Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 19 AUGUST 1986

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 19 AUGUST 1986

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

PRIVILEGE

Settlement of Premier and Treasurer's Defamation Action against Channel 9

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate—Leader of the Opposition) (11.1 a.m.): I rise on a matter of privilege. On Wednesday, 6 August 1986, the Premier and Treasurer responded to my comments about the settlement amount resulting from a defamation action between himself and a Brisbane television station. The Premier claimed that it was ridiculous for me to compare his defamation action with other defamation actions. The Premier defended his role in the matter, which resulted in a settlement figure that, although at this stage not revealed, has been confirmed by State Government sources, through the media, as being between $400,000 and $500,000. A Queen's Counsel opinion to hand——

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Sandgate is on his feet on a matter of privilege.

Mr WARBURTON: A Queen's Counsel opinion to hand, which was directed at the defamation settlement under question, clearly shows that, despite what the Premier may say, a payment of $400,000 as a settlement would be surprisingly high. In view of the circumstances, I seek leave to table the opinion by Mr R. S. O'Regan, QC, and other documents relating to the relevant action.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member for Sandgate is wrong again. No senior Government source has indicated any amount. The honourable member has stated quite clearly that he has no information whatsoever. He is a big hypocrite and although he has not done so on this occasion, he has tried previously to impute improper motives. If he had done so I would have asked him to withdraw the remarks immediately. I have already answered those questions.

Mr WARBURTON: I table the documents.

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

ASSENT TO BILL

Assent to the Appropriation Bill (No. 1) reported by Mr Speaker.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I draw the attention of honourable members to the presence in the Speaker's Gallery of Mr Jim Paichua and Mr Maze Magar, respectively Speaker and Clerk of the East Sepik Provincial Assembly.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

MOTIONS FOR SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Mr Speaker's Ruling

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members, on Thursday, 7 August, the honourable member for Nundah (Sir William Knox) attempted to move a motion under Standing Order No. 332 that so much of Standing Orders and the Sessional Order be suspended

as would prevent him from moving a motion without notice. I ruled that, under Standing Order No. 49, the honourable member must first seek leave of the House.

Honourable members, obviously some confusion still exists as to how a motion may be initiated for discussion in the House. Two Standing Orders cover the procedure in the Queensland Legislative Assembly. One is Standing Order No. 49, which states—

> "A Member shall not make any Motion initiating a subject for discussion, except in pursuance of Notice or by leave of a majority of the House, to be decided without Debate."

The other Standing Order that covers the procedure is Standing Order No. 52, which states—

> "A Motion may be made, without Notice, by leave of a majority of the House, to be decided without Debate."

Therefore, a motion may only be initiated either by the giving of notice, or without notice, and only by leave of a majority of the House.

Standing Order No. 332 states—

> "Any of the foregoing Standing Rules and Orders may be suspended or dispensed with by the majority of the House."

A motion to achieve the suspension of Standing Orders must, however, comply with the provisions of Standing Orders Nos. 49 and 52.

The practice in the Queensland Parliament must not be confused with the practice in some other Parliaments, including the Australian House of Representatives, in which the suspension of Standing Orders can be moved without notice or by leave, but only "in cases of necessity" and with "an absolute majority". The House of Representatives Standing Order No. 399 states—

> "In cases of necessity, any standing or sessional order or orders of the House may be suspended, on motion duly moved and seconded, without notice: Provided that such motion is carried by an absolute majority of Members having full voting rights."

It can be seen that that Standing Order of the House of Representatives is different from the Standing Orders in the Queensland Legislative Assembly. In fact, nothing similar to it exists in the Standing Rules and Orders of the Queensland Legislative Assembly.

Therefore, in this and in all other instances honourable members must follow their own Standing Orders. That is what I did on Thursday, 7 August.

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

Electricity Concessions for Pensioners

From Mr Clauson (159 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take action to provide concessions on electricity costs for pensioners.

Fish Stocks, Proserpine River

From Mr Burns (121 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will provide for the full-time employment of an inspector to ensure that fish stocks in Proserpine River are not damaged due to illegal netting.

Electricity Industry Inquiry

From Mr White (759 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will provide for an inquiry into the electricity industry to ensure efficient services.

Land Valuation Inquiry, Caboolture Area

From Mr White (209 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take action to provide for an open inquiry into land valuations in the Caboolture area.

Petitions received.

RAILWAY PROPOSAL

Clermont Coal Mine Spur Line

Hon. D. F. LANE (Merthyr—Minister for Transport) laid on the table working plans, section and book of reference and the commissioner's report for the construction of a railway from the Wotonga-Blair Athol line to the Clermont coal mine.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table—

Orders in Council under—

Electricity Act 1976-1986

Rural Training Schools Act 1965-1984 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

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

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

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

Water Act 1926-1986

Harbours Act 1955-1982

Canals Act 1958-1984

Regulations under the Sewerage and Water Supply Act 1949-1985

By-Laws under—

Brisbane Forest Park Act 1977-1981

Education Act 1964-1984

Reports—

Mediator of the Retail Shops Leases Act for the year ended 30 June 1986

Retail Shop Lease Tribunal for the year ended 30 June 1986.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Papal Visit

Hon. D. F. LANE (Merthyr—Minister for Transport) (11.11 a.m.), by leave: Honourable members may have noticed that today's media contains some speculation about the possibility of declaring a public holiday in certain areas of Queensland for the purpose of the visit by His Holiness Pope John Paul II on 25 November this year.

I wish to outline certain facts so that in the minds of tens of thousands of Christian people of all denominations who are vitally interested in the papal visit and in this very holy day there need be no confusion about arrangements for this important event.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You will need his blessing before then.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LANE: The honourable member for Wolston rarely opens his mouth without being in bad taste.

The position is that on 10 March Cabinet decided that, to assist the public transport system to cope with the huge task of transporting members of the public to the papal mass at QE II stadium, State schools in the Brisbane metropolitan area would be closed on that day. I understand also that Catholic school-children in the Brisbane archdiocese and Toowoomba and Cairns cities will be awarded a holiday on that day.

It also has been stated that Catholic school-children in Rockhampton and Townsville diocese will have in-house activities at school on the day of the papal visit and that any children from these schools wishing to attend the mass in Brisbane will be granted a holiday.

With regard to the possibility of declaring a public holiday in Brisbane, Ipswich, Logan and Redcliffe cities and the shires of Pine Rivers and Redlands on that day, officers from my department have been liaising with the committee set up to organise the papal visit. I expect a decision to be finalised on this matter after further information is made available to Cabinet.

A major transport planning exercise will be required to handle the huge crowd of 78 000 people at QE II, together with an estimated 2 000 voluntary workers and crowds of up to 10 000 expected at Brisbane Airport for the Pope's arrival and departure. The conclusion of the papal mass at 3.30 p.m. will produce a major demand for public transport.

The logistics of transporting such a huge number of people can be judged by the fact that on the opening day of the Commonwealth Games in Brisbane a total of 61 000 people were transported by bus/rail shuttle, bus shuttle, charter bus and coach, private vehicles and other means.

The most important elements of this exercise will be to provide sufficient transport to allow people of all faiths to participate in one of the most important single events of a religious nature to take place in Queensland in many years, and the first visit of a Pope to our country.

Education and the Satellite

Hon. L. W. POWELL (Isis—Minister for Education) (11.14 a.m.), by leave: On 29 August 1985, in this House I tabled a document titled *Education and the Satellite.* I now wish to table an updated version of that document covering the Mount Isa based trial, which is a world first. The updated document also covers a remote controlled video scheme, "Skytalking", teacher development, the "Tune in to TAFE" program, the satellite program used at the Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education and the use of the satellite by the University of Queensland. I table that document for the benefit of all honourable members.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the document on the table.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS AND SESSIONAL ORDER

Fringe Benefits Tax

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (11.17 a.m.): As the Premier and Treasurer has announced that he will oppose the fringe benefits tax, and as the Leader of the Opposition has indicated that he will be making representations to have the fringe benefits tax repealed or amended, I move—

"That so much of the Standing Orders and Sessional Order be suspended under the provisions of Standing Orders Nos. 49 and 52 as would allow me to move—

'That this House rejects and condemns the Federal ALP Socialist Government Fringe Benefit Tax on the following grounds:—

(1) That it is an iniquitous anti-social Payroll Tax' "——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Is leave granted?

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

AYES, 48		NOES, 29	
Ahern	Lee	Braddy	Wilson
Alison	Lester	Burns	Yewdale
Austin	Lickiss	Campbell	
Bailey	Lingard	Casey	
Bjelke-Petersen	Littleproud	Comben	
Booth	McKechnie	D'Arcy	
Borbidge	McPhie	De Lacy	
Cahill	Menzel	Eaton	
Chapman	Miller	Gibbs, R. J.	
Clauson	Muntz	Goss	
Cooper	Newton	Hamill	
Elliott	Powell	Mackenroth	
FitzGerald	Randell	McElligott	
Gibbs, I. J.	Row	McLean	
Glasson	Simpson	Milliner	
Gunn	Stephan	Palaszczuk	
Gygar	Stoneman	Price	
Harper	Tenni	Scott	
Harvey	Turner	Shaw	
Henderson	Wharton	Smith	
Innes	White	Underwood	
Jennings		Vaughan	
Katter	*Tellers:*	Veivers	*Tellers:*
Knox	Kaus	Warburton	Davis
Lane	Neal	Warner, A. M.	Prest

Resolved in the affirmative.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I thank the House for its support. I am surprised that the Leader of the Opposition and his Labor Party colleagues did not support the motion. I am sure that the Labor Party in Western Australia or Victoria would have done so. The Leader of the Opposition has done a lot of sabre-rattling on this issue.

These are the documents that people will have to observe.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I ask the Premier and Treasurer to second my motion.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member for Nundah put forward the motion?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I have to read the motion first, and I understand that it must be seconded.

The motion is—

"That this House rejects and condemns the Federal ALP Socialist Government Fringe Benefit Tax on the following grounds:—

(1) That it is an iniquitous anti-social Payroll Tax.

(2) Destroys harmonious relations between Employer and Employee.

(3) Increases unemployment.

(4) Creates inordinate administrative costs, both for the Government and private enterprise.

(5) Has confused thousands of law abiding Australian taxpayers who now run the risk of unwittingly breaking the law."

I understand that the motion is required to be seconded.

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—

"That the debate be now adjourned."

Question put; and the House divided—

AYES, 71		NOES, 7	
Ahern	Mackenroth	Hartwig	
Alison	McElligott	Knox	
Austin	McKechnie	Lee	
Bailey	McLean	Lickiss	
Bjelke-Petersen	McPhie	White	
Booth	Menzel		
Borbidge	Miller		
Braddy	Milliner		
Burns	Muntz		
Cahill	Newton		
Campbell	Palaszczuk		
Casey	Powell		
Chapman	Prest		
Clauson	Price		
Comben	Randell		
Cooper	Row		
D'Arcy	Scott		
Davis	Shaw		
De Lacy	Simpson		
Eaton	Smith		
Elliott	Stephan		
FitzGerald	Stoneman		
Gibbs, I. J.	Tenni		
Gibbs, R. J.	Turner		
Glasson	Underwood		
Goss	Vaughan		
Gunn	Veivers		
Hamill	Warburton		
Harper	Warner, A. M.		
Harvey	Wharton		
Henderson	Wilson		
Jennings	Yewdale		
Katter			
Lane			
Lester	*Tellers:*		*Tellers:*
Lingard	Kaus		Innes
Littleproud	Neal		Gygar

Resolved in the affirmative.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Cape Flattery Silica-mining

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston): I move—

"That so much of Standing Orders be suspended as will allow me to move—

'That this House rejects the State Government's actions in jeopardising existing silica-mining operations at Cape Flattery' "——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Is leave granted?

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

AYES, 29		NOES, 49	
Braddy	Yewdale	Ahern	Lee
Burns		Alison	Lester
Campbell		Austin	Lickiss
Casey		Bailey	Lingard
Comben		Bjelke-Petersen	Littleproud
D'Arcy		Booth	McKechnie
De Lacy		Borbidge	McPhie
Eaton		Cahill	Menzel
Gibbs, R. J.		Chapman	Miller
Goss		Clauson	Muntz
Hamill		Cooper	Newton
Mackenroth		Elliott	Powell
McElligott		FitzGerald	Randell
McLean		Gibbs, I. J.	Row
Milliner		Glasson	Simpson
Palaszczuk		Gunn	Stephan
Price		Gygar	Stoneman
Scott		Harper	Tenni
Shaw		Hartwig	Turner
Smith		Harvey	Wharton
Underwood		Henderson	White
Vaughan		Innes	
Veivers		Jennings	
Warburton	*Tellers:*	Katter	*Tellers:*
Warner, A. M.	Davis	Knox	Neal
Wilson	Prest	Lane	Kaus

Resolved in the negative.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

Questions submitted on notice were answered as follows—

1. Water Charges, Rebates to Cotton-farmers

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

"With reference to the announced rebate on water charges by his department as a result of the crash in cotton prices—

When can cotton farmers expect the rebate on charges recently paid to apply, and what procedures do they have to follow in order to receive the rebate?"

Answer—

The rebates that the honourable member refers to are a direct result of the strong representations made by the National Party members representing the St George, Emerald and Dawson Valley cotton-growers.

I congratulate the honourable member for Balonne, the honourable member for Auburn and the honourable member for Peak Downs on their initiative in seeking this assistance for their hard-pressed growers. These growers have seen cotton prices fall from an earlier estimate of $300 a bale to a range of $200 to $215 a bale for the 1985-86 season.

As a result of this State Government initiative, an estimated $310,000 will be rebated to growers in these three areas on 1985-86 water charges. The Queensland Water Resources Commission has already advised the growers in writing of the rebates. Those irrigators who had already paid their accounts have been given the option of taking a cash refund or having a credit applied towards next year's water charges. Irrigators who have not paid their accounts will have the rebate offset against the 1985-86 charges through the issue of credit invoices.

2. Night Rate Off-peak Hot Water Electricity Tariffs

Mr VAUGHAN asked the Minister for Mines and Energy—

"With reference to the promotion of the night rate off-peak hot water tariff launched by the South East Queensland Electricity Board on 19 May—

(1) What is the budget cost of the advertising of this promotion?

(2) How much has been spent to date on advertising of this promotion?

(3) How much has been spent to date advertising (a) on television, (b) on radio, (c) in newspapers and (d) in other fields?

(4) As at 30 June, how many domestic consumers were supplied with electricity by the South East Queensland Electricity Board?

(5) How many domestic consumers were on the (a) continuous hot water tariff, (b) controlled hot water tariff and (c) night rate off-peak hot water tariff?

(6) How many (a) domestic consumers and (b) other consumers have changed over to the night rate off-peak tariff since the commencement of the SEQEB promotion of the night rate off-peak tariff?

(7) How many consumers have been paid the $100 rebate for changing over to the night rate off-peak tariff?

(8) What are the conditions under which the $100 rebate is paid?

(9) Is it true that most, if not all night rate off-peak hot water systems are manufactured in southern States?

(10) If not, what Queensland manufacturers of hot water systems totally manufacture night rate off-peak hot water systems?"

Answer—

(1 to 10) The electricity industry is operating in a competitive environment. The night-rate water-heating promotion is a commercial exercise, and in such a campaign details are not made public or revealed to competitors. Because of the commercial nature of this marketing campaign, I do not intend to make any detailed information available.

3. Kianga Mine Inquiry; Safety in Mines Testing and Research Station, Redbank

Mr VAUGHAN asked the Minister for Mines and Energy—

"(1) Have all the recommendations of the 1975 Kianga Mine inquiry been implemented?

(2) If not, what recommendations have not yet been implemented and what is the reason?

(3) What action is being taken to ensure that all of the recommendations of the inquiry are implemented without delay?

(4) When is it expected that the safety in mines testing and research station at Redbank will be fully operational?"

Answer—

(1) All of the recommendations of the 1975 Kianga mine inquiry have been substantially implemented.

It should be understood that the circumstances surrounding the Kianga accident are not parallel to those events which resulted in the tragic accident at the Moura No. 4 mine on 16 July 1986. In the case of Kianga, the mine was engaged at the time in controlling a spontaneous combustion incident, whereas the Moura mine was operating under conditions of normal production.

(2) The recommendations which were not implemented in the precise manner suggested were—

(a) That a mobile training centre to be provided as a means of giving mine staff exposure to the latest techniques in the detection and control of mine fires. The necessary facilities are provided at mines rescue stations located at Collinsville, Dysart, Blackwater, Moura and Booval.

(b) That the Coal Mining Act and the New South Wales Coal Mines Regulation Act be standardised. In any case, that would have required a lowering of standards in Queensland. However, where possible, much has been done to achieve standardisation.

(3) See (1) and (2).

(4) It will be fully operational when it obtains National Association of Testing Authorities (NATA) accreditation, which, depending on delivery times for the specialised equipment items, could be up to nine months.

4. Hotel and Overseas Terminal Complex, Brisbane Airport

Sir WILLIAM KNOX asked the Premier and Treasurer—

"(1) Has he had the opportunity to evaluate a proposal to provide Brisbane Airport with a privately financed hotel and overseas terminal complex?

(2) If so, will he use his influence through co-ordinating committees to have such a proposal, or one like it, adopted by the Federal Government authorities?"

Answer—

Firstly, the building of a new international terminal at Brisbane Airport should be proceeded with forthwith. It is urgently required, and the Commonwealth Government stands condemned for its failure to take any steps to provide such a facility.

In answer to the specific questions raised by the honourable member, I advise—

(1) The Roma Street Development Group has submitted a tender to the Commonwealth Department of Aviation for the development of land at the new Brisbane International Airport as an integrated hotel and overseas passenger terminal. That tender is understood to be an alternative tender to the Commonwealth specification, which called for a hotel alone. Officers of the Premier's Department have viewed sketches and drawings of the proposal and have been assured that the developer can provide those facilities without any financial assistance from the Commonwealth Government.

(2) The Queensland Government will continue to press for an early commencement of construction of a new international terminal building, but a decision to accept or reject an alternative tender as described above is a matter for decision by the Commonwealth Government. It is to be hoped that the Commonwealth will see the proposal as a means of providing through private enterprise what it has failed to do from funds available in the public sector.

5. Queensland Government's High Court Challenge to Taxation Legislation

Sir WILLIAM KNOX asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

"With reference to the announcement by the Honourable the Premier that the Queensland Government intends to challenge certain taxation legislation in the High Court—

To what stage has this action progressed?"

Answer—

A writ was taken out in the High Court Registry in Brisbane on 30 July 1986 seeking a declaration that the Fringe Benefits Tax Act 1986 does not operate so as to impose on the State of Queensland any tax in respect of any fringe benefit. The fixing of a hearing date is a matter for the Registrar of the High Court.

6. Electrical Installations, Hamilton Island

Mr CASEY asked the Minister for Mines and Energy—

"(1) Is he aware that the electrical installations of power house, electrical distribution and other electrical works that have been carried out on Hamilton Island were undertaken by an electrical contracting company that is not licensed with the Queensland Electricity Commission in accordance with the requirements of the Electrical Workers and Contractors Board?

(2) As the resort owners of Hamilton Island are currently negotiating to have mainland power connected to the island, will he send inspectors from the Queensland Electricity Commission to the island to carry out the necessary tests to ensure that all electrical works on the island have been properly installed and are safe as the current electricity Acts preclude the Mackay Electricity Board from doing so?

(3) What proportion of the proposed high voltage power line to service the off-shore resorts currently being planned to run through Cape Conway National Park will be met by the Hamilton Island Resort operator?"

Answer—

(1) No.

(2) The commission will arrange for an inspection of the installation at Hamilton Island by one of its electrical inspectors—

(a) prior to connection to mainland power;

(b) if the owner requests assistance of the kind; or

(c) if it receives reliable information that such action is necessary in the public interest.

(3) The line forms part of the Mackay Electricity Board's supply and reinforcement works and is not dedicated to Hamilton Island.

7. Application for Exemption from Retail Shop Leases Act, Hamilton Island

Mr CASEY asked the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology—

"With reference to the application for exemption from certain sections of the Retail Shop Leases Act by the owners of the Hamilton Island Resort—

(1) How many traders on the island will be affected by the application?

(2) How many of them have raised objections to the application?

(3) When was the application for exemption made?

(4) What action has he taken to date to determine the application?"

Answer—

(1) Twenty-six retail facilities.

(2) One.

(3) 2 January 1986.

(4) By May 1986 sufficient information had been provided to allow the application to be considered. The registrar, Retail Shop Lease Mediation Panel and Tribunal visited Hamilton Island and furnished a report on 1 July 1986. I have considered that report and I propose, before a decision is made, to talk with the tenants on the island myself.

8. Psychiatrically Ill and Developmentally Disabled Persons

Mr D'ARCY asked the Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police—

"(1) What programs have been undertaken by the Welfare and the Health Departments to promote community living for the psychiatrically ill and developmentally disabled instead of institutional living or being an impossible burden at home?

(2) How much money has been spent in 1985-86 on such programs?

(3) How many clients have been so placed?

(4) What services, including back up services, are available to those living in the community?

(5) What is the financial commitment of the State and Federal Governments?"

Answer—

(1 to 5) The details requested by the honourable member do not come within my portfolio. I ask that the question be directed to the appropriate Ministers, that is, the Minister for Health and Environment and the Minister for Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs.

Mr D'ARCY: I do so accordingly.

9. Mr G. S. Orreal

Mr D'ARCY asked the Minister for Corrective Services, Administrative Services and Valuation—

"With reference to a prisoner in Brisbane Prison by the name of Gary Shane Orreal—

(1) Has Orreal been diagnosed as having terminal AIDS?

(2) Is the disease now in an advanced state and did officers of his department fail to detect this medical condition until recently?

(3) Is it known that Orreal has had sexual contact with several inmates?

(4) In view of the seriousness and implications of this matter, will he immediately investigate the allegations and make a statement to this House?"

Answer—

(1 to 4) It would not be appropriate or ethical for me to supply personal, confidential medical information relating to any prisoner in answer to a question in this House.

It is a pity that the honourable member who asked the question did not observe the same ethics. He may be assured, however, that appropriate action is taken at all times to safeguard the health of inmates in the Queensland prison system.

The Queensland Government believes that the reduction in the risk of spreading AIDS is purely a matter for government administration.

I will outline typical Labor Party policy. Between 130 000 and 235 000 condoms are stored at Long Bay Gaol for distribution throughout the New South Wales prison system. Condoms have been introduced into the prison system in an effort to prevent the spread of AIDS.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr MUNTZ: From the conduct of honourable members opposite and in particular the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for Wolston, who asked the question, I gather that they condone that type of action as Labor Party policy. Obviously the honourable member for Wolston has inside information as to what occurs in the

prison system, because he has been there, done that. He is quite proud of his record at the Wacol Prison.

Not only are those condoms being stored at Long Bay Gaol for distribution, but also considerable quantities of lubricating oil are to be supplied with those condoms. Nurses and prison officers in New South Wales have refused to distribute both the condoms and the lubricating oil.

I support the stand taken by those New South Wales nurses and prison officers. They do not want to have anything to do with the sickening Labor Government policy that has been dictated to the New South Wales prison authorities. People such as the honourable member for Woodridge (Mr D'Arcy), the honourable member for Mackay (Mr Casey) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton) condone the action taken within the New South Wales prison system. There is no way in the world that the Queensland Government will take part in any scheme which encourages homosexual activity through the distribution of that sort of garbage within the Queensland prison system.

I assure the honourable member that the Queensland Government takes the appropriate action of having all inmates tested for AIDS upon their entry to the prisons. We intend to continue that positive policy.

10. Removal of Coconut Trees to Hamilton Island

Mr DAVIS asked the Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying—

"(1) Is he aware that on 19 July workers and machinery from Hamilton Island came ashore from the Hamilton Island barge near Sunset Beach and Glouchester Park, which are south of Dingo Beach between Proserpine and Bowen, and the workers and machinery then removed approximately 20 large coconut trees, loaded them on to the barge and took them back to Hamilton Island?

(2) As there has been some concern expressed by residents of the area that some of the coconut trees may have been removed from an unsurveyed esplanade and from Crown Land, will he have this matter investigated to ascertain if some of the trees were illegally taken?"

Answer—

(1) I am aware that in July 1986 a report was made to the sub-district forester, Mackay, that a number of coconut palms had been removed and sold by the ostensible owner thereof to Mr Keith Williams of Hamilton Island tourist resort and that they were transported by barge to Hamilton Island.

Preliminary investigations reveal that about 20 coconut palms had been removed and also that the sale had been made by the ostensible owner and the removal had been with his approval. The palms were apparently sold and removed from a reserved esplanade within a freehold title, and advice to date is that the ostensible owner who sold the palms was the owner thereof and had the right to sell and remove them.

(2) Although advice to date is that no grounds exist to support prosecution action in terms of the Forestry Act against the ostensible owner of the land or Mr Williams, further investigations will be made into this matter.

11. Pumping of Sewage Effluent into Sea, Hamilton Island

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

"With reference to the fact that almost three years after it has commenced business as a major tourist operator, Hamilton Island Resort is still pumping its considerable volume of daily sewage effluent into the sea adjoining the island under licence from the Queensland Government—

(1) Has the resort been recently granted a twelve months extension to that licence to enable them to continue to dump raw sewage, with all its subsequent

health dangers, into the sea adjacent to the island where currents and tides continue to wash it on to the island's beaches and around the yachts and boats in the marina?

(2) Why does this Government continue to give such favoured treatment to this resort operator in this serious environmental problem, despite the health hazards involved?"

Answer—

(1 & 2) The Water Quality Council of Queensland has agreed to extend, by three months, the period for compliance with the conditions of the licence granted by it on 5 March 1985. In terms of such licence, the conditions attached thereto were required to be complied with within a period of 12 months.

Approval of a further extension of time within which to comply with licence conditions will be considered at the next meeting of the Water Quality Council.

I am advised that the extension of time granted has been so granted in recognition of the severe set-back to construction suffered by the resort in question as a result of the fire which destroyed its administration complex.

12. Employment of Mr P. MacNamara by Johnstone Shire Council

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

"(1) Is he aware that the ALP-controlled Johnstone Shire Council is employing a disbarred solicitor, Mr Paul MacNamara, to review the council by-laws?

(2) Is he aware that the company that Mr MacNamara is associated with paid the air fares for ALP Cr Les Schue, Deputy Chairman of the council, to fly to Brisbane to inspect demountable houses?

(3) Will he investigate this matter as it appears to be a job for the ALP boys?"

Answer—

(1 to 3) I am informed that a Mr Paul McNamara was engaged by the Johnstone Shire Council for the purpose of reviewing its by-laws.

It is the policy of the Department of Local Government to require any by-law made by a local authority and submitted for consideration for approval by the Governor in Council to be accompanied by a certificate from the council's legal advisers that the by-law is within the powers of the local authority to make. That policy will be enforced for any by-laws submitted by the Johnstone Shire Council, regardless of who was responsible for preparing the by-laws in the first instance.

I have no knowledge of the other matter referred to in the honourable member's question.

13. Use of Cyclone Disaster Funds by Johnstone Shire Council

Mr MENZEL asked the Premier and Treasurer—

"(1) Is he aware that the ALP-controlled Johnstone Shire Council has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars of cyclone disaster funds to build a new sports complex at Innisfail?

(2) Is he further aware that the same council carted thousands of metres of material to fill a swamp beside an industrial complex recently built by a prominent ALP councillor, George Pervan, Chairman of the Works Committee?

(3) Likewise, is he further aware that disaster funds were used to stockpile metal for the council at taxpayers' expense?

(4) Will he investigate these matters and bring criminal charges against the ALP crooks in the council?"

Answer—

(1) I am advised that the Johnstone Shire Council has commenced the development of sporting fields at Goondi Bend on an area reclaimed some years ago and that recently the council expended council funds on earthworks for the project.

(2) I am advised that approximately 800 cubic metres of cyclone debris and covering fill have been placed on the rear section of a local government (vehicle parking) purposes reserve, R.1724.

(3) I am informed that the council maintains stockpiles of overburden and crushed road metal at each dump site to cover the rubbish and maintain access to the dump face and that the considerable quantities of those materials that were used during the cyclone clean-up operation were subsequently replenished as a charge against the disaster relief scheme.

(4) In the finalisation of its claim for assistance, the council will be required to make appropriate adjustments for any items that may have been incorrectly charged against the natural disaster relief scheme.

14. Mackenzie River Bridge

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

"What is the state of progress on construction of the MacKenzie River Bridge, in particular, will it be completed before the coming wet season?"

Answer—

The construction of the bridge and approaches is progressing well. All of the bridge's pre-stressed concrete girders and units have been erected and six of the eight spans with cast-in-situ deck have been completed. The approach roadworks are well advanced, the cement-treated pavement having been recently completed. It is expected that the total works will be completed in the contract period and before the coming wet season.

The honourable member for Mirani (Mr Randell) has worked very hard to have the bridge constructed. As he has said on many occasions, the bridge will serve rural areas, as well as the mining towns of Moranbah, Dysart and Middlemount, enabling access to Rockhampton and southern destinations. It replaces a very old, narrow, wooden bridge. I appreciate the support given by the honourable member.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Electoral Brochures

Mr WARBURTON: In directing a question to the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, I refer to the Government's decision to distribute thousands of electoral brochures throughout the State. I ask: What involvement did Mr Fred Maybury and the Leo Burnett advertising agency have in developing and proposing the exercise? What is the latest estimate of cost for the whole program? What steps have been taken to correct the confusion created by many electors in the State having received the wrong brochures? Was the publicly funded program co-ordinated by Mr Jim Gillan, an officer paid by the National Party?

Mr HARPER: I appreciate the matter's being brought to the attention of the House by the Leader of the Opposition. I am pleased to say that the most successful brochure to have been developed was developed by the advertising agency retained by my department, Leo Burnett, with involvement by a Mr Maybury, who is associated with that company. I assure the Leader of the Opposition that the overall cost for each Queensland voter will be less than the cost of an ordinary postage stamp. In other words, the cost imposed by the Federal Government to post a letter of any sort to anyone in Queensland or elsewhere in Australia is much more than the cost of a campaign to help the voters of Queensland achieve electoral enrolment in this State.

I am surprised that the Opposition is critical at all of a move by the Government to ensure that people are enrolled correctly and that at election-time they are aware of the electorate to which they belong and the area in which they should vote. I would have thought that the Opposition would applaud the Government for taking the initiative by bringing to the attention of the people of Queensland the effects of the redistribution and by circulating information about the correct electorate for voters in sufficient time to correct any inaccuracies that may have occurred.

The Leader of the Opposition suggested that brochures for an incorrect electorate have been delivered. I am aware that some complaints have been made. As a consequence, the advertising agent and its contractors, including Australia Post, have given an undertaking that correct brochures will be delivered in the proper areas. I have given instructions that those responsible—the contractors and the advertising agency—remedy any inaccuracies that have occurred.

During an exercise of such magnitude, obviously errors will occur because human beings are involved. The delivery of these pamphlets involves human beings, and the possibility of error always exists. The people I refer to are paid workers of the advertising agency, and I reiterate that an undertaking has been given that errors that have been identified will be corrected. The services of a member of the Australian Journalists Association, Mr Jim Gillan—my former press secretary—have been retained, and he will continue to be retained in the capacity of consultant throughout the exercise.

Compensation Payments to Victims of Crime

Mr WARBURTON: In directing another question to the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, I refer to the decision against increasing an amount of $8,000 paid by the State Government as compensation to Jennifer Glindemann, who was a victim of a very savage knife attack in July 1984 on the Gold Coast.

I ask: Would the Minister care to explain why he considers $8,000 to be reasonable compensation, when the Supreme Court of Queensland awarded damages of $22,000 against the woman's attacker?

Mr HARPER: I think that the Leader of the Opposition has summarised the answer in his last few words. Unfortunately, what the Leader of the Opposition and Miss Glindemann fail to understand is that the ex gratia payment made by the people of Queensland through the Government never was and never has been intended to take the place of an award of damages made against the criminal. It is the criminal assailant who should be responsible for meeting the payment awarded by the court. Perhaps Miss Glindemann has been misguided by her advisers, or by the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues.

Mr Tenni: The tax-payer is not responsible.

Mr HARPER: As the honourable gentleman said, it is not the tax-payer's responsibility.

The Supreme Court made an award that takes advantage of the amended laws that operate in Queensland. Queensland provides the most generous compensation scheme in Australia. I have been informed by a journalist that Miss Glindemann acknowledges that the scheme operating in Queensland is more generous than that operating in Victoria. The fact that the court takes advantage of the innovative legislation, introduced by this Government, that increases compensation in cases of criminal injury does not mean that by virtue of the award made by the court, the people of Queensland should meet the commitment that the criminal assailant is expected to meet.

The amount awarded by the Queensland Government was considered by the Governor in Council to be adequate in this case. Because I do not believe that the Leader of the Opposition wishes the reasons for that deliberate decision to be placed on record, I advise the honourable member that the transcript of evidence given in the court is available if he cares to read it and arrive at his own judgment. I suggest that someone has asked the Leader of the Opposition to pose this question, but if he is really

concerned about the matter, he should refer to the transcript and make a considered judgment as to whether or not the decision made by the Governor in Council is the correct one.

Together with other Government members, I believe that that decision is correct. Miss Glindemann should be grateful to the people of Queensland for providing at least some assistance following an attack made by a criminal who was not in a position to fulfil his commitment to society.

Reduce Impaired Driving Program

Mr NEAL: In directing a question to the Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police, I refer to the criticism by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton) of the proposed RID campaign against drink driving. I ask: Will the minister explain how that campaign will differ from previous police campaigns, and why it has been adopted by the Labor Governments in Western Australia and New Zealand?

Mr GUNN: Once again the Leader of the Opposition is way off beam. He is playing politics without recognising the great benefits that this program will have for the community. I assure everyone that the RID program will be the most effective program that has been undertaken not only in this State but also in other States of Australia. Of course, it is different from programs in other States. Police will be able to operate from the kerbside and on the road. They will be able to stop a vehicle and check the driver's licence, the roadworthiness of the vehicle and conduct a breath test.

Mr Burns: Aren't they allowed to do that now?

Mr GUNN: I advise the honourable member not to get half-full of turps and drive home tonight. He may have got away with it in the past, but it would not be advisable for him to try it now.

Mr Burns: This is new, though?

Mr GUNN: This is new, all right.

Mr Wilson interjected.

Mr GUNN: The Scarlet Pimpernel has arrived!

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will not allow this to become a debate.

Mr GUNN: I do not drink and drive.

The Leader of the Opposition said that the RID program was a rort. The Labor Government in Western Australia and New Zealand have operated a similar system for several years. The previous system operated by the Queensland police was effective. I draw attention to an article in *The Australian* on 2 January 1986 which is headed "Road deaths up by 112". In 1985 the road toll in South Australia was 36 more than it was in 1984. That State has the "booze bus". In New South Wales the road toll was 30 more than it was in 1984, in Victoria it was 22, and in the Northern Territory it was 17. All those States have the "booze bus". In 1985 the Queensland road toll was one fewer than in 1984, in the Australian Capital Territory it was six and in Tasmania it was eight. Those figures indicate that the measures taken to curb the road toll were effective, but this State's new method will be more effective.

Mr Burns: If those figures are right, why did you implement it?

Mr GUNN: This program will further reduce the road toll.

Last year in New South Wales, in spite of the "booze buses", 1 064 lives were lost on the road. Because the current programs aimed at reducing the road toll in the other States are not effective, those States are now trialling a method similar to the method that is to be adopted in this State.

Mr Turner: The media will print this as soon as they have heard it.

Mr GUNN: I would not hold my breath waiting for that to occur; I bet that the *Daily Sun* does not print it.

The fact of the matter is that the new method will be effective. It will be trialled for six months, and I am sure that the people of Queensland will benefit from it.

Australia's International Credit-rating

Mr ALISON: In asking a question of the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to a press report on Tuesday, 5 August, that indicated that the United States international rating agency, Strategic Research International, has rated Australia last in its monthly assessment of 19 developed countries. It has given Australia the wooden-spoon rating, stating that Australia had the worst current-account performance of the 19 countries, the weakest position in manufactured exports, the second-worst performance in export product diversity——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I bring to the attention of honourable members that, when a question without notice is being asked, whether it is heard by other honourable members rests on their shoulders. It is important that the Minister to whom the question is directed can hear it. I ask for silence in the Chamber.

Mr ALISON: The agency also stated that Australia has a very weak position in price competitiveness. I now ask: Does the Premier agree that Mr Bob Hawke, firstly as President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions and latterly as Prime Minister, putting into effect the ALP socialist policies, has played the leading role in wrecking Australia's position in terms of its internal costs and the competitiveness of its manufacturers with overseas countries? Has Mr Hawke himself earned the order of the wooden spoon for being the greatest economy-wrecker that Australia has ever known? Does the Premier see any hope for Australia under the socialist policies of the Hawke Federal Government? Does he agree that it is essential to get rid of the ALP socialists from Canberra before Australia can expect any improvement in its internal costs and its overall economic performance?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: No-one can contradict the fact—there is no doubt—that Mr Hawke, Mr Keating and their party in Canberra are the greatest creators of poverty and hardship that this nation has ever seen.

They have created in Australia more poor people than there are in any other nation in the free world. For a long time in economic ratings, Australia ranked fifth of the advanced countries of the world. Australia is now ranked 19th. That rating is exceedingly low. Australia's reputation is exceedingly low. All that has been brought about by people supported by honourable members opposite, who try to further that policy of creating poor people, wrecking business and causing chaos.

As those in charge of communist countries do, members of the Labor Party believe that, if chaos, havoc and hardship are created, naturally people will get uptight and thus the Government can stay in power. Honourable members opposite have a great shock coming to them. At the next election they will be annihilated; they will be destroyed. Let us get rid of them. Honourable members opposite want to do to the State what their Federal colleagues have done to the nation. They have the hide and the audacity to tell the people of Queensland that they could run this State better than it is now being run. The evidence shows that they, too, have a reputation as great wreckers. They are very negative people; they will not have a chance.

Neither at the next election nor at any other time would I like to be in the shoes of members opposite. At the next election they will get the greatest shock of their lives. There is no doubt about that! They deserve every bit of what they will get. They have earned it; they will get it. As I have said, ultimately the Queensland Government will have to do the same to Mr Hawke in Canberra as it will do to honourable members opposite.

Reward for Information on Disappearance of Sharron Phillips

Mr PALASZCZUK: I ask the Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police: Has he received any request from the Queensland Commissioner of Police to provide a reward to any person or persons who provides information that leads to the solving of the disappearance of Sharron Phillips? If so, when will details of the reward be released? If no request has been received from the Queensland Commissioner of Police and in view of widespread public disquiet, will he on his own initiative offer a reward?

Mr GUNN: One of the problems in this particular case is that people other than the police did not want to leave it to the police. Those people apparently consider themselves to be the experts; they are investigating the unfortunate incident. Almost every journalist and every politician in this State wants to be an amateur policeman. I suggest that the matter be left to the police. Police officers have conducted and are still conducting an investigation.

If a recommendation is made by the Commissioner of Police, in due course that recommendation will be handed to me. I suggest that until that happens, honourable members opposite do not interfere in this matter but leave it to the police.

Settlement of Premier and Treasurer's Defamation Action against Channel 9

Mr PALASZCZUK: In directing a question to the Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police, I refer to an article in *The Sunday Mail* of 3 August 1986 in which it was stated that a senior Cabinet Minister had confirmed the payment to the Premier and Treasurer of an out-of-court settlement as a result of a defamation action taken by him against Channel 9, Brisbane. As the only Ministers who could legitimately be described as senior Cabinet Ministers are the Deputy Premier, the Minister for Works and Housing (Mr Wharton) and the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze), will the Deputy Premier confirm or deny that he was the source of the confirmation given to *The Sunday Mail* concerning that massive payment to the Premier?

Mr GUNN: This Parliament has almost come to the end of its term. All I will say to the honourable member for Archerfield is that he is wrong again. Since the honourable member became a member of this Parliament, he has never been right. Once again, he has guessed wrongly.

The matter referred to by the honourable member is a private one. It has nothing whatsoever to do with me.

Opposition Members: What about Claude?

Mr GUNN: Opposition members can keep guessing and going round and round in circles. However, the honourable member has made a grave mistake. Once again, he is wrong.

Mudginberri Abattoir Dispute

Mr McPHIE: I ask the Premier and Treasurer: Is he aware of statements made on 23 July by the Federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations (Mr Willis) that the Federal Government regretted the use of civil courts in the Mundginberri abattoir dispute and that it believed that, in industrial disputes, the use of section 45D of the Trades Practices Act was undesirable?

