible the formation in Queensland of a secondary mortgage market. By "a secondary mortgage market", I mean a market established for the purpose of buying, selling, borrowing on and trading in instruments, evidencing an interest in a pool of mortgages, wholly insured as to repayment by the mortgagor, held by a trustee and enjoying authorised trustee investment status.

This legislation has been designed with the aim of allowing the private sector to form the market, the Government's role being limited to removing any legislative impediments, establishing a board to oversee the market, providing a mechanism for registration of intermediaries and providing authorised trustee investment status for market instruments. My Government will not, under this legislation, be involved in the provision of funds to create activity in the market, as appears to be the case in the piecemeal legislation being introduced, I understand, in the southern States.

Official statistics show that, as at June 1983 outstandings on housing finance from traditional institutional sources in Australia were in excess of $60,000m. It is estimated that amounts owing on housing finance from institutions in the State were at that time of the order of $6,600m.

This large volume of mortgages has to date not been brought together to enable trading in Queensland within an established and structured market to at least enable it to retain its proper proportion of approximately 17 per cent of the nation's mortgage business. Such a market has been envisaged by Queensland and other States for some years. However, a number of inhibiting factors have tended to deflect to other forms of financing interest in this type of market.

In order to redress that situation and create a climate for a homogeneous market, a number of impediments under current Queensland legislation need to be removed with the aim of allowing the private sector to develop a market in the manner most appropriate to commercial reality but, at the same time, giving total protection to investors and ensuring undisturbed the enjoyment of all rights under a mortgage by the mortgagor.

The development of the strategy outlined in the Bill was entrusted to a committee chaired by Sir Edward Lyons. The committee included Mr Philip Miskin, a prominent Australian financier recognised as the father of the commercial bill market in Australia. It received valuable assistance from the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, the Honourable Neville Harper, and many State Government officers, representatives of the legal profession, mortgage bankers, trustees, permanent building societies, project builders, valuers, the Brisbane Stock Exchange, the State Government Insurance Office of Queensland and Queensland Trustees Ltd. I also thank Mr Leo Hielscher and his officers for their contribution and support, and Mr Leo Murray and his officers for the very arduous work that they did in preparing the Bill in a short time.

All those with whom discussions took place indicated that the formation of a secondary mortgage market in Queensland was not only a positive step but, indeed, an essential step. In the past, however, a crystallised suitable commercial format had not been devised in a single package. The Queensland Bill will achieve just that.

It is recognised that the continuing growth of Queensland's population is generating an ever-increasing flow of mortgages in the domestic and commercial fields. Unless positive steps are taken to release funds locked away in long-term mortgages or otherwise denied to the finance industry, the benefits of an enormous new influx of funds will be lost.

This Bill will ensure that there will be a free-flowing market of different varieties of mortgage-backed instruments of undoubted creditworthiness designed to tap the professional money market, the institutional market and the public market.

The instruments created will be bills of exchange, promissory notes and bonds in the professional market in large sums of $100,000 and over. Certificates will be issued under a prospectus for investment by the public in smaller denominations of $5,000 and over, while blocks of mortgages will be traded in the institutional market.

The potential of the market is vast as has been evidenced by the statistics quoted, and my Government is determined that any market to be developed in this State will be professional, safe and subject to registration of operators, ensuring that only companies and persons of undoubted stature and integrity are allowed to take part.

Provision has been made to safeguard the interests of clients through the mandatory use of trust accounts for transactions, and conditions and penalties also apply. In addition, approximately seven reputable trustees will be invited to register their interest in acting as trustees to the market for the instruments created, and they alone will hold all mortgage securities.

To ensure that the market operates in a style that protects the rights of mortgagors, mortgagees and investors, a system of registration is proposed in the legislation. Supervision will be exercised by the Commissioner of Corporate Affairs and the market will be monitored by a board reporting to my Government. It will be under the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General (Mr Harper).

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Why didn't he introduce the legislation?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: It is a very important measure, one that I promised during the election. Consequently, I am introducing it.

The board will be composed of four members of whom three will be from the private sector. The other will be the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs or his nominee. All appointments will be by the Governor in Council for a term of three years.

The board's objectives will be the orderly development of the market. Its functions will include investigating and recommending on applications for registration under the Bill, operations on the market, and monitoring the activities and the discharge of duties by registered trustees. Only those individuals or corporations registered under the Bill will be eligible to operate in the market and trade in securities issued, and they will have authorised trustee status.

Annual registration will be required by trustees, issuers of marketable securities, packagers of mortgages, and finance-mortgage brokers.

Applications in the first instance will be processed by the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs and be forwarded to the board and, in turn, to the Government for approval, in the case of trustees, issuers and packagers, with finance-mortgage brokers being approved only by the board after full investigation. Registration will not be transferable.

Management of mortgages with authorised trustee status is prohibited unless a person is registered as an issuer or packager.

No restraint is placed by the Bill on the holding by any one person of any registration, except that a trustee would be, by reason of the Trusts Act, precluded from acting otherwise.

I have been advised that for an effective market to develop, any marketable security issued must have authorised trustee investment status. This status will be conferred by the legislation for bills of exchange, promissory notes, bonds, certificates or other instruments which may be issued for the purposes of this market.

Any mortgage can be utilised by the market, whether land or land and buildings, either residential or commercial.

The Commmonwealth legislated many years ago for the provision of normal domestic mortgage insurance, if so desired by mortgagees, through the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation, and most domestic mortgages are currently so insured either partially or wholly. This legislation provides that before acceptance of the property for the purpose of the market, mortgages must be 100 per cent insured by the corporation or by an acceptable insurer, a valuation acceptable to the trustee must be obtained, and the value of any mortgage lodged not exceed 75 per cent of the value of the property.

In addition, the registered issuer must be assured of liquidity of between 10 and 12.5 per cent at any time depending on the level of advance involved, not exceeding 75 per cent. Also, any marketable security issued must be certified by the trustee.

A flat rate of $5 stamp duty will be payable on any mortgage lodged with the trustee. Except to the extent that a promissory note or bill of exchange is chargeable with stamp duty under the Stamp Act 1894-1984, stamp duty is not payable on any marketable security on issue, endorsement, payment or where transferred. Any trust deed made for the purposes of the market is likewise exempt from stamp duty.

For many years, Queensland has been the only State which has not allowed procuration fees. However, in order to motivate the market, registered finance—mortgage brokers will be permitted by the Bill to receive fees for work performed, but not exceeding 1 per cent of the amount of the loan or credit obtained. In addition, the broker can recoup fees and charges necessarily incurred, to comply with the conditions of this Bill.

It is anticipated that for an active market to develop, standardisation of documentation must be provided for. To this end, the Bill allows for the prescribing of standard forms of valuation, mortgages, trust deeds and marketable securities. The extent to which this is followed will be in accordance with market requirements. The Queensland Law Society has offered to assist in the preparation of an appropriate standard form of mortgage.

For the benefit of members, I will now give examples of the operations of the market. It is a simple operation.

At the outset, there are billions of dollars worth of mortgages, both domestic and commercial, currently held by institutions of various descriptions in various States. The aim is to enable them to be packaged in large numbers, for example, in $1m lots, and traded in a market, if so desired, by the mortgagee.

The first example is for the professional sector; in this case a building society. The building society holds some hundreds of millions of dollars worth of mortgages. It may wish, for liquidity or other reasons, to borrow against some of these mortgages. Let us, for example, take the case where it wishes to borrow $10m. The society will itself package suitable mortgages insured by the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation, commonly termed the HLIC, or an approved insurer to 100 per cent of the mortgage, which has a maximum loan of 75 per cent of the value of the property, into 10 $1m lots. Then, in conjunction with a prearranged trustee with a trust deed already drawn, it will draw 100 bills of exchange (mortgage bills) of $100,000 each. These are then, after certification by the trustee that he has been assigned and physically holds the mortgages, placed upon the market directly by the building society or by a financial institution acting for it. The bills are sold on the market and cash flows back to the society.

The society continues to manage the mortgages and may redeem them on any due date on the bill, not necessarily, but say in 180 days, or later if the Bill is reissued. This means that a building society is able, through a market, to obtain large amounts of funds when needed.

The second example is for the public sector, which, in this case is a mortgage trust. The mortgage trust procures from finance-mortgage brokers and packagers, or packages itself, a large volume of mortgages.

Take the case in which $10m worth of mortgages is assembled, being 100 per cent insured by the HLIC or an approved insurer, and having a maximum loan of 75 per cent of the value of the property. They are then assigned or written in the name of a

trustee and, within the terms of the trust deed, a prospectus is issued by the issuer who, in this case, is the mortgage trust. Certificates in lots of $5,000 each or more are marketed by recommendation, by advertising, through the Brisbane Stock Exchange, or through professional advisers. These are investments with buy-back provisions or, if listed on the Stock Exchange, they are marketable securities. The mortgage trust is a management company and will continue the management of the mortgages.

The third example is for the professional sector which, in this case, is a merchant bank, etc. The merchant bank or financial institution with a mortgage banking division packages a large volume of mortgages.

Take the case again in which $10m worth of mortgages is assembled, being 100 per cent insured by the HLIC or an approved insurer and having a maximum loan of 75 per cent of the value of the property, in the name of a trustee within the terms of the trust deed. Instruments such as bills of exchange, promissory notes, bonds, etc., are, after certification by the trustee, placed directly on the market by the issuer, which, in this case, is the merchant bank or financial institution. This type of institution usually operates continuously in the money markets. The merchant bank's mortgage division will continue the management of the mortgages.

The fourth example is for the institutional sector. A large insurance company, for example, purchases a large volume of mortgages, say, $10m worth, at the one time, probably from another institution or a packager. The institution may be buying purely for investment and may or may not go to the market for the purchase.

Currently, there is no outlet for institutions to trade a large volume of mortgages, and trading in single lots of this magnitude takes time. The insurance company may not necessarily manage the mortgages but will allow the original mortgagee to continue the management. There is nothing to preclude these institutions registering under the Bill and trading in the market.

It is not expected that the management of mortgages will significantly change in any sector of the market as the relationship of the mortgagor with the mortgagee will generally remain and the mortgagor's rights will always remain.

Finally, I cannot emphasise strongly enough the urgency of the passage of this Bill through Parliament. Queensland has very favourable advantages over the other States, such as the absence of the financial institutions duty tax, which could apply several times during the life-time of any one transaction. The other States, particularly New South Wales and Victoria, which are aware of the tremendous advantages of this market, are endeavouring to implement legislation of their own as quickly as possible. For this reason, I must congratulate my committee and everyone associated with it on the expeditious manner in which they have put the Bill together for my Government to present it tonight. It is undoubtedly the most complete form of legislation ever to be introduced in relation to this market. It is another first for Queensland.

I believe that the other States intend implementing similar legislation for this market, but they have not yet done so. This gives Queensland a tremendous advantage in being first into the market with a complete Bill that will release billions of dollars of funds for reinvestment in mortgages in Queensland. Included is a very attractive investment for all Australians. The financial savings to these investors, coupled with the security that has been built into the Bill, will entice and encourage them to invest in the market of Queensland, which will further enhance the strength and stability of the financial standing of the State. Honourable members can no doubt understand why I am so anxious to have the Bill passed through all stages tonight, particularly as I foreshadowed it in my policy speech prior to the last election.

There is no doubt that some modification will have to be made later when a clearer picture of the effect of the Bill emerges. That is obvious with a complex Bill of this nature. The Government intends to have a Bill that will enable the private-enterprise sector to operate freely with as little hindrance as possible. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate—Leader of the Opposition) (11.1 p.m.): There seems to be no doubt that the introduction of this Bill is the result of two things: firstly, this Government's complete embarrassment at being very correctly criticised for not applying the same professionalism to this task as has been applied in other States, and, secondly, the Government's very hasty response to the legislative action taken by two other Australian States, namely, New South Wales and Victoria.

After further criticism directed only yesterday at the Queensland Government regarding this matter, it was not unexpected that Sir Edward Lyons and a string of other Government advisers were seen leaving the Premier and Treasurer's office late last night. Tonight legislation is being rushed into this House for no other reason than to allow the Premier and Treasurer to be able to say that the Queensland Government is first cab off the rank in relation to secondary mortgage market legislation. That is the real reason for its introduction; it can serve no other purpose. That, of course, is grandstanding at its worst. It is absolute nonsense to suggest that, by passing this legislation tonight, we will suddenly see the proposed changes take place. As the honourable member for Wolston indicated earlier by way of interjection, it is surprising that the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, who should be responsible for bringing this Bill forward, has evidently been pushed aside once again, despite the involvement of his departmental officers on the investigative committee. But, perhaps it is not so strange in view of the rift that presently exists between the Premier and Treasurer and the Attorney-General.

Opposition members have been requested to allow the Bill a clear passage through the House this evening, and we are prepared to do that in the interests of having some form of legislation to which those interested in the secondary mortgage market can refer for guidance in relation to what this Queensland Government is all about.

Having perused the Bill—certainly not at length, because Opposition members have not had it for a great deal of time—I will be more than interested to hear the response to this legislation from prospective applicants. I must say that it is impossible in the time allowed by the Government to give what I would regard as a properly considered opinion on the provisions of this Bill.

Nevertheless, we support the principle completely, and so we will not oppose any aspect of the legislation.

As I have indicated, I am concerned that this appears to be a case of pushing the Queensland Treasury aside. I am concerned that the Treasury, which is the largest investor on the short-term money market in Australia, and which possesses expertise in securities and investments of all kinds, has been bypassed completely. I am amazed that, in respect of the board that will be set up, this Government has abrogated its responsibility by not having some expert Treasury officer involved. Not only is Treasury not represented on the board, it has had no input of any consequence as far as the investigating committee is concerned. From my point of view, that is surprising.

The Premier and Treasurer maintains that he is anxious to have the Bill passed through all stages today because he foreshadowed it in his policy speech prior to the last election. I defy the Premier to show me where he did other than refer to his party's so-called thrust to make the State of Queensland the money capital of Australia. Everyone can remember that.