As section 45D of the Trades Practices Act enables some redress to be given against the financially crippling actions of irresponsible trade unions, as was demonstrated in the Mudginberri abattoir dispute, does the Premier consider the statement made by Mr Willis on behalf of the Federal Government to be responsible? Or is it just another instance of the Federal Goverment's kowtowing to the union bosses?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The statement attributed to the Federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations is, of course, in very, very poor taste. It is

exactly the sort of statement that one would expect a former union man to make. Mr Willis supports the unions. All along the line, the Federal Labor Government has supported the unions at the expense of private employers and the nation. At every single opportunity, the Federal Government supports the unions.

As I have said, the comments made by Mr Willis in relation to the judgment in the action taken by the Northern Territory meatworks operator—in which he was successful—are in very, very poor taste. The Queensland Government has supported and will continue to support that meatworks operator completely and whole-heartedly. In spite of what Mr Willis says and what he attempts to do, the Queensland Government will always pursue the same line of action as was pursued by the Northern Territory meatworks operator, to ensure justice and fairness and the right to carry on a business as the operator ought to be able to do.

Today, support for employers in taking the type of action that is being taken is gaining momentum. In the Robe River dispute and the oil platform dispute in Western Australia, the same procedure is being followed as has been followed in Queensland. Such action will at least ensure that the work system has within it some law and order. I deplore the fact that Mr Willis has been so foolish and stupid to adopt that attitude. I have no doubt that the unions have told him to do so, and he has humbly and willingly obeyed them.

Settlement of Premier and Treasurer's Defamation Action against Channel 9

Mr BRADDY: In directing a question to the Minister for Works and Housing, I refer to a *Sunday Mail* article dated 3 August 1986 in which it was stated that a senior Cabinet Minister had confirmed the payment to the Premier of an out-of-court settlement for a defamation action against Channel 9, Brisbane. The only Ministers who could legitimately be described as being senior Cabinet Ministers are the Minister himself, the Deputy Premier (Mr Gunn), and the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze). Will the Minister confirm or deny that he was the source of the confirmation given to *The Sunday Mail* of that massive payment to the Premier?

Mr WHARTON: I am delighted to answer the question, which is merely tedious repetition of a previous question. The Deputy Premier answered that question fully. The honourable member for Rockhampton is talking a lot of tripe, because the Premier is above that sort of conduct. The honourable member is trying to introduce a red herring. It will get him nowhere. He is linking up with the press on silly-looking statements, and I am surprised at him. The Deputy Premier has already answered the question.

International Tourist Promotion by the State

Mr BORBIDGE: In directing a question to the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts, I refer to comments attributed to the Federal Minister for Tourism (John Brown) calling on the States to get out of international tourist promotion. What impact would such a decision have on Queensland? What is the Queensland Government's response?

Mr McKECHNIE: The comments of the Federal Minister for Tourism were widely reported. I attended the Australian conference of the Australian Federation of Travel Agents that was held in Brisbane. I assure the honourable member that Mr Brown's comments were the talking point of the meeting. A rumour was circulated elsewhere—not at that conference—that Mr Brown would return home to defend himself.

The Queensland Government, together with the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, has recorded tremendous growth in the number of international tourists coming into Queensland. In the two years ended March 1986, there has been a 130 per cent growth in the major tourist facilities in Queensland, compared with 48 per cent for the rest of Australia. That confidence in the tourist industry in this State has been generated by the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, partly by the promotion of Australia overseas.

Mr Brown would dearly love to implement his centralist policy of having the Federal Government—Canberra—decide on overseas tourist promotions of this country. The Queensland Government will not stand by and watch its tourist industry suffer through lack of promotion. Mr Brown's department in Canberra and the Federal body that controls tourism, the Australian Tourist Commission, could achieve a great deal more if Mr Brown could supply them with more money. That, however, he cannot do.

I acknowledge that the Paul Hogan campaign has been a wonderful success overseas. The Federal Government used the expertise of Paul Hogan very successfully, but it did not follow the campaign up with sufficient pamphlets and other literature. The Federal Government now says that it wants the States to withdraw. I assure the honourable member for Surfers Paradise that none of the States in this Commonwealth that I am aware of is keen to follow Mr Brown's advice. He loves to prance about the world stage. So be it.

The Queensland Government and the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation have conducted very good overseas promotions, which will be continued. A tremendous role is played by all airlines, not just Qantas. Against tremendous opposition, sometimes from Canberra, Queensland has been very successful in increasing the number of international flights into this State. Part of the Queensland Government's promotions are associated with that venture. Despite what Mr Brown says, the Queensland Government will continue with its efforts.

Statements by Mr B. Bishop about Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation

Mr BORBIDGE: In directing a further question to the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts, I refer to statements by a former Liberal member of this House, Mr Bruce Bishop, in support of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation and his criticism of the honourable members for Stafford and Nundah in their denigration of that body. What is the Minister's response to Mr Bishop's view that their statements will become a matter of acute embarrassment for the Liberal Party because of their own past record of ineptness in tourism?

Mr McKECHNIE: Sometimes, amazing statements are made by members of the Liberal Party in this State. They have engaged in a vendetta against the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, which has been responsible for increasing dramatically the number of jobs in Queensland. The members of the Liberal Party cannot have it both ways. They cannot criticise one area of the corporation's responsibilities and not acknowledge what it is doing in other ways.

In answer to a question asked earlier by an honourable member, I quoted figures on Queensland tourism. For the benefit of members of the Liberal Party, I will provide further figures. In the three years to December 1985, the number of international visitors to Queensland increased by 31.6 per cent. In the three years to June 1985, the number of interstate visitors to Queensland increased by 23 per cent.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr McKECHNIE: The Labor Party, through its tourism spokesman, is now joining the knockers.

The people of Queensland are very lucky to have a body such as the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, which has been very innovative in its plans to encourage tourism in this State.

Earlier, the honourable member for Stafford interjected with a half-smart remark. I imagine that some years ago Bruce Bishop was one of the honourable member's friends. He would not take lightly to the comment by the honourable member for Stafford. Mr Bishop understands the tourist industry. The criticism——

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr McKECHNIE: It is very interesting that the Liberal Party members in this House are criticising the president of the Gold Coast Chamber of Commerce. In other words, they are criticising all the members of the Chamber of Commerce who have elected Mr Bishop as their spokesman. The members of the Liberal Party should heed what Bruce Bishop has said. If the members of the Liberal Party continue to criticise the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation in the way that they have done, they will continue to be a "six-pack", or perhaps even a "four-pack", after the State election.

Human Rights Commission

Mr JENNINGS: In directing a question to the Minister for Northern Development and Community Services, I refer to a report to the Federal Government's Human Rights Commission, which has been reported in the press. That report states that Aborigines living on Queensland reserves are subject to an Orwellian type of scrutiny that other citizens of Queensland would not tolerate.

A study undertaken by a Queensland sociologist, Ms Barbara Miller, claims that the major laws governing Aboriginal reserves in Queensland infringe upon the most basic of human rights, including political rights, equality before the law, self-determination, freedom of assembly, equal pay, privacy, and the right to inherit. Those claims indicate that Ms Miller has neither genuine knowledge of the conditions pertaining on Aboriginal reserves in Queensland, nor knowledge of land title arrangements in Queensland. Queensland leads Australia in land title arrangements. Ms Miller has made no genuine attempt to ascertain the true state of affairs.

I ask: If the Minister is aware of that misleading report to the Human Rights Commission, will he advise the House of the position in Queensland?

Mr KATTER: Unfortunately, the media have not read the report referred to by the honourable member for Southport. The report refers to a period prior to changes being made in the laws of Queensland. Therefore, it has nothing to do with the present state of affairs in Queensland.

The Queensland laws referred to in that report are dramatically different from those laws that existed when this Government took office in 1957. At that time people of Aboriginal descent could be taken away from their families by means of removal orders. For example, a father could be taken from his children, or a mother taken from her children and simply removed to a place designated by the then Director of Native Affairs. That policy was implemented by the ALP, and existed for many years.

Entry and exit permits were required for all Aboriginal reserves in Queensland. A person of Aboriginal descent was required to obtain permission to leave or return to a reserve. Unfortunately, many people were refused permits. For example, an incident occurred in which a father was given a removal order to Palm Island and subsequently was unable to obtain a permit to leave. His family was unable to obtain a permit for entry to Palm Island.

Ms Warner: What about award wages?

Mr KATTER: The honourable member for Kurilpa should be ashamed of herself for being associated with the ALP.

I was staggered to learn that the superintendent of a reserve had the authority to inflict corporal punishment upon anyone within the reserve community. He had the right to imprison anyone for 10 days without trial. He also had the authority to impose a regimen of bread and water upon a person imprisoned under those circumstances. That action was in contravention of every concept and precept of British justice. The honourable member for Kurilpa should be utterly ashamed of herself for being associated with a political party that condones laws of that sort.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr KATTER: I can understand the pain that I am inflicting upon honourable members opposite by mentioning some of Queensland's recent history. Under previous ALP law, a person of Aboriginal descent was not allowed to drink at all in Queensland. Also, if a person of Aboriginal descent obtained a job as a ringer on a station, his wages were not paid directly to him but to the Director of Native Affairs. That ringer was then required to front up to an officer of the Department of Native Affairs and explain how he intended to spend his wages before he could obtain them. That was the law in Queensland when this Government took office.

The Premier, whom Opposition members take great delight in maligning, was one of the first Ministers responsible for removing what was some of the most discriminatory and vicious racist legislation on the books of any Government anywhere in the world. The Queensland Government removed those restrictions. The Governments of the Northern Territory, Western Australia and New South Wales are currently considering the introduction of legislation similar to the Queensland legislation.

Deregulation of Home-loan Interest Rates Charged by Banks

Mr FITZGERALD: I ask the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General: Has the deregulation of bank home-loan interest rates by the Hawke Government:——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have mentioned before that when a question without notice is being asked, I would like silence in the House. It is nearly impossible to hear the question that is being asked.

Mr FITZGERALD: I ask the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General: Has the deregulation of bank home-loan interest rates by the Hawke Government and its Treasurer, Paul Keating, had an adverse effect upon those persons who have borrowed money from building societies in Queensland and, if so, what action has the Queensland Government taken to alleviate the problems faced by Queensland borrowers from building societies?

Mr HARPER: The honourable member is certainly correct in suggesting that the action taken by the Hawke/Keating Labor Government in Canberra has had an adverse effect on home-loan borrowers from building societies in Queensland. One of the strange quirks of the Federal Labor Government is that it is prepared to hurt the people who traditionally give it most support. Once again, the traditional supporters of the Labor Party are being victimised—and it is nothing short of victimisation—by this blatantly sectional bias against building society home-loan borrowers. A deliberate decision was made by the Hawke/Keating Labor Government in Canberra to subsidise people who took out home loans from trading banks and the corporate bank structure.

The banks said to the Federal Labor Party Treasurer, Mr Paul Keating, "We won't make funds available unless the Federal Government assists us." Instead of saying, "We will assist the people, irrespective of where they borrow from," Mr Keating said to the corporate banking structure, "All right, we will assist those Australians who borrow from you, but we will impose sectional bias and we won't assist those people who elect to borrow money for home loans from building societies." A large number of those people are traditional supporters of the Labor Party.

At present, a subsidy is provided by the Federal Government to people who borrow money from the banks, but Mr Keating has indicated to me personally that the present Federal Government is not likely to change its attitude and has no intention of assisting equally the people who borrow money from building societies. If the Federal Government wanted to subsidise anyone, surely it should have been responsible and made the subsidy available to all Australians, whether they borrow money from the corporate banks or from the co-operative building societies.

The Queensland Government stepped in and did what it could to assist borrowers from building societies. I praise the building society movement in Queensland for the very responsible attitude that it adopted. Following discussions with me over a period when I was trying to negotiate and to convince Mr Keating to give the same assistance

to building society borrowers, the building societies in Queensland imposed a moratorium, which meant that they did not increase the interest rates on the predominantly owner-occupied loans. The building societies continue to adopt this responsible attitude, even though, of course, they have to meet market pressures that are being imposed on them by the mismanagement of the Australian economy by the Federal Treasurer.

To encourage people to invest more money with building societies, the Queensland Government took the further action of giving building societies an opportunity to be approved for trustee investments. The Government has taken positive action to ensure that the building society movement in Queensland remains viable and is able to lend money at reasonable interest rates to the people of Queensland, despite the present state of the Australian economy, so that people can buy and build their own homes and achieve that possession that is so important to the people of Australia—a home that they own. It is a shame that the Australian Labor Party and the Hawke/Keating Government have not been prepared to give the same kind of assistance to building society borrowers.

Private Hospital Licence, Logan City

Mr GOSS: In directing a question to the Minister for Health and Environment, I refer to the private hospital licence granted to the Logan City Private Hospital Pty Ltd by the State Government, and I ask: Was that licence granted to the company in preference to other applicants primarily on the basis of the claim made by the company that it had greater experience in establishing and running private hospitals? If so, does the Minister agree that, because the company is now for sale and because its sole asset seems to be the private hospital licence, the company is effectively selling the licence? In view of the fact that the company will not proceed to build the hospital, will the Minister consider withdrawing the licence and granting it to another applicant who is prepared to proceed to build the hospital?

Mr AUSTIN: I am not sure that enough time remains during question-time for me to fully answer the honourable member. I read in this morning's *Courier-Mail* that the honourable member intended to ask a question about this matter, and for some time I have been waiting eagerly for the question to be asked, although not specifically by him.

I give the honourable member the benefit of the doubt, because I believe that he is a reluctant participant in this saga. I say that because one does not need very much intelligence to realise that the journalist has written basically the same story three times in *The Courier-Mail.* Although he has switched the paragraphs round and changed the order, it is basically the same story. The journalist seems intent on implying, without stating directly, that the Government or I have done something sinister.

In a rather intoxicated state, the journalist telephoned me at home. He also telephoned two members of my staff who both reported gaining the same impression. It is agreed by all of us that the journalist was given a reasonable explanation of the facts. In spite of that, he continually refers to "Mr Austin" having rejected the application.

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

OFF-SHORE FACILITIES BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 7 August (see p. 276) on Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen's motion—

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

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (12.43 p.m.): This legislation could appear to the casual observer to be fairly mundane and lacking in interest. In spite of that, it is a very important piece of legislation because, when it is enacted, it will affect the construction

in July 1987 of the new Reef Link Resort, which will be located 70 miles off the coast of Townsville on the John Brewer Reef.

It is somewhat amusing to observe that it was the Premier and Treasurer who introduced the legislation. In the speech-notes that were circulated, he made reference on more than one occasion to the need for protection of the environment and to an environmental impact study that had been carried out by the developers. It was the same Premier and Treasurer who five or six years ago would have been responsible for allowing—against all good advice, including environmental impact studies—a flotilla of derricks and oil-rigs to drill the very precious and world-renowned Great Barrier Reef.

Perhaps the Bill should bear the subtitle "the floating hotel project". It relates to a particular tourist project, which is the Reef Link Resort that will be established on the John Brewer Reef. A report furnished by the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority during 1984-85 indicates that a joint State-Commonwealth committee was set up to research and examine in detail the implications of the project.

It is interesting to note that at that time discussions were held between the previous State Minister for Tourism (Mr Tony Elliott), the present Federal Minister for Tourism (Mr John Brown) and the Premier (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen). At a joint ministerial council meeting, guide-lines were laid down for the project. My notes indicate that, at its sixth meeting in November 1982, the ministerial council took a particular interest in this matter.

I point out to the House a number of decisions that were made by the ministerial council. The council supported in principle the encouragement of any new technically and environmentally acceptable developments that would enable people to use and enjoy the Great Barrier Reef. As a result of that meeting, a joint State/Commonwealth committee was established to consider proposals. The ministerial council's most recent meeting, its ninth, which was held on 3 April 1985, noted that further regulations and more comprehensive legislation were being developed. Of course, that refers to the legislation before the House today.

It is interesting to note that a number of constitutional issues impinge on today's debate. It is my understanding—and my understanding is shared by a number of people associated with aspects of constitutional law, one of whom is Professor Lumb of the University of Queensland—that most legislation applying to a State's territorial waters does not amount to a claim of sovereignty over those waters. As the State law is usually framed in the form of an exercise of jurisdiction over persons, acts or events, such an exercise of legislative power does not amount to an exercise of sovereign powers.

What should be clearly noted is that, although by legislating on this particular subject the State Government seeks to maintain certain responsibilities in relation to overall rights of supervision in some facets of legal jurisdiction, it can also be constitutionally argued—and correctly so—that the sovereignty of that territorial water will remain directly under the control of the Federal Government. That raises a number of very interesting points.

I now refer to some of the aspects that were raised at the 1985 meeting of the ministerial council. The council said that this legislation had been foreshadowed in the Commonwealth Government's statement of its program for the current session of Parliament, and that officers of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority had been involved in an advisory capacity. In the light of that consultation between the Federal and State Governments, perhaps the Premier could inform me whether or not it is now intended to pass complementary legislation in the Federal Parliament as a backup to the Bill being debated by the House today.

The ministerial council said—and I think these are the very salient points—that the problems to be resolved included questions of jurisdiction, which I do not believe presents a problem, but that insurance, public liability, navigational safety and environmental impact procedures for the assessment of proposals had been developed. Those procedures and the administrative framework for the assessment of and permission

to construct and operate an offshore tourist facility are currently under review by consultants to the authority.

The Opposition's objection to the legislation, as well as my own, is primarily about the day-to-day workings and, in fact, the actual structure of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, in which I state quite forthrightly I have very little faith. It strikes me as somewhat strange that the company that will have the ultimate responsibility for developing the project carried out its own environmental impact study. It is my understanding that, although that environmental impact study was accepted by the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, it caused consternation and a great deal of alarm to a number of people associated with the conservation movement throughout Queensland. I have not seen the environmental impact study, so I do not intend to pretend that I am an expert on the flaws contained in it. A number of questions remain to be answered.

One of the matters that the environmental impact study addresses is the considerable thought to be given to pollution problems. It states—

> "No sewerage or garbage is to be released onto the Reef. Fresh water will be provided by a desalination plant and the brine by-products from this must be carefully disposed of in deep water."

That raises a number of questions. If sewage or garbage, whether or not it be treated, is to be disposed of in the deepwater areas of the Great Barrier Reef, who is to say that tidal effects or the future changes to the reef itself will not result in an alarming effect on the coral and marine life associated with the Barrier Reef?

This morning I had drawn to my attention that a matter that has not beeen addressed in any shape or form by the environmental impact study is the effect that the various species of bird life that will land on this resort will have on the reef. One such bird is the albatross, which I understand carries a micro-organism in its down. A fear exists that similar birds will, on their migratory tracks through the Barrier Reef areas, when they land on the railings and other parts of an offshore resort bring from overseas diseases that will have harmful effects on some of this country's plants and animals that have been so preciously protected for a long time. The study also states—

> "A resort management plan and operating standards are being developed prior to any work being carried out on the John Brewer Reef. The plan will take into account not only the matters mentioned so far but a host of other details ranging from staff working conditions. . ."

Because the Queensland Government, the Premier and the Minister for Tourism are not prepared to support proper working conditions for staff on Barrier Reef Islands, that is a very important point to raise in the House. Consistently and continually this Government has advanced arguments to remove the 17.5 per cent holiday pay loading for employees in the tourist industry, eliminate penalty rates and to have people work seven days a week and until all hours of the night without adequate compensation.

The resort will be located approximately 70 km offshore from Townsville. Even though there is a loose arrangement between the Queensland Government and the Federal Government, the fact is that the resort lies in territorial waters that are outside the constitutional jurisdiction of the Queensland Government. For that reason I want to know what assurances the Premier and Treasurer will be able to give in his reply to the second-reading debate that the relevant unions will be able to enforce award provisions to look after their membership by protecting the conditions and employment rights of people working at the resort. It is a sad reflection on the tourist industry in Queensland that the major operators in this State are well known to honourable members, particularly to my good colleague the honourable member for Mackay (Mr Casey), for their shyster antics. One who comes to mind quickly is Williams on Hamilton Island. I want some assurance that proper conditions and working standards will apply to employees.

The location of the resort raises a number of other very interesting aspects. Is it intended that, in order to carry out proper law and order procedures 70 km off the coast of Queensland, police will be present at the resort? I am sure that all honourable members

know that tourist resorts of this type have the potential for guests to over-indulge in alcohol and for behaviour to get out of hand. If police are not present at the resort, how long will it take law enforcement officers to travel from the mainland in emergencies?

A matter of major concern that must be addressed is: What will happen when a cyclone alert has been given for that area of the reef? My belief is that it is intended to evacuate immediately by large fleets of helicopters operating from the reef resort. I wonder whether all safety aspects of such natural disasters have been considered. I repeat that that matter needs to be addressed.

In all probability, a number of honourable members are not aware of exactly what Reef Link is about. Those honourable members should be made aware of what it involves. It is a very exciting tourist project, which I most certainly support. However, I have some reservations about aspects of it.

A former Deputy Prime Minister of Australia, Doug Anthony, is closely involved with the project. Recently, the project was floated as a public company——

Sir William Knox: He is the chairman.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: Yes, I am aware that Doug Anthony is the chairman.

In my opinion, the manner in which the prospectus has been prepared and its presentation to the public do not reflect a true and proper picture of the financial aspects of the resort itself. The resort will be a $32m floating hotel for the Barrier Reef. I refer to an article about it—

> "Work has started on a seven-storey floating hotel to be moored on the Great Barrier Reef, off Townsville.
>
> The Bethlehem shipyard in Singapore has contracted to complete the $32.2 million, 200-room hotel, within a year.
>
> The shipyard president said the hotel would weigh 12,000 tonnes. It would comprise a main floating barge and steel docks topped with fitted out prefabricated metal containers which would serve as rooms.
>
> The hotel would be completed by June next year and then moved from Singapore to a mooring off the Queensland Coast, he said.
>
> Four Seasons Ltd., the hotel and resort arm of Industrial Equity Ltd's Hobart-based Cascade Brewery, has won the contract to manage the planned $37 million international-standard floating hotel.
>
> The floating hotel is being developed by Reef Link Resorts and the project underwritten by the Macquarie Bank. It will be known as the Four Seasons Barrier Reef and feature 176 rooms, conference facilities for up to 200 people, a tennis court, swimming pools and speciality shops."

What will happen to the various chemicals that are used in connection with swimming-pools, whether they be fresh-water or salt-water? The article continues—

> "Guests will travel to the hotel in a 400-seat, high-speed catamaran which will take 90 minutes to travel to Townsville and the hotel will have a staff of about 120 people.
>
> A spokesman for Barrier Reef Holdings said the first payments had been made to the shipyard and it was planned to move the hotel from Singapore to a lagoon in the John Brewer Reef, 72km from Townsville, by mid-July next year.
>
> The hotel would be carried to Queensland on a converted oil tanker.
>
> The hotel plan had environmental approval and a Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority permit, he said.
>
> News of the hotel plan has been kept low key because of a $26 million share float expected soon."

I caution members of the public to carefully consider the investment prospects being offered in that $26m share float.

Any thinking or rational Queenslander who had listened to the absolute political garbage that was spewed forth a few minutes ago by the Minister for Tourism would have to agree that he is completely out of touch with the requirements of his portfolio. For example, the management and staff of the present five-star international hotels on the Gold Coast will tell honourable members that the occupancy rate of those hotels is running at between 3 and 6 per cent. Hotel rooms are being offered at give-away prices in order to get people into the hotels. Last week-end tourism developers on the Gold Coast expressed fear and concern about the fact that they were not getting their fair share of the Japanese tourist market.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: Before the luncheon recess I referred to the proposed Reef Link tourist resort that is to be established 70 km off Townsville. I take the opportunity to slighty expand that argument and talk about the Queensland tourist industry. I will do that briefly, because at some future time there will be a better opportunity to discuss the matter in this House.

I refute the absolutely misleading statements made by the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts, who talked about how well the tourist industry in Queensland is travelling. The Labor Party acknowledges and welcomes the fact that, although tourism generally in Queensland expanded in recent years, the market is not travelling as well as the Queensland Government likes to claim. The Queensland Government is guilty of producing the most misleading information regarding the industry itself. I refer particularly to the very prominent role played by the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation and its chairman, Sir Frank Moore.

Currently on the Gold Coast there are five five-star international class hotels with an occupancy rate running at between 3 per cent and 6 per cent. Any person who travels past those establishments at night will not see any lights. That is not because the occupants have gone to bed early, but because the rooms are not occupied, and that fact can be checked out easily.

I am alarmed when the Minister talks about the role of the Australian Tourist Commission, a body which has been generously funded by the Federal Labor Government. Last year the funding to the commission increased by 40 per cent—an excellent move. Contrary to what the Minister said, a direct result of the overseas campaign by the Australian Tourist Commission, particularly the Paul Hogan advertisements, the follow-up work by the Australian Tourist Commission with further advertisements featuring Paul Hogan, and a vigorous selling campaign in countries such as Switzerland, Germany, Europe as a whole, Asia, Japan, America and Canada, is that overseas tourists are travelling to Australia in droves.

One positive aspect of the devaluation of the Australian dollar, one aspect that the Queensland Government never likes to discuss, along with the promotional campaigns by the Australian Tourist Commission, is that because of the great value in Australian holidays caused by the falling exchange rate, large numbers of people from North America and Japan are coming to Australia.

Mr Davis: They can't have it both ways.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: That is right, but, of course, the Queensland Government wants it both ways. I will refer to the Queensland Government's vision of free enterprise in a moment. The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, under the chairmanship of Sir Frank Moore, has become nothing more than exclusive private club, a cabal of chummy little mates, who, trotting the Minister along behind them, rush off overseas at every opportunity, spending the Queensland tax-payers' money. They fling generous sums of money all over the place, yet the tax-payers of this State pick up the tab for those jaunts. Those activities are in direct competition with the current overseas promotions by the Australian Tourist Commission.

I am not suggesting that there is no place in the market for the QTTC to take responsibility for promoting and selling Queensland. I stated that in my tourism policy, which I released only a number of weeks ago.

I question the rights of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. Earlier my friend the honourable member for Brisbane Central (Mr Davis) referred by way of interjection to the way in which Government members talk about free enterprise in this State. Free enterprise in this State is an absolute joke. Anyone who wants to go to the nth degree of socialism or jump on the bandwagon and talk about communism, as Government members do, will find that the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation is one of the best examples of an organisation that follows in that spirit. The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation is in direct competition with free enterprise in Queensland. If a tourist proprietor does not happen to be a personal friend of Sir Frank Moore or a supporter of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, he will not have business directed to his hotel, motel or other establishment.

I predict that a disaster will occur in Cairns in the next three or four years. The economy of Cairns and the level of employment in that city will finish up in a parlous state because of the development undertaken by the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation and Qintex at Port Douglas. The initial plans that were released by the corporation or by Qintex failed to spell out that the long-term plan is to turn Port Douglas into the game fishing capital of Queensland. Once the palatial resort is built and the harbour and mooring facilities come on line, a major exodus of the marlin fleet from Cairns to Port Douglas will take place. That will mean that tourists will not visit Cairns in the present numbers. The international hotels that already exist, and the one that is now being built, cater for an already over-saturated tourist market in Cairns. The economy of Cairns generally will suffer and jobs will be lost.

It is well known and cannot be denied that if a person does not happen to be on side with the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, he does not finish up on the receiving end of business. The QTTC is competing in the market-place against the private developer and the person in the tourist industry who has provided the money for years and suffered when times have not been good. Now that the industry is starting to boom to a degree, the QTTC is making sure that its mates from the National Party will derive the major benefit. The Opposition rejects that concept totally. I give an undertaking that a Labor Government in Queensland will change completely the structure and set-up of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation.

Contrary to what the Minister for Tourism said, visits by interstate people wishing to see Queensland have dropped by about 6 per cent during the last 12 months. That decline has occurred despite an increase in all other States of approximately 4 per cent. Queensland has gone backwards.

I will cite two reasons why Queensland has gone backwards. Firstly, it has done so because of the political and economic climate in this State. People do not want to come to Queensland. They are put off this State by the National Party Government itself. Secondly, the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation has totally neglected the local market-place. Queensland has not been promoted interstate and sold in the way that it should have been.

I think that every honourable member in this Chamber would be familiar with the Victour commercials that appear frequently on television. The former Premier of South Australia (Don Dunstan) has promoted Victoria. New South Wales and, in connection with the mighty Grand Prix, South Australia have been promoted in this State. However, if one travels interstate, one sees virtually no promotion of Queensland. The only promotion of Queensland in southern capitals occurs during the freezing winter months. The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation seems to think that it is fashionable to parade a few girls in bikinis at a shopping centre. That will not attract tourism to Queensland.

It is alarming that Queenslanders are now leaving this State for interstate tourist destinations before seeing Queensland first. That has happened because of an inadequate

advertising and promotion campaign to keep people in Queensland. The Queensland Government is dreadfully guilty of trying to paint a picture in people's minds that tourism alone will provide the answer to the economic woes of this State. I reject that contention totally. Tourism will not be the answer. It will play an important role. However, those people who are sitting back waiting for this sudden increase in the tourist industry to alleviate some of our economic problems will find that they are being led down the garden path.

I mentioned previously some of the problems that I see in the development of the Reef Link. I am not knocking the proposed development in any way, but I sound a note of caution to those people who are considering investing their hard-earned dollars in this particular project. I sound the same note of caution as I sounded in the House in 1980 when it was revealed that shares would be floated in relation to the Jupiters Casino. The sad fact of the matter is that people with shares in the Jupiters Casino have had their fingers slightly burnt, and their fingers will be burnt even more so. I predict that the same situation will arise in relation to the Breakwater Casino in Townsville. Both the Jupiters Casino and the Breakwater Casino are excellent projects. However, they are a little before their time because the State Government has not properly controlled their development.

I also mentioned some problems peculiar to Reef Link. Evacuation procedures will be carried out on Reef Link should an emergency situation, such as a cyclone, arise. I have mentioned those aspects that were drawn to my attention this morning by the honourable member for Windsor (Mr Comben). He mentioned the problems that could arise because of the various species of bird life that inhabit the area.

It is interesting to note that under the proposed legislation all responsibilities in relation to harbour works will be covered. The Queensland Harbours Act 1955-82 states the definition of "Harbour works" as follows. It—

> "includes generally any works for the improvement, protection, management, maintenance, or utilization of a harbour, whether above or below or partly above and partly below high water mark or low water mark; and in particular but without limiting the general import of the term, includes any basin, graving dock, slip, dock, dock-yard, wharf, bridge, viaduct, breakwater, training wall, embankment, or dam or any small craft facility (including a boat harbour, a boat haven, a wharf, a boat ramp and a mooring), or any reclamation of land from the sea or from the waters of any harbour (including any navigable river), or any excavation, deepening, dredging, or widening of any channel, basin, or other part whatsoever of any harbour (including any navigable river), and also includes any buildings and other works whatsoever used or to be used in connection with any harbour works."

Because this legislation covers harbour works, I would appreciate the Deputy Premier's advising me as to whether the Department of Harbours and Marine, for example, and ultimately the tax-payers, will be responsible for some of the maintenance work on the Reef Link site. Or will the responsibility for that maintenance fall totally upon the developers of the site? After all, the proposed development is a private development set up by a consortium that is highly financed by members of the general public and has been floated as a public company.

In March 1985 the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority commissioned the consultant Cameron McNamara Pty Ltd, in association with Coastal Ecosystems, to undertake a study on guide-lines and methods of environmental assessment of offshore development projects. The study has been overseen by a reference panel consisting of members from all sections of the authority. Advice was also sought from relevant Queensland and Commonwealth agencies.

I again express my concern about the effectiveness of an environmental impact study such as this. It is unusual for a development company that is responsible for the project itself to be given the responsibility of carrying out the environmental impact study. I am not saying that the company should not be paid for the environmental

impact study; it should be. However, I query the priority in having the company conduct the environmental impact study itself.

The report goes on to say—

> "Advice was also sought from relevant Queensland and Commonwealth agencies. The reports produced by the consultant are intended to outline a range of requirements and guidelines for impact assessment studies of offshore developments. It is proposed that the information generated will be used by the Authority and other relevant agencies to determine the need for, and extent of, environmental assessment of offshore development proposals. It is anticipated that a booklet outlining this information will be prepared as a guide to proponents and interested members of the public."

To my knowledge, no such book has yet been produced or has been forthcoming. I wonder when that book will be produced.

I am pleased to note that in certain sections of the development of the Reef Link area, some guide-lines have been laid down as to the type of paint to be used on the hull structure of the resort itself. No toxic anti-fouling paints that could be harmful to sea creatures or to the environment generally will be used. The report states that no other such chemicals are to be used in any shape or form.

I welcome the project, which is a very exciting one. My colleagues in the Townsville area, the honourable member for Townsville (Mr McElligott), the honourable member for Townsville West (Mr Smith) and the honourable member for Townsville South (Mr Wilson), also have found the project to be very exciting. If the project is carried out properly and promoted properly, it will be a great boon for regional development, for the further expansion of the Townsville economy and for north Queensland itself.

On behalf of the Opposition, I have outlined a number of reservations that I have. I notice that the Deputy Premier is absorbing everything in his usual highly intelligent manner, which is very hard for him to do at the best of times. I hope that he might be able to allay some of the misgivings that the Opposition has in respect of the Bill.

Mr Gunn: I will answer the lot. You be in the Chamber when I reply.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I will be in the Chamber when the Minister replies. I always hang on every word that he says. He is so unintelligent that his remarks make for great comic-book reading late at night. I am sure that other speakers will express concern at some of the aspects that I have not covered. The Opposition welcomes the legislation. I hope that it will work in the way that it is intended.

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (2.33 p.m.): This legislation, as usual, shows how far behind the times the Queensland Government really is. The Government believes that suddenly a particular problem will strike. I refer to the Premier's comments when introducing the Bill. He stated—

> "During recent months a number of developers have shown interest in establishing offshore facilities of a permanent or semi-permanent nature for purposes associated with tourism"—

and so on.

How wrong can the Premier be? As far as I am aware, offshore facilities involving the tourist industry in Queensland, such as offshore facilities that come within the definition in the Bill that refers to any facility anchored or made fast, supported by water or by any retractable pier, pile, column or other structural thing, have existed for something like 20 years.

For example, for over 20 years, an underwater observatory has existed at Green Island, and it is an offshore facility that could well come within the definition in the Bill. For something like 15 years, Hook Island has had a similar type of underwater observatory. Some such projects have been round for a long period, but this legislation says, in effect, that things will happen in future months.

The Opposition spokesman on tourism, the honourable member for Wolston (Mr R. J. Gibbs), referred to the Reef Link proposal, which is a floating hotel that will be placed off shore from Townsville. That is one project that is in the wind, so to speak. I believe that that resort will cause major headaches for the developer—more so than for the Queensland Government. Nonetheless, it is an exciting project, and may prove to be very successful.

Since developments on Hook Island and Green Island have taken place, numerous proposals have been put forward concerning the Great Barrier Reef. I admit that, after cyclone Ada swept through the Whitsunday Islands area in 1970—the area in which the bulk of the tourist facilities for inspection of the Barrier Reef are located—a great number of proposals were suddenly shelved. The legislation presently before the House really concerns the provision of facilities so that it will be easier for people to look at the Barrier Reef. In the past, although tourists were able to travel into the Barrier Reef zone, they were not able to go on to the reef itself because of weather conditions that cause severe hazards.

This so-called tourist-oriented Government in Queensland is not really a leader; it is merely a follower. After projects have been in existence for a period, the Queensland Government suddenly decides that perhaps they are proposals worth looking into in terms of legislation, which demonstrates the Government's ad hoc approach to tourism. After all, it was not the Queensland Government that created the Great Barrier Reef, or the surf, the sand, the sun or the skies—the major attractions that appeal to tourists.

It is not until something occurs that this Government is motiviated to act. The question must be asked: In recent times, what has occurred offshore that has caused the Government to examine a particular problem? I suggest that this Bill should be titled "The Hamilton Island Aftermath" Bill, because it has been introduced in the aftermath of the tragic accident that occurred late last year on Hamilton Island.

In his introductory remarks, the Premier and Treasurer said—

> "The Queensland Government, with the passing of this Bill, will be in a position to control and administer all aspects associated with the design, safety and commercial operations of offshore facilities."

That statement is an admission by the Government that up till now it has not been able to control all aspects of design, safety and commercial operations of offshore facilities. The problem I wish to draw to the attention of honourable members today is that the factor of safety has been swept overboard in considerations given to the provision of facilities for tourists who wish to visit the Great Barrier Reef zone, especially the Whitsunday Islands area. Many tourists who have already visited the area would be disappointed to know that the safety aspect had not been addressed properly. Up till now, the Government has not turned its attention to the safety of individuals.

Unfortunately, this legislation is a little too late to help those involved in the fatal helicopter crash that occurred late last year on a pontoon moored in the Hook Reef area of the Great Barrier Reef. Two helicopters from Hamilton Island crashed on the pontoon, with fatal consequences. I am informed that the reason for the crash was that insufficient space was available for everything that the pontoon had to accommodate and everything that had to be done, such as the alighting from helicopters and the boarding of boats that were to take tourists away from the pontoon and out to the so-called submarines to inspect the reef. The fallacy surrounding those underwater vessels is a subject I will refer to later.

The Bill now provides protection that should have been available long ago. The original prospectus on Hamilton Island issued in 1981 included the following statement—

> "Our original proposal, as approved by the Queensland Government in March 1979, was so comprehensive that there has been little need for revision . . ."

Among items approved by the Queensland Government in 1979, some seven years ago, was a "base for helicopter visits to the outer Barrier Reef".

The type of base that is defined in the provisions of the Bill has not been properly included since 1979 insofar as safety factors, such as design and commercial operation are concerned. That is a big minus for this Government. It is a glaring anomaly that should have been looked at and remedied long before now. After all, one of the responsibilities of government is to present to Parliament legislation that will cover events that may occur. When the Hamilton Island proposal was put forward the Queensland Government did not make legislative provision for the problems that have since occurred. For that it stands condemned. In actual fact, when one really looks at Hamilton Island it can be seen that it has done even worse than was first thought. I will refer to that later.

In relation to Hamilton Island, the law seems to have been skirted with regular monotony. It does not matter whether it has been deliberate or not, the law has been deliberately skirted or evaded, and in this particular case the law covering the safety of the people in the area has gone by the board. It is something like seven years since the law has been looked at and, of course, it has had to wait until such time as fatalities have occurred before something has been done. Speaking about the law being skirted, today I asked a question of the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern) and he admitted that there has been objection to the Retail Shop Leases Act——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The honourable member for Mackay is straying a long way from this debate.

Mr CASEY: Most certainly, Mr Deputy Speaker, and that has happened before in this debate. This has become a major debate on the tourist industry.

I emphasise this point in order to develop another point. In relation to the Retail Shop Leases Act, at long last one person was brave enough to speak out. Because of that, the Government started to do something, and the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern) will look at that problem.

Many aspects of safety have to be considered. When I speak about safety, I refer to safety both on shore and off shore.

If the Deputy Premier replies to the second-reading debate, perhaps he will be able to explain the difference in categories of marinas. I presume that marinas will be covered by the provision relating to harbour works. I hope that that is the case. It has been suggested that marinas will be placed out in the reef area. The proposals for mainland marinas up and down the coast are well-known, but there has also been talk of marinas in reef areas as well.

Mr Gunn: They are covered as though they are harbour works.

Mr CASEY: Now, at long last, they are being covered, but some of them have been operating for a long period. Permanent pontoons have been used by boats over a considerable period of time. To my knowledge, they have been anchored out on the reef for anything up to about 12 or 14 years. In some areas the period may be longer. However, I am speaking of the Whitsunday area, which I know well.

Returning to the point I was making in relation to the Hamilton Island area, in a question to the Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr I. J. Gibbs) today I raised the subject of mainland power. He was not prepared to investigate the matter that I raised regarding a company, which is not licensed in accordance with the requirements of the Electrical Workers and Contractors Board, installing power installations. Many questions could be asked about the skirting of the law in relation to safety aspects. Is it any wonder that if resort-owners can get away with that type of thing on island resorts, they are getting away with it off shore? That is a very real problem. Safety is paramount. The worst aspect as far as visitations to the reef by tourists are concerned is that if accidents and fatalities occur they scare tourists right throughout the world.

Honourable members may recall that about 12 months ago in Singapore a cable car was involved in a tragedy when a drilling rig ran into it. The wires were brought down and a number of people were killed. I am informed that that tragedy has almost completely wiped out the operating company. People no longer want to travel on it. That is a classic example of what can happen. If safety is thrown out the door and fatalities occur in the tourist industry, very real problems result. If laws relating to safety are skirted, then laws relating to other things will be skirted. The opposite also is true: If other laws are ignored, the law relating to safety will be skirted.

This morning during question-time the point was made that the owner of Hamilton Island had illegally removed trees from a reserve esplanade on one of the other Whitsunday Islands. The trees were said to have been purchased from a person who said he owned them. However, because an allegation has been made that the trees came from an esplanade reserve on that island, a big question mark hangs over that deal. Of course, as you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and other honourable members would know, that reserve quite clearly is Crown land.

The honourable member for Wolston (Mr R. J. Gibbs) has already raised the possible problem of disease on offshore resorts, particularly from migratory birds. Diseases carried by birds and amimals are particularly difficult to control. However, deliberate pollution is a very real problem that should be addressed by the Government. In answer to another question this morning, the House heard that the owner of Hamilton Island has been given an extension of yet another 15 months to pump raw sewage off that island. As well as going into the marina and the boat harbour, it is taken by the tide and the current to surrounding areas and even to reef areas. That is in spite of the fact that the 1981 prospectus for Hamilton Island stated—

> "We have already let the contract for a modern package plant for the treatment of sewage . . ."

It is about time that was installed, even though the Government has given the owner another 15 months. That also gives the lie to the statement this morning by the acting Minister for Local Government (Mr Tenni) that the building of the sewage treatment plant had been delayed because of the fire and the construction problems associated with it. That fire was only last year, yet the sewage treatment plant was supposed to have been under way as far back as 1981. Once more we see a deliberate flouting of the law.

As I have mentioned the flouting of the laws relating to sewage and other matters, I will deal now with the flouting of laws relating to the operation of vessels as covered by the legislation. In the Whitsunday area boating safety has been downgraded. Earlier this year the Government downgraded the legal requirements relating to the classes of skippers on specified launches and also on the life-saving equipment and life rafts that have to be carried on boats. It is rather amazing that the proprietor of Hamilton Island, Mr Keith Williams, has a tremendous influence on the Marine Board of Queensland. In fact, he was a member of that board at the time all these things were done. The complaints that are made to me are not complaints about somebody who is cranky and dirty on Keith Williams and Hamilton Island; they are made by experienced boat-operators in that area—some for 30 or 40 years—who have magnificent safety records. I have been out on the waters of the Whitsunday area with people such as John Brooks, the Mountenays, the late Nicolsons from Lindeman Island, the Evett boys and their father and the McLeans from Brampton Island. With all of them, safety was paramount. However, several smarties and shrewdies have moved into the area and they have thrown many of the safety provisions right out the door. The matter of overall safety must be looked at again. As I have already said, in the tourist industry, if safety is thrown away, trouble is just around the corner.

Mr Eaton: They always provided a good, slow, relaxing service to those tourist spots.

Mr CASEY: That they did, but at the same time there was a need for updated water transport.

The new faster boats have enabled many more people to get out to the reef round the Whitsundays and to have the time to see it. Further north, in the area of Mourilyan, which is represented by my colleague Mr Eaton, the reef is much closer to the shore, so the time required does not present such a problem. Tourists do not want to sit in slow boats for five hours, punching into a south-easterly, trying to get out to a reef. Now, tourists can travel for an hour or an hour and a quarter on the Sun Goddess from Hayman Island or on one of the big, new catamarans. Those boats are not only much faster but also much more comfortable, which is very important.

Mr Lee: They still get the south-easterlies, though.

Mr CASEY: That is true. However, the operators are skilful. The honourable member for Yeronga would be well aware that, once difficulties are encountered in the open water, one has real trouble. Safety is paramount. That is the point that I continue emphasising.

The Bill contains provision for exemptions. Those exemptions, of course, will be made by Order in Council. I am concerned, as anyone who knows the ways of the National Party Government in this State would be, as to just who will receive those exemptions. What will be the guide-lines for exemptions? Once again, will it be personal pressure from the Keith Williamses and other well-known National Party supporters or will it be on the basis of classes of vessels or types of operations? The guide-lines should be spelled out very clearly here and now.

Air Whitsunday, which operates out of Shute Harbour, provides an excellent service by flying boat direct to the reef, which is a long way off shore.

Mr Kaus: It's No. 1.

Mr CASEY: As the honourable member for Mansfield said, it is a No. 1 service. The operators of that service are No. 1. However, those operators know full well that safety is paramount. Last year, tragically, that service lost one of its aircraft. The crash site has never been located. I do not say that the Bill will prevent such accidents. It will not. As all honourable members know, that is one of the risks of air operations, wherever they might be. However, I point out that that accident was not caused by a lack of safety consciousness by Air Whitsunday or by the manner in which it conducts its operations.

For a number of years, people have been taken from Hayman Island out to permanent establishments on the reef. Telford has a large pontoon at Hook Reef and a so-called submarine, similar to the operation off Townsville. Such operations are working in the Whitsunday/Airlie Beach area and further south at the bottom end of the Barrier Reef.

It would appear that those services have been operating for years without the control of any legislation because the Queensland Government has not had enough nouse to anticipate what would be required. The services are worth while. However, it is scary to know that, until now, the operators of such services have been uncontrolled.

Members who have been in the Parliament for a long time, such as the honourable member for Mansfield (Mr Kaus), would remember that years ago a major debate took place about hovercraft in the Brisbane River. At least 14 or 15 years ago, legislation was passed for the safety of people travelling in hovercraft and for the safety of other vessels in the river. Of course, the river still does not have a hovercraft. However, so many years ago preparations were made. That foresight should have been exhibited in regard to the reef.

Protection should have been built into the legislation to guard against people who are prepared to ignore safety, such as the operators on Hamilton Island, for the purpose of making a fast buck. That does not get anyone anywhere. It is not an attitude that

people involved in the tourist industry should hold. It does not help the tourist industry in Queensland. Legislation containing tighter controls is needed. The legislation must have teeth so that people cannot, on any flippant excuse, obtain an exemption with the blessing of an Order in Council.

I turn to the differentiation between what will be harbour work covered under the Queensland Marine Act and work covered under the Off-shore Facilities Bill. A regulation or an Order in Council is needed fairly smartly that sets out quite clearly who will be controlled under the Harbours Act, who will be controlled under the Queensland Marine Act and what type of facility will be properly controlled.

I refer to the facilities that have already been established and fall into the category defined in the Off-shore Facilities Bill. The people who are involved in those operations and the tourists who go to those areas, hoping to be looked after in safety by the operators of those facilities, would like a decent deal and proper protection to be provided by this Bill.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (2.55 p.m.): This legislation is the result of a fairly long haul over many years in the legislative process. It is interesting to look at the history of offshore arrangements over the last 25 years. I do not intend to go over it; I only mention that territorial waters have to be defined. A definition was laid down some time ago. Today the Queensland Government is not happy about those early decisions, but at least the territorial waters were defined and the matter was fought in the courts of the land in order to establish quite clearly by legislative process who controls the territorial waters. Special arrangements have been made for the States to look after certain waters which would otherwise be under the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth.

A dispute arose regarding the Great Barrier Reef and how the reef should be used, who should be allowed to use it and who had the authority to use it. During that dispute it was discovered that Queensland acquired the islands and the land off the mainland some time after separation from New South Wales. That matter had to be attended to.

The Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act, which is mentioned in the Bill, established very clearly the relationship between the Commonwealth and the States in regard to the search for petroleum and development in marine areas.

Two matters have led to better relations between the Commonwealth and the States, one of which was the dispute over the Papua New Guinea border. That dispute was ultimately settled in a very satisfactory way. But for Queensland's making a stand on that issue, the results would have been quite different and, in fact, disastrous. I did have some reservations about the establishment of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, but so far it is working satisfactorily as a condominium under the control of the Commonwealth and the State. As well, median lines were established between Australia and Indonesia, and other arrangements were made regarding the control of territorial waters.

The condominium control of the reef by the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority has led to this legislation. A situation now exists in which the Commonwealth and the State work together very harmoniously. There may have been difficulties that were not apparent at the outset, but they have been resolved. The complete control of the marine area and the declaration of the parks, following surveys to establish the delineation of the various parks, have been successful operations.

There has been, and will continue to be, interest in the development of many offshore facilities. Although a floating hotel has been alluded to, this legislation is designed to cover all eventualities in regard to the development of offshore facilities along the coastline of this State. I hope that the floating hotel will be successful. I do not accept the Aunt Sallys put up by the Opposition spokesman on this matter. I trust and hope that it will be a very successful venture.

The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, which is controlled jointly by the Commonwealth and the State, has given the green light to the floating hotel proposal.

As a result, the structure has been built in Singapore with the aim of floating it out to the lagoon site some 70 km east of Townsville.

The project will be a very novel one and will, I am sure, attract tourists from all over the world. It will attract not only those who wish to look and observe but also those who wish to dive and engage in recreational pastimes that inovlve marine activities. I should imagine that the hotel would attract professional people, scientists and others who are interested in research in the Barrier Reef area.

Because of the sheer expense of building it and the cost of interest and redemption on it, which would be very large, I do not expect the hotel to be affordable to the average person. I hope that the venture is successful. I am sure that communication with the hotel will enable many people who otherwise would not see the reef to do so. It is not generally known that very few people have seen the reef and that very few visitors to the islands off the coast see it. Because of weather conditions or some other circumstances, most visitors to the island are prevented from seeing it.

It is extremely difficult to get anywhere near the reef from the continental islands. Of course, limited accommodation is available on the atolls. So this venture should be supported. I trust that the legislation will make it easier for that to happen.

Other issues need to be taken into consideration. I am quite sure that, had this legislation been in existence, the problems that arose on one or two of Queensland's islands concerning some people who should not have been there some years ago would not have occurred. In fact, it was those sorts of problems nearly 20 years ago that led people to discover the tenuous legal situation that existed in the jurisdiction of Queensland over some of those islands.

The accumulation of rubbish and debris deposited by people on many islands off Queensland's coastline is also a matter of concern. The dumping of rubbish does not seem to be policed as often as it could be. It may be impracticable in some instances, but a lack of discipline exists in the behaviour of people who claim that they want the islands for environmental and recreational purposes yet neglect them when they have the opportunity of using them. I hope that as a result of better laws and extension of jurisdiction the areas are policed more thoroughly.

As to the hotel—some concern has been expressed in this place and elsewhere about weather conditions. I understand that in the event of gale or cyclone warnings, special arrangements will be made to evacuate the hotel. I am sure that that can be done at very short notice, conveniently and comfortably with the help of both the helicopter and the vessels, including one very large vessel, that service the facility.

Associated problems will be encountered. However, I think that the risk involved is worth taking. It is true that the hotel will be located in one of the cyclone alleys of north Queensland. In recent years Queensland has not experienced as many cyclones as it has in the past. Perhaps Queenslanders are a little bit blase about them.

Mr Lee: It will want to be well anchored down, won't it?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I think that such matters have been considered. However, should the hotel be in the path of a cyclone, extensive damage could be caused.

Many years ago, the resorts on the Whitsunday Islands used to close from December to March because of cyclones and inclement weather. The resorts were not open during those months, and maintenance programs were carried out. The resorts closed a couple of weeks before Christmas and did not open again until 1 March. That was the arrangement for many years. It allowed maintenance to be carried out at a time when, because of the weather conditions, people were discouraged from going to those areas. The cyclones arrived right on the dot. Everybody expected them and they were true to form. Such cyclones have not been experienced in recent years, but no doubt they will return.

It is unfortunate that cyclones cause a great deal of damage. However, when they cross the coastline they become rain depressions that are of great value to primary

producers and the community generally. The community depends upon the normal cycles of weather, even though cyclones are an inconvenience to the tourist industry.

Clause 4 of the legislation refers to all the laws of Queensland being extended to cover the facilities, which will be defined from time to time. In the past few days Australia has witnessed a strike and virtual mutiny by approximately 300 workers on an oil platform in Western Australia. Had that platform been a ship, severe penalties would have been imposed upon those who mutinied and took control. I understand that laws govern the behaviour of people on oil platforms. The Queensland Government should be looking towards the introduction of legislation that will prevent or at least discourage a similar incident to that which occurred in Western Australia.

Although the proposed floating hotel might not be a ship, problems could arise in the event of industrial anarchy or capture by pirates. Of course, the latter seems a remote possibility in this day and age, but pirates do operate in the seas to the north of New Guinea. The taking of hostages and the related terrorist activities are not unknown in such facilities. All honourable members have seen what can happen in some of the southern Pacific island nations. People can be held to ransom; difficult circumstances can emerge. Although the possibility of such activities seems fairly remote to Australia and our environment, sooner or later they will occur.

Honourable members must think carefully about offshore facilities and consider not only the application of the laws of Queensland but also any special arrangements that are required to deal with incidents that occur in a remote location off the coast, whether it be a platform, a floating hotel, an island, an underwater facility or any other future development. I do not think I need try to mention all eventualities; the Bill has a general clause.

The industrial action on the oil platform off the coast of Western Australia could have become very nasty because of the difficulty encountered by law-enforcement officers and officers of the industrial court in obtaining access. The unrest which developed was relatively civilised when compared with what could have occurred.

It has been necessary to take special precautions to ensure the safety and security of platforms off Gippsland against possible sabotage and attack by hostile groups who may hold people to ransom. It is possible that that could occur further north. After all, illegal fishing has been carried out in the marine parks and the Barrier Reef. It is possible for people in boats to land along the coast without being observed. They could occupy territory and do things which are illegal according to State and Federal laws.

From time to time, island proprietors have had their houses and units burgled by people who appear in the night in boats and then disappear. The houses and units are cleaned out of all the napery—even beds and television sets. There are difficulties. I am not saying that they will occur immediately, but the people who supervise the laws of the land should consider the special problems posed by offshore facilities.

Mr SMITH (Townsville West) (3.11 p.m.): Previous speakers in the debate have displayed a knowledge of the Bill. It is correctly titled "Off-shore Facilities Bill", because that is what it is about. It deals with tourist facilities, and it is essential that the Bill be debated in that context.

I will elaborate on some of the topics covered by the honourable member for Nundah (Sir William Knox). One matter to be grasped in terms of the nation's tourist industry is that there are not many identifiable tourist destinations in Australia. The Opera House is one; Ayers Rock is another. The Great Barrier Reef is probably the largest single drawcard for overseas tourists.

As the honourable member for Nundah correctly said, until recently very few people had seen much of the reef. Because of the vagaries of the weather and the cost of transport, many people who live in north Queensland have not even seen the Great Barrier Reef. It is not at all unusual for overseas visitors to be able to talk more authoritatively than locals about the reef.

I am excited about the Reef Link project. I view it in a very positive vein for what it will do for the general tourism industry, employment and the overall image of Queensland and Australia. The project is in addition to other projects that are taking shape in north Queensland. The Reef Wonderworld, which is a bicentennial project, will give to people who might not be able to afford the Reef Link the opportunity to see a good example of what the reef is all about. As the Reef Link is likely to be very expensive to visit, the other facility will play a very important part.

Doug Tarca is a person who has to be admired. He is a visionary who started off with very little. He has owned a number of tourist facilities that have a reef type of background. He battled for many years to develop something that would fill the bill. I admire the man for his decision to stay in Townsville, particularly in the early years, before Townsville got its tourist act together, when most of the tourist operators regarded Cairns as the tourist haven.

In north Queensland, tourism is prospering. I was interested to hear the comments of the honourable member for Wolston (Mr R. J. Gibbs) about occupancy rates on the Gold Coast. I made a quick phone call over the luncheon recess and found that the newly opened Sheraton Hotel in north Queensland is operating at a 72 per cent occupancy rate. The Townsville International Hotel and the Travelodge are also doing very well.

The effect of the decrease in value of the Australian dollar is being felt in the tourist industry. Many people from the United States and other countries are visiting Australia. That would not have occurred if the Australian dollar had not depreciated so considerably.

The honourable member for Nundah (Sir William Knox) raised the point that needs to be thouroughly considered. He correctly said not many years ago people regarded reef destinations as being suitable for the winter months only, certainly not for the summer months. To some extent, people involved in the tourism industry are being unrealistic—or, perhaps, greedy. Tourist facilities throughout the world generally have seasons. Obviously, no attempt is made to promote a Swiss alpine resort when there is no snow. I tend to the belief that it is wrong, or misleading, to promote tropical tourist areas as all-year round tourist destinations. It could be very disappointing for people to travel to north Queensland in summer months only to find that they are caught in a severe cyclone. In addition, stingers can present a problem for tourists. If misfortunes such as those were to occur, the tourists would probably never return. The reality is that, in the better months of the year, Queensland has a tourism facility that is unequalled throughout the world.

Over-promotion, or perhaps inappropriate promotion, could devalue that facility. I take issue with Qantas because, when the first services from the United States were introduced into the north, Qantas saw fit to introduce the first flight in February. When the first plane arrived, it was raining cats and dogs. The sun did not shine for about a week. I question the planning and philosophy that dictate that a facility located in a tropical area should be promoted as an all-year-round destination.

The tourism facility that will be subject to the provisions of the Bill has been designed by people who have gained experience in the construction of oil-exploration platforms, which is probably the best experience for designing such a facility. I am informed that Reef Link will be capable of withstanding gale force winds of 163 km/h and waves to a height of almost 5 metres. A wave height of 5 metres would indicate a substantially rough sea in an area that is not open sea, but protected waters. I therefore have a great deal of confidence in the ability of that facility to withstand the conditions that might prevail in the area.

I turn now to the safety factor in the event of evacuation. The facility will accommodate more than 400 guests and 120 staff members. A catamaran that has a capacity of 190 people will service the resort. It should be remembered that that high-speed catamaran is not the only one of its kind in north Queensland, and I venture to suggest that the facility could be evacuated totally in between two and three hours. The safety factor is not of great concern to me.

The effect of over-capitalisation of the tourism industry has been mentioned. Too much development can be a problem in areas such as north Queensland and the Gold Coast, where the rate of development is exceeding demand. I join issue with the Queensland Government about the wholesale construction of supermarkets in an unregulated way. The same remarks apply to the provision of tourism facilities. It is clear to me that, if excessive competition in the provision of facilities is allowed to occur, the standard of services will fall, with the result that people will not want to return. For those reasons, it is important that some regulation be applied to the number of facilities developed.

I regard Reef Link as unique, and I have every confidence that it will help to put Queensland on the map, so to speak. A previous speaker referred to the endeavours of the Australian Tourist Commission. The Commission has done an excellent job, as has Paul Hogan. Having said that, I make the point strongly that the tourism industry should present tour packages. Because most honourable members are given the opportunity of overseas travel, they would know that overseas tourist information centres do not provide pamphlets on the Gold Coast, Townsville or Cairns. Instead, tourist information focuses on total regions, such as Queensland or Australia. Fragmentation is a severe problem in the tourist industry. It could have a self-destructive effect for people involved in the industry. For many years unfortunate rivalry existed between the cities of Cairns and Townsville. In recent times, to some extent, that has been overcome—and I have every hope that it will continue to be overcome—by a group known as the Cairns/Townsville Working Together Committee. My only regret is that at the present time the Whitsunday area is not included. In my opinion, the whole of north Queensland is a market package area.

Cost ought to be considered. Earlier I spoke about excessive competition between resorts. A factor directly related to the Queensland tourist industry is that Qantas faces severe competition in the transport of passengers from the west coast of America. Last week-end Qantas announced that, because of the competition being provided by the big US carriers who are subsidising the operation in order to keep up their internal traffic within the USA it was running that service at a considerable loss.

Now north Queensland has two international airports. People in the Mackay region—the Whitsundays in particular—are bringing pressure for their own international facilities. Recently I heard of support for another in Rockhampton, if not at the Iwasaki resort. It seems to me that, if development is allowed to continue unfettered, not only will a strain be put on the tourist operators themselves but also the competitiveness of Australia's own airline will be further weakened.

People cannot afford to be too parochial in these matters. I know that the honourable member for Cairns (Mr De Lacy) would not agree with me—nor would I expect him to agree with me—that a case existed for one international airport in north Queensland. It should have been properly sorted out whether it was to be Cairns or Townsville. The truth is that, as people have to sharpen their pencils more—and, in view of the type of competition that will be experienced, that will certainly happen in the tourist industry—sooner or later there will in fact be one only international airport. The notions of additional airports in Mackay or the Whitsunday area ought not to be given much currency. Talk of new airports would tend to cause a lack of confidence in the people who are already established in areas that are serviced by international airlines.

Many steps can be taken. I was very pleased to learn recently that Air Queensland has been given the right to operate between Cairns and Townsville. I have been pushing for that for many years. It was certainly the missing link. Air Queensland has modern aircraft, such as the ATR-42, a 40-passenger aircraft, which will assist in moving people around the State from an international airport. The package that has to be sold must include the ability to move people quickly to the various destinations in our State at a relatively low cost.

Incidentally, I do not believe that the introduction of East-West Airlines will help at all. It has picked the eyes out of the market. It makes me wonder. In fact, on the

matter of the recent appointments, I certainly share the criticism of Frank Moore, who is now on the board of Air Queensland. I wonder why that happened. I think TAA has erred in its judgment. By the same token, I note also that Dennis Howe, the former chief spokesman of East-West, now has a very senior position with TAA. I am interested in their direction.

As an operator, TAA has to be congratulated. It has a greater investment in tourist facilities in Queensland than its main competitor. TAA has been the major airline in tourism, and I believe that it was entitled to the support of the Government when it was coming under challenge from East-West's Lindeman Island offer.

The problems of the Great Barrier Reef and the authority that has been established to manage it have already been spoken about. The man at the head of that authority is Graeme Kelleher, a very professional man who had a very difficult job.

The question of co-operation between the State and Federal Governments has been discussed. It is timely to remind people of the difficulties that faced that organisation, particularly in the first few years when the member for Cunningham (Mr Tony Elliott) was the Minister for Tourism. Although he would attend meetings as a representative of the Queensland Government and make certain agreements with the Federal Government, the Premier would not endorse the action taken by his Minister. Because the member for Nundah (Sir William Knox) was in Cabinet at the time, he would know that is true. The follow-up to that was that the Premier sacked the member for Cunningham and took over himself. I have been surprised that the Premier has not been as disruptive as I thought he may have been.

Some people have very correctly expressed reservations about the offshore facility in terms of its environmental impact. That is a very, very valid consideration. I believe that Doug Tarca has a great regard for the reef. As long as Doug Tarca is in a position to exercise control, John Brewer Reef is very much in safe hands. However, that leaves open the question that at any time Doug Tarca might cease to control the facility. He might sell; in fact, the range of eventualities is unlimited. For that reason it is absolutely essential that the requirements with respect to any enviromental impact are very solidly in place.

Most honourable members know what is to happen and what are the objectives of those who will run this project, but it is no good simply looking at this one facility. Once this legislation is in place—it certainly ought to be in place—others will want to mount projects if not of the same magnitude then of the same type. I reiterate that it is only now that people are realising that the controls put on the developer of Hamilton Island were perhaps insufficient. I am not in a position to know just how serious that sewerage problem is on Hamilton Island. In fact, I have talked to Mr Williams about it and he claims that it is not serious. Of course, one could expect that view to come from him. However, it seems that it ought not even be a matter of concern. The impact should have been thoroughly foreseen and the legislation in place to ensure that no problems occurred. With the Reef Link project, Doug Tarca will return the sewage to the mainland and solidify it before it is dumped.

A point that has come out of this debate today relates to security and law enforcement. There can be no doubt that the security of such a facility will be an ongoing problem because it will always be open to abuse by people who consider themselves to be above the law and by those who wish to attract publicity to themselves. Although the Townsville City Council has no say in what will happen on the facility—it certainly does not come within its jurisdiction—the impact of its establishment will fall on that city and on its various agencies, including its law enforcement agencies.

Like most other cities, Townsville is already suffering from a lack of police presence in sufficient numbers. The Government should very seriously consider the widening responsibilities of police in the Townsville area, particularly with the establishment of the casino. It is not too early to consider the stationing in Townsville of a helicopter with instant availability to the police. It might be argued that other helicopters, such as those used by the local rescue service, the national disaster organisation or, for that matter, the army or the RAAF, are available. However, the point is that, time and time

again, that sort of assistance from other bodies cannot be made available instantly. Channels have to be gone through, and that takes time. As I have said Townsville is an expanding area. It is time to give very serious consideration to basing a police helicopter in that area under the direct control of the local enforcement agencies.

In conclusion, I reiterate my support for the project and my confidence in Doug Tarca in particular. I believe that the project will be profitable. The sums have been done properly. The project will add to the whole developing tourism scene in north Queensland. I confidently predict that it has a very rosy future.

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (3.31 p.m.): The Off-shore Facilities Bill is very timely. As previous speakers have mentioned, the legislation has probably been introduced at this time as a result of the floating hotel project that is now being launched in north Queensland. Along with other honourable members, I am sure that it will be a great success in boosting and adding greater depth to the tourist facilities that are available not only to international visitors but also to Australians who want to see their own country. Some people have a bit of a fixation about the importance of overseas visitors. However, 80 per cent of our tourists are—and I suggest will remain—domestic tourists. The tourists most important to Australia are Australians. I hope that the Government does not lose sight of that in its enthusiasm for attracting the Japanese and American market.

I have said that the Bill is timely. However, it must be recognised that the floating hotel concept is not something that has suddenly dawned. In fact, for years, to use the words of the Premier when introducing the Bill, offshore facilities have been provided in many ways and in many varieties. Most honourable members who have visited the reef over the years will have seen pontoons being moored in outer reefs, and even small boats being left semi-permanently out in the reef in order to provide access for flying boats or fast cruisers. Moorings and semi-permanent facilities have been available for quite some time. So, it is not before time that the Government started to think about how they should be handled.

As most honourable members would be aware, recently a new and very large tourist mooring facility has been taken out from Port Douglas to provide tourists with access to the reef, because that is what they come to see.

Offshore facilities are not a new thing. The floating hotel, I suggest, is not the end of the concept. Offshore facilities have a long way to go yet. The truth is starting to dawn on people in the tourist industry that no longer can they look towards using the reef or even the Whitsunday Islands as a destination for tourists. There is simply not enough space out there. There are not enough facilities for people coming to see the reef to cause people in the tourist industry to think that they will stay on the reef for their holiday. In fact I suggest that, if they did do that, most tourists would be bored silly after the first 48 hours.

People want to see and experience the reef. They do not necessarily want to stay on the reef. That is a good thing, because the amount of effluent, rubbish and other byproducts of human habitation would be enormous if people in their thousands, who wanted to visit the reef, stayed on top of the reef at a hotel on an island, a floating hotel or any other establishment. Most tourists will see the reef by visiting it as day trippers. The Government ought to be considering how it can assist and promote that sort of activity. A number of simple reasons exist why day-tripping will come about. It will not be simply because of the facilities that are available. I would not like to see much more development in places such as the Whitsunday Islands because it would become the Gold Coast on the Whitsundays. I do not think that many Australians would want that to happen. That area has virtually reached its capacity.

When isolated destinations are set up to include food service, laundry service and so on, apart from the pollution aspects that inevitably flow from that development, costs also increase greatly.

Increased costs will occur particularly if the Federal Government introduces the lunatic fringe benefits tax into the equation. The owners of accommodation will not be able to provide their employees with accommodation or with any of the transport or travel concessions that they currently provide. All these benefits will be taxed. This is just a small aside, but it highlights another additional on-cost that the Federal Government will bring about.

It is not possible to plug a three-pin power lead into a coral reef and get the electricity needed for refrigeration, lighting and safety. Activities at Great Barrier Reef destinations have a very limited span, and because of high costs people will not be able to afford to engage in them. One thing is certain: Australia must ensure that tourism does not become so elitist that the average Australian is precluded from seeing his own country. There is room for growth in offshore facilities.

I would not like to see the implementation of the kind of attitudes that have been hinted at by some of the previous speakers, particularly the last speaker, who put forward the extraordinary proposition that competition weakens competition. I have always believed that competition was one of those things that helped competition. The ALP, in its usual rather strange approach, believes that competition weakens competitiveness. The ALP also says it is time Australia started controlling these offshore facilities. The difference between co-ordinated development and Government bureaucracy must be made clear. The last thing the tourist industry needs is more administrative heavy-handedness from bureaucrats. There is a strong case for bodies such as the QTTC to assist in co-ordinating development projects, and the Liberal Party is enthusiastic about the QTTC's playing that role. A little later I will discuss some of the roles that the QTTC plays and about which the Liberal Party is not quite as enthusiastic.

It was inevitable that this matter would come before Parliament. If one could criticise the Bill in any way, one would state that it is a little bit sparse in some regards. No mention is made of attitudes that will be taken, of guide-lines, of parameters or of framework that people looking at the development of offshore facilities can have regard to. The Bill merely states that the law is the law—the same here as it is there.

All of the exemptions and provisos that have been included in the Bill recognise that offshore facilities are quite different from mainland facilities.

I question the existence in the Bill of one quite extraordinary exemption. I might have a naturally suspicious mind, but when I see such exemptions in Bills presented by this Government, I wonder who asked for them and who will benefit from them. Who will benefit from the exemption clause that says, "Here is an Act. Everybody has to comply with it, except that if the Governor in Council says you don't have to, you don't have to." Queensland has seen these kinds of Bills before, such as the Claytons deregulation Bill, in which it was stated that everything had to contain an exemption clause, and all the regulations will be ruled out except when the Governor in Council decides to the contrary. I hope this Bill will not become a Claytons Bill, one that governs everybody except those who the Governor in Council decides should not be governed by it.

I put the proposition that if a Bill is good enough, it is good enough for everyone, and no special pleading by friends who can come around to the back door or by someone who has a mate at the top should be able to exempt certain persons from its provisions. The law should be the law. If the Queensland Government is so doubtful about the utility of the Bill, the propriety of the Bill and whether or not the Bill will work, that it has to say, "Hang on a minute. Let us put an escape clause in, and we will stop people having to operate under this Bill," the Government should think about it a little bit more. Either it is a good Bill or it is a bad Bill, and if it is good enough for one, it is good enough for everyone.

Why should those with special interests, special pleaders, or special anybodies have a chance to get out from under the Bill? It should be one law for everyone. That is what the principle of the rule of law is all about. If there is a law, all men are equal before it—or they should be. Not all men are equal before the law. Those who are not

are those who can persuade the Governor in Council to allow them to be exempt from it. A significant amount of caution is required with provisions of this nature as in any provision of any law, any Act or any regulation. The law should be the law.

At this stage it would be appropriate to talk about the tourist industry in slightly more general terms, because that is where the impact of the Bill lies. As the Premier said in his second-reading speech, the Bill does not deal with oil-drilling or mineral exploration, it deals with other offshore facilities which, in large measure, will be tourist facilities. The way in which those facilities will be controlled, co-ordinated and managed, depending on which attitude the Government takes, will be extremely important in determining whether or not the Off-shore Facilities Bill is a success or just another passing fancy.

There is no doubt that the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation will play a significant role, because it has shown itself to be a body of tremendous power and influence in this State. After all, it is a well-known fact in this State that when the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation was unhappy with a Minister who was once in charge of it, he was removed. In fact, he was not only removed from that portfolio; he exited from Cabinet and is about to exit from Parliament.

The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation is a very, very powerful body. It is one that the present Minister, the honourable member for Carnarvon (Mr McKechnie), tries desperately to control and, for the most part, he does a very good job. However, with due respect to the Minister, he is a minnow amongst the sharks and therefore some larger hand should be taken in respect of the role of the QTTC in the administration and policy direction of how measures such as the Off-shore Facilities Bill will be implemented by the Queensland Government and whether projects will be allowed or not allowed.

It must be recalled that the Bill provides for things to be considered or not considered as parts of harbours works. Therefore, Government discretion will play an important role in the process. I suggest that two departments will play a role in the matters that are deemed to be harbour works under the Bill. Of course, the Department of Harbours and Marine will, quite properly, play a technical role as to whether a hotel is anchored down properly in a cyclone-prone area. The other Government department, or quango—one can call it what one likes as one sometimes gets a little confused about what the QTTC is supposed to be in this State—that will have the policy role of saying whether something should happen or should not happen will undoubtedly be the QTTC. Therefore, the general attitudes taken by that body are important and relevant to the administration of the Bill.

One of the matters that have been of great concern is the way the QTTC handles its attitude in these matters, particularly its hell-bent blast towards socialism. Somewhere along the line someone has to point out to the QTTC that there is a difference between promoting tourism and marketing tourism. "Promotion" and "marketing" are said as two different words because they are two different things. Regrettably, many people blur the difference. The QTTC is and should be a promotional arm of the tourist industry that does its job magnificently. Appropriately, it has received the strongest praise from all segments of the tourist industry and from all political parties right across the board for the terrific job it does in promoting the tourist industry in Queensland. The members of the QTTC should receive the whole-hearted congratulations of every Queenslander on the job that it does. The problem is that, at times, the QTTC gets a little confused. Most confusion arises in the distinction between promotion and marketing.

The QTTC has been turned loose and is virtually out of control. It is well known in this State that the QTTC removed its last Minister and has the present Minister jumping through hoops pretty well. The QTTC is beyond control and going its own separate way, building up its own little socialist empire. Anyone who wants proof of that need go no further than the last annual report, which shows the QTTC boasting about how it has increased its sales in the Townsville area. Of course, the Townsville

area will be affected greatly by the floating hotel that is under consideration in the Off-shore Facilities Bill and therefore is very relevant to this debate.

The QTTC said that it had boosted its ticket sales by 33 per cent. What a boast for a free enterprise Government instrumentality to make! It has stood up in black and white before this Parliament and said, "Look at what we have done. Look at how much business we, a Government-oriented and Government-controlled socialist organisation, have been able to take out of the pockets of private enterprise in the Townsville area alone."

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The honourable member is straying some distance from the Bill.

Mr GYGAR: Or course, I am unable to refer to individual clauses at this stage. However, having dealt with the exemption section in clause 3, I wish to speak about the application of the provision, rule and doctrine of the laws which apply in Queensland at the present time. I particularly wish to mention the application of the provisions of those laws which relate to the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation and the way in which it can manage the tourist industry. I also mention the way in which the Minister and the other members of Cabinet are able to control the various commercial activities of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation.

The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation in its role of promoter, co-ordinator and marketer of tourist facilities in Queensland will have a strong influence on offshore facilities and upon those features mentioned in clause 4 of the Bill. How are those provisions going to work? One of the provisions of clause 4 that ought to work is a redefinition of what the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation has been doing lately. It is out of control. I do not want any out-of-control socialist juggernaut exercising controls over offshore facilities to be created under this Bill.

The floating hotel has been acknowledged as one of the main reasons for this legislation. What will be the involvement of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation in its operation? What activities are legitimate and appropriate for this quango, this socialist monster that is now getting out of control because it has the Minister under its thumb? What is it going to do? If it is going to promote the floating hotel then that is appropriate, and will have the enthusiastic and overwhelming support of all honourable members. However, if the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation is going to set up a ticket-selling office in Townsville and say, "Buy your tickets here for the floating hotel established under the Offshore Facilities Bill.", then that is quite out of the question. However, the corporation is doing that and is boasting about it. This allegedly free enterprise Government has a report before it wherein a quango is saying, "Look at us. Are we not terrific? We put a few more free enterprise travel agents out of business in Townsville last year." During the past 12 months, on the figures available, over $3m in commissions was lost to private enterprise. That amount was swallowed up by this socialist quango which an allegedly private enterprise Government has allowed to spawn and which allegedly free enterprise Ministers have been totally unable to control.

A Government and corporate travel service has been established solely to skim the cream off the travel market. Everyone involved in the tourist industry knows that the easiest money to make is that which comes from company X picking up the telephone and saying, "Look, we have got four executives who have to go to London for a conference. Give us four first-class tickets each way and book us into a decent hotel and make sure there is a cab there." That exercise only takes five minutes of effort on the part of the booking agent and he makes an enormous commission. However, booking agents need that commission because it carries them through the problems they strike with mum and dad from West Chermside who come in six times to discuss their holiday before they finally decide that they will go by train, anyway, and obtain their ticket from the Railway Department.

Mr White: Is it true that even members of Parliament must buy their tickets through the Tourist and Travel Corporation and not private enterprise?

Mr GYGAR: As the honourable member for Redcliffe says, even those members of this House who are supporters of private enterprise are not allowed by this Government—acting, no doubt, under instructions from the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation—to use private enterprise travel agents to book their travel when they travel inside Queensland on parliamentary duties. That is a disgrace. How can any free enterprise Government allow that sort of nonsense to continue? Why should honourable members not be allowed to have dealings with private travel agencies? It would not cost the tax-payers any more. In fact, if the 82 current members of Parliament—soon to become 89 because again our small-government Government wants more members of Parliament to help it govern smaller—were able to go to Jetset Tours, for example, and negotiate a deal, I believe we could obtain reduced travel rates of the order of 3 or 4 per cent.

Mr Gunn: When I go overseas, I always engage Jetset.

Mr GYGAR: Back-bench members are not allowed to do that.

Regrettably, back-bench members are not like the elite in this House who can bring down Orders in Council and rules to fiddle things in their own way and in their own time. We humble honourable members of this Parliament who are subject to direction by the Executive Government of this State on this issue are told straight, "You will use the QTTC full stop." I will not say that I would like to use Jetset, because one is not allowed to advertise services on the floor of the Parliament, however I would like to be able to select from the range of outstanding private tourist operators in this State, those people who I think can give me the best service and the tax-payers of Queensland the best deal. All members want to save money for the tax-payers, however because a quango has a stranglehold on travel, members are not allowed to do so.

I am a little astounded by the admission made by the Deputy Premier. He said that when he goes overseas he uses Jetset. I would like to ask the parliamentary travel service why Ministers can do those things and back-benchers cannot. I thought that all parliamentarians were equal and that rules that were laid down for one were laid down for all.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I have mentioned previously that I consider that the honourable member for Stafford is straying from the Bill. I am quite certain he is now in criticising the travel arrangements of members of Parliament. That has nothing to do with offshore facilities.

Mr GYGAR: I was responding to the admission by the Deputy Premier. My high dudgeon at his revelation unfortunately tempted me to depart from the Bill.

However, I was discussing the Off-shore Facilities Bill, which is a timely Bill. Perhaps the Bill is a little late because the actions it will control have been going on for some time.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr GYGAR: I regard the honourable member as a socialist, because as soon as anything sticks up its head, he wants to control it right from the start. Those of us who have a more free enterprise approach to things wish to see the market develop in its own way, and the market has developed in its own way. If the honourable gentleman had been in the Chamber when I began to outline some of the problems that could arise with this legislation, he would have heard me outline how smaller facilities had started on reefs, how boats had been anchored and how small pontoons had been erected. The point has now been reached where an Act to control such facilities is necessary.

I am not criticising the Bill as such. It is time that this Bill was brought in and it is a good thing, but it is a little bit on the vague side. The Bill could give more indications of what attitude the Government will take. I am particularly concerned, because although there are no indications of direction, there is a blanket exemption clause that allows the Governor in Council—in effect the Cabinet—to exempt people from laws. It would be bad enough if it applied to any law, but when it is a law that is so general and so wide,

and contains no directions, no thrust, no indications at all, the fact that even under those circumstances the Governor in Council can exempt people from it should disturb every member of Parliament who is concerned about the rule of law and the fact that all persons are equal under that law.

I also express concern as to what the QTTC might get up to if it is involved in the administration of those provisions, as it inevitably will be under the provisions of clause 4. I again express the hope that someone in this Government will take a long, hard look at that organisation, line it up and tell it the difference between promotion and marketing. It should be pointed out that private enterprise believes that Government should promote; socialists believe that Governments should do. What the QTTC is doing in marketing at the moment is straight-out socialism and this Government should hang its head in shame at not only letting the QTTC get away with that, but by being conned by the sharks in that outfit into actually standing up in this Chamber against their free enterprise principles and praising its socialist activity.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (3.54 p.m.): I will address my remarks to the Bill and the basic concerns I have about the effect it will have on the Great Barrier Reef.

The Bill is really concerned with future development of facilities associated with tourism and other activities on the Great Barrier Reef. The Capricornia section is the most recent area to be included in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority zone. Offshore facilities have the potential for the greatest benefit in the area. The development of offshore facilities is probably the only way that tourism as an industry will grow in the Capricornia section of the Great Barrier Reef. It is very important that, through the provisions of this Bill, past mistakes are not repeated. The Government must ensure that the legislation presently before the House takes the future into account.