Honourable members will recall the stamp duty amendments affecting stock exchange transactions and the Opposition's comments at the time, which have proved to be absolutely correct, that that move was doomed to failure right from the beginning. No mention was made in the policy speech of a secondary mortgage market. To suggest that the proposed abolition of the ad valorem conveyance duty on transfer of mortgages of real estate and its replacement with a nominal duty of $5 could be foreshadowing this legislation that we are discussing tonight is certainly drawing a very, very long bow.

The Opposition is pleased that the Government has recognised the huge potential of the secondary mortgage market in Australia. The Opposition is concerned that legislation is being rushed through without due consideration being given to the most

appropriate mechanisms and means by which this market can be established and fostered in Queensland. As I have said on numerous occasions, stamp duty on the trading of mortgage-backed securities needs to be abolished. That is certainly a feature of this Bill.

Other necessary initiatives include changes to the prospective requirements under the Companies Act and the allowing of building societies to invest in mortgage-backed securities. Unlike the southern States that have announced similar measures and introduced similar legislation to that being introduced tonight, Queensland seems to be adopting a much more regulatory position than the more free enterprise and deregulatory initiatives of New South Wales and Victoria.

The Government is to control the operation of the secondary mortgage market in Queensland through the establishment of a board which will comprise representatives of the Government and the private sector. Only registered corporations and individuals will be able to operate and issue mortgage-backed securities. Presumably, if the Queensland Government licenses the issuers, it is in a sense underwriting those issuers. However, the board will have the responsibility of monitoring activities and ensuring the orderly operation of the market. The Government will, in effect, become the overseer and, one might say, sit on top as a regulatory body or authority. New South Wales and Victoria are following on the experience of the United States Government and have decided to opt for the establisment of corporations that have both private and public ownership. The Victorian and New South Wales Governments will be fully involved in the market, and that involvement presumably will give the market confidence and credibility.

Given the complexity, the volatility and the newness of the market to which we are referring, the Queensland Government's involvement will be crucial to establishing the credibility of the market, because nobody will invest in paper that is issued by a virtually unheard of corporation when readily available alternatives exist; for example, Aussie Bonds. The decision to establish corporations in Victoria and New South Wales has been taken after extensive consultation with the financial community. It was the private sector's arguments that largely convinced the New South Wales and Victorian Governments to back those corporations.

I am not saying that the market will not develop in Queensland. What I am saying is that, given the alternative forms of security investments available to Australian investors, both institutional and public, it is unlikely that they will invest in what will virtually be a new and unknown corporation when the rate of return, that is the interest rate offered by that corporation, will not be very much different from Aussie Bonds.

Secondly, mortgage-backed securities will have variable interest rates. The group most likely to be interested in such securities will be the building societies. They are likely to be buyers of mortgages, as they can buy short-dated mortgages to satisfy their liquidity requirements. In effect, they will transfer funds from the short-term money market into the mortgage market. That will allow them to provide substantial additional funds for home loans.

If the United States experience is followed, the secondary mortgage market can become second only to the Government's security market and comprise about one-quarter of all financial transactions. That is the importance of what we are talking about tonight. The implications for the Australian financial scene are enormous. The economic benefits of having the market operate in Queensland would be substantial. However, all commentators are of the opinion that it will take time for the market to be established. The rush with which this legislation is being pushed through is, quite frankly, little more than grandstanding. It is unlikely that much will happen before the new year. Certainly, reciprocal arrangments will have to be made with all of the States if the market is to develop fully. Queensland has a lower saving rate than Victoria. Given that fact, Queensland corporations would seek to sell their paper in the Victorian market. Victoria and New South Wales, similarly, would like to sell their paper in Queensland. Such interstate co-operation, which is indeed essential, would facilitate the movement of southern funds into Queensland. In the United States, if I may use that as an example once more, the secondary mortgage market facilitated the movement of funds from the

high-saving north-eastern States to the developing south-western States. States such as Queensland and Western Australia, therefore, are likely to be significant beneficiaries of the establishment of such a market.

The Opposition's main concern is this: if the participants in the market are to make money, why does not the State either directly or through one of its instrumentalities such as the State Government Insurance Office take an interest? This is not socialism. We do not want that thrown at us. Such a prudent financial move would give confidence to the market. It would give credibility to the corporation and allow full participation from the private sector. The Government would in no way corner the market. Queensland is abolishing all the impediments to the establishment of a market in Queensland and saying, simply, "Go to it." However, for the reasons I have outlined, the private sector is unlikely to jump in of its own accord. New South Wales and Victoria, through their Government-backed corporations, are likely to take the initiative. That is the fear we on this side of the House have because of the manner in which the Government is approaching the market.

Under the secondary mortgage market, banks, building societies and finance companies will be able to issue certificates or bonds backed by mortgages they hold. The residential mortgage market accounts for approximately 20 per cent of the total financial assets in Australia, with building societies alone holding $10 billion in mortgages. Those mortgages could be used to provide a huge new investment outlet for major financial institutions and building societies. It would provide billions of dollars in investment funds. Increased funds for housing, especially for first-home-buyers, would be the immediate result. That is why we are so keen to support a sincere development of the secondary mortgage market in Queensland.

As I have already said, many moves must be made before much will occur. The rushing through of this legislation is, I repeat, simply a gesture to give the impression that Queensland is finally doing something. The Opposition fully supports the moves to attract the market to Queensland, but it questions whether the initiatives suggested are adequate; whether the initiatives contained in the Bill will strengthen this State's financial sector.

The Opposition has grave doubts about those parts of the Bill covering authorised trustee investment. I have no doubt that, before the market under discussion is effectively in place, the House will see a spate of amendments.

Finally, the Bill provides for regulations to be made. The Premier has given no indication that the regulations are in place. I simply repeat that this secondary mortgage market is a long way off, but the Opposition gives the proposal its fullest support and I would hope to see something occurring as early as possible.

Hon. W. D. LICKISS (Mount Coot-tha) (11.15 p.m.): The Liberal Party supports the legislation and its passage through all stages tonight. The Liberal Party quite clearly understands the circumstances that necessitate this action. It is acknowledged that other States have already established and operate secondary mortgage markets. The Liberal Party agrees with the Government that such a market should be established in Queensland. I might say that this matter was looked at some time ago.

The framework of the legislation is commendable and I pay tribute to the actions of the Parliamentary Counsel and all of those associated in the drawing up of the Bill. Unfortunately, time does not permit of an examination of the Bill in detail and I make the plea that in the future sympathetic consideration be given should any amendments prove to be necessary and that such amendments be effected without any great delay. When legislation of this type is examined with the speed necessitated tonight, errors and omissions can occur.

After a quick look at the Bill, I will refer to a matter which I will address in detail at the Committee stage. It relates to the constitution of the board. The Bill provides that except for the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs, people from outside the Queens-

land Public Service will be appointed to the board. However, Commonwealth public servants do not appear to have been excluded.