The honourable member for Mackay (Mr Casey) highlighted the disasters that have occurred on offshore facilities associated with Hamilton Island. Not only was loss of life involved but also destruction of the environment by the pumping of raw sewage directly into the deep waters of the area. The public as well as the environment needs to be protected.

At present, the Capricornia section of the Great Barrier Reef is very well managed by the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority. I hope that development of offshore facilities will take into account that greater numbers of people should be able to utilise and appreciate the facilities of the reef without environmental blunders occurring.

One very disappointing aspect of the second-reading speech of the Premier and Treasurer was that no mention was made of co-operation between the State and Federal Governments. It is a significant error on the part of the Premier and Treasurer to regard development of Great Barrier Reef tourism facilities as being the responsibility of Queensland only. The fact of the matter is that it should be a joint venture. Co-operation with the Federal Government is very important. It is also important to take account of the Federal Government's attitude toward the major environmental impact on the Great Barrier Reef by the provision of offshore facilities.

In the latest report available, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority outlined its attitude toward offshore structures. That authority has examined environmental impact in detail. It is therefore disturbing that the Queensland Government goes along its own willy-nilly path and refuses to recognise the element of co-operation that is required, not only with the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority but also with the Federal Government.

In the annual report of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, under the heading "Offshore Structures", the following appears—

> "The tourist industry is continually investigating innovative approaches in providing first class facilities which allow visitors to see and experience the reef at first hand."

Great potential exists in the Capricornia section of the Great Barrier Reef for the development of tourism. Access to many of the islands visited by tourists is gained through Bundaberg, which is the southern gateway to the Great Barrier Reef. The provision of offshore facilities will benefit the development of that tourism. The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority focuses attention on that aspect in the following terms—

> "The use of offshore structures, particularly to accommodate tourists during their stay 'on the Reef' is seen as having considerable potential. Visitors would be provided with access to a range of completely new reef experiences, while pressure on the islands of the Reef would be reduced."

Reducing pressure on the islands of the reef is a very important aspect in the consideration of offshore structural developments.

I turn my attention to the small Lady Musgrave Island, which is a beautiful coral cay that can be traversed on foot in half an hour. If facilities were to be developed on the island, the nature of the island's attractions would be destroyed. In contrast with that, if properly planned offshore structures were to be provided, tourists could visit the island and protection could be afforded to wildlife and the reef itself. The report I referred to earlier later states—

> "The development of offshore structures would necessitate the use of new and sophisticated technology, such as that developed for offshore mining, to build, not on an island, but on a reef or the seabed itself."

Innovation, sophistication and new development are three very important aspects to be considered relative to offshore structures. Accidents will occur wherever those aspects of technology exist, especially with the very fragile aspect of the environment of the reef. The possibility should be of concern to all honourable members.

Mr Lee: Don't you think the people who are building them would have gone into all of that?

Mr CAMPBELL: Isn't it marvellous how accidents still occur in the nuclear-power industry—accidents which have caused hundreds of deaths—because it has been new and innovative technology? Isn't is marvellous how, with all the new and innovative technology of the motor industry, hundreds of people are killing themselves on Queensland roads? With new technology, accidents will occur.

Mr Lee: It is not the motor car; it is the dill behind the wheel.

Mr CAMPBELL: What about the space shuttle? More money has been put into that than into any other undertaking with new technology. That resulted in the sad loss of seven astronauts. The honourable member for Yeronga says there will be no accidents. How ridiculous and how silly it is of him to even imply such a thing. Accidents will happen.

I refer to the reference in the annual report to the Capricornia section of the Great Barrier Reef—

> "In March 1985 the bulk ore carrier TNT Alltrans ran aground on Lady Musgrave Reef in the General Use 'B' Zone, Capricornia Section, in which shipping is a prohibited activity. She was refloated with minimal apparent damage to her superstructure although the coral in the area of impact, and that immediately surrounding it, was killed. A Commonwealth Department of Transport enquiry is taking place into this apparent breach of the Capricornia Section Zoning Plan."

This is one aspect I raise now: What happens if a floating offshore facility breaks away? Will parts of the reef be killed? It is very important to consider that. Only last year, on 3 April 1985, the Ministerial Council of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority said that—

> "... further regulations and more comprehensive legislation are being developed. This legislation has been foreshadowed in the Commonwealth Government's

statement of its program for the current Parliament and officers of the Authority have been involved in an advisory capacity."

I now ask: Was the Off-shore Facilities Bill drafted in co-operation with the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority? The basis for the second question I would like to ask is contained in the report, the relevant passage of which states—

"The problems to be resolved include questions of jurisdiction, insurance and public liability, navigational safety and environmental impact. Although existing offshore structures are few and relatively small, a number of more ambitious proposals, at various stages of planning, have been referred to the Authority."

In relation to the Reef Link project, I ask: Have the problems associated with, firstly, jurisdiction, secondly, insurance and public liability, thirdly, navigational safety and, fourthly, environmental impact been fully researched and have they been fully clarified with both the Federal Government and the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority?

It is very important to ensure that the procedures for the assessment of proposals have been developed. These procedures and the administrative framework for assessment and the permission to construct and operate an offshore tourist facility are currently under review by consultants to the authority. It is important to remember that project No. 221, which was undertaken to investigate guide-lines and methodologies for environmental assessment of offshore development, was proposed to be completed only in August 1985; so it is to be hoped that the environmental impact study has been fully accepted and been drawn up in relation to that proposal. I repeat that it was only at that time that the full guide-lines were available.

The development of the proposals needs a co-operative approach between the Queensland Government, the Federal Government and the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority . The Bill is important because it has a special impact for the Capricornia section of the Great Barrier Reef. That section of the reef is currently being fairly well managed. I congratulate all those who are involved with Heron Island, because they do a great job. I refer to the operators of the resort, the university and the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

The same mistakes that were made in the past must not be repeated. The co-operative approach to the management of Heron Island will be useful for many years to come. The Capricornia section of the Great Barrier Reef comprises many small islands. Therefore, any further development of the area must be carefully considered. Any over-utilisation of the group by the public could be a disaster. At present Lady Musgrave Island is restricted to day visitors and overnight campers. That is working reasonably well. If structures were to be built on that island, the wildlife and the reef could suffer permanent damage, so it is important that the management plan be kept in place. Offshore structures could be an integral part of that plan.

The reservation that the Opposition has is that the co-operative approach should continue. The Premier's second-reading speech, which did not mention the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority or the Federal Government, seemed to lack any co-operative approach. If the best potential for the development of the reef for the people of Australia is to be realised, steps must be taken to ensure that no permanent damage is done to any sections of it.

The Opposition welcomes the Bill. It will provide protection not only for the public who utilise the Great Barrier Reef but also for the environment.

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (4.8 p.m.): I rise to reinforce the comments of the member for Wolston (Mr R. J. Gibbs) and the member for Mackay (Mr Casey). They covered the matters very well and I wholly support their contributions.

The member for Wolston referred to some developments going overboard. That is a problem that must be faced up to by many tourist operators. Many of them seem to think that the tourist is a filthy-rich person racing around looking for somewhere to

throw his money away. In fact, he is very astute. The reason he can afford to travel round as a tourist is that astuteness and his ability to handle the dollar. Too many people who are now entering the tourist industry do not see things in that light.

I am concerned about the areas of responsibility of the different Ministeries. One can see that there can be the involvement of Lands, National Parks, Tourism, Local Government, Police and perhaps some other portfolios. This State has witnessed successful entrepreneurial developments involving hundreds of million of dollars. In his second-reading speech, the Premier said that the operation would be covered by applicable Queensland legislation. That legislation would be the Local Government Act, the Harbours Act and the Queensland Marine Act. What could happen after the development is that, because of some unforeseen circumstance, the Government could be forced to spend money in these areas of its responsibility. No mention has been made of whether mooring charges will be levied by the Department of Harbours and Marine. Will operators who transport people to and from the facility be charged mooring fees? These are matters that concern me particularly because I represent an area that is currently undergoing great tourist development and has great prospects for future development.

The big boys want to move in after the areas have been pioneered for many years and once the custom is established. I refer in particular to Beddara Island, which is owned and operated by TAA or Australian Airlines. That company wants to make Beddara Island an exclusive island.

For 27 years or thereabouts, a tourist boat operator—and this applies to other operators as well—has been operating daily trips to Beddara Island in the tourist season and thrice-weekly trips in the off season. That operator has not been told not to land on the beaches. For many years, the procedure has been that the service lands tourists for afternoon tea or morning tea, whatever the case may be, in the shallows, where the place is quiet. The paying customers are provided with morning tea, afternoon tea or lunch, depending on the time of the visit. Some visitors like to go for a walk on the beach; others like to go for a swim.

Government influence will have an effect on tourist operators in my area, and I am quite concerned about it. The local people are also concerned that the operators who have pioneered the development of tourism in the area are now getting squeezed out by the modern pace and modern facilities of these progressive entrepreneurial developers. I am not opposed to that, but the local tourist-boat operators have provided a service by which the Barrier Reef and its islands can be enjoyed at a relaxing pace.

I draw the attention of the Government to attempts that are being made to make Beddara Island an exclusive island, such as occurred with Daydream Island. It has been done before. The Government is giving in to pressure from the big companies, which influence it with talk of multimillion-dollar expansions and huge projects. The Government has to accede to reasonable requests, because, after all, Queensland is being developed; but exclusive development should not be allowed to take place at the expense of the local business people and the local tourist operators who have pioneered areas all the way along the Queensland coastline.

Mr COMBEN (Windsor) (4.14 p.m.): I intend to speak for only a few minutes. Most of the provisions of the Bill have already been well canvassed by members on this side of the House. However, I do want to raise two matters. One of those matters concerns a possible health risk with offshore facilities such as those that the Bill will facilitate.

At a recent meeting of the Queensland Ornithological Society, a very good address was given by Dr Ian Humphries-Smith of the University of Queensland Parasitology Department concerning sea birds and the possible transmissions of diseases via sea birds to humans out on the Great Barrier Reef and especially on artificial floating facilities such as those encompassed by the Bill.

I share with other members of the Opposition a belief that the type of development proposal covered by the Reef Link project is one that wil be good for tourist development in Queensland because it is able to be a sustainable tourist development, as long as it is not damaging the environment.

However, the matter that Dr Ian Humphries-Smith raised at the particular meeting to which I refer was that a number of parasites, or vectors, are to be found on pelagic sea birds out in the deep water and can be brought to Barrier Reef islands and to floating facilities such as the Reef Link. At the end of his address, Dr Ian Humphries-Smith gave a very humorous rendition of what could possibly happen on some of these floating facilities.

He was particularly concerned that two types of encephalitis could be brought to such facilities by birds bringing in both ticks and other parasites and, as a result, a very high economic risk was involved. The health risk was not a high priority, because encephalitis does not kill people, and the chance of people catching such a disease from parasites on birds is small. However, there need not be many people on a major tourist facility for them to catch such a disease and for the whole tourist facility to be wiped out economically. It is not good for the general economic state of Queensland or for its tourist development if 200 people staying on the Reef Link Hotel are all scratching themselves or have rashes and are feeling a bit sick.

I wish that other honourable members had been at that particular lecture. If they had been, few would then venture out onto such platforms, reefs or hotels. The number of pelagic birds coming into such areas is quite large. These birds do carry ticks and other parasites and people should be wary of the diseases that could result from exposure to these parasites.

Mr Innes: On that basis, how could people reasonably and safely go to Heron Island and Green Island?

Mr COMBEN: People can reasonably and safely go to places such as Heron Island and Green Island. As the honourable member for Sherwood well knows, only the black noddy is found on Heron Island, and this matter concerns larger and different types of sea birds. I am referring to some of the pelagic birds that travel across the southern oceans and can introduce exotic diseases. It is not a high-priority health risk, but a potentially high economic risk.

In an artificial situation, such as the top of a floating hotel, where a large number of birds will come in, either to roost or rest at times, a very large quantity of guano—that is the polite term—will build up. The crusting that will occur on the top of such facilities will be the breeding ground for various types of mites, midges and parasites, such as would be found in the Liberal Party. It can only be expected that some of those parasites will reach the people on the facility. It is an artificial situation that does not exist on islands, where the sun kills the parasites and where the natural systems will leach away the guano.

My second point concerns the consultations between the Queensland Government and the Commonwealth Government regarding this Bill, which is to provide for the application and administration of laws at sites where offshore facilities exist or are to be moored or fixed in the adjacent waters of Queensland. Members are all aware of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Act and the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, and also of the extent of the co-operation, co-ordination and consultation between the two levels of government, which has created one of the world's greatest parks and certainly the world's greatest marine park.

If enquiries are made of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, it will be discovered that there has been no consultation or co-operation concerning this Bill. That is the truth of the matter. My colleague the honourable member for Bundaberg (Mr Campbell) previously asked a question on that very matter. I have made fairly extensive

inquiries since learning that this Bill was to be debated, and I have found that there has been no co-operation, co-ordination or consultation between the two levels of government.

When consideration is given to the extent to which this project is a joint venture of those two Governments, the question has to be asked: Why is this Government suddenly finding itself unable to attract powers and authority to itself without consultation regarding this matter, and is this some sort of Queensland grab for power? I am not happy about it, and do not believe Queensland has been doing the right thing by the shore areas in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park over which it has jurisdiction, insofar as the Queensland Government has not been providing adequate staff or resources to effectively look after those areas. This sort of proposal for more facilities and fixed facilities off shore has an effect over the whole area, an effect that will concern the zoning and management of areas of the national park to which honourable members have referred.

There is a potential for accidents in such facilities, which are an integral part of the marine park. Although total co-ordination should take place between levels of Government, it does not. The Queensland Government is trying to do its own little bit without talking to anyone else. It is a narrow-minded, selfish Government that does not take a wide view on any subject.

One matter that could be covered by this Bill is the recent announcement by the Government on the Shelburne Bay issue. The proposed port facility in the Shelburne Bay area involves a 1 400-metre jetty that will jut right out into the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, through Rodney Island and out to sea. Rodney Island is an island within the Great Barrier Reef region and is on the Register of the National Estate and the World Heritage List. It contains a unique type of fig-tree dominated rain forest and represents half of this total area of rain forest on Cape York Peninsula. It is also an important Torres Strait pigeon nesting and roosting site (a bird with limited distribution). The companies have already damaged Rodney Island with poor surveying work, and the port facility could lead to the total demise of the rain forest on Rodney Island.

The construction of the port will require the blasting for pylons through a diverse and well-developed fringing reef surrounding Rodney Island. This is all within the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, and in fact the lease that the Queensland Government has just granted extends out over the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park over the proposed port facility.

The port facility is directly adjacent to the largest area of Marine National Park B declared within the whole Great Barrier Reef region. This has been declared because of the high conservation values and pristine environment of the Barrier Reef in this region, and because Shelburne Bay is one of the five most important sites for the endangered dugong in the whole Great Barrier Reef region.

The conservation values of the proposed Shelburne Bay mining area are very great because it is a long-standing national park proposal. It is one of the largest and most diverse wilderness areas in Australia.

As to the economics of mining in the area—one of the world's largest export silica mines operates at Cape Flattery, which is 400 km south of Shelburne Bay, in an area of less environmental sensitivity than Shelburne Bay. Cape Flattery has over a hundred years of resources remaining, even though it is providing over 70 per cent of the import Japanese silica market. In April this year, the domestic Japanese silica industries were declared structured industries in Japan because of an over-supply situation. There is a risk that if the Shelburne Bay project were to go ahead, it could exacerbate that over-supply situation and threaten jobs at the existing Cape Flattery operation.

Cape Flattery is undergoing a $30m expansion to enable it to export 2 million tonnes of silica sand per annum, with the employment of 50 people. A new $12m port is nearing completion. The Shelburne Bay operation would employ only between 15 and 20 people. That is an accurate figure obtained from the company's own draft environmental impact study. There is no need for this project on the edge of the Great Barrier Reef.

In fact, it could have a negative economic and employment impact on Australia. The Shelburne Bay region is of the highest conservation significance and could be developed into a world-class national park that, in the long term, along with other national parks on Cape York, could be a very significant international tourist drawcard for Queensland, providing jobs and giving sustainable economic development, a term that is unknown to the Queensland Government, as is well shown by other matters that are raised in this Chamber.

The Queensland Government decision is premature and irresponsible because a draft environmental impact study, required by the Commonwealth Government because of the need for the Commonwealth to consider the issue of a permit for the construction of port facilities within the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park and the need for foreign investment approval, is still undergoing processes of public review.

The Queensland Government's own mining warden recommended rejection of this mining lease application in February this year because of concerns of threats to the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, particularly in relation to the introduction of the Japanese mussell, which does survive in tropical waters and could have a devastating impact on the reef and the Shelburne Bay waters.

Again, a proposal that is being considered by the Queensland Government will not come before this Assembly, and that could have a detrimental effect. Although I understand that the Opposition will not divide on the Bill, it has grave reservations about the facilities that are being provided, their environmental impact, whether they do provide sustainable development and whether they will be beneficial or will in the long term have a very detrimental effect on the reef.

If the Government cared sufficiently to be concerned about this issue, it would be investigating a large number of factors concerned with the Reef Link proposal and would not be making a grab at further powers. If the State Government were making those inquiries members of the Opposition would support it. However, the Opposition is aware that the Government is not concerned about Queensland's environment. It is an uncaring Government. It is not interested in the future development of Queensland and takes a short-term view of every proposal put to it.

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police) (4.26 p.m.), in reply: I point out to the honourable member for Wolston (Mr R. J. Gibbs) that the Federal and Queensland Governments have never argued as to whether or not offshore tourist facilities should be built. Both Governments and the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority were keen to see the legal framework sorted out.

It is obvious that offshore developers must have a legal framework within which to operate. This Bill provides that framework. The Commonwealth Government may introduce legislation to complement this Bill. However, the Queensland Government would oppose any push by the Federal Government to unilaterally control Queensland's tourist resorts and other facilities. An appropriate environmental impact study is required not only by Queensland but also by the Commonwealth. Such a study will be carried out. The proposed Bill does not assert Queensland sovereignty over offshore facilities. It simply extends necessarily the range of the law in Queensland.

The questions raised by the honourable member for Wolston in relation to employment safety and other control measures highlight the good sense of this Bill. The laws in Queensland currently cover offshore islands and the same good government will now be extended to cover offshore resorts, in particular the Reef Link resort. Maintenance costs will be borne by the consortium.

The reference to the Harbour Act allows the structures to be regulated by the Queensland Government as though they were harbour works. Those works will be covered by section 86 approvals and will have conditions attached to them.

I remind the honourable member for Mackay (Mr Casey) that special legislation is required because no proposals of this type have arisen in the past. The proposed Reef

Link is located in an area outside the territorial sea. This Bill is necessary to tie the new structures to the Queensland legal system. This is being done in the interests of peace, order and good government, which we are fortunate to have in this State. That is our right under the Queensland constitution.

Mr Davis: Ha, ha!

Mr GUNN: The honourable member for Brisbane Central can laugh because he does not have much longer in this House. This Government got rid of him once before and we will do it again.

The honourable member for Mackay mentioned exemptions. Exemptions are necessary to allow for unforseen circumstances such as vessels which might be involved even though they have nothing to do with tourism, mariculture, etc.

The honourable member for Stafford also commented on the exemption clause. A possible exemption could occur when a vessel is moored for a prolonged period in order to instal navagation aids, for example. This Bill is not intended to apply to such a vessel. I point out to the honourable member for Stafford that this Bill is not a tourist promotion Bill. It is a Bill which will enable the relevant State laws to apply to the new generation of offshore structures.

The honourable member for Bundaberg (Mr Campbell) referred to co-operation with the Commonwealth Government. That is not in question. Surely he would not allow the Commonwealth Government to set up new quangos to employ building inspectors, health inspectors, licensing officers, corporate affairs officers and others. However, the Commonwealth Government has set up quangos in other sectors; it has duplicated Government activity time and time again. The Queensland Government does not expect the Federal Government to take action. The subject of the Bill is obviously a matter for the State and does not involve the Commonwealth.

The honourable member for Bundaberg also mentioned the co-operation of the Commonwealth Government and the Great Barrier Reef Marine Parks Authority in specific offshore developments. That co-operation will continue in the future. The role of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority and Commonwealth agencies is provided for under clause 8 of this Bill. The Bill is necessary for the State of Queensland.

Motion (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to.

Committee

Mr Menzel (Mulgrave) in the chair; Hon. W. A. M. Gunn (Somerset—Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Clause 3—Exemptions—

Mr CAMPBELL (4.31 p.m.): I ask the Minister for clarification about the proposals that cover aquaculture and fish-processing ventures. Will the Bill give exemptions or are they covered elsewhere by the Bill? Will the Bill cover areas that may be dammed and floating structures, or are those covered under the Harbours Act and Fisheries Act?

Mr GUNN: They are covered by the Bill.

Clause 3, as read, agreed to.

Clause 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—Fixed off-shore facility deemed harbour works—

Mr CASEY (4.32 p.m.): This clause requires further explanation from the Minister. My concern touches partly on the matter that was raised by the honourable member for

Bundaberg about exemptions. When speaking about exemptions, the Minister said that it could well be that some types of vessel have not been covered. The definition reads—

> " 'vessel' includes a ship, boat, air-cushion vehicle, barge, pontoon or craft, capable of floating whether wholly or partly submerged, and whether or not it is self propelled."

That is a very broad definition. It covers everything in the exemption clause.

During the debate on the second reading, I raised a matter, about which I now have a cutting from the *Telegraph* of 12 December 1985. A fatal crash occurred on a pontoon moored out on the Great Barrier Reef. Over the years, other Queensland legislation has clearly defined the Great Barrier Reef as a part of Queensland, coming under the jurisdiction of this Government. For that reason it and the Commonwealth are responsible for the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. The *Telegraph* article refers to two helicopters colliding on a pontoon. A helicopter with a pilot and six passengers was preparing to take off when its rotor blades clipped those of the other helicopter. One helicopter was completely destroyed and the other was seriously damaged. Two large helicopters were parked on a very small pontoon that would be quite clearly covered under definitions in this Bill. Judging on its past record, I fear that that type of pontoon would be given exemption by the Government. Clause 5 refers to the Harbours Act. As the pontoon was moored, could it be that at that time it was under the control of the Harbours Act, or is the legislation now to be tidied up to make sure that safety provisions covering the type of incident to which I have referred are embodied in regulations?

I am not making up a case; nor am I harping on what may or may not happen. I am referring to a specific incident. Although no result of the inquiry has been published, I understand that the initial investigation revealed clearly that the cause of the disaster was that the pontoon was undersized. For the amount of helicopter traffic that was using it, the pontoon was simply too small. It was probably extremely fortunate that a major tragedy was averted. Safety is a matter of concern, and the lack of safety associated with offshore facilities is a problem that needs to be addressed.

Mr GUNN: At present, pontoons anchored on the reef are located on the high seas. The Bill will firmly bind such structures to the provisions of State laws.

Clause 5, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 6 to 9, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

GOVERNMENT LOAN BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 7 August (see p. 277) on Mr Gunn's motion—

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

Mr BURNS (Lytton) (4.37 p.m.): This Bill gives the Government authority to raise loans for departmental capital works purposes. As such, it gives honourable members an ideal opportunity to comment upon the rapidly escalating debt of Queensland.

The Queensland Government has the worst debt situation of any State Government in Australia. That makes a mockery of the Premier's claims of prudent financial management and small government.

Queensland's debt is rapidly getting out of control. As an example of the inability of the Government even to comprehend this situation, one only has to look at the appallingly inaccurate letter sent by the Deputy Premier and Treasurer (Mr Gunn) to *The Sunday Mail* on 25 May claiming that Queensland had something called a "pure

public debt" which was serviced from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and required just 5.1 per cent of total receipts to be so serviced. The Deputy Premier and Treasurer tried to make out that this public debt of approximately $2,100m was the total debt of the State Government and its statutory authorities. Nothing could be further from the truth. This debt represents only about one-fifth of the total debt.

Queensland's total debt, which includes the net public debt under the financial agreement, departmental borrowings and the gross contingent liability of the State Government, and is met and serviced by the State's statutory authorities, has exploded over the last two years. In 1984, the total State and semi-Government guaranteed debt stood at $8,731.4m. A year later in 1985, the debt had exploded a further $2,000m to $10,785.3m.

Again a year later, at 30 June 1986, although figures are not available as yet, an increase of a further $1,800m or so is expected, and that will take the total debt to approximately $12,500m. I make the point that $5,000 is owed by this State Government for every man, women and child. That debt has virtually exploded over the last two years as this Government went on a borrowing spree.

This is by far the highest debt in per capita terms of any State Government in Australia and, as such, it represents a massive mortgage of our future for which future Queensland generations will have to pay. One commentator called it the worst form of child abuse possible, because the children of today will pay in the future for this debt. Is it not ironic that the State Government that jumps up and down shouting "free enterprise" and "small government" should have the worst public debt of any State Government in Australia?

The other ironic thing is that the Queensland Government does not know accurately its real debt position. No attempt has been made by State Treasury to accurately identify its total net debt. Would any Government member really know how much the total debt is in this State? The State's debt has grown so rapidly in the past few years with so many different agreements being entered into that the State Treasury has lost track of its obligations. This is not to say that it does not pay its bills when they become due. What can be said is that it has lost track of the real net debt cost to the State.

Honourable members will recall that embarrassing admission a few years ago in the Treasury's internal publication titled *Data-Q*, in which it was admitted that debt redemption was sometimes included in travel expenses and incidentals. What an embarrassing admission to make! I will refer to it again. It was under the name of Assistant Under Treasurer (Financial Administration), Mr J. D. Reardon, Public Accounts—Data Standards, who said—

> "In some cases debt redemption is included under subdivisional items such as 'travelling expenses, incidentals etc.' How then can the Treasurer quickly know the financial position of the State level public budget sub-sector?
>
> The problem is compounded"—

and so on.

The point is that that man, the Assistant Under Treasurer (Financial Administration), Mr Reardon, made the admission that that is where some of the public debt of this State is hidden, namely, under the headings of travelling expenses and incidentals. Can honourable members imagine what might be covered under those headings?

One wonders whether the situation has improved to any great extent since that admission. Last year, in answer to a question of mine, the Deputy Premier admitted that the State Government had no idea of its total net debt, and he tried to evade the situation——

Mr Gunn: It is not our debt.

Mr BURNS: Of course it is our debt. The authorities and quangos are the responsibility of the Government. It set them up. If the Government did not want the

quangos to operate, it did not have to implement them. The Deputy Premier always dodges his responsibilities.

One of the things I like about debating the economy and matters such as that with him is the way in which he was appointed. Does anyone know what was said? Joh went into Cabinet and asked, "What's two times 20?" The Deputy Premier said "34", and got the job because he was the closest. That is the answer that I get. It is a fact of life as far as the Deputy Premier is concerned, so he should not be giving me his economic expertise.

Mr Borbidge: That is how you fellows count votes.

Mr BURNS: Unfortunately the honourable member for Surfers Paradise did not get 34.

The situation has not improved. I repeat that, in answer to a question of mine last year, the Deputy Premier admitted that the State Government had no idea of its total net debt and he tried to evade the situation by claiming that it was largely an academic exercise. He is saying it again right now. I put it to the ordinary householder, to the ordinary bloke in the community: Would he regard it as purely academic if he did not know how much he owed on borrowings? The Deputy Premier says that it does not count, that it does not matter. He says it does not matter what the electricity authority owes, it does not matter what all of those quangos owe—it does not count. I think he is a strange man to have as a Deputy Treasurer of this State and the Deputy Leader of the Government of the State.

Tax-payers in Queensland have a right to know what their Government owes, and it is totally unacceptable for the Government to claim that it does not matter. In short, the Government has lost track of its borrowings and urgent action needs to be taken to correct this totally unacceptable situation.

The Government also seems to have lost track of the foreign exchange losses it has incurred on its overseas borrowings. On 3 December last year, I asked a question of the Deputy Premier on the total overseas currency exposure of the Queensland Government and its statutory authorities and the realised foreign currency losses on those borrowings. I was told by the Deputy Premier that the foreign currency borrowings amounted to $1,705m with realised losses of some $75m and an overall currency loss of $346m.

On 6 August this year, I asked a similar question of the Deputy Premier. He claimed that the information was not held centrally and therefore he could not give me an answer on realised foreign currency losses. Why was it that last year he could provide the answer but this year he could not? Either the Queensland Government has become grossly imcompetent in the management of its foreign borrowings over the past year and does not know the extent of the losses sustained by tax-payers of Queensland or it is covering up because of a huge increase in the losses sustained on our foreign borrowings. It is either one or the other. If he could tell me 12 months ago, why can't he tell me now? He refused to tell me recently. I say he is covering up. Last year he admitted that $75m was lost on our foreign borrowings. What is the score this year? Is it well over $200m? Why did he not answer the question when he was asked, as any other Treasurer would do? He answered it 12 months ago. Why did he not answer when I asked him recently? The reason he did not answer is that this year is an election year and the Deputy Premier does not want the people to know. The Government has to cover up a few things.

Apart from the losses sustained because of poor financial management, another burden is the interest payable on the huge debt. Again, details are hidden and spread throughout the Auditor-General's report. No doubt the Government hopes that they will not be found.

Look at the debt and interest payments of the Queensland Electricity Commission. Its latest report shows that its gross loan debt was $3,130m, on which interest charges amounted to more than $400m. No wonder the State Government had to whack a 25

per cent tax on electricity bills to pay for this debt! That is what it is—a 25 per cent tax! On the total debt of $12,000m, Queensland must be paying close to $1,600m a year in interest payments alone. Nobody should mention that it is only tax-payers who pay. It is the consumers who pay. Consumers cannot be differentiated from tax-payers. Whether a bloke out there who turns on his light is paying as a tax-payer or as a consumer, he pays a tax for the Government's financial mismanagement of the electricity industry. The Government set up the electricity industry; it set up the authority. The National Party made all the decisions. Because of the Government's mismanagement, every person in this State has to pay. The electricity industry is the best example of gross mismanagement caused by capital expansion financed by borrowings.

Mr Milliner: What about Tarong over Millmerran?

Mr BURNS: Yes, that is right. $267m was involved there.

Three years ago, the Leader of the Opposition pointed out to the Minister for Mines and Energy that the consumption projections of the Queensland Electricity Commission came out of fantasy land and, when the annual report was tabled in the House, were already out by 600 MW. When that major blunder was pointed out, the Minister accused the Opposition of being negative.

Now the State's electricity-generating system has more than 2 000 MW of unused capacity, which means an unnecessary investment of more than $2,000m, for which the consumers of Queensland are being charged to the hilt. Borrowing to finance capital works is fine if the capital works are necessary and are a productive boost to the economy. Unfortunately for Queensland, this has often not been the case. The grossly excessive expansion of the electricity supply industry has placed a huge cost burden on both domestic consumers and business in this State. Before capital works projects are undertaken they should be the subject of detailed cost-benefit analyses, but it appears that generally in Queensland that is not done.

Another huge project that can be questioned is the $600m central Queensland rail electrification program. I have always argued that the Queensland Railways should use the State's coal and run on electricity. When diesel-electric locomotives were introduced, I argued against the then Treasurer (Gordon Chalk). However, if one is dealing with economics, which is what is being dealt with today, one has to remember the price of oil. On today's prices, I wonder whether the electrification will be economic.

Mr Gunn: Long term.

Mr BURNS: I still support it. I make the point because I have argued this for years.

I am saying to the Deputy Premier that every time a project comes up, a cost-benefit analysis should be provided to this House. This is where the decisions are supposed to be made. This is the place where those who represent the ordinary consumer, the ordinary tax-payer, ought to be told—not in those shonky documents that the National Party likes to call the State Government Budget documents that will be given to honourable members next week. Half of the time they conceal more than they contain.

Lastly, I wish to speak about the State deficit. That is relevant because it is largely funded through borrowings. Queensland has the highest debts of any State in Australia. We can ignore the weak claims by the Premier that Queensland can balance its Budget while the Federal Government cannot. The Premier would not know a balanced Budget if he fell over one.

I will tell honourable members a story that is common up at the Treasury. The scene is the final Budget meeting between the Premier and his officers. In comes Leo Hielscher, and Joh says, "Hello, Leo."

"Hello, Mr Premier."

"Listen, Leo, is everything all right?"

"Yes, everything is all right, Mr Premier."

"Are you looking after the farmers?"

"Yes, we are looking after the farmers."

"Have we still got some mines operating and some cranes on the horizon?"

"Yes, Mr Premier."

"Thank you, Leo."

That is the end of it; away they go. That is the Premier's total involvement. They laugh about that up at the Treasury, but it is the talk of the town.

On one occasion I was told that Treasury officials were highly amused when the Premier telephoned and asked for an explanation of why interest rates went up and down. He wanted that explained in case he had to answer a question in the House. That is the same person who wants to go to Canberra to lead the nation.

I return to the deficit. From the information provided by Australian Bureau of Statistics it is clear that Queensland's Budget deficit is the highest in Australia. Unlike the manipulative propaganda machine of the State Government, the Australian Bureau of Statistics uses a uniform definition of deficit for all the States and the Commonwealth. Every Government has to face the same test.

The deficit means, of course, the difference between total income and total expenditure and is the gap that is to be financed through borrowings in order to enable a Government to balance the Budget.

In 1985-86, Queensland had to borrow $1,153m so that it could balance its Budget. That was the highest of any State Government and, in per person terms, Queensland has a deficit of $450 for every man, woman and child. So, Queensland is not doing too well under Treasurer Bjelke-Petersen. It was more than double the average deficit of the other States, and indeed it was much higher than the Commonwealth deficit, which was $314 per person, or $135 less per person than the Queensland deficit.

Queensland has a State Government that criticises the Federal Budget deficit when the figures show that it has a far worse record with a deficit that is higher than that of the Commonwealth and higher than that of any other State in Australia. What hyprocrisy from a State Government that has the worst debt of any State Government in Australia!

Queensland has a State Government that is totally unable to give honourable members an accurate figure on its net debt situation. It has a State Government that claims it does not know what losses it incurred last year on its foreign borrowings.

That is either an admission of gross incompetence in financial administration of Queensland's foreign borrowings or a situation that is so bad that the Government is too scared to tell the House the real position. God help Australia if the Queensland Government had to set the example for economic and financial management!

When the State Budget is brought down next Tuesday in this Chamber the Premier will once again claim in his speech that he has delivered a balanced Budget. The facts that I have outlined today show that nothing could be further from the truth. The situation is such that the State Government urgently needs to bring its deficit and debt under control.

The biggest myth still alive in Queensland today is that this State has a balanced Budget. Thankfully, that myth is gradually being exposed.

Far from having a balanced Budget, Queensland has a balanced Consolidated Revenue Fund together with a State Budget deficit of $1,153m and a State debt of close to $12.5 billion. Not only is the Premier attempting to perpetuate a myth but he is also seeking to perpetrate a fraud with his dishonest claims about a balanced Budget.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (4.52 p.m.): I support the Bill. It is usually a formal Bill and should not require a great deal of debate. However, some matters do require attention at this time.

It is interesting that in 1976 this House passed a Bill for $300m. In 1980, this House again passed a Bill for $300m. However, on this occasion, in 1986, approval is sought in this Bill for $480m. The Deputy Premier indicated that that would last for four or five years. At the present rate of commitment, which is between $45m and $50m a year, it will be considerably more than four or five years—approximately 1994 or 1995—before a Government Loan Bill again comes before the House.

Legislation is required by the Commonwealth/State Financial Agreement to give the necessary authority for the State not only to make the agreement but also to handle the funds. Honourable members know—and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Burns) has referred to this—that these matters are authorised originally by the Loan Council, of which the State, of course, is a participating member.

The distribution of quotas of loan money is a very significant part of the Federation structure of this nation. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition may have overlooked the fact that this money is not just for the State Government. The funds are for a number of statutory bodies, all of which are very necessary for the development of the State and for the provision of facilities for the community. If the funds were not necessary, the Loan Council would not have approved the authority.

Not only this State but also the Commonwealth and all other States are involved in overseeing the whole of the operation of Loan Funds. The amount stated in the Bill is not a capricious figure plucked out of the air; nor is it some notional figure. There do exist estimates of requirements for local authorities, statutory authorities, the Government itself and public works of the Government. I think that it excludes housing authorities. The Minister will correct me if I am wrong. Subject to an oversight by the Loan Council, all of those bodies are mentioned. This is purely a machinery Bill to facilitate the handling of that money on behalf of all those authorities.

A substantial amount of money has to be approved. $480m is a record amount, and perhaps the Minister could explain why such a substantial amount is necessary now, bearing in mind that previous borrowings were of the order of $300m.

Mr Gunn: It is a different dollar now.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: These are 50c dollars, and the Deputy Premier is quite correct.

Many of the public works involve the purchase of capital equipment, particularly by local authorities. That aspect should be looked at very closely, because much of that capital equipment comes from outside Australia. I am sure that the cost of such equipment is sky-rocketing. Much of that capital equipment is earth-moving and road-making equipment, and I think it would be wise if the Government had a good look at how the local authorites are spending their money on that capital equipment when they could be using private contractors. It might save the local authorities the amortisation on the loan money for that capital equipment. Nevertheless, it is a necessary procedure.

I believe the power, authority and respect in which the Loan Council is held is underestimated. From time to time members talk about the credit-rating of this State. The credit-rating of this State would amount to nil if the Loan Council did not exist. The States and the Commonwealth, through the Loan Council, underwrite the loans of this Government, local authorities, the Federal Government and statutory authorities throughout the nation. That supplies the States with the credit-ratings they enjoy. The mere existence of the Loan Council gives this nation the strength to be able to go out into the markets of the world and the financial markets of this nation and raise money almost instantaneously. This fact cannot be credited to the Federal Government or to any individual Government, but to the Loan Council. Whether it is Tasmania or Queensland, a water authority or a Government enterprise in the Northern Territory, money can be raised instantly without any qualms on the part of those who lend the money to this nation in various forms, either internally or externally.

The credit-rating of this State is entirely dependent upon the Loan Council standing behind the State. I do not believe Queensland needs to get a credit-rating. Queensland's

credit, with the backing of the Loan Council, is so good that nobody needs to inquire where it stands in the credit-rating scale.

Mr Gunn: I don't think they bother.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The Deputy Premier is quite right. They do not bother.

From time to time honourable members talk about Queensland's credit-rating. It has exactly the same credit-rating as the other States. It has no significance relative to the borrowings by this State. The Deputy Premier could go overseas tomorrow and ask for $100m, and he would have no trouble getting it. He would not have to produce a single piece of paper to establish Queensland's credit-rating. This State's standing is so high that it is not necessary for him to go through that procedure. Plenty of countries in the world have to get a rating, and those countries are the ones that are least likely to attract trade.

Tonight the greatest Treasurer in the world will tell us how he is going to get Australia out of the greatest mess in the world, which he created.

Mr Gunn: Put us further in.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: That may be.

He succeeded the former greatest Treasurer in the world, the Treasurer of Mexico, who received that award the previous year. I do not know Mexico's current credit-rating.

Mr Gunn: The same as Ecuador.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The Deputy Premier says that it is the same as Ecuador. It is pretty low on the scale. Mexico cannot even pay the interest on its loans to the rest of the world. The IMF has had to lend Mexico money so that it can pay interest on its loans. I hope that that stage has not been reached in this country.

That is the background of the Loan Council's activities. The Parliament has the responsibility of authorising the handling of those loan funds from time to time. Six years have passed since it happened, and presumably that period or longer will pass before a similar Bill comes before the Chamber. A large amount is involved. I ask the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer to enlighten honourable members on some of the matters covered by the funds. I am sure that honourable members would be happy to receive that information.

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (5.1 p.m.): I support the argument advanced by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Burns). Some time ago I asked the Deputy Premier about Queensland's deficit, including Government borrowings and statutory borrowings. In reply, I was told to look at page 23 or thereabouts of last year's Budget papers. Although I had examined the Budget papers, the documents showed a State deficit of only about $1.3 billion. The Opposition believes that the debt of the State Electricity Commission is something like $3 billion. Why is that information not shown in the Government's papers?

The Rural Reconstruction Board departmental appropriation account for 1982-83 shows how the Government operates. $10m was withdrawn from that account and placed in consolidated revenue. The money was lent out to the sugar-mills. The Opposition does not object to help being provided to the sugar industry. However, the Opposition objects to the way in which the Government goes about providing that assistance. The Government provided loans on which it received interest. Originally, the Queensland Government obtained the money from the Federal Government on terms under which nothing was paid for two years. Following that, an agreed interest rate of about 4 per cent was paid. The interest rate on the last money advanced was about 7 per cent. Payments of principal and interest were waived for two years. The Queensland Government failed to on-lend that money to those in the rural industry who were in trouble. The Government charged ruling bank interest rates, but a few people received the money at the concessional rate. The figures produced by the Government hide certain things.