Another matter that needs to be considered is that the board members will be appointed by the Governor in Council, yet the board members, upon the recommendation of a Minister, will appoint their deputies. If a casual vacancy occurs because a board member is not able to continue, no provision is made for his deputy to be excluded from continuing or to be allowed to continue. I have mentioned a couple of matters that have come to light after a quick reading of the Bill. I have not had time to consider it in detail. Perhaps my colleagues and I may be able to catch up on some of the provisions of the Bill during the Committee stage, although there will not be much time. As I say, the Liberal Party does not intend to obstruct the passage of the Bill tonight. It is worthy of our commendation and complete support. It will be of great assistance to securities trading in Queensland.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (11.19 p.m.): I rise to make a few short observations on the principles of the Bill. As was suggested earlier, I suppose that this could be considered to be the third lap in the race to find who comes first in the great secondary mortgage competition. Victoria and New South Wales have announced that they are moving in this direction and somebody suggested they have introduced their legislation. To avail itself of the potential market, Queensland certainly has to be in the market-place. The concept and the principle are clearly supported.

An Opposition Member: Why do we always have to follow the southern States?

Mr INNES: Perhaps we arrive at the result by a slightly different route. After hearing about public ownership, it is probably just as well.

The reality is that there is, potentially, a great deal of money that can be released for other purposes. That has been indicated fairly clearly.

Although it has been suggested that the matter is simple, that is not so. It is a fairly complicated and sophisticated operation. The trust deed is a very important document because it will back the trustees. I understand that the seven trustees within the industry who lead the market in Australia in the drawing up of trust deeds, while being well on the way, are not totally satisfied that they have found the ultimate document at this point in time.

The simple point is that the bundles of mortgages that exist in the simple domestic example, for instance, are taken and put together to allow the institutions that have become the mortgagees to sell them so that they can be provided with more funds to do whatever they want to do. After parcelling up the mortgages and releasing money back to the original mortgagee, someone who has acquired the residual body of mortgages, by way of the device in this Act, can then parcel it up again and let it out, by a variety of devices, in small parcels by way of promissory notes, certificates of entitlement, or a variety of bills of exchange and marketable securities that are outlined in the legislation. This is a new area. It is not simple. It requires a variety of new concepts. I do not pretend that I understand fully the ramifications of this new market.

It must be understood that, with everything new, caution should be exercised. People who presently believe in relation to the most important acquisition in their lives—their house—that they have a relationship with a specific person, such as the SGIO Building Society, the Metropolitan Building Society, or a bank, which makes their mortgage safe with that building society or bank, will, after the advent of this Act, no longer feel so secure.

I suspect that most honourable members have a mortgage of some sort, that they believe that it is with a bank or building society and that it will stay there. Any person who has had a bad crop or has become unemployed—I hope no-one in this Chamber is currently unemployed—might well find that his mortgagee has allowed some indulgence and has put up with a temporary embarrassment. The bank or building society will probably see a person through such times. That happens quite often in times of divorce,

when there may be problems with cash flow or embarrassment caused by restrictions on the use of combined assets.

This legislation clearly creates a market that will facilitate the building societies, banks, or other people who hold mortgages in selling the mortgages—the entitlement of the mortgagee—to someone else whose interest will be purely and totally financial, and probably competitively financial. The mortgage will be removed from the person in this sophisticated market to someone whose attitude towards indulgences and waivers is not quite the same. The illustrations outlined in the speech suggest that in some instances the original mortgagee will be the manager of the mortgage.

The warning note that must be sounded for people who have mortgages is that with the advent of this Bill and the creation of a secondary mortgages market, there will be a facilitating of the ready transfer of mortgages, which does not presently exist and which is not customary. It might well become part of the sales pitch of a building society. It might say, "We do not sell your mortgage. You deal with us, you stay with us and we will look after you."

I understand that in the United States of America, in a certain area of its development, housing loans were entered into at rates of interest that later proved to be low. Certain mortgage companies got into difficulties and on-sold the mortgages to mortgage-broking firms. Those firms did not adopt the attitude that had been adopted by the original companies, which were mainly locally based, and foreclosed like steam, because the mortgagee, as well as the mortgagor, has rights.

If I am incorrect in what I have said, I certainly pose these questions to the responsibile Ministers: Is it not a fact that mortgages can be sold by mortgagees without the permission or approval of the mortgagors? Therefore, is it not important that, in the future, mortgagors should understand just what the situation will be and, in particular, what the policies will be of those people with whom they are entering into mortgages? What is the relationship between the legislation governing building societies and this legislation? Where is the interaction? Is there any restriction on building societies being able to deal freely with mortgages, or is it proposed that there should be any restriction on them?

We are dealing with something that is vitally important to 90 per cent of people in this State—the mortgage of their home. They should understand that there is a real question whether the firms with which they believe they have entered into a mortgage might sell out to somebody else whose attitude might be quite different in relation to enforcing strictly the terms of the mortgage.

I raise that question because of the advent of the secondary mortgages market. It does not persuade me that one should not enter that market; but it does raise for me the need to ask those questions. If those questions have any validity, people must be warned about the nature of mortgage transactions in the future. It might even be that moves are made to secure the attitude and understanding that presently exists with those firms with which people have mortgages—banks, building societies and others.

The Leader of the Opposition has suggested that it was drawing a long bow to say that the lowering of stamp duty has a relationship with this legislation. I suggest to him that he is being quite unfair in saying that. This market could not be created unless there was nominal stamp duty, or no stamp duty, on the transfer of mortgages. It was vital that that action be taken to facilitate the development of the mortgage market.

If the Leader of the Opposition had read the last several Budget speeches, he would have seen that an attempt has been made to create a climate in which mortgages are negotiable. As part of that attempt, stamp duty has been lowered. In the southern States, no stamp duty is imposed on transfers of this type. In Queensland, it will be a nominal stamp duty of $5, which will not impede the transactions.

Having taken a bite out of the Money Lenders Act, I encourage the Government to bite a bit more. In my speech in the Budget debate in 1981, I referred to the Money Lenders Act and to its antiquated effect on the commercial life of this State. In that

speech, I suggested that stamp duties should be used adventurously so that Queensland could get a competitive edge over the other States.

At the time, I called also for reform of the Money Lenders Act. Queensland is behind New South Wales and Victoria in relation to the provisions of that Act. In the nineteenth century, when interest rates were often extortionate and people were unsophisticated, there was a purpose to the Money Lenders Act. Perhaps there is still a purpose today in having such an Act to govern financial transactions involving what I might call little people.

References in this Bill to procuration fees echo the provisions of the New South Wales legislation. In New South Wales, any commercial transaction that is usually carried out between men of commerce is outside the ambit of the Money Lenders Act. New South Wales does not even play round with a 17½ per cent interest rate or a variable interest rate.

As I said in 1981, a building society or a bank that is selling its mortgages to another financial institution has sophisticated people such as lawyers and accountants, who are also wordly-wise, to handle its transactions. Such institutions do not need to be protected against anything. The Money Lenders Act should not contain references to them. That is just an impediment. That Act contains restrictions that are unnecessary. Most importantly, the prohibition on procuration fees should be dispensed with. It is not necessary, because it is part of commerce.

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen: We are going to amend the Money Lenders Act.

Mr INNES: I welcome that move, and the Government will have my total support.

As I said, I welcome the provision in this Bill that removes the operation of the Money Lenders Act, which prohibits a procuration fee being charged. As every honourable member knows, that fee has been called many things. Carpet-baggers were coming into the State, going into hotel rooms and entering into transactions, and they invented all sorts of names for the procuration fee, including establishment charges and commissions, to name only two. In fact, the transactions were all unlawful, but the business was done. Very often the contract was consummated in New South Wales and that State received the stamp duty. That provision in the legislation is a welcome move, and there should be more similar moves.

I should like to raise a couple of points relative to the Bill, but they will not stop the progress of the legislation through the House this evening.

As I am sure the Premier and Treasurer is aware, honourable members have not had time to absorb the fine details of the Bill or to look closely at its wording. Of course, there could be flaws in it. As the honourable member for Mount Coot-tha said, if further study discloses flaws, and given the circumstances in which the Government wishes to push the legislation through, I ask that it takes on board any constructive submissions for better wording. I ask that any such amendments be implemented as soon as possible. I am sure that if the board has problems with the legislation, the Government will act as soon as possible to amend it.

I would like to make one point about corporations that will be allowed to become trustees. The Premier and Treasurer has indicated that seven corporations may be selected as trustees. I would have thought that it would be better to indicate what the criteria would be for selection so that the companies could compete against each other. We in the Liberal Party believe in free enterprise, as does the Government. As many companies as can qualify should be allowed to find a place in the market. If that is not possible, the criteria that form the basis of selection should be stated. I do not want suggestions that the favoured are chosen to be made in Queensland, as they have been made in New South Wales about instant lotto. We believe in the free market; let us have free market competition, which is open and above board, for what will become a valuable commercial right as trustees. I ask: What criteria will be used to select companies to become trustees under the Bill?

Mr Gygar: What about a tender procedure?

Mr INNES: As the member for Stafford said, a tender procedure would also be perfectly open and above board, and that would allow those valuable rights as trustees to be obtained.

Hon. Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (11.35 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions and suggestions. They are worthwhile ones and, naturally, the Government will take them on board.

I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his comments. I must say to him, however, that the Government has been working on this measure for a long time. It certainly is not being rushed through tonight. As I indicated in my second-reading speech, many institutions worked with the officers concerned. I gave a list of those people who had been working together. The Under Treasurer was involved and I had lengthy discussions with him at our meetings.

As to the legislation that is being introduced in other States—that legislation is only piecemeal and is not a complete package. That is quite evident from the fact that today no other State has a market such as the one that my Government is seeking to achieve and activate. We know that other States will create such a market at a later date.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to the participation of the Governments of two Labor States. He must recognise that the amount that those Governments have contributed by way of participation is $5m. That does not really mean anything.

The honourable member for Sherwood referred to the charge of $5 per transaction by way of stamp duty. It must be remembered that Queensland does not have a financial institutions duty tax, which can be applied a number of times to a single transaction. Certainly, some improvements could be effected by not having a $5 fee on transactions, but that matter and others can be assessed as time goes on.

Without doubt, this legislation will result in the release of a good deal of money for the purchase of homes. I should like to read from an editorial that appeared in "The Sydney Morning Herald" today. It read as follows—

> "Obviously, if a mortgage market existed, these building societies could buy short-dated mortgages to satisfy their liquidity requirements.
>
> In doing so, the building societies would in effect transfer these funds out of the short-term money market into the mortgage market."

In other words, the funds would be unlocked. Later—

> "At an average amount of $50,000 per mortgage, this would help create no less than an extra 20 000 home loans."

So the benefits that will flow from this legislation can easily be seen.

I assure the honourable member for Sherwood that there is no reason why people should feel insecure. In my second-reading speech, I said that this scheme would give total protection to investors and would ensure undisturbed enjoyment of all the rights under a mortgage by the mortgagor. That must be kept in mind. Banks have a special relationship with their clients, and no bank will allow a situation to arise in which it will lose clients. The same remark can be made of building societies. No-one needs to be deeply concerned about this scheme.

It is necessary to be selective in choosing the people who will fill the positions of trustees, packagers and insurers of securities because we have to confine our choice to people of repute and high standing in the community.

At no stage have there been any arguments of substance which deter my Government from its stated aim of making possible the first complete package of legislation enabling the private sector to proceed with the establishment of a viable secondary mortgage market.

This Bill has the innovation of authorised trustee investment status for market instruments, as, it is believed, will be the case in the major southern States for similar instruments. Even today it was reported in "The Sydney Morning Herald" that instruments issued by the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation were as good as Commonwealth Bonds. It is provided that Queensland's market instruments will be 100 per cent insured by that corporation.

The reason for the granting of authorised trustee investment status under carefully evaluated conditions and with built-in liquidity requirements is to add a level of statue to the instruments which will expedite marketability and, as it is envisaged that Queensland is to be the first into the market, we are anxious to ensure as high a volume start as possible, without, in the opinion of the market advisers, exceeding any prudent level of advance in the light of the security requirements.

It may be thought that as a result of this Bill there could be an increase in the rate of interest applying to mortgages. However, I am advised by persons experienced in the industry that the sheer volume of the market and the competition thus created is more likely to cause an easing of interest rates for housing. Commercial lending is by its nature generally negotiated between the parties. That must have an effect of reducing interest rates.

Banks have from time to time lacked liquidity resulting in pressure being brought to bear on borrowers. This market is by its nature designed to enable a better flow of liquidity resulting in the banks being in a better position to take care of their long-standing clients. That is certainly a positive aspect.

In periods of high liquidity building societies will be able to purchase mortgages from the market enabling them to utilise otherwise semi-idle liquid or locked-in funds. In periods of tight liquidity these same investors will be able to sell or borrow on mortgage bills supported by mortgages held and so recreate liquidity. There are traditional periods during the course of the year when liquidity in the monetary system tightens. As all honourable members would know, this period usually is between March and June.

The effects of deregulation have yet to be tested in Australia in a tight period. Should building societies find a need for funds during this period, it is anticipated that the fact that there is a professional market place for them to tap should mitigate the normally adverse effects experienced at this time.

It could be construed that, in a period of deregulation, my Government seeks to regulate an emerging market. However, without some form of control over the standards of those who are to be permitted to trade in the market my Government is supporting, it is prudent to set down a style of regulation which will enable a secondary mortgage market to develop on sound lines. The intention, however, is clear. My Government is providing conditions under which private enterprise can operate and prosper while at the same time having clearly in our minds the security and well-being of both mortgagor and investor.

I have been advised that domestic mortgages are more likely to be written for shorter periods of three to five years with an option or right to renew if the mortgagor's history of payment is good, and it is more likely that newly created mortgages, and the last three to five years of established mortgages, will initially be traded.

I wish, however, to make clear to honourable members that nothing in this Bill can take from any mortgagor the full rights conveyed by the mortgage documents. I emphasise that point to honourable members.

Mr De Lacy interjected.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: New South Wales has only piecemeal legislation.

The fact that the mortgage enters the secondary mortgage market does not alter the situation to which I have referred. Any adverse market trend cannot result in the sale or misuse by an issuer, or trustee, of an individual mortgage in good standing. In fact, a mortgage can only be foreclosed under normal conditions of default by the mortgagor

and only after consultation in this market between the issuer and the insurer. It is unlikely that the original management of the mortgage will significantly change.