The Queensland Government wonders why the Federal Government wants to change the system under which it is trying to help the primary producers. As I have said, the Queensland Government has been placing Federal Government money in consolidated revenue and calling it its own.

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen: Can't you speak the truth for once in your life?

Mr EATON: It is in the Government's figures. I am prepared to table the documents for their incorporation in *Hansard.* If I do that, everyone can see them.

The Government talks about statutory bodies.

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen: I thought you were an honest man.

Mr EATON: I am. I am producing evidence. I do not say anything that cannot be supported. I have the information available and I am prepared to table it for its incorporation in *Hansard.*

For various reasons, the State Electricity Commission borrowed $494m. I have another list that I am prepared to table for incorporation in *Hansard* for the benefit of all honourable members. The document shows the borrowings by both statutory authorities, including the State Electricity Commission, and private companies. It shows money borrowed overseas for developmental projects in Queensland.

Frequently, the Federal Government is criticised in this Chamber by the State Government. The Queensland Government continually knocks the Federal Government. It is the only rope onto which the Queensland Government can hold. Government members try to belt the Federal Government because there is nothing that they have done in Queensland on which they can hang their hats.

For a long time the Federal Government was criticised for incurring an overseas deficit. It was suggested that the Federal Government was doing nothing to reduce that deficit. The Federal Government could have stopped that deficit by refusing to allow companies to borrow money overseas for projects in Queensland. Had the Federal Government done that to stop the rising overseas debt, the State Government would have responded by saying, "Because Queensland is not a Labor State, the Federal Government refuses to allow us to borrow money." For the Oaky Creek mine, MIM Holdings borrowed $237m. CRA borrowed $300m for the Blair Athol mine. For the Utah take-over, BHP borrowed $765m. The Gladstone expansion by Queensland Alumina involved borrowings of $250m. The list is endless. Santos borrowed $A600m for the Cooper Basin. The sum of $US360m was borrowed for Curragh, German Creek and Blair Athol. Comalco borrowed $US120m for the Boyne Island smelter. As I mentioned previously, SEC borrowed $A494m. Those borrowings total in excess of $3,000m.

I have an extract from *The Bulletin* of 3 December 1985, which I am also prepared to table and incorporate into *Hansard.* The article in *The Bulletin* refers to the Australian Accountants Centenary Congress in Adelaide, at which it was pointed out, "for every $100 that big government borrows this year, $93 will be used simply to meet the interest bill on the previous borrowings." That relates to the whole of Australia and includes State and Federal Government borrowings. If that money is obtained at the rate of 7 per cent interest—a very low rate by today's standards—and the $93 is paid on the interest bill of money already owing, it will be found that the entire $100 has gone. Therefore, how can debts be repaid? Only the interest has been paid on the present debt.

The State Government must take cognisance of borrowings. If it does not do so, although Australia will be in deep trouble—it is already, through past financial mismanagement—the State Government will have a bigger load to carry than that of the Federal Government.

Mr Casey: Most of that is offshore borrowings and offshore repayments, and that is what is pulling our balance of payments back.

Mr EATON: The honourable member for Mackay is quite correct.

I refer now to the article in *The Bulletin*, which stated—

"An Accountants' convention in Adelaide is not where one might expect matters of great public scandal to be canvassed.

Yet mild-mannered Sydney broker Jim Dominguez—who specialises in raising funds for power houses, water works and other public utilities—managed to do so last week.

His comments scored only a few paragraphs in the more serious newspapers the next day but the implications of his speech deserve more attention.

In a paper entitled Funding the Public Sector Deficit, he demonstrated to delegates at the Australian Accountants' Centenary Congress an alarming picture of public borrowings out of control.

Among important points he made were:

The Australian public debts has quadrupled in the past 10 years and, among developed countries, only Italy tops Australia in notoriety for the scale of its public debt creation."

Once again, although I am speaking of Australia, Queensland is involved in this matter as well. The article continued—

"The total borrowings of commonwealth and state governments and public instrumentalities have ballooned from $25.4 billion 10 years ago to almost $107 billion.

That's equivalent to a burden for each of Australia's 6.2 million taxpayers of $17,250.

More alarmingly, nearly a quarter of the accumulated debt has been borrowed offshore, where it must be repaid and serviced with devalued Australian dollars.

Interest payments to foreign financiers on public sector debt totalled $1.9 billion in 1984-85 and burgeoning borrowings will impose increasing strains on Australia's balance of payments."

I do not need to emphasise that, because the figures are now more than eight months old. The article continued—

"That last point is highlighted in the latest balance of payments figures published for the month of October. Australia suffered a deficit on current account of $1.6 billion for the month. Of that, $500 million was due to imports exceeding exports and the remaining $1.1 billion was due to 'invisibles'—a significant part of which was interest paid on foreign debt."

A couple of Budgets ago, when the Water Resources budget was itemised, it was found that the total budget was in the vicinity of $111m. Over half of that amount, $69m, was borrowed from the SEC for the dam and water reticulation that were needed to operate the Tarong Power House successfully. That amount of $69m was put into the Budget as Government money. However, it came from the State Electricity Commission. At the present time the Government is not counting the SEC. The State Government is borrowing from the statutory authorities or making the statutory authorities contribute to some of the costs of projects. Those costs should be borne by the State Government out of consolidated revenue.

Although the State Government claims it is putting in $111m, that is not so. Those figures can be checked in the Budget presented two years ago.

I totally support the accusations made by the honourable member for Lytton (Mr Burns).

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police) (5.10 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions. The honourable member for Lytton (Mr Burns) has fallen into the trap of confusing the Government's debt with that of statutory authorities, which is guaranteed by the Government. This is a hoary old question that the honourable member brings

up every year. Most statutory authority debt is not a charge on the Consolidated Revenue Fund; it is met by local authorities, electricity authorities, harbour boards, the Wheat Board and so on. It would be a charge only in the unlikely event that a statutory body failed to meet its obligations. This has not happened to any major bodies for many years.

Statutory body debt is not hidden through public accounts. Rather, interest and redemption are shown where they belong, as the responsibility of the body concerned.

In regard to QEC financing arrangements, honourable members opposite cannot have it both ways. The honourable member for Lytton attacks the Government for borrowing funds and for using revenue funds to avoid the need for borrowing.

Main line electrification is a long-term economic project. The honourable member for Lytton admits that it will be to the State's benefit. I wish that years ago the Government had electrified more railway lines and used Queensland coal and its own resources instead of importing fuel. Although fuel prices might be cheap at present, honourable members should not hold their breath, because they will go up again. Queensland has coal supplies to last for hundreds of years.

Mr Burns: You should always carry out an economic impact exercise.

Mr GUNN: It has to be looked at on a long-term basis. One cannot look at it now and pluck something out of the air.

Mr Burns: The decision on diesels made by your Government was against the long-term interests of this State.

Mr GUNN: It has turned out, in hindsight, that it was. I agree with that. I was not in Parliament when diesels were debated, but I remember the debate. Queensland had tonnes of coal and the Government should have looked at that. However, the Government has made a positive move towards electrification and I hope that it continues to do so. Electrification is creating employment in Queensland and is using Queensland's resources. That project is a plus to the Queensland Government.

Debate on the ABS deficit simply raises an old and discredited argument. The ABS itself has said that figures are not strictly comparable State to State and that figures represent simply the State's need for capital for economic growth. In an area in which no economic growth is occurring, there is no need for capital. South Australia's borrowings are a fraction of Queensland's borrowings because no growth is occurring in South Australia at all. Tasmania is in much the same position.

If ABS shortfall was low, it would represent a low-growth situation. It does not take much to work that out. Economic growth is occurring in Queensland. Capital is required, so the Government goes out and gets it. As the leader of the Liberal Party says, the Government has no difficulty obtaining capital and it is obtained at the lowest rates.

As far as the Budget is concerned, the honourable member for Lytton (Mr Burns) is still trying to come to terms with real Budget situations in the State. I point out to the honourable member that the Consolidated Revenue Fund is balanced, which will become apparent next week, trust funds are in credit and the Loan Fund is balanced. Where is this mysterious deficit? It is not around. It cannot be found.

The honourable member for Nundah (Sir William Knox) misunderstands the rate of allocation. His figure of $40m to $50m per annum for 1986-87 is artificially low because of the special arrangements with housing funds that the Government has with the Commonwealth. About $60m will be diverted to this particular purpose. The normal level is $100m to $130m. Therefore, funds are expected to last only for the five years that were mentioned.

The honourable member for Nundah also asked where the loan funds were utilised. Major areas in 1985-86 were: loans and subsidies to local authorities, Railways Department normal programs, Water Resources Commission construction programs and construction of schools, police stations, departmental buildings and so on.

Motion (Mr Gunn) agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 12, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

SOIL CONSERVATION BILL

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to the conservation of soil resources and to facilitate the implementation of soil conservation measures by landholders for the mitigation of soil erosion."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) (5.17 p.m.): I move—

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

This Bill is designed to update the existing Soil Conservation Act, which was proclaimed in 1965 and amended in certain particulars in 1980. Let me commence by stating that this Bill is substantially the same as the Bill that was introduced during the Third Session of this Parliament on Wednesday, 19 March 1986. I say "substantially the same" because most of the clauses in the Bill now presented are identical to those contained in the Bill presented in March. There are two respects in which the Bills differ. Let me explain the reasons for these differences.

There has been marked reduction in Part VI of the Bill, the part that deals with financial assistance. This reduction has been made possible by the commencement of operations of the Queensland Industry Development Corporation, or QIDC as it is more commonly known. Under the provisions of the Queensland Industry Development Corporation Act of 1985, the QIDC commenced operations on 1 July 1986. The QIDC assumed responsibilities for the Agricultural Bank from that date.

The March version of the Soil Conservation Bill of 1986 was required to detail the procedures under which the Corporation of the Agricultural Bank would arrange advances to land-holders wishing to undertake approved soil conservation works. Now that the QIDC is operative, it is necessary to include only one simple clause, clause 25, in the Bill under consideration. The procedural details are catered for within the Queensland Industry Development Corporation Act.

I must hasten to add that the reduction in space devoted to the financial assistance part of the Bill does not imply any change in the current arrangements whereby loans are made available for soil conservation activities or any reduction in funds for such purposes. On 11 August 1986, Cabinet reaffirmed its commitment to the provision of loans for soil conservation purposes at a concessional rate of interest through the QIDC Agricultural Bank division.

The second area in which the Bill now presented differs from the March version concerns the provision of planning and approval details to affected land-holders and to

local authorities. Members may recall that towards the end of my second-reading speech on 19 March, I invited public comment on the Soil Conservation Bill. Responses to that invitation were generally highly favourable and supportive.

A few local authorities and producer organisations pointed out that the Bill as introduced did not specify how all affected land-holders and local authorities would be informed of proposed plans and of approvals given to soil conservation plans. My soil conservation advisory committee agreed that the Bill should require my department to serve on, or post to, all affected parties notifications similar to those appearing in newspaper advertisements together with a copy of the relevant plan. The Bill now presented makes specific provision for notifying land-holders and local authorities of soil conservation plans that may affect them.

There were several questions posed and comments made by local authorities, producer organisations and conservation groups. Many of these related to means of administering the proposed legislation rather than to the content of the Bill that has been under public consideration since last March. I am satisfied that the Bill now presented accommodates the significant issues raised since March 1986.

It is not my intention to again go over much of the ground that was covered in March and is fully recorded on pages 4449 to 4453 of Parliamentary Debates No. 15, 1986. On that occasion I outlined the inadequacies of the existing Act and the problems that had arisen with land-holders perceiving soil conservation projects in declared areas of erosion hazard as Government initiatives rather than as Government assistance to land-holders. Nevertheless, a great deal has been achieved under the present Act.

The total area of crop lands protected by contour banks, contour grass strips and strip cropping increased from 150 000 ha in 1965 to 600 000 ha in 1975 and 1 100 000 ha in 1985. The increased rate of adoption of soil conservation practices has been influenced by the results of research, by better equipment and by the use of high technology by officers of my department who provide technical services to land-owners. However, the provisions of the new Bill are more appropriate to current State-wide needs.

I restate my belief that this Bill reflects the philosophy that the prime responsibility for the control of soil erosion rests with individual land-owners and land-users. The Government has four roles, namely—

to provide leadership in achieving co-ordination between affected parties;

to provide extension services to ensure that the public is aware of the importance of controlling soil erosion;

to provide technical advice and assistance to enable land-owners to adopt erosion control measures; and

to undertake research to develop effective and economically feasible methods of controlling erosion.

So that the required co-ordination and co-operation is achieved, there is clearly a need for various committees to be created. This Bill does not give birth to any quangos. There is no need for statutory committees in a situation in which the Government sets out to assist land-holders in meeting their responsibilities.

My department has a Soil Conservation Advisory Committee, which has six representatives of primary producers and one representative of the Local Government Association. That committee has the opportunity to consider any matters of consequence to soil conservation in Queensland. The Director-General of the Department of Primary Industries has an interdepartmental co-ordinating committee, which ensures adequate communication between the various Queensland Government departments associated with soil erosion and its control.

The Bill provides for the establishment of other committees as considered by the Director-General to be necessary or desirable to assist in implementing the soil conservation legislation. From experience gained with advisory group committees on the Darling

Downs, and in the Isis and Gin Gin areas, I assure honourable members that district committees will be established in various parts of the State. We have seen a few instances in which highly effective committees have developed spontaneously without prompting by the department. I would like to see an expansion in the numbers of rural communities where land-holders recognise that it is to the mutual advantage of members to form committees to play a part in planning and co-ordinating soil conservation activities.

I know that in some cases local groups will want to discuss aspects of land degradation other than soil erosion. However, the intent of the Bill is to provide for the control of soil erosion in Queensland. It is not intended for use in the control of other forms of land degradation such as overclearing or dryland salinisation.

Research and extension on these and other land management problems form a considerable part of the work of the Division of Land Utilisation of the Department of Primary Industries. Solutions to these problems are not readily achieved through legislation designed to control soil erosion.

The Bill is not intended to contol land use problems such as urban encroachment and losses through subdivision to hobby farms for which adequate statutory controls exist under the Local Government Act. Of the 3 200 000 ha of cultivated land in Queensland, some 86 per cent requires soil conservation protective measures. This is our priority task.

At this stage it is necessary for me to reaffirm the objects of the Soil Conservation Bill. They are—

(1) To repeal the existing Soil Conservation Act 1965-1980.

(2) To provide for the legislation to be administered by the Minister for Primary Industries through his department instead of through a soil conservation authority as at present.

(3) To provide the opportunity for the establishment of non-statutory district advisory committees as the director-general considers necessary or desirable to assist in carrying the Act into effect.

(4) To introduce revised statutory planning provisions in the place of existing provisions for soil conservation districts and areas of erosion hazard.

(5) To establish the mechanisms that will ensure the co-ordination of activities associated with the implementation of soil conservation schemes.

(6) To allow the approval by the department of soil conservation property plans for individual land-owners.

(7) To cater for the co-ordination of works by co-operating land-owners through the preparation of project plans and approval of those project plans by the Governor in Council.

(8) To ensure that approved property plans and project plans are binding on land-owners and their successors in title.

(9) To protect land-owners against civil action when they discharge or concentrate run-off waters in accordance with an approved plan.

(10) To provide for financial assistance to local authorities and other bodies to facilitate the implementation of community works essential to the successful operation of soil conservation schemes.

(11) To empower agents of the Director-General, Department of Primary Industries, to perform the tasks necessary to develop and to assist in the implementation of property plans and project plans.

(12) To enable land-owners to appeal to the Land Court for resolution of objections to the requirements of project plans.

(13) To provide for the director-general to apply to the Supreme Court for an injunction requiring a land-owner to comply with, or to refrain from contravening, a soil conservation order or a run-off co-ordination notice.

(14) To provide for the continuation of the principles of the existing Act regarding application of section 47 (24) of the Local Government Act, levee bank licensing. It will prevent or withdraw the application of the levee bank licensing provisions in respect of any part or parts of a local authority area included in a property plan or a project plan approved under the proposed legislation.

(15) To allow the Governor in Council to prevent a local authority from approving subdivision plans without first obtaining the consent of the Department of Primary Industries where such subdivision plans are likely to hinder or prevent the effective implementation of an approved property plan or project plan.

(16) To establish procedures for the payment of compensation.

(17) To provide for the imposition of fines as penalties for breaches of the provisions of the proposed Act.

In March I referred to only 16 objects. The Bill presented at that time provided for the establishment of non-statutory advisory committees but I regarded that provision as a means of accomplishing other objects. From feedback received it is clear that many parties consider that the establishment of committees should be stated as an explicit objective, so the Bill now has 17 objects.

In introducing this Bill I am satisfied that there has been ample opportunity for public comment. Copies of the March 1986 Bill were distributed to each local authority in Queensland, to representatives of primary producer organisations, to each of the established soil conservation advisory group committees and to each Department of Primary Industries centre throughout the State. Press releases were made inviting comments and suggestions. This Bill accommodates the legislation-relevant responses.

Because members and the public have had five months to consider and comment upon an almost identical Bill, I propose that we proceed to debate this Bill as soon as it pleases the House.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr De Lacy, adjourned.

RECIPROCAL ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act 1959-1981 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) (5.30 p.m.): I move—

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

This Bill is concerned with the enforceability in Queensland of foreign judgments obtained in circumstances where the defendant has not voluntarily submitted to the jurisdiction of the foreign court.

The issue of the enforcement in Australia of foreign judgments obtained in such circumstances has been under consideration for some time by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General.

The Bill is based upon model legislation that has been prepared following the standing committee's detailed consideration of that issue.

As the law presently stands, foreign judgments may be enforceable in Australia under reciprocal enforcement of judgments legislation, which exists in all States, or, alternatively, such judgments may be enforceable at common law.

The Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act 1959-1981, which is similar to legislation in other Australian States, ensures that if a foreign judgment is to be enacted in Queensland under the Act, or at common law, certain conditions must be met.

One of the major conditions that applies to both proceedings under the Act and at common law is that the foreign court must have exercised a jurisdiction that is recognised by our courts.

Under both the Act and at common law a foreign court's jurisdiction in respect of an action against a person may be recognised if that person voluntarily submitted to the jurisdiction of the court, such as by entering an appearance and arguing the case on its merits.

However, the situation can arise in which a person may enter an appearance in a foreign court, not to contest a case on its merits, but for a limited purpose, such as to contest that court's jurisdiction or to invite the court, in its discretion, not to exercise its jurisdiction.

The Bill is designed to ensure that in such a situation the person appearing is not to be taken, for that reason alone, to have voluntarily submitted to the jurisdiction of the foreign court.

Thus, in those circumstances, if the foreign court nevertheless proceeded to hear the action, any judgment subsequently obtained against that person could not be enforced in Queensland simply because an appearance had been made for such a limited purpose.

The Bill amends the Act in relation to proceedings under its provisions in two respects.

An appearance by a person only for the purpose of inviting a foreign court, in its discretion, not to exercise its jurisdiction is not to be regarded as a voluntary submission to the foreign court's jurisdiction.

Similarly, an appearance, only for the purpose of protecting or obtaining the release of property which is, or may become, subject to a type of court order known as a mareva injunction is not to be regarded as a voluntary submission to the foreign court's jurisdiction.

The Bill also amends the common law so that the principles which are used for the determination of the question of voluntary submission under the Act are also applied to proceedings at common law.

This Bill is yet one more example of this Government's determination to protect the interests of its citizens.

It will ensure that persons who only wish to enter appearances in foreign court proceedings for certain limited purposes, such as to contest the court's jurisdiction, will not thereby render themselves liable to have any subsequent foreign judgment enforced against them in Queensland.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Goss, adjourned.

SALE OF GOODS (VIENNA CONVENTION) BILL

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General), by leave, without notice: I move—

> "That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to give effect within Queensland to the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods, and for other purposes."

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) (5.34 p.m.): I move—

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

I introduce a Bill that has been prepared following agreement by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General to implement the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods through State and Territory legislation rather than Commonwealth legislation.

Matters relating to the sale of goods have traditionally been areas of State jurisdiction and therefore it is appropriate that Queensland rather than the Commonwealth should enact the legislation.

The convention is contained in schedule 1 to the Bill. The convention predominantly relates to international transactions and its relevance to domestic transactions is insignificant. Article 2 of the convention sets out the types of sales that do not come under its umbrella and, as can be seen, they are quite extensive.

Apart from the convention itself, the Bill consists of seven clauses, including the formal provisions. The Bill provides that it shall bind the Crown in right of Queensland, and also as far as is permitted, the Crown in all of its capacities. The provisions of the convention will have the force of law in Queensland and prevail to the extent of any inconsistency between it and any other law in force in Queensland.

The Bill also provides that a document purporting to be a notice issued by a Minister of the Crown in Queensland and published in the *Government Gazette* or a document purporting to be a notice issued by a Minister of State for the Commonwealth and published in the *Commonwealth of Australia Gazette* or a document certified by a legal practitioner to be a true copy thereof containing declarations in respect of the convention is evidence of the matters contained in the document.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Goss, adjourned.

DRUGS MISUSE BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 7 August (see p. 280) on Mr Gunn's motion—

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

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (5.37 p.m.): The Opposition agrees in principle with the Government's stated intent in introducing the Drugs Misuse Bill, that is, to deal with the Mr Bigs of the drug trade. Unfortunately, the mere passing of this legislation will in no way hinder or stop the operations of the drug-trafficker in Queensland. To do that there has to be a commitment from the Government and the police force to go all out to stop the insidious drug trade.

There currently exists under the Health Act penalties of life imprisonment and $100,000 fines for drug-traffickers. Those penalties have existed since 1976, which was the last time the Government attempted by legislation to stop the drug trade.

As I have already stated legislation is not the way to stop drug-traffickers—law enforcement is. Queensland needs a commitment by the Government to increase police numbers and also the number of full-time officers in the Drug Squad. The last annual

report of the Police Department stated that there were 28 full-time officers in the Drug Squad, the same number as there were six years ago.

Much has been said by Government Ministers about the growing drug trade, but nothing has been done to increase the numbers of police working full-time on trying to combat it. To place this Government's priorities in perspective, it should be considered that although there has been no increase in the number of officers in the Drug Squad in the past six years, the Government has stationed five officers full-time at Jupiters Casino. To protect what? I do not know. A fail-safe security system was promised at the casino.

Also, in the past three years a police officer has been deployed full-time at Parliament House, that is 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Recently the Government ensured that that would be a permanent posting by building for the police a special office on the ground floor. Without being critical of the individual officers who are placed on duty at Parliament House, as they are only doing the roster they are placed on, the most important decision they have to make is what TV channel to watch. Surely those officers would be better utilised patrolling the streets.

If one studies the attitude of people to the drug trade, one finds that their major concern is directed towards the drug addict. Therefore community attitudes can be broken down into three categories—

(1) The person who is concerned for the well-being of his fellow man, or relatives of drug addicts who are concerned for those people.

(2) Parents who are concerned that their children will be exposed to drugs and as a result could become drug addicts.

(3) People who could not care less; who believe they are not affected by the drug trade, and therefore the drug trade does not come anywhere near them.

This legislation is directed not at the Mr Bigs of the drug world but at the people I have outlined in the first two categories. The legislation has been introduced into this Parliament with more fanfare than would accompany a royal visit.

The Government has used much media hype to create an impression in the minds of most Queenslanders that the legislation will stop the drug trade. However, that is simply not true. As I have already stated, law inforcement, not legislation, is the answer to the drug trade. However, consider the Queensland Government's real attitude and response to the growing drug problem.

Mr Gunn: Grow your own marijuana; that's what you advocate.

Mr MACKENROTH: Later I shall refer to the Labor Party's drug policy.

Mr Gunn: You don't know the policy.

Mr MACKENROTH: I know the policy because I wrote the policy. I put it through the Labor Party's last convention.

Under the present Drugs Misuse Bill, the Government is loosening the laws on marijuana. For some offences the amount of drugs that one is permitted to possess has been increased. The Government is responsible for making the drug laws on marijuana in the State of Queensland more loose and freer. The Deputy Premier should not try to criticise the Labor Party. Although the Labor Party once talked about decriminalising marijuana, that is no longer a part of its policy. The Deputy Premier is the one who has done it, and he has done it through this piece of legislation. The Deputy Premier included the matter in his press release to the media.

For one offence, the amount of marijuana referred to has been increased from 25 grams to 500 grams, which is 40 times the amount of marijuana that can be possessed now. The Deputy Premier or other members of the National Party should not start talking about the Labor Party's policy on marijuana.

Mr Gunn interjected.

Mr MACKENROTH: You released the information in your press statement. Was it correct?

Mr Gunn interjected.

Mr MACKENROTH: That has gone. Let us forget about that. It has gone. I will tell you what our policy is.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I think that it might be useful for the proper and appropriate conduct of this debate if the honourable member were to address the Chair.

Mr MACKENROTH: The Minister is the person who continually interjects. If he continues to interject, I will answer his interjections through you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

I was referring to the Government's response to the growing drug problem. The response started seven years ago, on 9 November 1979. The Premier then advocated mandatory prison sentences for traffickers of hard drugs. Seven years ago the Premier admitted that there was a real drug problem in Queensland. However, since that time the only action taken by the Queensland Government has been to inundate the media with press statements about what the Government should or would do.

Honourable members should consider the following selection of statements over the last seven years. On 9 November 1979, the Premier advocated mandatory prison sentences for traffickers of hard drugs. Eleven months later, on 22 October 1980, draft legislation in the form of a drug-trafficking Act, which would provide for a non-parole term of 20 years' imprisonment for drug-trafficking, was recommended by the Solicitor-General's Office.

Twelve months later, on 8 October 1981, Cabinet considered a proposal that first-offence drug-growers and traffickers be imprisoned for at least five years. Cabinet agreed to increase funding for police drug-detection work. That has not yet been forthcoming.

Two years later, on 27 September 1983, the Premier pledged to introduce legislation imposing mandatory life imprisonment, without parole, for convicted heroin-dealers. Five months later, on 19 February 1984, the Premier reiterated that determination to introduce mandatory non-parole life sentences for serious drug offences.

Another five months later, on 28 July 1984, the Premier announced that legislation to amend penalties for serious drug offences would be introduced during the August Budget session of Parliament. That was August 1984.

Two months later, on 25 September 1984, Cabinet announced that the promised drug-trafficking Bill would provide that Queensland-held assets of convicted drug offenders acquired from illegal drug activities would be forfeited to the Crown. Three months later, on 26 December 1984, the Premier announced that the drug-trafficking Bill would be introduced into Parliament in 1985.

Four days later, on 30 December 1984, the Premier announced that the State Government would take a strong stand against the early release of persons convicted under Federal drug laws. Six weeks later, on 11 February 1985, the Police Minister revealed that the proposed drug-trafficking Bill was still with the Parliamentary Counsel.

One month later, on 10 March 1985, the Minister for Justice stated that the drug-trafficking Bill would provide for the forfeiture of the assets of convicted drug offenders.

One month later, on 4 April 1985, the Premier stated that the Government was planning legislation to provide for mandatory non-parole life sentences for convicted heroin-dealers and fines of up to $250,000. The quantities of certain drugs which would attract such penalties had not been finalised.

Five days later, on 9 April 1985, a spokesman for the Minister for Police stated that it was not known when the proposed drug-trafficking Bill would be introduced into Parliament.

Eight months later, as a result of all those statements, there was the introduction of the Drug Misuse Bill, Mark 1, on 10 December 1983, six years after the promise to act. The Minister for Police at that time, Mr Glasson, stated in his second-reading speech that Cabinet had made its decision on 15 August 1983 to prepare this Bill.

From those statements can be seen the speed with which the Queensland Government moves when confronted with possibly one of the biggest problems facing our society today and especially the young people in our society.

Seven years ago, the Premier admitted there was a problem and promised action, Four years later, Cabinet discussed the problem and decided to introduce a Bill. Three years later, the legislation was before the Parliament. Imagine if it had been a property-developer wanting a special rezoning; It would have been completed in a week. If it had been an issue on which this Government thought it could score politically at the expense of the Federal Government, heaven and earth would have been moved and all the resources of the Government would have been swung behind the issue. However, when dealing with this issue which concerns and affects the lives of so many Queenslanders, it has taken this National Party Government seven years to respond. That response has come only as a deceitful political ploy designed to create an impression of a concerned Government. That deceit can be seen in the promise of the legislation just prior to the 1983 election and the introduction of the legislation just prior to this year's election. Even in doing that, this National Party Government could not do it right. As all honourable members know, the legislation introduced in December last year was so bad not only in its ramifications but structurally that it had to be withdrawn. One would have expected better when the State Government has had over two years to draft the Bill.

As I have stated, the Labor Party will support any sound initiatives by this Government to combat the drug trade. To show our support for that principle, the Labor Party will support this Bill through the second-reading stage. However, I indicate at this stage that I intend to move a considerable number of amendments to the Bill in Committee.

The Labor Party, whilst supporting the stated intent of the Drugs Misuse Bill, Mark II, still believes the Bill contains a number of major flaws. The only real solution to overcome those flaws would be to withdraw the Bill once again and to redraft it from scratch. Unfortunately, it appears that this will not happen. It is for this reason the Labor Party will attempt to amend the present Bill to one which is workable and acceptable by community standards.

The Labor Party believes the Drugs Misuse Bill should have been drafted to provide that penalites for drug offences be divided into three categories, namely, for drug-traffickers, drug-pushers and drug addicts.

Drug-traffickers would be regarded as the so-called Mr Bigs and the Mr Not So Bigs who operate in the drug trade simply to make profit from the addiction of others. It is these people who, at one end of the scale, are more responsible than anyone else for the deaths and misery suffered by so many addicts. Penalities for these people should be 25 years in gaol.

Drug-pushers would be next on the list, and these would be regarded as people who sell small quantities of drugs to others for profit. In the main, pushers are addicts who are selling drugs to maintain their own habit.

Possession of drugs by drug addicts would be last on the list, and in drafting penalties for these people, recognition would be given to the fact that drug addicts have a serious health problem and the possession of drugs for their own use is a breach of the law against community standards. The only persons suffering by their breaching the law are themselves or their families, who must sit around and, perhaps, watch them slowly die.

The mere possession of drugs by an addict for his own use in no way constitutes a crime against another person, and recognition should be given to that.

Crimes committed by addicts to pay for their habits is a different issue and one that I intend to raise later. Penalties for drug addicts for possession should also include rehabilitation programs. But, unfortunately, the Drugs Misuse Bill in no way addresses that question.

As I have stated, penalties should be commensurate with the crime and should range from a maximum penalty of 25 years with hard labour for drug-traffickers to a maximum penalty of two years with hard labour for offenders dealt with summarily through the Magistrates Court.

As can be seen from that range of penalties, the only difference between my proposal and the Government's is that mandatory life imprisonment is not included but is replaced by a 25-year sentence.

Contrary to statements by the Premier and Police Minister, people sentenced to mandatory life imprisonment under the Drugs Misuse Bill will be eligible for parole, and most people sentenced to mandatory life usually serve about 12 years. It can therefore be seen that the acceptance of a 25-year sentence would be regarded as making the legislation tougher and a greater deterrent than mandatory life as contained in the Bill before the House.

I would like to deal now with the mandatory life sentence provisions contained in this Bill. The Labor Party will be opposing those provisions by moving for the adoption of the tougher penalty of 25 years gaol with hard labour. However, the discretion of imposing that penalty will be left to the judge.

The inclusion of mandatory life sentences in this Bill—and remember the only other offence in Queensland that attracts this penalty is first-degree murder—shows, I believe, a complete lack of confidence by the National Party Government in the judiciary. There currently exists under the Health Act the provision of life imprisonment for drug-traffickers. So what the Government is saying to the judiciary with the provision of mandatory life in this Bill is, "We are not happy with the sentences which have been handed out by the courts, so we will decide the sentence for you." However, if that is correct, why has the Justice Minister not made use of his powers to appeal against sentences which have been handed down by the courts since the life imprisonment provision was included in the Health Act in 1976?

So, we have a Government that, on the one hand, provides the judiciary with the power to grant life sentences at its discretion and, on the other, without appealing against sentences handed down, claims that it must introduce mandatory life sentences.

I believe the Government has included mandatory life sentences in this Bill without considering the consequences or the integrity of the judiciary. This provision has been included simply to make it appear to the general public that the Government is tough and prepared to do something about the drug problem.

One of the consequences of including this provision would be the reluctance of juries to convict when the juries believe that the penalty would be excessive. However, some of the other consequences may be much more serious.

Take a drug-pusher who is cornered by police and is using whatever means are at his disposal to escape, including shooting police officers and innocent bystanders. Let's face it, a convicted criminal cannot get mandatory life twice at the same time. So why would he worry about the mandatory life sentence, when he can shoot the officer and perhaps get away? The pusher knows that, if he is caught with 2 grams of heroin, his penalty will be the same as if he is caught with 2 kg. Therefore, pushers may actually increase the amount of drugs smuggled into Queensland.

I firmly believe that the provision of 25-year sentences rather than mandatory life would be a greater deterrent. By introducing 25-year sentences, the Parliament would be saying to the judiciary, "We want you to get tough in handing down sentences for drug-traffickers." The Parliament would be giving to the courts a sentence which is

harsher than any other penalty in Queensland law. However, the handing down of a 25-year sentence would be left to the trial judge, who would be able to assess all relevant factors pertaining to each case. The provision of a 25-year sentence would, however, make the judge aware of the Parliament's concern about the damage being done by traffickers to our society.

Much has already been said in the media about mandatory life sentence for an adult who supplies heroin or a First Schedule drug to a child. However, consider the following very likely scenario. Two teenage friends become addicted to heroin and one is three months older than the other. For a three-month period when that person first is regarded as an adult, he would be liable for a mandatory life sentence if he gave his friend a small amount of heroin. After the three-month period, when his friend is regarded as an adult, he would possibly be dealt with summarily in a Magistrates Court for the same offence and be liable to a maximum two-year sentence.

Members may very well say that example and others already given in the media are extreme examples and may not happen but, believe me, any one of the examples given will happen. When that occurs, there will be public outcry.

At this stage, the Government is working on the likely emotional response by the public to harsh sentences for adults who supply drugs to children. The Government's statements conjure up the image of the dirty old man lurking outside schools waiting for schoolchildren. The Labor Party supports tough penalties for adults supplying drugs to children; but, once again, the offence has to be seen in context before a sentence is handed down. I do not believe that a mandatory sentence can be set for a crime that has not yet been committed. Therefore, I will move at the Committee stage to amend the Bill to provide for 25-year sentences.

I ask the Police Minister (Mr Gunn) to give me his interpretation of the term "child" under Queensland law. Much has been said by lawyers, the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties, the Bar Association of Queensland and the Queensland Law Society Incorporated about a person who should be regarded as a child. In each and every instance, an 18-year old person giving drugs to a 17-year old person is cited.

I have researched a number of Queensland Acts and I am yet to find a stated definition under Queensland law that a child is a person under the age of 18 years. Under the Age of Majority Act, the provisions state that when a person attains 18 years he has reached the age of majority. In contrast to that, the Children's Services Act states clearly that a child is a person who is apparently under the age of 17 years. If the Minister for Police cannot give his interpretation now, I ask him to do so in reply. It is a very important matter.

Under the Health Act, "child" is defined as a person who is under the age of 17 years. Under the provisions of the Criminal Code, no definition is provided for "child". One fact that is interesting to note is that the definition of an infant under the Children's Services Act is a person who is under the age of 18 years. If the definition provided by the Children's Services Act is to be adopted as the bench-mark for this legislation, it would appear that a lesser sentence in Queensland would be imposed for supplying drugs to an infant than for supplying drugs to a child.

I would like the Minister to clear that matter up in his reply. If one reads the provisions of the Drugs Misuse Bill in conjunction with provisions of the other Acts I have referred to, it clearly cannot be said that "child" is a person under the age of 18 years in all cases. The only interpretation I have been able to discover is that "child" is a person under the age of 17 years. If the intention of this legislation is to suggest that a child is a person under the age of 18 years, a definition for "child" should be provided in the interpretation clause of the Bill.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.

Mr MACKENROTH: The next section of the Drugs Misuse Bill with which I deal is Part II. The facets about which I comment at this stage include offences being dealt with summarily and the delineation of offences by weight.

Firstly, I cannot agree with the principle in the Bill that the prosecutor or police officer has the right to elect whether an offence is dealt with summarily in the Magistrates Court or on indictment in a higher court. On the whim of a police officer, the penalty suddenly jumps from a maximum of two years' gaol to a maximum of 15 years' gaol. That power being granted to police officers will lead to the police using it to extract confessions from suspects. One can well imagine a police officer saying to a suspect, "If you plead guilty, I will prosecute you in the Magistrates Court, where the maximum penalty is 2 years' gaol. If you do not plead guilty, I will take you to a higher court and you might be placed in gaol for 15 years."

The legislation should contain proper guide-lines stating whether a charge should be dealt with summarily or upon indictment. Such a procedure is outlined in the New South Wales Drugs Misuse and Trafficking Bill. It is interesting to note that the former Minister for Police (Mr Glasson) told this House that the Drugs Misuse Bill was based on the New South Wales Drugs Misuse and Trafficking Bill. It appears that the Government has taken the parts of that Bill that it wanted—that is, the provisions that increase the powers for police officers—but has taken no sections of that Bill that would protect the rights of ordinary citizens.

The other matter that I wish to raise is the manner in which offences are graded by weight. I raised my concern with this issue when the Bill was introduced the first time. I am pleased that the Minister has partly listened to those concerns, by introducing a new section under which drug addicts can have 100 times the quantity of a non-drug addict before receiving the same penalty. However, I still do not feel that those changes are sufficient. The quantity of drugs in one's possession should not decide the sentence; rather should it be the use to which the drug is to be put. I have already outlined my views on mandatory life sentences. Contained within that philosophy is my belief that the use to which the drug is to be placed and the quantity of drugs involved should both be matters which the trial judge considers when sentencing someone.

Part III of the Bill deals with the powers of search and even this part, more than any other, is where one can see the influence of the Police Department in the drafting of the legislation. It is pleasing, however, that the Government has completely redrafted and expanded the clause that was part of the previous Bill. I have no doubt that that was a result of submissions from the Bar Association of Queensland and the Queensland Law Society.

However, the Bill still contains provisions that must be viewed with alarm. Possibly the most frequent complaint I receive about the police is their misuse of the power to search without a warrant, a power given to them under the Health Act when they wish to search for drugs. The Lucas report in 1977 stated—

> "Some of the evidence we have heard has left us in litle doubt that the powers of detention, search and seizure in connection with drug offences which have been conferred upon police by the amendments to the Health Act made in 1971 have on occasions been grossly abused."

I have little doubt that that was correct then. I firmly believe that the abuse of that power would be greater today.

Recently I spoke to a woman whose home had been searched three times in one month using the provision of the Health Act, without obtaining a warrant. Undoubtedly the woman was being harassed for some reason by the police. Under the Health Act they are able to violate her privacy without having to answer to anyone.

Mr Davis: And ransack the place.

Mr MACKENROTH: That is right.

I am therefore pleased, having that type of case in mind, at some of the provisions of this part.

Recently I was asked by a member of the media would I support, as he put it, increasing police powers to obtain a warrant over the telephone or by telex or radio.

My simple answer to that question was, "yes." That power, if properly administered and checked by the police administration, could held to stamp out the abuse of the power-to-search provisions that are now contained in the Health Act. Under this new power, the necessity to search premises without a warrant should become almost obsolete. If the Police Department finds that a particular officer or station is using the powers under clause 18 (12) of the Bill, the Commissioner of Police should immediately order an inquiry and take appropriate action.

The new clause 20, which provides for a register of searches, could help the innocent person to prove that he or she is being harassed by police. However, it will be important for members of the general public to be aware of the provision so that, if they are detained or they or their premises are searched without a warrant, they can check the register to ensure an entry relating to the incident has been made by the police officer involved. Therefore, if they are detained or their vehicle or property is searched again, a complaint of harassment could be verified by the entries in the register.

The Labor Party will not support clause 21, which allows the police to take a person charged with an offence to a place to investigate the offence. That provision should be totally unacceptable to the House. It does not exist in any other law in Queensland or, for that matter, in any other law in Australia.