Intermediaries in the market will be very carefully selected in order to enjoy authorised trustee investment status. In the event of a default by an intermediary, which is most unlikely, the trustee who holds the physical mortgage as security protects the rights of the mortgagor and the investor.

The experience in Australia is that even a large organisation can sometimes be subject to bad management. That is possible. In the event of an issuer being unable to meet its obligations, it must be pointed out that the securities are in the possession of the trustee. The issuer will be the only one at loss. However, the commercial bill market history in Australia is one of the market-place invariably being in a position to buy in securities. As a consequence, in the course of 20 years, no major merchant bank trading in the market has ever defaulted.

It is anticipated that following this legislation there may be a need for further provisions to be made in law for the conduct of the mortgage market, as I said earlier. The development and practices of the mortgage market will be monitored. The Government will not be slow to initiate whatever action is necessary and implement it.

My Government has received every co-operation from the business sector and from within the Government to facilitate and guide this project, and for this I am most grateful. Our move will give Queensland a tremendous advantage in being first into the market with a complete Bill. Once again, Queensland will lead in progressive legislation for the benefit of the people.

Motion (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to.

Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Row, Hinchinbrook) in the chair; Hon. Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3, as read, agreed to.

Clause 4—Interpretation—

Mr INNES (11.47 p.m.): The first matter I speak to is rather technical. I ask whether in the definition of the term "secondary mortgage market" the term "marketable securities" includes a mortgage itself. "Secondary mortgage market" is defined as meaning—

> "the market formed by the buying and selling and offering for sale of promissory notes, bills of exchange, certificates of entitlement or other marketable securities that entitle the holder thereof to the whole or a share of the mortgagee's entitlements"

The question I pose is this: Is it not unsure whether the term "marketable securities" in fact covers the mortgage itself? Is it not intended that the secondary mortgage market will include not just those subordinate certificates of interest or entitlement, shall we say? Is it not intended that the mortgages themselves will be part of the mortgage market? Does "marketable securities" include the mortgage itself?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I was attempting to follow what was said by the honourable member so that I may obtain advice from the officers. However, I emphasise that in drafting we have ensured that the people who have taken a mortgage—the investors—are completely protected.

I do not see that there is any way, through the introduction of the legislation, that the Government or anyone else can be affected detrimentally. I am informed by my officers that it is the securities that are traded, not the mortgages.

Mr INNES: So the mortgage is not in fact included in the terms? I thought that was the case.

I do not for a moment suggest that the Government intends that mortgagors shall be adversely affected but, as a consequence of this legislation, can a mortgage be transferred to a mortgagee without the permission of the mortgagor?

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen: Yes, that is correct.

Mr INNES: So potentially the relationship can go to somebody other than the mortgagor's bank or building society?

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen: But the banks cannot afford to lose their clients.

Mr INNES: One would hope so, but I just raise the precaution.

Mr LICKISS: I was under the impression that a mortgage cannot be assigned without the permission of the mortgagor. If it is an entitlement to a mortgage, I can understand that somewhere along the line that may be able to be taken over by another person, but what I am concerned about is whether a building society, as mortgagee, can assign one of its mortgages to another mortgagee without the permission of the mortgagor. I was under the impression that that is not permitted. Could I have some clarification of that?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: It cannot be done at the present time, but the Bill provides for it. As I have already said, there is no way in which that will affect the mortgagor, who is completely protected. Nowadays many of us would not even know where our mortgages are or whether or not they have been traded. The one objective of banks and building societies is to look after their clients because they cannot afford to lose their customers. To sell a mortgage the approval of a mortgagor is not required. That enables a bank or other institution to gain further liquidity, which in turn helps the client if he ever wishes to take out another mortgage with that institution.

Clause 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—The Board—

Mr WARBURTON (11.54 p.m.): The concept of the board contained in this clause is of some concern to the Opposition, because it seems to me that it establishes somewhat of a bureaucracy at the top of the market. Unlike a corporation, it will not give any lead in the market-place. Could the Premier advise whether or not, during the course of his investigations and subsequent decisions in respect of this matter, any consideration was given to the establishment of a corporation? When I look at where this sort of a market has been established in other places, it would seem to me that the concept of a board is somewhat unique.

Secondly, I notice that the board will consist of five members, one of whom shall be the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs or his nominee.

If the Government wants to get this matter on the rails quickly it is important that the board be created as soon as possible. The Premier and Treasurer may have an idea of the people whom the Government wants to place on that board. Members of the Opposition are certainly interested to know about them. I ask the Premier and Treasurer to disclose the names of the board members whom he has in mind. I think Sir Edward Lyons has been discounted; he is not in the race. Mr Miskin may be a possibility, but that remains to be seen. He is odds-on favourite with the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing at the moment. More importantly, was consideration given to the establishment of a corporation, particularly as the board concept is seemingly unique in this market arrangement?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: A corporation was spoken of but no serious consideration was given to it, because the Government wished the whole operation to be, as it were, entirely in the private sector area. The Government will give it the necessary status and, at the same time, leave it to private enterprise.

The four people to be appointed to the board will be vetted by the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs. The trustees, the packagers and the issuers of securities will be considered for appointment. The names will be submitted to the Minister. At this point in time I cannot suggest any names, because nothing has been finalised. I assure the

Leader of the Opposition that the two public servants and the three private enterprise people will be of good standing and of proven character.

Mr De Lacy: Are you going to put any Labor blokes on it?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I cannot ever remember asking a public servant whether he votes Labor or not. I do not know whether or not the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs is a Labor man. I could not say, because I do not ask anyone his politics. It could be a fifty-fifty chance; there could very easily be one on the board.

I assure the Leader of the Opposition that the board concept is a practical one which we hope will work in a very efficient and satisfactory way under the commissioner in the interests of the whole operation and people generally.

Mr LICKISS: I understand what is intended in the legislation, but I am wondering whether the words say what is intended. It seems to me that the two definite people on the board are firstly the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs or his nominee and, secondly, one officer of the public service of Queensland. The public service in Australia can be in two realms. It can be the Commonwealth public service in the realm of the Commonwealth and the State public service in the realm of the State. The legislation provides that there can be only two public servants in the realm of the State. The other three can be people completely detached from the public service. They can be members of a quango, who are not public servants for the purpose of any Act, or they can be members of the Commonwealth public service, because Commonwealth public servants are not debarred by virtue of the proposed legislation.

I point that out in terms of the wording, in case some clarification may be required in the future. It can be got over now because the Governor in Council approves of those who will be appointed and therefore can be quite discerning in his appointments. Nevertheless, for the sake of the wording of the legislation, the matter should be closely examined, because I do not think it says exactly what is intended, as indicated by the Premier and Treasurer.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I appreciate that.

Clause 5, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 6 and 7, as read, agreed to.

Thursday, 20 September 1984

Clause 8—Casual vacancy in Board's membership—

Sir WILLIAM KNOX (12 midnight): The problem that I see with this clause also arises with clause 11, which deals with deputy members. Clause 8 refers to casual vacancies on the board. Clause 11 provides that a deputy member shall be deemed to be a member of the board.