To show how the provision could be abused, I refer to the example given by the Queensland Law Society. A suspect could have been in police custody from, say, 11 a.m. on Saturday until, say, 8 a.m. on Monday, a period of almost 48 hours. At 8 a.m. on the Monday, just two hours before the police are obliged by law to bring him before the court, he could be arrested. In this scenario, the last court sitting was at 8.30 a.m. on the Saturday. The suspect—now the arrested person—could then be held for a further 48 hours, thus being in police custody for 96 hours before he has to be brought before the court.

In its submission to the Government, the Queensland Law Society suggested that, if the suspect's consent is to be obtained for this post-arrest 48-hour removal to any place, that consent could be made truly verifable by having the now arrested person brought before a magistrate in open court so that the magistrate could determine the arrested person's willingness to go anywhere with the police for 48 hours? Unfortunately the Government has failed to take up that suggestion. Perhaps the Minister could explain why.

The Bill provides that an acquitted person who has been forced to provide his voice-print, photograph, finger-print, palm-print, foot-print, toe-print or handwriting sample must apply to the police to have them destroyed. This Government, which has indicated its opposition to the Australia Card—a card intended to cut out tax evasion and catch welfare cheats—seems obsessed with compiling through the Police Department as much information on citizens as possible. All members are aware of the activities of the Special Branch and the files it keeps on ordinary, law-abiding citizens. In the past few years, at every opportunity the Government has included in legislation that voice-prints, photographs, finger-prints, palm-prints, foot-prints, toe-prints and handwriting samples will be destroyed only at the request of the person acquitted. One wonders just what bank of information the Police Department is building up on ordinary, law-abiding citizens. I firmly believe that, if someone is charged and acquitted, those prints or photographs taken by the police should be immediately destroyed. I will move an amendment along those lines at the Committee stage.

Before the dinner recess, the Minister for Police, who was at that stage in the House, referred to the Labor Party policy on marijuana. I have no doubt whatsoever that the Drugs Misuse Bill has come before the House today as a result of the National Party's 1983 election promise to bring in tough drugs legislation. That promise was made because at that time the Labor Party had a policy on the personal use of marijuana. The National Party has continually tried to say that the Labor Party still has that policy. Tonight I will make the Labor Party policy quite clear to the House. I hope that, when any member

of the National or Liberal Parties makes a contribution to the debate, he does not attempt to say that the Labor Party still has that policy on the personal use of marijuana.

The Labor Party policy is quite clear: the personal use of marijuana will be regarded as a simple offence. The 1984 Labor Party conference in Townsville made that policy quite clear. I opposed an amendment that the policy should include the growing of marijuana. That was defeated overwhelmingly by the Labor Party conference.

The Labor Party does not have a policy relating to the decriminalisation of the growing and using of marijuana. If any honourable member says that it does, he or she will be lying. The Labor Party has no such policy.

Labor Party policy is that the smoking or possession of marijuana for one's personal use should be regarded as a minor offence. Quite simply, that means that the person would still be charged with an offence under the Health Act or, if this Bill is passed, the Drugs Misuse Act. He would still appear before the Magistrates Court, be found guilty and fined.

The difference between the policy of the Labor Party and the policy of the present Government is that under Labor a young person who experimented with marijuana would not suffer a double penalty in that a criminal conviction would not be recorded against his name. I believe that the general community would support that. I do not believe that the general public would support the recording of a criminal conviction against a young person who experiments with drugs. The figures reveal that approximately 60 to 70 per cent of young people do experiment with the smoking of marijuana. People who have a criminal conviction recorded against their name cannot get a job in the public service, or with an insurance company or bank, and are unable to join the police force or any of the armed services. The Labor Party would ensure that that did not occur.

The Queensland Government recently introduced legislation to enable such people to apply to the Magistrates Court to have their criminal convictions struck out. The Labor Party is saying that such people should not have a criminal conviction. The only difference between the policy of the National Party and the policy of the Labor Party is that the National Party says that after five years those people can have that particular conviction struck out. I can see no great difference.

I ask Government members and members of the Liberal Party not to lie and deceive the people of Queensland about the Labor Party's policy on marijuana. I ask them not to talk about statements that were made three years ago. Quite clearly, at this stage, the policy of the Labor Party is not what it was three years ago. If Government members and members of the Liberal Party want to say that that is the policy that the Labor Party had, members of the Opposition could say exactly the same thing about the Government in relation to random breath-testing. In regard to the issue of random breath-testing, the Government wants to say, "No. Since six years ago we have been able to look at the issue and we have changed our minds. Because we have changed our minds, what we said six years ago no longer counts."

Mr McPhie: You have explained it very well, but I was not aware of it. At no stage have we got up and deliberately lied. We might not have understood.

Mr MACKENROTH: The National Party Government continues to put out propaganda based on a policy that is extinct. I have seen that propaganda.

Earlier the Deputy Premier tried to attack the Opposition over its pre-1984 policy. I explained the position to him then. I have once again explained it. It is probably the fifth time that I have explained the position in this Assembly since 1984. The Deputy Premier has heard it. He does not want to hear it.

I do not think that the Bill is good enough. The whole purpose of the Bill is to try to make out that the Labor Party is soft on drug addicts and on people who deal in drugs.

Mr De Lacy: Is the Labor Party policy a public document that is readily available?

Mr MACKENROTH: The policy of the Labor Party is readily available. Members of the National Party are usually the first people to buy a copy of it.

Mr Alison: I have got a copy of it. It is the best thing going for us.

Mr MACKENROTH: The honourable member for Maryborough has a copy of it; he should read it. I hope all Government members read it.

Mr Turner: Does your policy stipulate how much they can have in their possession?

Mr MACKENROTH: I do not believe that these drugs can be graduated by weight. Those kinds of decisions should be made by a judge, and, if this House has faith in the Queensland judiciary, the Queensland Government should allow those decisions to be made by the judiciary. If the police feel that the quantity of the drug in the person's possession was an amount for sale, and not for his own personal use, the police could charge him with that offence. That would not prevent that person raising as a defence in court that he had that marijuana in his possession for his own personal use. The magistrate or judge should be able to make that decision. If the Minister and the Government had faith in the judiciary, they would agree that the judiciary are very learned men with the confidence and experience to make such a decision.

Under the Third Schedule of this Bill the quantity of cannabis that is regarded as being dangerous is set out as 500 grams or, if the dangerous drug consists of plants the aggregate weight of which is less than 500 grams, 100 plants. Therefore, using that schedule, if a person is in possession of under 500 grams he has committed one offence and if he is in possession of over 500 grams, he has committed a different offence. The Bill refers to 100 plants, and a person can be guilty of one offence or another depending on the particular day that a police officer calls at his premises.

The weight of one fully grown cannabis plant, which can grow to a height of seven ft, is between 600 grams and 750 grams. If a person is in possession of one fully grown cannabis plant, he is in possession of more than 500 grams. On the other hand, if he has 100 seedlings that have only just sprung up out of the ground, he would be in possession of under 500 grams and would be liable for the lesser penalty. That is ridiculous. If a person plants 100 seeds and grows 100 plants, it is obvious to me and to most ordinary thinking people, that, by growing 100 plants, that person would be growing that amount of marijuana or cannabis in order to sell that particular drug. The Government is saying that if the plants have not grown high enough, that person will not be regarded as a trafficker or a drug-pusher, but as having that drug for his own use. Once the plants reach a stage where they are able to be weighed, and the weight is more than 500 grams, then that person is regarded as a drug-trafficker. That shows the ridiculous situation that arises by setting out sentences that are struck mandatorily by weight under this legislation.

Weights will be used to differentiate between offences, but a person should be able to argue a defence before a judge that he had that particular drug for his own use and be found guilty of a lesser offence. If the Queensland Government had faith in the judiciary, it would know that the judges would be able to make such decisions.

I refer to crimes committed by drug addicts. In Queensland there has been a huge increase in the number of bank robberies. In the shopping centre where my office is situated, there are three banks, two of which have been robbed three times in the last four years, and one that has been robbed twice. In four years in one very small shopping centre there have been eight robberies at only three banks. Over the last six or seven years throughout Brisbane there has been a huge increase in the number of banks, building societies and shops that have been robbed, mostly by people who were armed.

A huge increase has occurred in the number of private homes that are broken into during the day and ransacked. The Police Department's clear-up rate in that area is about 18 per cent. About 82 per cent of robberies of that kind are never solved. Most

thinking people would agree that the majority of those robberies of banks, building societies or private homes are committed by drug addicts who need money to pay for their addiction. That in itself is a problem.

We, as legislators, and the Government should be looking at that as a problem, not simply saying, "We will lock up those people and throw away the key.", and filling up the gaols. We should see what we can do about rehabilitation. If a drug addict found with heroin in his possession is sent to gaol for three years, it may be that he is responsible for a number of other crimes such as bank robberies or breaking and enterings. Perhaps he will not be charged with those offences. As soon as that person is released from goal, he will return to his addiction problems and continue to rob banks and homes to obtain money to pay for his addiction.

Some drug addicts need about $2,000 a week to support their drug habits. No drug addict can obtain that money from any source other than crime. We need to look at that as a problem and say, "Let us do something about those drug addicts and try to rehabilitate them." Drug rehabilitation programs could be implemented and drug education programs could be conducted in schools so that young people do not experiment with drugs and become drug addicts. This legislation should cover such matters. However, it does not. The legislation is merely a piece of paper that will be used by the Government to say, "We are the toughest Government in Australia on the Mr Bigs and the drug dealers."

The Government will not do anything about the drug problem. It will not increase the number of members of the Drug Squad or the Queensland Police Force in order to do something about the problem. The number of people who are arrested by the police or gaoled by the courts will not increase. The end result will be a tough piece of legislation that will lie in the Government Printing Office gathering dust.

If the Government wants to be responsible, it should do something in its Budget next Tuesday to increase police force numbers. By increasing the number of members of the Drug Squad in Queensland so that the legislation, which I am sure will be passed tonight, can be enforced, the Government would be doing something very concrete.

As I stated at the beginning of my speech, the Opposition supports the legislation in principle. It will support legislation that will do something to stop the drug trade. However, the Opposition does not believe that the legislation in its present form should be passed by this Assembly. For that reason, a number of amendments will be moved by the Opposition at the Committee stage.

Mr CAHILL (Aspley) (7.39 p.m.): The Seventh United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, held in Milan, Italy, in August and September 1985, adopted six major instruments and 26 resolutions. Among the resolutions adopted by the congress were those relating to organised crime and drug-trafficking. This was followed by the 40th Session of the United Nations General Assembly's adopting the resolutions.

Among the resolutions debated was one concerning the struggle against illicit drug-trafficking. It invited all member States, which included Australia, to strengthen instruments of combat against the illicit drug traffic and to introduce or strengthen any legal instruments that appear to be effective in regard to the nature of organised crime, either national or international, displayed by such traffic.

Nations were exhorted also to introduce or strengthen all legal instruments to facilitate the investigation of the proceeds from illicit traffic or allow the tracing, freezing or forfeiture thereof; to take all necessary legislative measures to maximise co-operation among nations in the matter of investigation of illicit profits and the forfeiture thereof; and to provide, where necessary, for new kinds of offences concerning the acquisition, possession, use or so-called laundering of illicit profits.

Duty is the debt we owe to ourselves, to society and to God. As all human communities are governed by law, so must we govern ourselves by law. That law is a

duty. Our duty is prescribed to us by our conscience and conscience will always tell us whether we have done our duty or not.

In bringing down this legislation, this Government is realising its responsibility. The legislation is in accordance with the conscience of the Government and in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations Congress.

Certainly the cynicism of contemporary generations towards institutions is rampant. Standards, once the object of attainment, are now despised. The reluctance to accept society is massive; and drug addiction statistics tell their dreadful tale.

However, Parliament is—or ought to be—a forum for formulating and expressing our social consciousness; and that is what this Bill is all about. This Parliament has a responsibilty to provide its law-enforcement investigators with sufficient weaponry to combat these cankers of trafficking in dangerous drugs; supplying dangerous drugs; receiving or possessing property obtained from trafficking or supplying; producing dangerous drugs; possessing things in connection with dangerous drugs; permitting the use of places for commission of an offence concerning dangerous drugs and living off the proceeds of the drug trade.

If the State Government does not give its officers these powers and back them up, it would be analogous to a military command to storm a hill using swords against machine-guns.

Organised criminal groups are involved across the spectrum of drug-trafficking activities. They obtain illicit substances at overseas sources, arrange for their importation, manufacture illicit drugs and then distribute these drugs at the retail level. Furthermore, the crime networks are involved in a broad range of financial activities as they generate and manipulate the extensive profits of the drug trade.

Drug money flows through business friends to launder the funds; and, indeed, the drug-trafficking proceeds are also used to invest in legitimate business. There is a serious potential for corruption in the business environment. Drug-trafficking is a continuing criminal enterprise in which a series of criminal laws are violated for financial gain. Drug-trafficking requires the collaboration of a large number of people; the complex structure and methods of the operations make drug-trafficking, by definition, organised.

Thus the perniciousness of crime is being fostered by interrelated developments. Drugs and organised crime have combined to wreak havoc on our communities and our lives.

It may well be that the combination of drug traffic and organised crime represents the most serious crime problem facing our nation today. Directly or indirectly, it threatens each person and institution in this country. It threatens the fabric of society and the gown of public integrity.

So this Government must, as a matter of great urgency, implement a series of initiatives to use its resources better in the fight against drug-trafficking and organised crime.

According to the estimates, in the United States alone at least $80,000m a year is laundered through the thousands of professional money-washers who specialise in these transactions. Of this total, $15,000m represents proceeds from drug transactions alone. This is not only washing dirty money; it is washing deadly money.

The drugs mentioned in the First Schedule of the Bill are the particular killers: the narcotics—chief of which is heroin; the stimulants—the chief among them cocaine, and its dreadful derivative, crack; and the hallucinogenics—phencyclidine (PCP) and Lysergide (LSD).

The No. 1 killer in that group is clearly heroin, first synthesised from morphine in 1874. Honourable members would know that pure heroin is a white powder with a bitter taste. However, street heroin may vary in colour from white to dark brown because of impurities left from the manufacturing process or the presence of additives, such as food colouring, cocoa or brown sugar. Pure heroin is rarely sold on the street, because it is

under the control of the big trafficker. A bag—selling for a single-dosage unit of heroin—may weigh about 100 mg, usually containing about 5 per cent heroin. To increase the bulk of the material sold to the addict, the diluents are mixed with the heroin of ratios ranging from 9:1 to as high as 99:1. Sugars, starch, powdered milk and quinine are among the diluents used.

Some honourable members may have had, as I have had, the horrifying, nauseating experience of seeing addicts in advanced stages of heroin addiction. I have seen a girl of 19 years of age who obviously was formerly extremely attractive but who was so far stripped of pride in herself and, indeed, in knowledge of herself that her personal hygiene no longer mattered to her and there were cockroaches crawling through her hair. On such occasions, if one could have found the trafficker, the supplier and Mr Big, one would have been tempted to take the law into one's own hands.

I turn now to the stimulant cocaine—the most potent stimulant of natural origin, extracted from the leaves of the coca plant. It was first isolated in 1880. It is, of course, particularly useful in surgery because of its ability to anaesthetise tissue while simultaneously constricting blood vessels and limiting bleeding.

Of course, many of its therapeutic applications are now obsolete. However illicit cocaine is distributed as a white crystallised powder, often diluted by a variety of other ingredients, the most common of which are sugars such as lactose and also by some local anaesthetics. Since the cost of cocaine is high, there is a tendency to adulterate the product at each level of distribution.

The drug is most commonly administered by being sniffed through the nasal passages; and less commonly, injected directly into the blood stream. Another method, free basing, consists of smoking it in a small pipe.

Unlike such drugs as LSD and heroin, cocaine is reputed, erroneously, to be relatively safe from undesirable side effects. It has the potential for extraordinary psychic dependency. Recurrent users may resort to larger doses at shorter intervals until their lives are largely committed to their habituation. Anxiety, restlessness and extreme irritability may indicate the onset of a toxic psychosis similar to paranoid schizophrenia. Tactile hallucinations so afflict some chronic users that they injure themselves in attempting to remove imaginary insects from under the skin. Others are prosecuted by the fear of being watched and followed. Excessive doses of cocaine may cause seizures and death from respiratory failure.

Now, some drug-users have a theory that if a drug is not physically addictive, it is not harmful, and this is the error made by cocaine-users. Certainly cocaine, generally, causes no physical dependence, tolerance does not occur and there are no physical withdrawal symptoms. However, the psychological craving for the drug is very strong.

Recently, however, a substance known as the street drug of the future has come to notice. It did not appear until late in 1985 but its rise as a new form of drug abuse has been as dramatic as its explosive name. It is called crack.

It is a free-based cocaine which appears as small, white crystalline lumps and may be smoked. It is the most potent and dangerous form of cocaine abuse; and the trouble is that it is made very easily from either baking soda, ammonia and/or powdered amphetamine. When ammonia is used, crack is reputed to give a greater euphoric effect than when bicarbonate of soda is used.

Another terrible danger of crack is that it is an extremely affordable drug of abuse for our youth. Vials of many diverse sizes are available. A small vial estimated to contain approximately 100 mg costs somewhere between $10 and $20; but intelligence sources from the United States indicate that some vials may be purchased for as little as $2 to $5.

The reaction to crack takes place from within four to six seconds and lasts approximately 15 minutes. Intelligence sources also from the United States say that

recently a newspaper carried the story of a five-year-old using the substance, supplied to him by his nine-year-old brother.

The distinction between cocaine and crack is that the latter is strongly addictive. Users become paranoid often after their first experience; they hear strange things or see things move that are not in motion and often the paranoia leads to violence. The skin, after long-term abuse, may turn yellow or grey; there are breathing problems, convulsions and the coughing-up of black phlegm. There are many parts of the body affected by this most dangerous drug. For example, the central nervous system; the arteries—with a blood pressure increase of up to 15 per cent, which has caused in some cases brain haemorrhage; the eyes; the heart—which can increase in rate by up to 50 per cent and bring on cardiac arrest; the lungs; the limbs—which convulse with involuntary contractions. In fact, as with all these drugs, it causes an inferno of craving and despair.

Looking briefly at the Australian scene a few years ago, one can see that in 1981—and the figures have increased since—15 368 persons were charged with drug possession, importing, using or administering, trafficking and related offences. That is a shocking statistic. Inherent in that shocking statistic is that, of that number, 10 052 people were aged between 18 and 25 and 1 298 were aged 17 or under. For heroin-type charges alone in the five years to 1981, 12 149 people came before the courts.

Unfortunately, the lowest charge figures related to importing—292 in five years; and there was also a low figure, 1 652, concerning trafficking. Sadly, the greatest number of people charged, 9 132, concerned possessing and using.

It would be a singular disservice to our responsibilities as members of Parliament if we did not bring down the harshest measures available to us to do our best to stamp out this pernicious disease. Of course, the penalties are harsh; but we have, as members of Parliament, a sworn duty. Certainly, the demands of duty are not always easy to obey. Duty demands sometimes a severe setting-aside of strongly held inclinations. Duty bids us look neither to the right nor to the left, but straight ahead.

I support the Bill and commend the Minister and his advisers.

Mr GOSS (Salisbury) (7.51 p.m.): Because of the damage that drugs inflict on the whole community, particularly on the youth of this State, I do not think that any member of this House or any responsible, relevant community organisation or leader would withhold support for tough penalties against drug-traffickers and for appropriate measures that will limit the spread of drugs of any kind in the community. Having said that, I turn my attention to the question of what the appropriate measures are.

It seems that to a large extent honourable members are captives of the promise made over three years ago by the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) to introduce "the toughest drug laws in Australia". It is an indictment on this Government and a reflection on its competence that it has taken three years to produce legislation that is still defective in a number of respects.

After two and a-half years' deliberation, the Government produced the previous legislation. After toughing it out for a while, the Government eventually had to concede that it was a failure; grossly incompetent in its drafting and effectiveness. It had to be thrown into the bin.

To its credit, the Government has made a number of changes to the legislation that was previously introduced, but the changes have been suggested by bodies such as the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties, the Queensland Law Society Incorporated, the Bar Association of Queensland, by many people who have gained expertise in dealing with drugs, and by members of the Opposition, in particular the Opposition spokesman on police matters, the honourable member for Chatsworth (Mr Mackenroth). Those suggested changes and the arguments should not have been necessary.

Any reasonably competent Government and Cabinet Minister should have foreshadowed the changes that were necessary and dealt with them. But, no, the legislation that was introduced was both defective and excessive, and failed to deliver what the

Queensland community was looking for—tough but effective, tough but fair, new drug laws.

The Bill presently before the House goes a considerable distance towards addressing those problems, but its provisions are still defective and excessive in a number of respects. In spite of that, and because of the mentality that pervades this Parliament all too often, that is, that any concession or any back-down is a sign of weakness, it is unlikely that any concession or back-down will be forthcoming from the Government. Instead of allowing a true and free debate that would result in a better standard of legislation, the Minister for Police (Mr Gunn) and the Government too often stick to their guns—or in this case, to their "Gunn".

The Government tries to create the impression that it is in control. In a superficial sense it is in control, but in terms of legislative intent and in terms of legislative effect, the results can be very unfortunate for the community. As I said earlier, everybody can agree with the purpose of the legislation that is before the House; unfortunately, for the reasons I have briefly outlined, the legislation will have undesirable consequences in a number of respects.

It is important to place on the record the objections and the criticisms that have come from bodies such as the Bar Association of Queensland and the Queensland Law Society—bodies with considerable expertise as a group. They probably have more expertise than any other group in the community except, perhaps, the Police Department. In terms of the appropriate legislative result, from the point of view of the public, the legal profession has more to offer.

I now refer briefly to parts of a submission signed by Mr Ian Callinan, the President of the Bar Association. That submission was sent to the Government in January this year. A number of the comments contained in it are still applicable. Although they referred to the previous Bill, they are 100 per cent applicable and relevant to the Bill before the House. The Bar Association commenced by saying that no recent legislation has matched the universal disapproval of members of the association to the first Bill. The sorts of things that attracted that universal disapproval are, by and large, still contained in the Government's legislative proposal.

Some of the general observations that Mr Callinan and the Bar Association made—and yesterday's media reported a repetition of the criticism by the Bar Association of the Minister's legislation—were pertinent. For example, the submission stated—

> "It is also likely that the trafficking in drugs will be associated with other criminal activities such as conspiracy, prostitution, bribery and so on. Traditional penalties and police powers are likely to prove insufficient in coping with the size and scope of such activities. Indeed, the proscribed conduct may need to be enlarged. However, the question remains whether or not the present law is adequate."

The submission dealt with the Health Act, particularly section 130, in these words—

> "Section 130 of the Act contains a wide range of drug offences and certainly anyone engaged in drug trafficking would be caught by the legislation."

Under that legislation—

> ". . . . a person is liable upon conviction on indictment to imprisonment with hard labour for life, or a fine of $100,000, or both."

The submission refers to the deeming provisions in section 130J of the Health Act, under which any person who has in his possession a quantity in excess of the prescribed quantity is deemed to have it in his possession for a specified purpose. That is a very rigorous and onerous provision in the legislation, which reverses the traditional onus of proof that has been enjoyed under our British system of justice. The offender has to establish that he neither knew nor had reason to suspect that any drug was on the premises occupied by him or under his control and so on. He also has to negative the operation of section 24 of the Criminal Code. In addition to that, police are given wide powers of detention, search, seizure and arrest under section 130M of the Health Act.

Section 157 contains provision for protection of informers. Over the years, the penalties for drug offences have steadily increased.

As I said before, the maximum penalty of life imprisonment is already on the books. The fact that the Attorney-General has rarely exercised his powers of appeal under the Criminal Code in respect of such sentences, I believe, exposes the Government's record of the pursuit of tough penalties. If it were seriously pursuing such tough penalties, more appeals would have been lodged. It would be interesting if the Minister were able to inform the House how many appeals had been lodged in the last 10 years or so since the 1976 legislation was introduced.

The other aspect, to which I refer, which remains a criticism of the Bar Association, is the failure of the legislation to define the term "carrying on the business of drug-trafficking". The core of the legislation is that part which relates to serious offences, which attract mandatory life imprisonment; yet no definition is included. That is a serious deficiency in the legislation.

The Queensland Law Society made an extensive submission, which it has recently updated. The Law Society makes a number of comments similar to those of the Bar Association. The position of the Law Society should be recorded because it shows that the Government——

Mr Gunn: Would you like me to read out the letter that was sent to me? It was a good letter.

Mr GOSS: If the Minister would like to lay it on the table, I would be happy to read it out.

Mr Gunn: I thought you might have a copy.

Mr GOSS: Is the Minister prepared to table a copy of it?

Mr Gunn: Yes, I am. It is really praising the Government.

Mr GOSS: I accept the Minister's undertaking that in his reply he will table that letter. I will be happy to have a look at it because I received a censored version of the letter from the Queensland Law Society. The reason for that is the very dubious way in which the Government deals with professional bodies in this State. As the Deputy Premier well knows, the Government submits drafts of legislation to bodies such as the Bar Association of Queensland and the Queensland Law Society at short notice and does so on the condition that those bodies do not tell the public what they think of the legislation.

Mr Gunn: This has been on the table since October last year.

Mr GOSS: What was tabled in October?

Mr Gunn: The Drugs Misuse Bill.

Mr GOSS: Not this one.

Mr Gunn: Oh!

Mr GOSS: What does the Minister mean? The Bill before the House is completely different. The Bill introduced by his predecessor was an even bigger mess than the one under debate. Of course, it had to be thrown in the bin; it had to be discarded entirely. The Government has made substantial changes.

Mr Gunn: I am pleased you said that we have made substantial changes.

Mr GOSS: Yes, the Government has made substantial changes. If the Deputy Premier had been listening, he would have heard me say that at the outset. What I said was that the legislation——

Mr Gunn: I did not hear you.

Mr GOSS: One of the Deputy Premier's problems is that he does not listen. He has the arrogant attitude, "We know everything."

Mr Gunn interjected.

Mr GOSS: I will have to ask Mr Deputy Speaker to deal with the Deputy Premier.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Booth): Order! I suggest that the member for Salisbury address the Chair and that there be less cross-fire in the Chamber.

Mr GOSS: Mr Deputy Speaker, will I be protected from that sort of behaviour?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have made the decision. I suggest to the honourable member that he continue his address.

Mr GOSS: Mr Deputy Speaker, through you, the problem——

Mr Gunn: You must be a cream puff in court.

Mr GOSS: There he goes again. His problem is that in his previous interjections, which have not been dealt with, he evinced that arrogant attitude that is very dangerous in terms of the public benefit. The public should be benefiting from the process of consultation not only in this place but also with the relevant professional bodies.

Mr Gunn: You spent your life defending crims and making money out of them, too—or out of the tax-payers.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much cross-fire. I suggest that the honourable member for Salisbury continue. There is absolutely no reason whatever for him to be waiting for interjections.

Mr GOSS: I wish to reply briefly to the comments of the Deputy Premier, which suggest that I had spent my life defending crims, or some phrase like that, and making money out of it. I make no apology for the fact that in my previous calling as a solicitor of the Supreme Court of Queensland I acted for people who came to me and who had been charged with offences. That is the whole basis of the legal profession. It is unfortunate that the second most senior member of the Government fails to understand the way in which the legal profession works. It is no doubt partly as a result of that failure to understand important institutions in this State that he treats bodies such as the Law Society with the contempt and in the cheap way that he does. I condemn him for that.

I return to the Deputy Premier's defective legislation. One of the significant things about the Bill is the way in which the debate has been timed so that it is submerged by the publicity that will surround tonight's Federal Budget. He has done that because he is embarrassed by his legislation. If he were not embarrassed by it, he would leave it on the table for a much longer period. After all, it is quite technical and controversial legislation that will have far-reaching effects; yet, because not even he is proud of the legislation and because he would be embarrassed by the reaction from the public if they were to get to know about it, he wants to get it through the House in the shortest possible period and at a convenient time. Too often that is the way that this place operates.

Mr Gunn interjected.

Mr GOSS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I point out to you that there he goes again.

One change that the Bill makes to one of the defects in the previous legislation is the greater distinction between hard drugs and soft, or Second Schedule, drugs. That is a definite improvement. Another improvement is contained in the provisions covering drug-dependent persons.

An interesting point is that the legislation recognises the need to make the distinction between those sorts of categories but it fails to allow for the distinction that should occur in another important area, that is, mandatory life imprisonment. By removing the

discretion of judges, the legislation is essentially inconsistent, because judges draw the distinction between First and Second Schedule drugs. Judges draw the distinction between regular traffickers and drug-dependent persons. However, the provision dealing with mandatory life imprisonment does not allow Supreme Court judges to have a discretion in that matter.

The contempt with which the Government holds the judiciary in this State is again evidenced by that provision. In most instances, the best, most capable and experienced practitioners are appointed to the bench of the Supreme Court; yet under this legislation the judges of that court will not be given the power to distinguish between a person who has a semi-trailer load of heroin and a person who has a small quantity of cocaine, albeit for an illegal purpose. That person should be dealt with and punished. However, a distinction should be drawn in the penalty imposed. The penalty should fit the crime. By taking away that discretion, the Government has earned the condemnation of the judiciary, the Bar Association and the Law Society.

I refer to a phrase that has been used by the Premier—and it has probably been used by the Deputy Premier, given the way in which he tends to mindlessly repeat things that the Premier says—that is, "mandatory life without parole".

Mr Gunn: I wouldn't pay you with Monopoly money.

Mr GOSS: I would not trust the Deputy Premier with anything more than Monopoly money. The way the Deputy Premier administers the Treasury demonstrates that he cannot be trusted with anything more than Monopoly money. His knowledge of economics tends to suggest that it is drawn almost entirely from the playing of that game.

I now expose another fraud or defect in the legislation. The Deputy Premier and his mate the Premier tend to use the phrase "mandatory life without parole". Of course, it is a fraud. Mandatory life under this legislation is the same as for a conviction on the crime of murder. That is mandatory life. However, no reference is made to "without parole". Of course, under this legislation, as with the penalty for the crime of murder, people may apply for parole. Perhaps that might be after 10, 12 or 14 years. However, what happens for the crime of murder is what will happen under this legislation. That is where the Government is perpetrating a fraud on the public. Many people think that "mandatory life" means literally that it is life without parole. However, of course, that is not so. A fraud is being perpetrated on the Queensland public that leads to a belief as to the severity of the legislation. The provision that has been adverted to by the Opposition spokesman—that is, a maximum penalty of 25 years, with other lower penalties for relevant offences—is a much more judicious, fair and probably in serious cases severe penalty to impose for an offending activity.

I turn now to the provisions dealing with detention without arrest and detention after arrest. The legislation has a general approach towards increased powers of police, but no complementary safeguards for innocent members of the public. That is of great concern when this State has a Minister such as the one it has at the moment, who enabled the police involved in the Mannix case, for example, to get away with what they did; who defended the report of the Police Complaints Tribunal without explaining it or answering serious questions that necessarily arose from it.

When further abuse of police powers occurs by that small group of police who consistently abuse their powers, where is the protection for the citizen? Where is the tape-recording of interviews for the innocent person questioned by the police, the person who will be the subject of this mandatory life penalty? After all, the member for Merthyr (Mr Lane), who is now Minister for Transport, gave evidence to the Lucas inquiry about certain police officers being prepared to go to any lengths to gain a conviction. He told the Lucas inquiry, under oath, that certain police officers would go to any lengths—would even commit perjury—to get a conviction. What will be done about those police officers to protect the innocent citizen?

I mention also that, despite the police having increased powers, despite the police being given the power to charge somebody with an offence that will render him liable to mandatory life imprisonment, the police still have the right to elect the jurisdiction under which that person is charged. If the police elect to proceed under summary jurisdiction, the maximum sentence is two years' imprisonment. If they elect to proceed on indictment in the higher jurisdiction, the sentence is mandatory—life! That is serious.

If the legislation was competent and fair, either the court would make the decisions as to which jurisdiction was appropriate, or guide-lines would be laid down to control or guide the exercise of that discretion by the prosecution. In my practice as a lawyer I saw cases involving small quanties of marijuana referred to the Supreme Court, where the maximum penalty was life imprisonment, while cases involving greater quantities of drugs were dealt with summarily. I often wondered why the police had taken that particular course on a more serious charge, or adopted the higher jurisdiction regarding relatively small quantities of drugs in the possession of first offenders. The inconsistency is in itself a serious problem. The fact that dubious motives might be involved is always possible and is something that should be dealt with by the legislation. The increased powers of the police to detain and search any vehicle or any thing should be subject to a code of conduct and should not be open-ended as at present.

A serious problem to the community is the ability of the police to obtain an interception warrant and to place bugging or listening devices in the home, car or office of any person, including a solicitor or barrister's office. Under this legislation there is nothing to prevent the police from bugging the offices of solicitors and barristers. It is a safe bet that the police will not plant their bugs during office hours. They will break in at night to do it under the order they obtain from the Supreme Court. Many of the police who would do that would not be able to resist the temptation to go through the files. The potential for abuse by unscrupulous police officers is sufficiently serious for safeguards to be established. There are no safeguards in this Bill.

The minister referred to the safeguards that exist under the Invasion of Privacy Act. How adequate are those safeguards? Since the Minister took over the Police portfolio, has he stopped the practice by the police of applying for blank-cheque orders from the Supreme Court judges under the Invasion of Privacy Act? If the Minister does not know, I trust he will find out from his advisers if the police are following a set of guide-lines prepared some years ago, under which they apply to Supreme Court Judges for an order to plant a bugging device on any person and in any place for an unlimited period. The police were doing that some years ago, and there is no evidence to suggest that they have stopped.

If that is the way bugging devices are going to be planted and operated, a lot of people had better be careful. Information on the ordinary affairs of many innocent people will be scooped up by such listening devices, and they will have to rely on the integrity of the Queensland police not to use that information. If the police use a bugging device in the office of a solicitor, they will pick up confidential information on commercial cases, divorce cases and other police cases.

What would happen if the police planted a bugging device in the office of the solicitor acting for Barry Mannix? That solicitor might also have been acting for a druggie about whom the police required evidence. Barry Mannix's whole defence to save himself from mandatory life imprisonment for murdering his own father depended on his ability in court to prove police perjury, assault and other unlawful activities. If information on such a case, involving serious allegations of police impropriety, is picked up by these bugging devices will the police who get that information say that those matters are irrelevant to their drug investigation, burn the tapes and discard that evidence? Would they have telephoned the detectives at the Broadbeach Police Station to advise that they had details of what the defence was preparing in the Mannix case and that the Broadbeach police had better adjust their evidence, have another round-table conference, as was done in the Southport SP case, to work out who would swear on oath what had happened,

and adjust the evidence to make sure they got a conviction? That is what happened in the Southport SP case, which led to the Lucas inquiry.

The Government's Director of Prosecutions was a member of that three-man inquiry. Mr Sturgess, Mr Justice Lucas and Inspector Becker found that the practice of planting evidence, such as drugs, on people and verballing people was, to use the inquiry's term, "pervasive". Where is the protection for the innocent citizen? Where are the safeguards that will prevent the abuse of bugging devices? There are none in the legislation or in the Invasion of Privacy Act. It will be interesting to see whether the Minister is prepared to respond to that comment.

Another dangerous precedent is the provision in the legislation that allows cases to be heard in secret with no publicity and no record. I think that that is a very dangerous process.

The forfeiture provisions are important because it is necessary to attack the major incentive for the drug trade, which is the very high profits that people can make out of drug-trafficking. The members of the Queensland Government continually talk about how they have the best legislation in Australia, the southern hemisphere or the universe. No hyperbole is too much for this lot! They are always talking about how they pave the way and how other States follow behind. New South Wales and Victoria got their forfeiture provisions off and running ages ago. Queensland is running a poor last to the Labor States when it comes to doing something about attacking the profit motive. The Government's provisions need more thought.

The other matter that has not been taken into account is that the forfeiture provisions should not be restricted only to drug offences. What about the illegally obtained assets from other criminal activities? Why can they not be attacked as has occurred in other places? The Government has not thought through its provisions. It is not thinking far enough ahead. It is not up with the thinking of southern States. The whole lot should be referred to the Law Reform Commission so that it can be done properly instead of bringing forward a half-baked version.

The legislation has improved substantially. I said that at the outset and I am quite happy to concede that. However, the legislation contains serious deficiencies and grey areas, such as the absence of a definition of the meaning of carrying on the business of drug-trafficking. The legislation has the potential for serious injustice for people involved in the drug scene in a minor way to be gaoled for mandatory life imprisonment. A fraud is being perpetrated on the public who think that it is mandatory life without parole when, of course, it is no such thing. The penalty is life imprisonment, which is the same penalty provided for the offence of murder. I accept that it is a serious penalty. However, it is not what the Premier has represented for the last three years that this legislation has been foreshadowed.

Another serious provision that warrants explanation by the Deputy Premier is that which permits police to take a person to various places for up to 48 hours after arrest. I cannot see the justification for that. Once a person is arrested and charged, that should be it. He should be put in the watch house and taken before a court at the earliest opportunity. The Minister gives the following explanation for the clause in his explanatory notes—

> "This section is needed because of the large numbers of cases involving drugs where plantations and caches of drugs are located in isolated areas that are very hard to find."

What is that all about? The legislation provides that a person can be taken somewhere pursuant to the investigation of that offence; in other words, that offence with which he has been charged. If he has been charged with cultivating a whole plantation, why do police need to take him there? Because it is very hard to find? Surely if he had been charged, the police would already have found the place? It sounds as though something else is going on. Once again, it sounds as though a back-door route is being used to achieve some other purpose.

The Minister's explanation does not hold water. Until he can provide a serious and substantial justification for such an increase in police powers, the legislation should be opposed, and the Opposition will oppose it.

The legislation lets down the public of Queensland badly. As I said earlier, New South Wales and Victoria were off and running some time ago. The Government promised the legislation three years ago. It has taken the Government three years to come up with the Drugs Misuse Bill Mark II. Although it is an improvement on Mark I, it is still a pretty sloppy job. It is typical of the Government's incompetent drafting.

That is unfortunate. The people of Queensland, the Opposition, the legal profession, the police and the whole community support tough and effective new drug laws, but they are stuck with this half-baked Bill with its defects simply because of the arrogant, non-listening attitude, "We have introduced this legislation. We are not going to back down one little bit. This is the best legislation in the world. It is the toughest legislation in the world." It is nothing of the sort. It is a fraud. Before too long the Government will be returning to this Chamber to amend the legislation.

Mr ALISON (Maryborough) (8.20 p.m.): I believe that this legislation will be a milestone in the fight against the insidious effects and devastation that both hard and soft drugs have on our community.

Last year, the then Minister for Police, Mr Bill Glasson, introduced the Drugs Misuse Bill and let it lie on the table for public discussions. There has been a lot of discussion and it has been a very good exercise.

I am pleased that this current Bill before the House, introduced by the Deputy Premier, Mr Bill Gunn, has sharpened the distinction between hard drugs and soft drugs in relation to offences and penalties.

There can be no doubt that a considerable number of our youth are smoking marijuana, and, I believe, in most cases under the mistaken belief that it does them no harm. I will say more on this aspect later.

A considerable amount of misinformation has been spread through the media—some of it mischievous, some of it political, and some of it just ill-informed.

I am very pleased that in his second-reading speech the Minister cleared up quite a few points in regard to this misinformation. For instance, he made reference to the fact that there are basically only four offences for which mandatory life sentences are prescribed. These offences are: trafficking in the hard drugs; supplying hard drugs to a child; producing more than two pure grams of heroin, or possessing more than two pure grams of heroin.

If the Government is fair dinkum about cutting back on illegal drug usage, I believe it must introduce penalties along these lines. The only life penalties in relation to soft drugs that I read in the Bill are in regard to trafficking, supplying drugs to a child, receiving or possessing property obtained from trafficking or supplying, producing over 500 grams of marijuana or possessing over 500 grams of marijuana. As I read it, the presiding judge has the discretion whether or not he inflicts the maximum penalty.

I am also pleased to note that we have not gone as far as New South Wales in regard to permitting the use of a place for the commission of a crime as defined in the Bill. The Deputy Premier has pointed out that under the New South Wales legislation, the owner of a house or building that is used for the consumption of drugs or some other illegal activity in regard to drugs can be found guilty of an offence if he merely suffers that to happen. I believe that is too tough, and I prefer our approach that there must be proof of permitting, which, as I understand it, means proof of some active permission rather than just suffering it to happen.