Although clause 8 deals with the fate of members of the board, there does not seem to be any provision dealing with the fate of deputy members. If a member dies, it is not clear whether a deputy member has any rights. Frankly, I do not think he should; but there seems to be a hiatus there.

It is true that the Governor in Council can move swiftly to fill a vacancy on the board, and no doubt that will happen in most instances. It is not a matter of life and death at this stage, but I thought that it would have been desirable to provide for the fate of deputy members, seeing that in some cases they will be fairly influential in the running of the board.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: A deputy member's appointment cannot survive the termination of his principal's membership.

Clause 8, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 9 and 10, as read, agreed to.

Clause 11—Deputy members—

Sir WILLIAM KNOX (12.2 a.m.): The procedure for the appointment of deputy members is somewhat strange, and I think that it could create a serious problem. The appointment of ex officio members is quite clear; I do not think that there is any doubt about that.

The members of the board are appointed by the Governor in Council, and rightly so, but the deputy members are appointed virtually on the recommendation of individual members and with the approval of the Minister. It would seem that frequently circumstances will arise whereby deputy members will have to act on behalf of members of the board. Because of their power and the way in which they will have to act from time to time, it would seem to be desirable that deputy members should also be appointed by the Governor in Council.

The Governor in Council, quite rightly, has the authority to appoint the members of the board. Why should the deputy members not have to answer to the master, who is, of course, Cabinet and the Governor? I bring that matter to the attention of the Premier and Treasurer because I think it is a flaw in the legislation and it could become an embarrassment later.

As I have said, deputy members are appointed on the recommendation of the members and with the approval of the Minister. The Bill does not say what happens if a member of the board nominates a deputy who is not acceptable to the Minister. Again, that problem could be overcome by providing that all deputy members are appointed by the Governor in Council. That would run over the top of any power or supposed power that a member might think he has. The Governor in Council should be responsible for the appointment of the deputy members, no doubt in consultation with the members of the board.

Because of the way in which the provision is worded, on occasions, because of illness, absence overseas or other commitments of members, the board could comprise all deputy members. I think that that would take away the authority of the Governor in Council. I hope that, in future, that provision will be considered for amendment. I can foresee dangers if the Governor in Council is not at all times the authority for these appointments.

I suggest to the Premier and Treasurer that deputy members of the board should be appointed at the same time as the members are appointed. In other words, the deputy members will be preordained. Everybody will know who the deputy members are in advance instead of their being appointed in a piecemeal way that could be an embarrassment to the board, to the Government and to other people involved. I can see no harm in having people who are appointed to the board nominating and recommending their deputies so that the deputies can be appointed simultaneously by the Governor in Council.

Mr LICKISS: I support the comments of the member for Nundah.

I draw the attention of the Premier and Treasurer to a matter that has been mentioned already. The Commissioner for Corporate Affairs, who holds a commission, will be a member of the board. His nominee, I take it, would need to be a public servant, although the Bill does not state that.

The member of the Board who is a public servant may not be required to nominate another member of the public service as his deputy. That could mean that there is an imbalance on the board because the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs is probably not classed as a public servant, and the nominee of the public service member may not necessarily be a member of the public service. The Bill does not specify that he must be a member of the public service.

That can be overcome, of course, because, under the Bill, any deputy must be approved by the Minister. I draw the matter to the Premier and Treasurer's attention because, if the legislation is being tidied up at a later date, it should be given consideration.

Clause 11, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 12 to 16, as read, agreed to.

Clause 17—Registration to allow operation on secondary mortgage market—

Mr INNES (12.8 a.m.): I hope that the Premier and Treasurer will bear with me, because I am doing everything on the run at the moment.

Clause 17 provides that people who wish to operate on the secondary mortgage market must be registered. A registered packager of mortgages will become one of the people who can operate on the secondary mortgage market. A packager of mortgages is defined as "a person registered under this Act as a packager of mortgages for the purpose of the secondary mortgage market" What is the consequence if a person who supplies mortgages and who works in the conveyancing of mortgages to the secondary mortgage market is not registered? Is there any prohibition or penalty for an unregistered person, such as a solicitor, who puts mortgages up for somebody else so that they can be used on the secondary mortgage market? Is there any penalty?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am sure that the commissioner will supervise and control this whole operation very carefully. There is no way in the world that other than a registered packager will be able to deal in this area. I cannot see why the honourable member should imagine that somebody would appear out of the blue and become involved without the commissioner's being aware of it. He will take action very quickly.

Clause 17, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 18 to 22, as read, agreed to.

Clause 23—Notification of change in governing body of corporate registered person—

Mr CAMPBELL (12.11 a.m.): It is amazing that, although the Bill refers to trading in lots of $1m, someone who does not play the game faces a maximum fine of only $1,000. In the debate on the Liquid Fuel Supply Bill, it was revealed that someone who does not do the right thing can be fined as much as $50,000. It is interesting that for the commission of white-collar crime involving $1m or even $10m, which might be borrowed, the maximun penalty will be only $1,000. That is very poor. As the scheme envisaged by the Bill will involve millions of dollars, adequate penalties should be imposed. The penalty of $1,000 should be increased.

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen: It is only a minor matter—notification of change.

Mr CAMPBELL: That is right. However, the maximum penalty that can be imposed for major fraud is $1,000. That is not enough.

As honourable members have said, this legislation is new legislation, and it is supposed to be the most comprehensive legislation in the State. However, the Premier and Treasurer has said that probably it will need amending. Anyone who is able to find loopholes in the legislation and manipulate the system can be fined only $1,000. That is an insignificant sum, and it should be increased.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: A note that has been passed to me says that the true penalty is the revocation of registration, which would apply to anyone who does not comply with the requirements of the law. Naturally, such a person would lose his registration. That would be a severe penalty.

Clause 23, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 24 to 26, as read, agreed to.

Clause 27—Authorized trustee investment—

Mr INNES (12.13 a.m.): My question on this clause is a very short one. I should like to have some explanation of the way in which the percentages were arrived at. What is the basis for the use in the table of 66.66 per cent in relation to the value of the mortgage and of 12.5 per cent as to liquidity?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The answer to the honourable member's question is that those figures were used in accordance with industry advice. I cannot tell the honourable member their exact purpose, but they are based on advice given to the Government by people who are well versed in the industry and who are qualified to give such advice.

Clause 27, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 28 to 35, as read, agreed to.

Clause 36—Restriction on right to procuration fee—

Mr INNES (12.15 a.m.): I wish to raise a question on the procuration fees generally. While I am dealing with that matter, I will raise a matter under clause 38 so that the Premier has some warning about it.

As I understand it, unless there are outgoings, the procuration fee is limited to 1 per cent. I understand that if there are outgoings, they can be added to the 1 per cent. A necessary interstate flight or an interstate or international telex are the type of outgoings that would reasonably be added to the procuration fee.