I would very much like to see our State Government carry out an intensive publicity campaign in conjunction with this legislation—a campaign aimed particularly at our youth and designed to get the message across that it is certainly dangerous and harmful to smoke marijuana. As I said before, I have no doubt that many of our youth are experimenting with marijuana in particular, under the mistaken notion that no harm

will come to them. In addition, of course, there is always the possibility of the users of the soft drugs gravitating to the hard drugs. However, I believe we should have this publicity campaign in a major effort to dispel any notion that the smoking of marijuana is not harmful.

In addition, I would like to see the Drug Squads given all the police they actually need to get stuck into the drug-trafficking in this State and to bring to account the traffickers, the producers, the financiers, and the Mr Bigs in the murky background, who are very difficult to bring to court without sufficient manpower, equipment and legal assistance given to our Drug Squads.

I now refer to the $100m Drug Offensive being funded jointly by the Federal and State Governments. Whilst I believe that the booklet put out is a useful document, I do not believe it is being read by the youth or even reaching the youth. I believe we should do our own thing in this State, as I mentioned before, with the emphasis on TV, the newspapers and the schools. When one realises just what the ALP policy is in relation to soft drugs and the absolute obsession that Mr Hawke has with keeping his image in the best possible light, one could be excused for thinking that the offensive is more a PR exercise for Mr Hawke than anything else. Just last week, Dr Blewett, the Federal Minister for Health, was in Maryborough and was supposed to be promoting the national campaign against drug abuse. However, really he was there to try to support the ALP candidate, Mr Peter Nightingale. Dr Blewett gave us another example of this nonsense of consensus; that is, do not make a decision unless one has got, or appears to have, most people on side with one.

Dr Blewett made much of a survey allegedly conducted by the Roy Morgan Research Centre on behalf of the national campaign against drug abuse and which allegedly came up with the public view that alcohol and heroin were rated as the most serious problems. The point that he was trying to get across in his statement in Maryborough was that this was the way that the Government should go simply because a survey indicated that this was the way that people thought it should go. Although I acknowledge that alcohol is certainly a problem, it is not the problem that marijuana is in this community. Even though most decent people do not see the effects of marijuana, they do see in the streets from time to time the effects of alcohol abuse.

The results of the survey quoted by Dr Blewett certainly are taken up by him and the Federal Government, because it fits in with the ALP policy of decriminalising the private use of marijuana.

Tonight, honourable members opposite are in somewhat of a dilemma and it will be very interesting to see how they vote on the Bill.

I quote from the ALP health statement of policy, as follows—

> "That the private use of marijuana will not be a criminal offence. The Health Act will be amended to provide that the sole penalty will be a pecuniary nature and will not include a prison sentence and no criminal conviction will be recorded."

I do not see how honourable members opposite can support this Bill with their policy being what it is.

Earlier this evening, honourable members heard the honourable member for Chatsworth (Mr Mackenroth) go to great pains to explain to the House in a very indignant manner that he personally tried to get it into ALP policy at the 1984 State conference that the growing of marijuana for private purposes would become legal or at least decriminalised. I think I understood him correctly, but I am not too sure what term he used.

Mr MACKENROTH: I rise to a point of order. I did not say that. The honourable member for Maryborough either was not listening or was not here. I said that as the health spokesman for the Labor Party at that stage, I had that particular point taken out of our policy. If the honourable member had listened, he might know what he is talking about. I ask the honourable member to withdraw that statement.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Booth): Order! If the honourable member wishes to make a personal explanation, he will have the opportunity to do so after the honourable member for Maryborough finishes speaking. At this stage, I do not think the honourable member for Chatsworth can ask for a withdrawal.

Mr MACKENROTH: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member said that in my speech I said something that I did not say. I can ask for that to be withdrawn. It is a personal reflection——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I did not hear the honourable member's speech.

Mr ALISON: I will accept the honourable member's explanation.

Mr MACKENROTH: I rise to a point of order. I ask the honourable member to withdraw it. Under the Standing Order of this House, he has to withdraw it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I did not hear the honourable member's speech, so I am at a bit of a loss here. I heard some of it but not all of it. Standing Order No. 120 says that personal imputations will not be allowed. In view of that, if the honourable member for Chatsworth claims that he did not say that, the honourable member for Maryborough should withdraw.

Mr ALISON: I will accept the honourable member's explanation and withdraw my comments, if that makes him happy and allows me to go on with my speech.

The honourable member's explanation does not affect the fact that the Labor Party is soft on drugs; it is as simple as that. I have read the Labor Party policy. It runs away from the issue and is very touchy about it.

I have been trying to get the Labor Party's candidate to tell the good people of Maryborough what the Labor Party policy is on drugs, but I cannot get him to do it. So I have to remind the people of Maryborough from time to time what the Labor Party policy is. The Labor Party realises that it is on a a loser, and from time to time outside this House it will be reminded of its policy.

Mr Mackenroth: Get a copy of my speech.

Mr ALISON: I will not worry about the honourable member's speech. I will worry about the Labor Party policy, because that is one of the best things that the Government has going for it.

I understand that a little earlier this year, the South Australian Labor Government introduced legislation to enable on-the-spot fines to be issued for South Australians caught possessing small amounts of marijuana. When introducing the legislation in the South Australian Parliament, the Labor Health Minister, Dr John Cornwall, admitted that marijuana was harmful but nonetheless he introduced legislation which in effect downgraded the penalties for the possession of marijuana.

That shows the hypocrisy of the Labor Party in Queensland. It is in here mouthing platitudes about wanting to attack the drug trade, yet it has this stupid, ridiculous soft policy on drugs.

It was only last month that the community enjoyed the spectacle of a royal commissioner, Mr Jim McClelland, an ex-Whitlam Government Minister, advocating that heroin should be sold legally—I emphasise "heroin should be sold legally"—to users aged 20 years and over. Royal commissioner Mr Jim McClelland is quoted in the newspapers as saying—

> "Heroin has become a dangerous obsession in this country and perhaps the time has arrived for a new, a rational, approach to what should be a medical rather than a law enforcement problem."

Royal commissioner Mr McClelland went on to state—

"Essentially we should accept the principle that recreational drugs"—

"recreational drugs", mind you—

"such as heroin should be treated in much the same way as pornography"—

that is really a lulu from royal commissioner McClelland—

"—tolerated but not condoned."

What a shocking statement from an ex-Minister of the Crown and currently a royal commissioner!

Mr Mackenroth: It does not matter what Government members talk about—they always have to fit Whitlam in.

Mr ALISON: I am sorry if I am upsetting the honourable member for Chatsworth, but to my way of thinking, those comments show a complete lack of balance and understanding of the drug problem in this country. Fancy putting the use of heroin on the same level as pornography! Royal commissioner McClelland is a disgrace for having suggested that.

I conclude by saying that I fully support the Bill. As I mentioned previously, I believe it will be a milestone in the Queensland community's fight-back.

Mr Vaughan: But will it get the big boys; that is the question?

Mr ALISON: This Government will get the big boys—don't worry about that!

This legislation will be a milestone in the fight against drugs in this community. I am quite sure that the whole community will benefit from its enactment.

As I said earlier, I would like to see this State carry out its own publicity campaign, aimed principally at youth and through the channels of television, radio and schools, not only to discuss the problem and stress the harm that is inflicted by hard drugs, but also to get across to the young people of Queensland that smoking, of marijuana in particular, is very harmful and they should get out of their heads the notion that, whether they smoke a Craven A or marijuana, it is not harmful. I reiterate that I would like this Government to consider that course of action.

Mr BRADDY (Rockhampton) (8.32 p.m.): Along with the previous speaker, I would like to consider this legislation in its context; but, unlike the previous speaker, I do not see any point in ranging as far as a discussion on royal commissioner Mr McClelland or former Prime Minister Mr Whitlam. I believe that the legislation presently before the House has to be examined in the context of Queensland, in the context of the legislative will of this Government, the actions of the Queensland Government, and indeed the actions of the Queensland Police Force for which the Executive of this Government is responsible.

Let me examine the recent record to see whether the Queensland Government and the Queensland Police Force will measure up to such an extent that it can be said, "We, the people of Queensland, will have confidence in the way this legislation will be administered, and will have confidence in the way that the police force will act in terms of the legislation, particularly relative to some of the aspects criticised by the Opposition and others in the community, because the powers given to police by the Bill are too wide."

I suggest that as recently as this week, because of an issue that arose concerning the so-called non-existent illegal casinos, the people of Queensland were given a prime example of the standard that can be expected.

Anybody who knows anything about drugs knows that drugs proliferate around gambling houses, particularly where illegal gambling takes place. All round the world, from the days when Al Capone operated in Chicago, drugs, gambling and prostitution have gone together. The Queensland Government has been telling people for years that

something that every taxi-driver in Brisbane could have told them does exist did not exist. The Government claimed that illegal casinos do not exist; that there is no such thing. Did not the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) tell that to everyone approximately six years ago, as my colleague the honourable member for Wynnum (Mr Shaw) recently reminded the House? The Minister said that there were no illegal casinos operating in Brisbane, and that anyone who said they existed was lying.

As I said, everybody knows that illegal casinos and drugs co-exist. What has occurred recently? The following report was published in *The Sunday Mail* on 17 August—

> "On Wednesday, the Jupiters chairman, Sir Roderick Proctor, said the first seven months of hotel casino operations had produced a disappointing $3.27 million profit."

In spite of that, the Queensland Government—apparently the only people in Brisbane who did not know that illegal casinos existed up till that time—suddenly discovered for the first time that illegal casinos did exist.

For the first time the Deputy Premier and Minister for Police, who is now absent from the House, issued the instruction, according to *The Sunday Mail*, "I told the police I wanted them knocked off." Up until the day before they did not exist. Those illegal casinos had never existed. His statement in *The Sunday Mail* continued—

> "The Commissioner, Sir Terence Lewis, rang me last night to say the police had acted and I'll be getting a full report from him first thing in the morning."

Mr Mackenroth: The Sturgess report that was tabled in this Parliament had the addresses of the casinos.

Mr BRADDY: Exactly. But nothing was done. As I said, illegal casinos conducting illegal gambling are known world-wide as the hotbed of drugs, as places to launder the proceeds from drugs. The honourable member for Maryborough (Mr Alison) has the temerity to speak about hypocrisy. What hypocrisy? During the last 18 months that I have travelled between the airport and Parliament House I have asked practically every taxi-driver, "What do you know about illegal casinos in Brisbane?" They all know. They have all offered to take me to an illegal casino. The honourable member for Maryborough and other Government members talk about hypocrisy. They would be the greatest hypocrites in the political life of this country. They have allowed illegal casinos, those hotbeds of gambling, vice and drugs, to proliferate. What has the Queensland Police Force done about that?

It is also known right around world that where illegal gambling casinos exist, and where drug-running persists, someone is accepting bribes; someone is receiving some money under the counter. Why else would they continue to exist? The members of the Opposition do not know who has received the money, but people in high places in this State have been paid to keep those illegal casinos running. Members of this Government—they are very quiet now—have the hide to talk about hypocrisy. What hypocrites they are. I would charge them with the greatest act of hypocrisy in this State.

Why were the casinos closed? Mr Gunn is again quoted in *The Sunday Mail* as saying—

> "I don't go looking for these places but I merely acted after a complaint from one of our fellows."

Apparently, as he says elsewhere, someone in the National Party finally telephoned him and said, "Hey, these places do really exist." Mr Gunn, who did not believe Mr Sturgess, who did not believe every taxi-driver in Brisbane, who did not believe the Opposition, and who never asked his police officers, finally believed someone because he was a member of the National Party, and National Party members are apparently always right. So once one member of the National party took his blinkers off and discovered the illegal casinos, people had to be told that they were closed. What rubbish. They were closed because Jupiters Casino was not making the profit that was expected. Now these

hotbeds of vice and illegal gambling that were used to launder drug money are to be closed. For the first time, they can be discovered, owned up to by Mr Gunn and closed. That is the context in which this Government can try to look Opposition members in the eye and say that it is serious about dealing with vice and drug-running in this State. I challenge it to deny that it has exhibited, over the last six years at least, the greatest act of political hypocrisy that has been seen in this country.

What is the other background to this legislation? There is more than one way of dealing with drugs. First of all, the community has to be educated, because if people do not want to take drugs, no amount of illegal drug-running and availability of drugs will prevail. I suggest to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that you are not interested in drugs; you do not take drugs because they are available—you do not take drugs because you do not want them. What is this Government doing about drug education?

Is the Government, in an excess of hypocritical zeal, merely saying, "We will throw people in gaol and pretend to throw the key away," although it is not really throwing the key away, or is it really trying to do something more?

Mr Alison interjected.

Mr BRADDY: I suggest to the member for Maryborough, who cannot even find his way to an illegal casino on his way to Maryborough, that he would be better off keeping quiet, just as I kept quiet when he made his speech. At the Committee stage I challenge him to deny that he was not aware of those illegal casinos until they were discovered by the Deputy Premier (Mr Gunn) last Saturday. I challenge him to tell the Committee whether or not he was aware of them and whether he went to the Minister and asked that the police who were not carrying out their duties be investigated.

What is the Government doing about drugs? I have spoken to several school headmasters about the Government program of education and discovered that it is pure hypocrisy. What the Government is doing in this regard is sending some people along to the schools to talk to teachers to try to entice them to include drug training and education in the school program. There is nothing wrong with that; that is perfectly OK. What is wrong, however, is that it does not go far enough. A real course of education on drug and alcohol awareness should be conducted. Even though Government members will not face up to it, the people who know—that is the headmasters of this State—tell me that the greatest problem in our schools still is not drug abuse in the sense of marijuana, cannabis or whatever it is, but the old fashioned drug abuse of alcohol, which has been with us for a long time. It is still by far the greatest drug of abuse for the schoolchildren of Queensland, yet the Government merely pays lip service to education by sending selected teachers round the State to talk to other teachers.

What is needed is a program in which children enter relationship courses and are taught, with a great deal of care, subtlety and consideration, what drugs really are—that is all drugs, including alcohol. They have to be taught the ability to stand up for themselves. They have to be encouraged in their self-esteem and their self-confidence so that they can resist drugs. Really that is what has to be done. If the Government was to do that at the same time as it brought in realistic legislation, it would be then carrying out the role of a Government.

What we in the Opposition say is that the Government would get one mark out of ten for its educational process on drug and alcohol abuse. It would be lucky to get that, but the Opposition is generous. For its use of the police force, how many marks would the Government get? As the Opposition spokesman pointed out to the House, in fact in recent years the Drug Squad has not increased in size at all. It is the same size as it has been for several years. Does that demonstrate a real willingness by the Government to face up to the problem of tracking down those who are trafficking in drugs, or is this legislation merely another facade? The Government is good at building facades. Because it does not want to know what is going on, it is good at wearing self-imposed blinkers. A person does not have to climb Mount Everest to know that it is the highest mountain in the world; he does not have to go to the illegal casinos to know that they exist and

he does not have to go there to know that, if they do exist, the laundering of drug money will continue. What we get from the Government is complete hypocrisy. What the Government did, only a week ago, just before an election, was to introduce an amended Bill and say, "This is it. We are really serious about doing something about drugs. We had our eyes closed all this time but now we have suddenly been converted." The Government has fallen off the horse on the road to Damascus, has it?

I suggest that the community will not accept that. The community knows that the Government does not invest properly in education for drug and alcohol awareness. The community knows that it does not invest properly in giving the police force sufficient numbers to investigate and prosecute drug-dealers. The community knows that the Government has never investigated the police force and insisted that police officers carry out their duties properly and close down places where drugs can be illegally obtained and money from drugs can be illegally laundered.

When the Government does take action, the community knows that it does so in a context of complete hypocrisy and insincerity. Only when Jupiters Casino has the temerity to actually not be as profitable as it should be will this Government act. What a bunch of hypocrites Government members really are! Members of the Government go before the people—knights in shining armour, they would have them believe—and say, "We will fix up the drug-running in Queensland." What nonsense! As the Opposition spokesman (Mr Mackenroth) and the member for Salisbury (Mr Goss) have pointed out, it is even more of a facade because the sentence of so-called life imprisonment, which cannot be mitigated, is again a piece of nonsense.

Mr De Lacy: A stunt.

Mr BRADDY: It is a complete stunt.

The Government would have the community believe that a person who receives that sentence will go to prison and never leave it. It is a nonsense. As I said, it is a stunt. This Government is good at performing stunts. The Government has a lot of trained seals who speak in this House and pretend that what they are saying is for the good of the community. In fact, frequently, I think that they believe it themselves. I would like to be able to convince myself of the truth of things that I want to believe in as often as members of the Government can. However, unfortunately, it seems that there is a monopoly of that particular talent on the Government side.

What does the Opposition say? The Opposition says that the whole background to the Bill is a nonsense. The Government has never demonstrated a real willingness to do anything about drugs. In reality—in the real world—the Government has never made the police get out and do their job properly. The Government has never encouraged the police force to do its job properly.

Mr Littleproud: Do you mean that Queensland police are not as good as the police in any other States in Australia?

Mr BRADDY: I say that the Queensland Police Force has a lot to answer for when it has allowed illegal casinos to continue to operate in Brisbane and on the Gold Coast for the last six years, particularly when it is known that drug money is laundered through illegal casinos. Members of the Queensland Police Force have a lot to answer for, and if they cannot answer for themselves the Minister should answer for them.

I suggest that the honourable member for Condamine should get his colleagues in other States to ask questions if those States are experiencing similar problems. The Opposition will ask the Queensland Government to be accountable to the people of this State. Government back-benchers should not whinge about Canberra, New South Wales or Victoria, as they frequently do. The Opposition is interested in the State of Queensland, and it is calling to account the Queensland Government in relation to the State of Queensland.

I turn to the legislation itself. The anomalies and deficiencies of the legislation have been well canvassed by the Opposition spokesman and the member for Salisbury.

However, I want to mention a couple of matters that have not previously been raised. In the context of the remarks that I have already made, one particularly disquieting provision relates to the inability of people to recover costs from the police force in any circumstances—no matter what happens—in relation to a prosecution. That is a classic piece of legislation that is inserted by police forces, particularly the Queensland Police Force, whenever they get a chance to draft a Bill themselves. It is a self-protection clause.

The position in law is that, generally, no costs are awarded against the police unless the prosecution is clearly and blatantly wrong in the first instance or the police are caught perjuring themselves. The court is given the opportunity to penalise the police officer concerned for his perjury or because the case should never have been brought in the first instance.

One of the Bill's provisions states that under no circumstances whatever can costs be awarded against the police. The Opposition criticises that clause for the reasons I have already given. Unfortunately the Opposition cannot have the complete confidence in the police force that it would like to have. The Mannix case has been referred to by the honourable member for Salisbury (Mr Goss), and I refer to the illegal casinos that have proliferated in this State in circumstances which suggest only that people in high places, either in the police force or elsewhere in the community, were receiving some financial incentive in order for the illegal casinos to continue. For what other reason would they continue?

Mr Prest: It might have been one of the ex-members of the Valley marauders.

Mr BRADDY: It is very interesting indeed, as the honourable member for Port Curtis has said, and one could speculate endlessly about who the people were who received the incentives to allow those gambling casinos, these places where drug money is laundered, to continue operating. Government members are very quiet regarding that point.

Mr Shaw: Why did they give them a month to close up?

Mr BRADDY: As the honourable member for Wynnum (Mr Shaw) has said, they have been given a month to close. What a joke! A month to close an illegal casino, and it is only being closed then because the Government casino is not making enough money. The Government talks about hypocrisy.

Mr Prest: One of the members who received this money must want some more for his election campaign.

Mr BRADDY: Many kinds of things can occur in a month. It appears to be a very civilised act. The Queensland Government should not be in the act of being civilised towards people who provide facilities for illegal drug moneys to be laundered. If Government members had read any of the reports relating to drug abuse in Australia, they would know that gambling casinos are the classic places where drug money is laundered. They are not just being good old boys by allowing these illegal casinos to continue operating. It is not just a case of a little bit of the Australian live and let live, but the provision of a facility for the laundering of illegal drug money in Queensland. If Government members can live with that on their consciences, good luck to them.

The Opposition is not going to be lectured by the likes of Government members about what morality is in relation to drugs and public administration. They stand condemned as either fools or deliberate hypocrites because of the way that the Queensland Government has allowed those illegal casinos to proliferate. The Opposition will not stand for that hypocrisy and rejects totally the Government's remarks. The Opposition knows the contempt in which this Government is held by the people of Queensland for its deliberate blinkering of itself and its deliberate lies to the community regarding these matters.

This Bill contains the facade or pretence of being tough. The pretence has been seen through and other matters have been raised that have been shown to be nowhere

near good enough in a really civilised community, such as the failure to enable costs to be awarded against a police officer in circumstances where that police officer has behaved maliciously or badly. That is a very bad provision in the Bill. Similarly the detention without arrest provision has been criticised severely by the Queensland Law Society and previous speakers. I join in that criticism and the other criticisms voiced by the shadow Minister and the honourable member for Salisbury (Mr Goss). I endorse each of those criticisms and agree whole-heartedly with them. I will return to specific criticisms during the debate on the clauses.

I challenge Government members to stop talking about what they are doing and to deliver, to ensure that the Queensland Police Force carries out its proper role in relation to drug enforcement laws and that it has enough personnel to enable it to carry out that role.

When the Government sees instances of the Queensland Police Force deliberately closing its eyes to abuses of the law in the community, I hope that it will have the gumption to say, "Enough is enough", and demand that the police get out and do their job.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (8.55 p.m.): The law-making process is a difficult one. There must be a balance between what one has learnt from the past, what one thinks is right and what one thinks the people in the community want. From time to time, major changes will take place in those balances. It is a shame that this legislation has come before the House on Federal Budget night and at the end of a three-year period of government. It is the sort of thing which is probably better dealt with, as it was advocated, at the beginning of a three-year period of government.

I understand that the Government made a commitment to take action on drugs. Action on drugs was a commitment by the Liberal Party. To be fair, it must be said that before the last election the Labor Party made statements of a commitment to do something about the drug problem. The timing of this legislation is unfortunate. The end of the three-year period has arrived. Earlier this year, one attempt was made to introduce legislation. That legislation was subjected to detailed and significant criticism. As the honourable member for Salisbury (Mr Goss) conceded, a great deal of that criticism has been taken on board, but not as to fundamentals. Rather than deal with the details of this legislation tonight, I propose to address a few remarks to the principles.

Matters of drafting cause disquiet amongst some members of the Liberal Party, as do the extension of police powers, the consequences of the reversal of the onus of proof, detention and seizure of property. One could make a variety of criticisms of detail. The nub of the problem comes back to the issue of the extension of mandatory life sentences.

For the offence of murder and, as I recall, treason, both those penalties presently fall. Those members of the Labor Party who have made the criticism that an element of hypocrisy has existed in the selling of this legislation are right. The legislation has been sold to the community. The community understands that the legislation means that the key will be thrown away and that the prisoner will be incarcerated for the whole of his natural life. That is a consequence that some members of the Government want people to believe. They want people to believe that the legislation is the toughest and the strongest legislation possible and that it means absolutely no remission—a life sentence.

Of course, the Government is guided by advisers. They would have told the Government that the provisions in this legislation do nothing to remove the provisions of the Offenders Probation and Parole Act and that, therefore, people will be able to make an application to the Parole Board.

I wonder whether many members of the community who support the taking of the toughest possible action against people who deal in the hard-drug trade understand that it will usually mean the serving of a sentence of 12 years' imprisonment. After that period a person who keeps his nose clean can make an application for parole. The Mr

Bigs of this world have a habit of keeping their noses clean as much as the Mr Littles. I would think that Meyer Lanski and the mob were less offenders against the gaol system of the United States of America than were the psychopathic intermediaries or hoodlums and minor underlings through whom they operated. The big boys and in some way the more sinister people are likely to have the cleanest record in gaol. It is wrong to suggest that this is life imprisonment absolute. However, the proposition still remains. The discretion has been removed from the judiciary and given to the Parole Board. The people of Queensland should understand that.

I return now to the original principle of an understanding, or misunderstanding, deliberately or unconsciously sown in the minds of the public. However, what about the basic principle of life sentences for specified drug transactions? Some honourable members of the Liberal Party would take a traditional view, the view of the law, that each penalty is measured according to the degree of the offence. A consequence of that view would be that small amounts of drugs would attract penalties smaller than those meted out for large amounts of drugs. Life imprisonment should be left for the Mr Bigs.

The Governments in New South Wales and Victoria have already acted with legislation based on the recommendations made by various royal commissions. What has been the result of the introduction of that legislation in those States? According to media reports, which both the honourable member for Rockhampton (Mr Braddy) and I accept, one can go down the back streets of Kings Cross on any morning or night and see or photograph heroin needles and paraphernalia that go with the hard-drug trade. It appears that the new drug legislation has not had a substantial impact on this dreadful trade in New South Wales and Victoria.

I am sure that all honourable members would support the view that those who cynically and deliberately set out to make money by pushing hard drugs, in particular, are the most contemptible of people. What they do is equivalent to, if not worse than, murder. I refer to murder which occurs out of the intensity of a domestic environment or an association of intimacy and all the emotions that it brings. Those people who deliberately enter the hard-drug trade and who set up their crack factories are doing something infinitely worse than murder. They are starting a process of murder on an extensive scale.

Since the first flight of this legislation, and certainly during the last six months, the incident occurred in Malaysia involving Chambers and Barlow. I reject hanging as a barbaric act. I do not support the introduction of capital punishment. My major argument against capital punishment is that it is irreversible. In the past, juries and courts have made mistakes, sometimes because of the actions of the accused themselves. People will confess to things that they have not done. Both Chambers and Barlow knew what the penalty for trafficking in hard drugs was. The penalty was widely advertised in Malaysia. They knew what the local laws were. They were convicted by courts applying British principles of justice, principles which Australia has inherited. Chambers and Barlow were convicted and executed, as they knew they would be if they were caught with that amount of hard drugs. One has every reason to suspect that that has been salutary to the whole filthy drug trade. I believe that fewer people travelling on aircraft between Australia and Malaysia or Thailand are carrying heroin.

It is difficult to argue logically with those people who say, "If your system of fine balances and traditional balances has not worked and is demonstrably not working, there is perhaps some virtue in throwing the book at people who are found with even a small amount of drugs. If you scare the minnows—the small people—because they face life imprisonment, subject to whatever remissions they might receive, you might stop the trade." Unfortunately, the reality is that the police are more likely to find the minnows. The Mr Bigs are clearly the most difficult to come to grips with. That has been the history with police forces everywhere in the world.

I will leave aside the timing of this legislation. There is some force in the suggestion that a level of politics is involved. Politics is involved in breath-testing. The politics figures out that there are more votes amongst drinkers and publicans than amongst the

relatives of the slain on the roads from drink-drivers. It is an exercise of balancing, in which the balances come down in favour of the drinkers and publicans for a long period. The balance in this case—the timing of the legislation, being at the end of a three-year term of office—might be viewed cynically as the Government's wanting to appear to be tough on drugs. Honourable members should look behind the timing of the legislation to see if any argument can be made for it. The argument, I suggest, is that the hard-drug trade in particular is an equivalent of murder; it is a trade which starts a process that ends with the destruction of life; that mandatory sentences exist for murder and for at least one or two other offences; that even the reforms that have been implemented as the result of royal commissions in New South Wales and Victoria have quite clearly failed to achieve a result. There is some force in the suggestion that, in terrorem, the exemplary nature of the very harsh penalty that was exacted on Barlow and Chambers did have a salutary effect on others, which is one of the purposes of punishment. Therefore, it is worth a try to throw the book at people for the most serious aspects of the trade in drugs.

The Liberal Party has debated the subject and has a traditionalist approach with which I, obviously as a lawyer, have some sympathy because of my training; but I understand the other view. The balance in the parliamentary Liberal Party has come down to the view that it is a filthy trade; that the other means have not worked and it is worth a try to throw the book at offenders in an attempt to strike terror into the minds and the hearts of the little people because, if they are knocked out of the system, the Mr Bigs are exposed or cannot operate. The Liberal Party believes that the more serious aspects of drug-running should be visited by extremely harsh penalties. The widely publicised advent of the development of synthetic drugs such as crack, which apparently occurs extensively in the United States, where synthetic, deadly, horribly addictive drugs can be manufactured at low cost and can be sold at prices far lower than those traditionally received for cocaine and heroin, is spreading like a disease. There is an enormous outcry and an enormous sense of futility by law-enforcement people and by legislators in the United States about the spread of synthetic drugs in that country.

The honourable member for Rockhampton (Mr Braddy) is right in saying that the sorts of places in which those trades prosper are the degraded slums of New York. It is always a shock for a person in Australia to realise that places exist in the United States that are far worse than anything that can be seen in Australia. The trading takes place in the slums of Europe and Australia. I would include the back streets of Kings Cross among the sleaziest parts of Australia, inhabited by society's misfits, outcasts, prostitutes, broken-down people, pimps and criminals. The circumstances necessary for that synthetic trade to take off exist in Australia. Indeed, recently people were discovered on a farm south of Warwick making synthetic LSD.

Mr Vaughan: Warwick must be a bad place.

Mr INNES: I am sure that, if you, Mr Deputy Speaker, had anything to do with enforcement, that manufacture would not take place. I do not think anyone in this House would, for one moment, question his stance on, or attitude toward, this issue. I would not question any honourable member's stance on, or attitude toward, the use of drugs.

An Honourable Member: But there is a fair bit of insinuation cast in the direction of the Opposition.

Mr INNES: Yes, and a fair bit has been cast back in the other direction. I can recall a Queensland royal commission devoted to the mutual allegations of the madmen in the Australian Labor Party and the madmen in the National Party that cost the people of Queensland hundreds of thousands of dollars.

An Honourable Member: With the pure Liberals standing alone in the middle.

Mr INNES: But not making the allegations. There was a Liberal who was the subject of allegations that proved to be completely baseless and who became involved in the sordid garbage-raking which the Labor Party and National Party carry on from time to time.

The reality is that a very important issue is being brought into focus tonight. The issue concerns whether implementing something as serious as a mandatory life sentence can be justified in addressing the more serious aspects of the drug trade. At the margins lie the problems of definition and the question of whether, for example, 2 grams is too little; whether, for example, when 2 grams of pure heroin is involved the issue is different from when 2 grams of diluted heroin is involved. A number of factors have to be considered.

Because so much room for argument exists, the Liberal Party has begun from a different viewpoint and has arrived at a consensus view. It has decided that something needs to be done about drugs and that the course of action adopted might be a complete departure from tradition. The consensus view is: let us try throwing the book at people who are down the line as well as at people who are up the line, because they seem to be the only people that legislation can affect.

It might well be that the lessons of history still apply and that adjustments will be necessary in the future. I am sure that all honourable members would recall the full flight of public opinion and outrage against drink-driving, short of the introduction of random breath-testing, that resulted in the introduction of drivers' licences being cancelled. Because some voters were upset by that move, the Government introduced amendments to provide for day-time driving licences. Perhaps honourable members will be involved in a similar exercise of adjustment and amendment for this course of action because it does not work.

If the Government can stop one youngster being fed heroin, LSD, cocaine or something else that sets him on the inevitable path toward death before the age of 30, almost anything is worth trying, particularly when one takes into account the trauma and devastation experienced by those associated with young addicts. In addition, the Opposition has agreed that the servicing of drug habits has resulted in a huge increase in crime. An enormous rash of suburban crime has been related to seeking money for drugs.

Five hundred grams of marijuana might be a small amount, but it is certainly large enough to suggest that the person who possesses it will smoke quite a deal or will be able to pass it on to a number of other people. The Liberal Party will support the legislation as a trial; as something radically different; as something that is out of keeping with the traditional approach to the law; but as something that attempts to stem the horrendous trading in drugs by terrifying people in this State sufficiently to deter them from embarking upon drug addiction or pushing other people into a life of drug addiction.

The Liberal Party does not relish total removal of judicial responsibility; nor does it relish the deception that the Government is involved in of suggesting to the public that all discretion relating to drugs has been removed. The Parole Board has been criticised in this House as often as has the judiciary. I can recall the outrage about people being let out on parole and committing other crimes straight afterwards. The question has been asked: Is the Parole Board going soft? The Government should be honest with the public and tell them that the Parole Board is still there.

The Liberal Party believes that the bench should retain its discretion to order non-parole periods. What is done when a Mr Big is apprehended? What is done when somebody is apprehended with 50 kg of heroin or 50 kg of cocaine? The system should be structured so that it visits a person such as that with a greater penalty than that imposed on somebody else who is found with 3 or 4 or 2.5 grams. The only way that can be achieved is by giving the bench of the Supreme Court the power to make non-parole orders and forbidding the Parole Board or the Government to allow parole to take place within that time.

For the serious cases a non-parole period should be included, because it is known that, notwithstanding the illusion that has been shown by some Government Ministers who perhaps do not understand the legislation that is being passed, the average for people who keep their noses clean, despite a possible life sentence, will be between about 10 and 12 years in gaol. Clearly, there are cases in which that period should be 25 years, 30 years or the entirety of their natural life.

When it comes to corporate penalties, it is a little unusual to find that they are, by comparison, so light. If somebody has made a million dollars out of a hard-drug trade or made a million dollars as part of a complex of illegal activities but perhaps not out of the hard-drug trade, why not rip into him with a massive fine? I believe that most people who have a million dollars would pay a million dollars to stay out of gaol for life.

The Liberal Party believes that the penalties with regard to the financial aspects are quite paltry by comparison with the sort of sentences that are suggested for the hard-drug offenders. Perhaps money and corporations have not got that nice whiplashing image that might be the intention of some aspects of this legislation. Nevertheless, as a matter of justice, some parity should exist between the financial penalties, or fines, that are paid, particularly in the case of corporations, and the sorts of penalties that could be visited upon individuals. The Liberal Party will support this fairly radical and very different attempt to do something about the hard-drug trade. The attempt will amount to nothing if sufficient resources are not made available in the police force.

A matter of significant criticism of the present Government is that it does not provide sufficient police to reasonably police this State. In my area, instances have been found of juveniles dealing with marijuana, of complaints being made about the use of marijuana, and of the Juvenile Aid Bureau and other police being so overloaded that they just do not bother about small amounts of marijuana. If small amounts of marijuana are not bothered about, and if somebody who gets a few small amounts and puts them together suddenly finds himself facing life imprisonment, then we really have got——

Mr Scott: They leave the silvertails alone and go for the workers.

Mr INNES: What is that?

Mr Scott: Mr Shaw made the comment that it is different in his area. We wonder why.

Mr INNES: The reaction I got was that there was so much of its use going on in so many places in Brisbane that it was just impossible to deal with very small amounts—experimental amounts.

Mr Scott: It is a very interesting point because it means the Government is tolerating them as well.

Mr INNES: On half a dozen occasions in the life of this Parliament I have raised this issue. Nothing effective is being done about the extent of marijuana use among school-age children in this State.

The member for Maryborough (Mr Alison) called for action. On a number of occasions before today I have called for action. Now, at the end of a three-year period, he calls for action.

We in the Liberal Party do not want just this legislative graffiti to chalk up a few marks on the wall and to be used in election pamphlets. Let us assume and let us hope that the legislation is an act of sincerity. However, unless it is backed up by sufficient police to get on to the ground to start catching people, it means nothing. The fear of being caught is an equal to the fear of a penalty which can be imposed. Let us hope that this State is not writing these enormous penalties because it is not prepared to commit the resources to police drug misuse and to catch the people concerned.

Mr Scott: Do you feel that the provisions of this Bill will make it more likely that the police will crack down on the small users who you said are proliferating? I do not think it will.

Mr INNES: No, I do not. The police have so few resources that they simply have to target the adult and the bigger trade. They literally cannot deal with all the minor cases of juvenile and experimental use of marijuana. The darned stuff is growing on creek banks in Brisbane; that is the extent of the spread of the stuff in this State. It is growing all over the State.

More resources, particularly of the educational type, are absolutely essential to target the young and to bring home to them the severity of the potential penalties involved. The Federal Government's initiative was a very poor one. A large booklet was delivered to every house in Australia. I will guarantee that it was not read by between 95 and 97 per cent of those households. It was too big! Apart from the tragedy of the Prime Minister's own experience, that was about the only thing that was done. Combating the drug problem requires an intense educational program by trained officers, and by far more juvenile aid officers than are available in the whole of Queensland, to bring home to a generation the incredible severity of the penalties that are now available, the fact that society has said that this is a horrible trade, the fact that it is visited by absolutely horrific penalties, and the warning that they must never think of embarking upon it. Let us not bring up a generation in which drug-taking is apparently tolerated because nothing is done about it.

It is not without a great deal of soul-searching that we in the Liberal Party arrive at our conclusion. Although we realise and respect the more traditional and logical approach that has been proven over time, that is, that always the penalty should match the crime, in this case the Liberal Party goes with those who are urging the sledge-hammer approach—the terror of the severity of penalties—as a way of stamping out a trade that has not been stamped out in other ways.

Mr SHAW (Wynnum) (9.23 p.m.): As was done by the member for Sherwood (Mr Innes) in this debate and as has been done many times in the public arena, earlier speakers mentioned the Mr Bigs. People say, "We want these penalties so that we can deal with the Mr Bigs." I am concerned that the Mr Bigs never seem to appear before the courts. As much as the community tries, and as much as people agree that it is the Mr Bigs whom they want to catch, it always seems to be the poorly educated person, the one who seems to think that there is a quick dollar to be made, who is caught. Quite often it is the young fools who get caught and all too often it is the Mr Bigs who get away. I hope that in the future a few more Mr Bigs will come before the courts. That has not been the case in the past.

I will resist the temptation to cover aspects that have already been covered in the debate, although there is much I would like to say. I wish to take up a specific point of the member for Chatsworth (Mr Mackenroth), who said that he hoped that the practice of searches without warrant would cease. I wish to cite a few examples to show why I support that view. In addition, I will take up a point raised by the honourable member for Sherwood (Mr Innes), that is, that the police have to use a certain amount of discretion in the way in which they launch prosecutions. That is so.

When dealing with legislation such as this, perhaps it is fair to say that the argument could be accepted that there is a need for severe penalties and a need for extreme powers to be granted to police to deal with extreme situations and that the Government should be able to rely on their discretion not to use those powers unwisely.

Unfortunately, the examples that I will now give to the House indicate that that is not so. I do not cite these examples with any pleasure. I would like to be able to say that the police are using these powers wisely. Possibly, in the main, they do. However, so many cases arise—many in my own electorate—that I am forced to reach the conclusion that very often the police do use these powers unwisely.

Some of the examples that I will give are certainly not a credit to the police force. One of them would be a credit to the Keystone Cops. My first example concerns a person who lived in a house at Manly. He and his family had lived in the house for three months prior to the incident to which I refer. At 3.30 p.m. on a Saturday afternoon, the gentleman concerned was at home with his wife and family when two police cars drove into the yard. Two police officers came up the back steps and two police officers came up the front steps and burst into his home. Originally, the police said that they had come in response to a noise complaint, which caused quite a deal of confusion in the minds of these people because they had never seen such a reaction to a complaint about noise.

The police officers moved through the house but, on being questioned about having a warrant, said that they did not have one and left. On the Saturday evening, the matter was reported to me.

An Honourable Member: It's very strange that they left.

Mr SHAW: It is very strange. It is even more strange that at 9.20 a.m. next day, the police came back with a warrant to search the property. The people living in the house understood the police to say that it was a search for a stolen CB radio. The police then said that they were also searching for drugs.

The house was searched thoroughly, as were personal possessions including the wife's drawers. That is probably an unintentional pun, because her underwear drawers were searched also. The gentleman's wallet was searched. All I can say is that the police must have been looking for either a very, very small CB radio or a very, very small quantity of drugs. As I say, the gentleman's wallet was searched very thoroughly.

The police said—and this is very important because it recurs in examples that I will cite—"We'll be back," and away they went. Nothing was found, and the police left.

The matter was investigated thoroughly and it was found that previous occupants of the house—honourable members will recall that I said that the people concerned had been in the house for only three months—did have a conviction for a drug offence. It is quite obvious that the police called back to the same property and searched the house because people who had lived there previously had committed a drug offence.

The tenants of whom I am speaking shifted to another house and have had no problems since then. I am not aware of whether there has been a recurrence of that episode but involving the people who now live on that particular property. The first lesson to be learnt is: do not live in a house whose past occupants have a criminal record.

My second example is a fairly mild one but it involves bad public relations for the police force. It involves a man, his wife and three young children who, at 8.15 p.m. on a Saturday evening, were returning to their home via Old Cleveland Road. The family were pulled up by the police on the side of the road. Their car was searched thoroughly. The boot was empted. The glove-box and other places where things could be secreted in the car were emptied out. The gentleman of the family was subjected to a body search.