Clause 38 refers to the fee that must be paid into a trust account and how the money is taken out of the trust account. I think that there has been some slight rearrangement of the clauses. Clause 38 states that a person shall not withdraw moneys paid by him into a trust account until the loan or credit has been secured or until the expiration of a period agreed between the broker and the client if the loan or credit has not been secured. Subclause (3) of clause 38 states—

> "Moneys withdrawn from a trust account upon an event referred to in paragraph (a) of subsection (2) shall be retained by the registered finance-mortgage broker.
>
> Moneys withdrawn from a trust account upon the event referred to in paragraph (b) of subsection (2) shall be refunded to the client by whom they were paid."

The question I ask arises from the practice in relation to trust accounts. It would appear that subclause (3) would allow a person to sign a cheque on his trust account to his general account, covered and backed by the power of this Bill, and then sign a cheque from his general account to the client. The usual operation of trust accounts and the usual intention of trust accounts is that a person does one of two things. He signs the cheque straight to himself, if he is lawfully entitled to that money, or he signs the cheque straight to the client. A person is not allowed to put into his general account money that is intended for the client. The reason is that he must, if possible, stop the intermingling of his money with his client's money. Say that a person is in overdraft and the bank moves in. His trust account moneys are frozen.

It would seem to me that the phraseology is not that which I recall in the Trust Accounts Act. It would have been far better to use that wording and say that a person can do one of two things: pay out to his client; or pay out to himself, if he is authorised to do so. However, he cannot withdraw and then refund, because he runs the risk of intermingling his money with his client's money in the general account.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am sorry, but I have to admit that my officers cannot quite understand what the honourable member is saying. If he could provide his question in writing at some stage, he will be given an answer. However, tonight neither my officers nor I can follow what the honourable member said.

Mr INNES: As I recall the Trust Accounts Act, a person does not withdraw money other than to pay the moneys that can lawfully be paid to him, or to pay money to his client. At the time when he signs the cheque on his trust account, he either signs it to himself, if he is entitled to it, or the cheque is made out to the client to be paid directly to him. So it goes straight from the trust account to him, if he is entitled to it, or to his client. It seemed to me that the phraseology of that clause, "moneys withdrawn" and "shall be refunded", suggested a base of time when a person could validly write out

a cheque to himself and then pay the client without breaching the proposed Act, whereas it should really be phrased so that the person has an obligation to sign the cheque straight to his client, or to himself, if he is lawfully entitled to it.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The answer is that they are retaining only the procuration fee. I assume that that is the answer the member is seeking. That is the answer that is given to me.

Mr CAMPBELL: I refer once more to the penalty. This legislation covers transactions of $1m. One per cent of $1m is $10,000. The penalty for fraud or for making a mistake is only $500. Again I believe that that is not high enough. A person may be guilty of some wrong-doing, for which he is paid $10,000, yet the maximum penalty that may be imposed on him is $500. It ought to be greater.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Once, again, deregistration is the real penalty.

Clause 36, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 37 to 40, as read, agreed to.

Clause 41—Regulations—

Mr INNES (12.22 a.m.): This is the last point I will raise on the Bill. I refer to subclause (m), which says—

> "The Governor in Council may make regulations . . providing for all matters and things that in the opinion of the Governor in Council are necessary or convenient for the proper administration of this Act or to give the effect to the provisions of this Act."

I raise a question that relates to the Subordinate Legislation Committee. Is not the phraseology of that provision a little wide? It appears to delegate to the Governor in Council a law-making capacity. It is possible to have an opinion of the Governor in Council wider than the terms of the legislation which would allow him to make regulations. That would really take matters further than the construction of the Bill. I thought I recalled that a more restrictive form of words had become customary in that type of delegation.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: That is the usual clause contained in many other Acts. I think that that is very well known.

Clause 41, as read, agreed to.

Clause 42—Penalty provision—

Mr CASEY (12.24 a.m.): I wish to take a little further the point made by the honourable member for Bundaberg. Clearly, this clause deals with penalties that may be imposed under the legislation except where they have been specifically stated. Most penalties specifically stated have been set at $500. On two occasions the penalty is $1,000, that is, for failure to advise of changes in the name of the corporation and for managing mortgages without registration.

Under the remaining provisions of the Bill, as one honourable member has mentioned already, there are many ways in which white-collar crime can be perpetrated. Some of the dealings will be multimillion-dollar transactions. Taking a fee of 1 per cent, the sum involved will be hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The Bill really deals with the money manipulators of the world, who deal in very large sums of money and tend not to have very much concern for those at the bottom of the ladder. If honourable members do not believe that, they should look at what happened with the bottom of the harbour schemes. In the 1960s, no-one would have believed that anyone would have been able to manipulate taxation and company legislation to such an extent. As a result of that manipulation, many people finished up in very severe trouble and many small investors found themselves in positions that they never dreamt they would be in.

As some honourable members know, a classic example of that is to be found in what is known as the Macrossan report, which was commissioned by the Parliament. Because of the way in which some of the money manipulators of this State manipulated the Co-operative Housing Societies Act, the Land Act and the various pieces of trust legislation, they legally walked away with millions of dollars that belonged to small investors in this State. One of the problems is that it is the small investor who gets caught.

I am not being critical of the legislation. I can accept the way in which it is being brought forward, and I believe that the scheme is worth a try. I support the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition in his speech.

As a great deal of money will change hands, some of the manipulators stand to make a large profit. That is why the legislation places fairly tight controls on registration and places some fairly strong powers in the hands of the members of the board.

The Premier said that if anybody gets caught, he will lose his registration. That sounds very good. But how often have honourable members found that once money manipulators in the company structures are caught and lose their registration in one financial field, they suddenly pop up in another area. That was certainly the case with those who were named in the Macrossan report, which was tabled in the House. That inquiry investigated a number of co-operative societies and found that, some years before, the same people had been involved in a series of round robin share dealings that stripped companies of their assets. By that method, those people made their fortunes and they lived to fight another day in a similar financial area.

If the same type of thing happens under the provisions of the Bill, in the long run those who will get their fingers burnt will be the small mortgagors in the community. I know that the Premier said earlier that, because mortgagees do not want to lose the trade of their clients, the mortgagors will be protected. That is all very well. But when a manipulator sets out to deliberately defraud without thought for those whom he hurts, it is the small people of the community who are hurt. Consequently, a $500 or $1,000 fine will be no deterrent to those who want to be registered under the Bill and work in this field for a period of time. They will end up deliberately manipulating the money market so that they can scoop off the cream for their own benefit.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Honourable members must remember that, apart from the fine that may be imposed and the deregistration that may take place, white-collar crime is dealt with under the Criminal Code. Some honourable members have overlooked the fact that the Bill covers only the functions of the market, and that those who perpetrate a fraud will face the relevant penalty for the offence under the relevant Act. Offences under the Bill will be prosecuted under the Justices Act.

I think everyone overlooked that point when it was suggested that there could be small fines or deregistration. If a white-collar crime is committed, regardless of who is involved and regardless of the field of activity in which he is engaged, he will be dealt with very firmly and strongly under the relevant Act if the offence is of a serious nature. I think that covers the position quite adequately.

Clause 42, as read, agreed to.

Clause 43, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, read a third time.

The House adjourned at 12.32 a.m. (Thursday).