The police claimed that an ash-tray in the car smelled of pot. The family concerned do not smoke or drink at all. They are the least likely people to be using pot, and are particularly concerned about the whole incident. In particular, the children were most upset and frightened by the experience.

If the Minister wishes to see them, I have the details on all of these cases. A more important case that came to my attention concerns a woman at Hemmant who telephoned her husband and me. I telephoned the woman back. She was in an extremely distraught condition and in tears. She had been preparing the evening meal for her family when police suddenly broke into her home. They searched the whole house, including the bedroom, and went through private papers that she had in the home. On investigation it was found that her husband had gone to the local police station that afternoon and

changed the address on his driver's licence. It transpired that 10 years previously he had been stopped and questioned, although not charged, by police from this same police station. There were no grounds for suspicion whatsoever, but, because he had been previously questioned by police, his home was searched and his family was subjected to the indignity of the search. I was assured that it would not happen again to this family and, to my knowledge, it has not happened again.

A police policy is obviously emerging whereby spot checks are made back on a person who is questioned by the police or convicted of an offence. It would be fair enough if the check was discreet and the search was made as a result of evidence or an indication that a person was transgressing again. In all of the cases to which I have referred so far there has been no indication of such a transgression. Frequently, when the police go through people's property, they make the statement, "We'll be back." Perhaps this is one way to ensure that people behave themselves and do not transgress. It is a threat that is viewed most seriously, and I will outline some of the dangers resulting from it.

At this stage it is worth asking whether the aim of this legislation is to get convictions or to ensure that young people do not take up drugs, or, if they do, that they see the error of their ways and do not stay with drugs. Members would all agree that is what the aim should be.

The next case came to my notice only last week, and I have not yet had an opportunity to discuss this matter with the Commissioner of Police. At 6.45 a.m. on Saturday, 11 August, a young man, who has a previous conviction, awoke to find four or five police officers in his house. This was the first indication he had that they were present. They broke into the home and flashed a piece of paper in front of his eyes as he forced himself awake. He was not certain whether it was a warrant to search the house or the *Sunday Sun* comics. The police demanded that he produce the drugs that he had in his possession. He stated emphatically that he had none, that he had a conviction and that he did not want another one. He said he was being very, very careful.

I have spoken to some acquaintances of this young man, to his employer and to him, and I believe him. When he denied having any drugs the police forced him to lie on the floor. He was kicked. He spoke to me over the telephone and I asked him to come and see me. I suggested that he go to a doctor, but he would not do so. When he came to see me, at first he did not want to show me any bruises. I insisted that if he wanted me to take up the case on his behalf, he had to provide me with some kind of verification that what he was saying was true. He then stripped to the waist, and I can verify that he was extensively bruised. I asked him whether he played football or was involved in any other type of violent activity. He assured me that the most violent game he plays is pool. In my opinion, it is the playing of pool that brings him to the attention of the police. However, that is by the way.

The police searched his home. The person was asked to open a locked wardrobe. He said, "Just a minute. I will get you a key." They said, "Don't bother.", and smashed open the wardrobe. The wardrobe is still damaged. The police officers left again, saying, "We'll be back to see you again." Most importantly, they said, "Next time, we'll bring our own." It is that threat that brought the person to see me. I wanted to raise that threat here because it is a matter on which I would like to speak to the commissioner. I want to find out the real reason why they went to those premises. Such a threat should not be taken lightly.

The person to whom I refer now has a very good job. He has good prospects and is fearful of losing them. As I said, he is no angel. He has a previous conviction. In the past, he has certainly moved on the fringes of the drug scene and was possibly involved with it. However, at this stage he is terrified about what could happen to him. Because he has made a fresh start, he does not want to lose it. On the occasion to which I referred, the man was too frightened to return to his own home and to stay there overnight. He spent the night at his employer's home. I have spoken to his employer,

who has verified that. The person is now looking for another place in which to live. He has changed his circle of friends and has done everything possible to avoid police attention. That sort of attitude should be encouraged. As I said earlier, in the absence of any evidence that he is again returning to the problems that led him into trouble in the past, he should be receiving assistance instead of threats and harassment. It is frightening to think what could happen under the legislation when one sees what happens under the present powers held by the police.

I will not list all the examples that I could cite. However, this matter causes me a great deal of concern. If it were an isolated case, I would say that somebody was having a bit of a whinge because he was not happy with the police and he was just getting it off his chest. However, it has happened so often that it must cause concern.

The last example to which I shall refer falls into the Keystone Cops category, although I assure honourable members that the circumstances were not funny for the people involved. I expressed concern at the time that the Government announced its intention to take part in Operation Noah—the dob-in-a-neighbour campaign. People were invited to ring up anonymously to dob in somebody so that the police could act on that information. At that time I expressed the hope that the police would act with some discretion. I drew the attention of honourable members to the fact that inevitably a number of people would have dobbed in the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. Undoubtedly, the police would have said, "That is a lot of nonsense," and not have investigated the matter.

Mr Mackenroth: If he dobbed in the Premier's son, he would have been right.

Mr SHAW: Maybe. Somewhere between the Premier and the person next door there must be a cut-off point at which the police decide to investigate a matter. I suggest seriously to honourable members that the point must be ridiculous.

I refer to the result of an anonymous tip. It is an example of how little care is taken in checking out such anonymous tip-offs. The police received anonymous information that a drug party was under way in a house at Manly. A party was indeed in progress at the time. Two police cars arrived. One stopped outside and the other was parked in the driveway. Six police officers rushed into the home. Two police officers went up to the front steps; two went round the back. The police officers surrounded the assembled throng. One thinks that the police would have become a little suspicious when, having demanded to see a woman, whose full name they gave, she came to the door in a bridal gown. Anyone with any sense at all would have thought that perhaps somebody was having a lend of him, but not those police; no fear. They demanded that the woman answer their questions. They stood there and cross-questioned her in her bridal gown. They cross-questioned all the guests who were assembled and waiting for the ceremony to begin. The names of all the assembled guests were taken by the police. All that activity occurred while the celebrant was standing waiting to proceed with the wedding ceremony. One would have thought that before that stage was reached the police would have apologised, said, "Look, we are sorry. We had an anonymous tip-off. Obviously somebody thinks it is a joke," and left quietly.

Mr Scott: They would not make an admission.

Mr SHAW: I am not sure. The fact is that once they were there, the police blundered on regardless.

I am unaware of any action that has been taken to attempt to ascertain who gave the anonymous tip-off. I realise that at times it may be very difficult to locate the source of such tip-offs. However, in this particular case it was the woman's second marriage. The police were aware that the tip-off had come via a trunk-call from the town in which that woman's first husband was living. Surely that information would have been at least worth investigating.

Mr Vaughan: Insufficient evidence.

Mr SHAW: There probably was insufficient evidence. However, if the police had made some inquiries they might have frightened off somebody thinking of doing the same sort of thing.

Mr Mackenroth: He wasn't a police officer, was he?

Mr SHAW: Perhaps he was.

How much public money is being wasted following up anonymous tip-offs? If somebody maliciously rings up and causes a search for somebody supposedly missing on the bay, for example, that person is asked to pay the bill for the public funds that he has wasted. However, to my knowledge no check is conducted of people who make vexatious tip-offs to police about drugs.

I have the details of the case to which I referred. They are available if the Minister wishes to investigate it and take further action. If he does so, I would be interested to hear the results of his investigations.

I believe it is time for the Government to become fair dinkum in dealing with the drug problem. I agree with the view expressed by the honourable member for Sherwood (Mr Innes) that the Government is not fair dinkum. The honourable member for Chatsworth (Mr Mackenroth) said that a number of aspects of this Bill indicate that the Government is not making a serious attempt to deal with what is a very serious problem.

If the Government really wants to prevent young people from taking up drugs, it should be stopping media advertising and the films that young people see every day, films that portray drug-taking as a normal everyday occurrence—the normal thing to do.

I object strongly to the accusations by Government members that Opposition members are soft on drugs. If anybody is soft on drugs, it is Government members. I realise, of course, that when Government members claim that the Opposition is taking a soft attitude to drugs, they do not really believe that and are only playing politics. However, I do not accept their accusations lightly.

If anybody is soft on drugs it is the Premier. He claims that his Government does not envisage introducing random breath-testing to check for drunken drivers leaving hotels because that would not be fair. The Premier would be aware that when random breath-testing was introduced in Western Australia it almost closed the hotels. That is the reason why the Queensland Government does not want to introduce random breath-testing. The Premier knows that if his Government wishes to stop young people taking up the use of tobacco—which kills more people than any other drug—it will involve a lot of money. However, the Queensland Government consistently refuses to prosecute people who sell tobacco to minors. Those aspects are not covered in this Bill for the simple reason that too much money is involved in tobacco sales to minors for the Government to police them.

If anybody is soft on drugs and not prepared to bite the bullet, it is the Government, not the Opposition. This Bill is not fair dinkum. It can be called a shameful stunt. I say "shameful" because it surrounds a very real problem in the community and it is to this Government's discredit that it it not making a very real effort to combat it.

Mr WHITE (Redcliffe) (9.45 p.m.): I do not think that there is a more insidious problem in the community today than the impact of drugs on our young people. As a pharmacist who has been involved with the methadone program over a long period, I do not think that there is anything more devastating to the families and friends of young people than to see them completely devastated by the iniquity of hard drugs.

Recently, the problem was brought home to me when the eldest son of very close friends of mine, who was the same age as my eldest son, started to dabble in soft drugs. I refer to marijuana. He then graduated, regrettably, onto heroin, to the great distress of his family and all concerned. No matter what effort was made, what policing was carried out and what health resources and psychological and psychiatric services were

involved, eventually one night, he blew his brains out in front of his parents in their dining room. I have not come across anything more personally devastating than to see my godson blow his brains out. That is what honourable members are talking about tonight.

If honourable members are really serious about dealing with the drug problem, they should forget about the rhetoric of hardline legislation and really get down to the business of doing something concrete about dealing with the problem. I am not one to go soft on drugs, and most members in this House would know that.

It is very convenient politically to be talking about harsh legislation and penalties. In this legislation, ultimately the decision will revert back to the Parole Board, and there has been much criticism of that.

My colleague the honourable member for Sherwood (Mr Innes) has expressed great concern about the lack of discretion that the judiciary will have in this matter. I am all for going hard on drug-dealers, the Mr Bigs and those people who profit from the sale of drugs and destroy our community and our young people. I do not think there is anything more evil and insidious than the impact of hard drugs in the community. It is very easy to put it below the surface and say that it does not exist, but it is like a disease. It is a cancer that is permeating the whole community at the moment.

If this legialation acts as a deterrent, the Liberal Party will support it, even though it may have reservations about the Bill. In our society, the stage has been reached at which the Government should give anything a go in the hope that it will have some form of deterrent effect on the people who deal in drugs. Unfortunately, the facts of life are that the Mr Bigs and the people who really are the big dealers are the ones who will not be prosecuted and will get away because they are invisible and hard to get at. The small fry will be prosecuted.

There has been much talk about harsh penalties, but not much has been said in Government circles about resources in respect to education and, importantly, the impact of the media.

I remember 20 years ago when the first major story was written about soft drugs. I refer to a preparation called drinamyl, which was a combination of a barbiturate and amphetamine preparation. It was known as purple hearts. It was written up by the media as some sort of sex stimulant. After that, time and again people started to go into chemist shops and to doctors to obtain purple hearts, because their interpretation of the media reporting convinced them that that particular drug was a sex stimulant.

The first story was a load of rubbish, but nevertheless it led to marijuana until the stage was reached at which, over the last decade or so, television stories have depicted graphically young people injecting drugs from a syringe or by using other methods. Nobody has done anything about tackling media standards.

I realise that the responsibility for media standards rests primarily with the Federal Government, but I would have thought that, if the Queensland Government were really serious about solving the drug problem, it would have curtailed the way in which drug cases are reported by the media. Young people are very impressionable, particularly if they are from an unstable family relationship. Very often drug-users are young people who come from single-parent families or broken families that are unstable. They are particularly impressionable, and they are also keen viewers of television. Over a period of observing drug-abuse behaviour on television, the impressionable young people to whom I have referred regard it as being not an abnormal practice. That point deserves the strongest emphasis because all honourable members—not just the Government and the media—have a responsibility to control the misuse of drugs. If all honourable members are serious about dealing with the drug problem, the course of action should not be restricted to legislative enactment in isolation.

I turn my attention now to whether adequate resources are available to combat the problem. All honourable members would know that a shortage of manpower exists in the police force. I suggest that it would be puerile to pass legislation—and undoubtedly

it will be passed—if the police force and surveillance resources are insufficient to do the job properly. If adequate manpower resources are not provided, honourable members might as well forget about any attempt to solve the drug problem. To my mind, the whole debate on controlling the misuse of drugs turns on enforcement resources.

Mr Lee: Otherwise it is merely a charade, isn't it?

Mr WHITE: As the honourable member for Yeronga correctly observes, the whole process will become a charade unless sufficient resources are provided for the police force and other agencies, such as the Juvenile Aid Bureau.

Criticism of the police force has been made by some honourable members this evening. No senior officer of the police force I know of believes that every policeman is an angel. Having said that, I hasten to add that, in my experience of dealing with members of the police force, I have found them to be very helpful and supportive. The major concern expressed to me by them is that, although they would love to follow up a case, the manpower is simply not available for them to do the job properly. It would be insensitive and quite amateurish of honourable members to be critical of the police force on the one hand if, on the other hand, the police force is not provided with enough officers to deal effectively with the problem.

Solving the drug problem nowadays involves a process of education. All honourable members would be aware of the drug offensive implemented by the Prime Minister. Honourable members also would have heard the Prime Minister's personal story about a drug problem that has affected him, with which all of us, in a non-partisan way, would have to sympathise. Goodness knows what it cost to produce the glossy booklet that was distributed by the Federal Government. When the pamphlet was delivered to my letter-box, it got wet, and I know where it ended up. I dare say that many copies would have suffered a similar fate. The question must be asked of the Federal Government: Why waste money by undertaking a campaign such as that, when all it showed was a group of young people talking to the Prime Minister? The cost would have amounted to millions of dollars. Although a glossy booklet has been produced, what has been done to effectively solve the problem? Has a campaign been launched to carry warnings against drug abuse into our churches, our youth groups and our schools in an effort to do something concrete by educating young people about the problem?

The effectiveness of a properly organised education program can be seen by drawing an analogy between dealing with the drug problem and the way that the cancer problem has been dealt with by organisations such as the Queensland Cancer Fund. That organisation has done a marvellous job in educating people about the dangers of cancer. Another analogy that springs to mind is the work being done by the Queensland Leukaemia Foundation. In spite of those examples that exist in the community, the major problem facing society today—the drug abuse problem—is compounded by the fact that resources are very thin on the ground.

Appproximately 12 months ago, I spent a few days at the Wayside Chapel in Sydney and I became aware of the problems associated with the whole drug scene. It is absolutely terrible. Other speakers in the debate have referred to congregations of young people who are dissipating their lives. I know that not everybody is a fan of the Rev. Ted Noffs, but through his Life Education Centre and the Wayside Chapel he has at least made a start. The type of program, the gimmicks—"gimmicks" is the wrong word; nevertheless it will have to do—and the way in which his message is conveyed to young children represents at least a start. The Government ought to take on board a serious consideration of such a program. I understand that the Life Education Program is part of the New South Wales Education Department's system. At least there is Government co-operation. I know that on the Gold Coast a move has been made to set up a life education centre. That is a step in the right direction. The treatment of people who are on drugs has to be considered. For argument's sake, people are critical of the methadone program. I suggest to honourable members that at least the methadone program takes those youngsters out of the hard-drug scene. At least their health will not be impaired by the use of dirty needles. At least they will be in an environment in which they are

dealing with professional people who have expertise in health, the back-up of counselling services and so forth. It could be argued that the methadone program is not worth a cracker, but I suggest that at least it is a tangible alternative, the benefits of which have been seen. One could argue how good it is, but it has brought youngsters out of the dirty, hard-drug scene.

The drug problem is grave. The reality is that it will not be resolved by legislation alone. We in the Liberal Party support doing something constructive to overcome the drug problem in our society. The Liberal Party spokesman, the member for Sherwood (Mr Innes) has pointed out his concern about the discretionary powers removed from the judiciary. As he mentioned, the Liberal Party will be supporting the legislation because it believes overall that something has to be done, and it is to be hoped that the legislation is a step in the right direction.

Mr CLAUSON (Redlands) (9.58 p.m.): This legislation is, by its very nature, quite controversial. I do not believe that anyone can escape that fact. I believe that when considering the enormity of the insidious drug problem which confronts society world-wide, no-one can claim to possess the key to unlock the solution. Over the centuries drug addiction has caused problems, which have spread like the tentacles of some large octopus, and which affect the lives and property of innocent persons in society. An individual's addiction to drugs is naturally sad and debilitating for him. However, the effects do not stop there. It is a well accepted fact that persons who find themselves addicted to the more pernicious, heavy-type drugs are likely to be involved in crimes against property in order to sustain their habit.

Exact statistics are very hard to compile. However, in 1971 the United States Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs analysed 1 722 criminal case histories involving serious crime. That study indicated that 23 per cent of those arrested were heroin-users, 7 per cent had been users and were no longer users but, more notably, 32 per cent of those interviewed admitted the use of other illegal drugs and 61 per cent of those who used heroin were involved in crimes against property. Only a small number of heroin-users were involved in crimes committed against the person. That category was dominated by the amphetamine-user. As the honourable member for Redcliffe (Mr White) pointed out, amphetamines were a trend drug but have now been overlooked. However, the sad fact is that the use of amphetamines results in a heightened physical desire by the user who, consequently, becomes more emotional and much more likely to use personal violence against an individual than a person in any other of the groups tested. It was found that the amphetamine-users were responsible for more rapes and homicides than any other group of drug-users.

It is also noteworthy that other studies have indicated that narcotics-users, particularly heroin-users, are also polynarcotic and fall back on amphetamines when heroin is not available to them. Therefore, classification of drug-users into categories of violent or non-violent criminal activities is difficult. Because of the multiple user such as the heroin-user who is using amphetamines at the same time, it cannot be said, for example, that a break and enter perpetrated by an addict to heroin does not have the potential to violence where a residence or an office is involved and resistance may be met from persons within those premises. That very possibility is one of the prime reasons why a powerful attempt has to be made to counter the drug industry in our society.

The sharks who are the predators of our young must be curbed. I do not think one member of the House would disagree with that statement. It is a sad fact that the age of the tiro drug-user in our society is becoming younger and younger. In fact, in America 14 years of age is the average age of people attempting to use drugs for the first time. It is also not uncommon to hear reports of persons peddling drugs to schoolchildren at the very gates of the schools which they attend. Nearly 90 per cent of drug offenders are aged 25 years or under at the time of their first drug conviction.

Mr Scott: Is this in Queensland?

Mr CLAUSON: Is it relevant whether it is in Queensland or anywhere else in the world? What a load of rubbish! The Labor Party has now realised what a wimp of an attitude to drugs it originally had. Now it has changed its policy. The member for Chatsworth (Mr Mackenroth) was crowing about the change in the Labor Party's drug policy—what a laugh!

When one considers the cost of attempting to rehabilitate an addicted drug-user, drug abuse is a frightening spectre. The sad state of affairs is that, by the time a drug-user has been detected, he has lost personal motivation, he has not accumulated any work skills and, as a result, he has no self-esteem and in 90 per cent of cases is unable to be placed in a position of worth. The withdrawal from addictive drugs is a long and painful process. Although members of the Opposition may scoff at this assertion, when people are going off heroin cold turkey, it is absolutely impossible to achieve a success rate of more than 5 per cent. The reversion rate is 95 per cent.

The honourable member for Chatsworth (Mr Mackenroth) spoke about rehabilitation of drug offenders. Queensland has the best methadone program in Australia for rehabilitating drug offenders. A constant stream of people are coming across the border to receive assistance in Queensland. So, once again, the honourable member for Chatsworth is incorrect.

Mr Mackenroth: You make methadone addicts.

Mr CLAUSON: Really? It is better than having heroin addicts. There is some hope for them.

The difficulty in trying to rehabilitate drug offenders is that now addictive behaviour is being established so early in the addict's life that there is never an adult environment to which the unfortunate person can be returned. It is these factors that in part have prompted the formulation of this Bill.

Society is becoming tired of the unscrupulous feeding off the pockets and lives of the young and the innocent. The world is tired of the cost. A comparison of the penalties imposed by various nations provides an interesting illustration of the feeling of Governments on this topic.

For example, in Burma, for a broad range of offences, the penalties range from six months to death. In Malaysia, the penalty for trafficking is death, and heavy sentences are imposed for lesser drug-related activities. In Canada, possession of drugs can lead to a sentence of six months, but the penalty for importation and trafficking is from seven years to life. In Britain, which is another country that has finally bitten the bullet, systematic heroin or cocaine-trafficking is treated as predmeditated murder. Anyone caught for that offence in that county is liable to life imprisonment. In Japan, gaol sentences of three years to life for trafficking or possessing hard drugs are not uncommon.

The penalties that are being formulated throughout the world are beginning to reflect the anger that communities are feeling about this foul and despicable trade. Obviously, members of the Opposition are in favour of that trade.

To date, the people involved in drugs have refused to take seriously the general contempt for their enterprise. They defy social standards with bold contempt. The legislation is designed not only to punish those persons when caught but also to go some way towards deterring them from continuing in this trade.

The honourable member for Aspley (Mr Cahill) referred to the laundering of $80 billion per annum in the United States. That is only part of the cost to society. As early as 1977, the United States drug enforcement administration calculated that the criminal activities of heroin-users could be calculated at almost $7 billion per annum. At best, that is a sobering figure.

The drug trade within our own boundaries is growing. The electorate will no longer tolerate that escalation. Police powers in other countries are beginning to reflect the general feeling that more extensive powers are necessary. Under the legislation, the role

of the Parole Board has not been usurped. The punishment can fit the crime in the sense that, if there is a genuine cause for rehabilitation of an offender, the board is capable of dealing with it.

Mandatory life sentences fall short of hanging or machine-gunning to death, as prescribed in other jurisdictions. However, I consider the use of tracking devices—which has been criticised in this debate—to be the application of modern forensic technology in order to track down those who are preying on society.

The honourable member for Wynnum (Mr Shaw) referred to some of the transgressions of police officers in their method of searching for drugs. It cannot be denied that, occasionally, some police officers do transgress the boundaries of propriety. Where human beings are involved in any service, whether it be the air force, the army or the navy, people will transgress and be punished. To suggest that this Government allows this to continue simply because the Government accepts it as part of day-to-day life is absolute nonsense.

I consider that the legislation is necessary to attempt to make some inroads into this pernicious trade that is dogging our society and that everybody complains about, requests harsher penalties for, and asks those in authority to take some action about. It is necessary to have this legislation. I support the Bill and look forward to its passage through this Assembly.

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police) (10.11 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate. It is a source of amazement to me that Opposition members sound off about how tough the Labor Party is on drugs, when only a couple of years ago it advocated growing one's own. That was part of its policy as stated in this House. Other Labor Governments in other States have been decriminalising certain drugs that lead to the addiction to hard drugs.

Most Opposition members have objected to mandatory life sentencing and quoted instances of the Parole Board releasing offenders after a short time. It is the Governor in Council who has the final say on the release date of offenders. Once again the Opposition is grandstanding by referring to 25-year sentences, knowing full well that no-one will receive such sentences. Some Opposition members have used this debate to embark on police-bashing; that is something the ALP has always done well. That does not come as any surprise to this Government, as the ALP has been doing it for years. Whenever the ALP needs the police, it is the first one to call them.

The drug problem will be one of the greatest problems facing this nation, and the Queensland Government should be praised for bringing in tough legislation to deal with a very tough problem. No Government can pussyfoot with a problem of this magnitude, which is what the ALP wants it to do. The Government makes no apologies for bringing in legislation of this magnitude, and I am convinced it has the support of the vast majority of the population in this State. No matter where I travel, people are asking the Government to bring in the toughest legislation that it can.

The Opposition has proposed a number or amendments to this Bill and has moved towards political grandstanding that Queensland has never seen before. The fact is that the ALP has always been soft on drugs and has always supported the criminal.

Mr Mackenroth: Do you know what the amendments are?

Mr GUNN: That is the ALP's track record, and it is well known in this country. When the ALP goes to the polls, the people will have the answer for it. There is no doubt about that.

Most of the speeches made by members of the Opposition were along the same lines, complaining about the mandatory life sentences or engaging in police-bashing on the side. The rehabilitation of drug addicts is still provided for in the Health Act and the courts have referral powers under that Act. Election for summary trial is available

in a fewer number of cases than is currently the case and it is court supervised, which is the main thing.

The safeguards which are recommended by the Lucas committee of inquiry regarding searches are contained in section 20 of the search register.

I refer to the comments made by the honourable member for Rockhampton (Mr Braddy) and the honourable member for Wynnum (Mr Shaw), who embarked on a bit of police-bashing on the side. The honourable member for Wynnum complains about some police behaviour in four instances.

Mr Wilson: They spent more time raiding innocent people than finding them guilty.

Mr GUNN: When did the honourable member for Townsville South wake up? He has not been seen all night. He should go back to sleep.

Queensland has a Police Complaints Tribunal, so if the honourable member for Wynnum has any information whatsoever, he can apply to that tribunal or to the Commissioner of Police. However, he chooses to come into this House to do his share of police-bashing, as many other Opposition members do.

The Police Complaints Tribunal has been set up to deal with complaints against the police. I asasure honourable members that the tribunal functions very well. The complaints that have been made in this Chamber will not be repeated outside. The honourable member for Rockhampton (Mr Braddy) alleged that someone in high places has been paid to allow the illegal casinos to operate. The honourable member is not present in the Chamber. He hits and runs. That is typical of the Labor person. I invite the honourable member to produce evidence of his pay-off allegations. Let us hear from him. Let him tell us who those people are.

The Government makes no apologies for the Bill. The legislation is tough because tough legislation is demanded. There is no way in the world that the Queensland Government is going to go soft in any way with any amendments or anything else. The Government believes that the public will receive the Bill in the way it expected the public to receive it. I can only repeat that the Government has no apologies for the legislation.

Motion (Mr Gunn) agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—

"That the House do now adjourn."

Consumer Credit Laws; Complaint by Mrs Warwick

Mr GOSS (Salisbury) (10.18 p.m.): The subject that I wish to raise in the Adjournment debate relates in general to the need for new consumer credit laws in Queensland to protect the average consumer in relation to consumer transactions, particularly in the hire purchase field.

Recently, Mrs Warwick of Eagleby approached me about a problem that she had with a used car company at Logan city. She and her son were enticed and deceived into purchasing a motor vehicle when they thought that they were just putting a holding deposit on the vehicle until such time that a decision was made to purchase it. The vehicle was not in operating condition and required substantial repairs before it would be. Because of the deceit of the salesman, a contract to purchase the vehicle was signed. Futhermore, Mrs Warwick and her son were enticed and deceived into signing an application for hire purchase finance to finance the vehicle. In fact, they were told that the document was an application and, if approved, the money would then be available if they finally chose to go ahead with the purchase of the vehicle.

In the days that followed, despite the fact that the vehicle was still not in working condition and could not readily be repaired, the used car company collected the money from the finance company, which was Custom Credit Corporation. The used car company took the son's van as a trade-in and advertised it, quite deceptively, under a misdescription in terms of the quality and size of that vehicle. When the mother, Mrs Warwick, and her son realised what was going on and asked for the return of their trade-in and for the cancellation of the deal, they were told that it was too late. Effectively, they were told to go and jump in the lake. Those circumstances are very serious.

Theoretically, the hire purchase laws should have worked effectively in that case. However, because of the unscrupulous approach by that salesman, those people suffered and risked being in debt for thousands of dollars to Custom Credit Corporation over a transaction that should never have occurred and which they believed had not taken place.

Fortunately, after an approach from me, Custom Credit Corporation, to its credit, was prepared to intervene and to use its persuasive powers to get the company to rescind the deal. Eventually, after some haggling and some resistance on the part of that Logan city used car company, the trade-in was returned; the moneys were returned to the finance company; and Mrs Warwick and her son escaped the liability for thousands of dollars that they would have otherwise had to pay the finance company, Custom Credit Corporation, which, I stress, acted honourably and properly throughout all stages of this episode as soon as the relevant facts were brought to its notice. However, the problem remains that the consumer credit laws and, in particular, the mishmash of laws relating to hire purchase, bills of sale and so on are quite unsatisfactory.

A considerable time ago the Attorney-General promised to amend consumer credit laws to bring them into line with other States, particularly the consumer credit legislation currently operating in New South Wales and Victoria. It is high time that legislation was introduced. People such as Mrs Warwick, and many other people in Logan city and elsewhere, often enter into consumer credit transactions with organisations such as Custom Credit and Mercantile Credits when seeking hire purchase finance at the lower end of the finance market. Those people may find themselves faced with serious problems if they are deceived or fall into the hands of unscrupulous traders or salesmen. People need to be protected from such people. Protection and safeguards must be built into the legislation.

Mrs Warwick and her son were very fortunate on the occasion that I mentioned. However, too many people have been trapped and have not fought back in an attempt to redress the situation, as Mrs Warwick and her son did. Unfortunately, the situation in relation to consumer credit can lead to other problems such as the repossession of vehicles and the loss of homes. A further example of the way in which people become trapped in those situations can be seen where people are being put into homes by unscrupulous real estate agents under the first-home-owners scheme.

The consumer credit laws are long overdue for an overhaul in order to provide protection for the average person. Not only should people be protected from unscrupulous real estate agents, but they should also be protected in relation to the quality of goods so that they do not end up buying cars which could only be described as bombs. There is no doubt that the vehicle purchased by Mrs Warwick and her son was a bomb. They were both under the misapprehension that they were simply placing a hold on the vehicle in order to be able to purchase it when it was put into a roadworthy condition.

Time expired.

Air Navigation Charges

Mr McPHIE (Toowoomba North) (10.23 p.m.): I wish to draw the attention of all honourable members to the implementation of some new air navigation charges by the Federal Government. Those charges were introduced to apply as from 1 July 1986. They were not part of the Budget which was brought down this evening. However, they might

as well have been included in the Budget because they are increased charges and are something to which this Government constantly objects.

The Budget brought down in Canberra tonight provides for a $3.5 billion deficit. Some of the Opposition commentators have been congratulating the Federal Government on its Budget. I do not believe it should be congratulated. I believe that it is a disgusting situation when the Federal Government can only reduce its deficit to $3.5 billion. What happens to that $3.5 billion at the end of 12 months? It is paid off by overseas borrowings and further raises the indebtedness of this country. The reductions which have been carried out are not enough. The Federal Government is simply continuing its program of increasing taxes. It is increasing the taxes paid by all Australians including the common people whom the Opposition claims to support. All the Federal Government is doing is money-grubbing continuously to fund its operations. It should be reducing costs and charges in order to give people the opportunity to get this country back on an even footing.

I return now to the new air navigation charges. A new charging system has been introduced based upon aircraft weight. The previous flat rate system although it was increased from time to time, worked successfully.

With the introduction of the new navigation charges, a charge will be imposed on aircraft weight per landing. For example, a Sunstate Nomad aircraft operating into Brisbane will be liable to pay a tax of $30.07. The tax payable per landing on an Ansett 727/200 aircraft operating into Brisbane will be $674.70. When that tax is converted to a per passenger per landing basis, the Nomad operators will be paying $2.20 per passenger and the 727 operators will be paying $7.60 per passenger.

The Federal Minister for Transport, Mr Peter Morris, argued that it is a reasonable levy, a reasonable increase and that it is spreading the load equitably amongst tax-payers. I would query whether that is true. It is an unfair tax on the third-level operators and the commuter operators in the country who have lesser services and facilities. It is an unfair tax on the short-haul operators and the short-sector operators who are involved in frequent services.

Honourable members should look at what is involved with this tax. When a Boeing 727 operates on one leg from Townsville to Brisbane, Ansett pays $7.60 a passenger tax because one landing is involved. When a Fokker Friendship or F27 flies down the coast with six landings, allowing for the lesser amount per passenger landing involved, three times the tax is being paid. The tax is hitting the commuter operators and the third-level operators. Sunstate has estimated that the annual tax will increase from $90,000 to $400,000 after subsidy payments have been stopped.

The flying doctor, who does such an excellent job, has estimated that next year, when the general aviation sector is taxed, he will be paying double the tax that he pays at the moment.

This is a blatant tax-gathering stunt that has been seen regularly and continually from the Federal Labor Government, and that is not the way to put this country in order.

The Federal Government is taking this money and it is not improving any services or facilities. It is making the user pay to prop up its programs in Canberra and it is not reducing Government expenditure. Tonight, the Federal Government was skiting about a $3.5 billion deficit for the year, which is disgusting and should be condemned.

The air navigation charge tax ignores the unearned increment of the whole community and the Federal Government is asking the passengers to pay. The passengers will have to pay, because in the last week the airlines have been granted a 7.5 per cent fare increase.

An Honourable Member interjected.

Mr McPHIE: The honourable member can make all the noise he likes, but this is a tax on the people and it is a tax that they cannot pay. They are being slugged at every opportunity so that the Federal Government can pay for its excesses in Canberra.

Time expired.

Electricity Tariffs

Mr VAUGHAN (Nudgee) (10.28 p.m.): As the Electricity Act is to be amended in this session of Parliament, I want to take this opportunity to call on the Government to amend section 160 of the Act to ensure that thousands of electricity-consumers in this State pay no more than the prescribed price for the electricity they consume.

Unfortunately, under the existing provisions of section 160, an electricity authority can supply electricity to a consumer, who can then resupply that electricity to occupiers of premises under that consumer's control. It is up to the consumer whether that electricity is supplied through a meter or not.

Section 160 (4) states—

> "Whether or not electricity supplied by the consumer to an occupier is metered is a matter for election by the consumer."

However, section 160 (3) provides—

> "Where the consumer elects to recover the cost of electricity supplied to the occupier on the basis of the occupier's consumption as determined by a meter, the amount he charges the occupier for the electricity shall be either—
>
> (A) the amount obtained by muliplying the quantity of electricity used by the occupier by the average price per kilowatt hour paid by the consumer for the electricity; or
>
> (B) the amount the occupier would have paid at the lowest appropriate tariff applicable to his electricity usage if he had been a consumer of the electricity from the electricity authority,
>
> at the option of the consumer."

Where the consumer elects not to resupply electricity through a meter, there is no control over the price that can be charged. It is only if the consumer elects to resupply electricity through a meter that the price that shall be charged is prescribed. However, even then there is little or no control over the price that the consumer actually charges.

As an example of what is happening in the community, I refer to the case reported on page nine of *The Courier Mail* on Monday, 11 August 1986. Apparently a house at West End had been divided into seven flats, but the flats were not individually wired and all electricity consumed was recorded on the one meter. The owner of the house was the consumer and was the person who received the electricity account from the South East Queensland Electricity Board.

In accordance with the provisions of section 160 of the Electricity Act, the owner who had elected not to install meters in each flat divided the electricity account among the seven tenants as he or she thought fit. Either some or all of the tenants consider that they have been overcharged, but they can do nothing about it.

A spokesman for the South East Queensland Electricity Board acknowledges that that organisation receives two similar complaints a month, and is of the opinion that landlords may be prosecuted. However, he did not say how, and I doubt that any have ever been prosecuted, in spite of the number of complaints received by SEQEB.

Even if the consumer elects to have electricity supplied through a meter and even if the price charged for the electricity is prescribed, no guarantee is provided that the correct price will be charged ultimately. I cite as an example the operation of the provisions of section 160 of the Electricity Act as it applies to residents of the Merrimac Meadows estate, situated on the Gold Coast, who are supplied with electricity by the

developer of the estate. Meters were installed in each of the 20 houses and 10 duplex units. The developer charges 12.9c a unit of electricity, which is 60 per cent more than the price paid by the ordinary domestic consumer.

Tens of thousands of people who live in caravan parks are also paying much more than the domestic tariff for their electricity. Some caravan parks have had meters installed; some have not. In caravan parks that have meters installed, I understand, residents are charged up to 15c a unit and more.

The present provisions of section 160 of the Electricity Act also prevent thousands of people who occupy flats and units that are not metered, as well as those who live in caravan parks and estates similar to Merrimac Meadows, from availing themselves of reduced hot-water tariffs. I call on the Government to give further consideration to amending section 160 in the way in which I proposed in November 1984 when the Electricity Act was last amended. Such an amendment would make it mandatory for meters to be installed and for the tariff to be set not by the consumer but by the electricity supply authority. Unless section 160 is amended to prevent unscrupulous landlords exploiting their tenants, many electricity consumers who are on low incomes or fixed incomes will continue to pay extremely high prices for electricity.

I point out also that the legislation proposed by the Government to provide pensioner rebates will have no application to pensioners who are occupying flats or units that have only one meter, and will enable the landlord to determine the rate to be charged. It will also have no application to pensioners who reside in caravan parks in areas in which SEQEB or other electricity authorities have failed to police the provisions of section 160. Moreover, it will not apply to people who live in developments similar to the Merrimac Meadows estate, in which only one meter has been installed by the developer and no access is available to lower rates for the supply of electricity for hot water.

I appeal to the Government to provide for pensioner discounts when it moves to amend the Electricity Act—a move that has already been foreshadowed. I also ask the Government to amend section 160 of the Electricity Act to ensure that the thousands of electricity-consumers who reside in caravan parks, flats or units and similar types of accommodation that have only one meter pay the same price for electricity as everybody else.

Government Incentives for Economic Recovery

Mr CAHILL (Aspley) (10.33 p.m.): As a matter of urgency, I call upon the Queensland Government and this Parliament to use their full force to take whatever steps are necessary to convince the Federal Government that the road to recovery of full employment will be embarked upon only by providing the people with the incentive to participate in that recovery. Let us give Australians the hope and encouragement to work that they need most urgently at this time. People who are adrift in a sea of confusion, hopelessness and lost ideals and who listen to their leaders' daily warnings of "worse to come", lose their desire to work, particularly when their weekly take-home pay is no longer as large as the electricity bill, the rate bill or the insurance.

The largest and most effective encouragement every Australian desires is the return of the Australian dream. The building industry is one of Australia's largest. The follow-on of real jobs would help pull this country back on the road to recovery more quickly than would the recovery of any other industry. The incentive needed to achieve that is for the Federal Government to relieve the burden of interest rates on home-buyers by making all such interest tax deductible. This would be the incentive needed for the young home-buyers who yearn to own a home with all the fervour of their forbears but dare not, for fear of losing what they have should the interest rates soar beyond their capacity to pay; should they have a family in the early years of marriage; or should they lose their jobs.

The almost-forgotten tax-return cheque was, in their forbears' day, the light in the window that would pay an outstanding rates bill, electricity bill or insurance premium. Relief came at least once a year.

For every tradesman who picks up his tools in the building trade, four jobs are created behind him. If the Government gives incentive and security to our home-buyers, it will snowball into creating real jobs in the small business sector, urgently needed apprenticeships, employment in local industries such as timber, glass, steel, bricks, roofing supplies, carpets and floor coverings, tiles, prime cost items, electrical goods and soft furnishings. It will go a long way towards solving our unemployment problem and overturning the present situation of 50 per cent of Federal Government gross revenue's being used for welfare.

Very quickly it will encourage our young into the work-force in trades of their choice, unloading the burden of our thousands of street kids who lose all hope of a future before they begin, because they are told before they leave school that they have no hope of a job.

The cost to the Government would be negligible—in fact, it would be beneficial—because the dole payout would be lowered; deserted wives would be far fewer in number; the crime rate would be lowered; the courts and legal aid would have less use; the juvenile aid and social workers would be better able to cope with minimum, rather than maximum, numbers; teenage prostitution would subside; there would be less need for abortion of our future generations by our frightened, insecure young couples; and there would be less abuse of children by parents who would normally be working for the betterment of their family unit but who in today's economic climate have been backed into a corner and belted into oblivion by high taxes, interest rates and insecurity until they lash out at the people they love most. Eventually in ever increasing numbers many decide to end it all, to give their children peace in the only way visible to them in their sea of insecurity and hopelessness, and that is death. The numbers are on the increase. Last but not least, there would be less need for public housing.

Our Federal Treasurer thinks that he can solve all the problems by taking more taxes. The vast majority of Australians will soon have no chance of being tax-payers, let alone the beneficiaries of fringe benefits! Let the buyer beware. We have been promised that the great fringe benefit tax will result in lower taxation for the average wage-earner. I agree. It will stop a great number of Australians from paying tax at all, as it will result in fewer jobs and longer dole queues.

The way to reduce the burden of all tax-payers is to have more of them, which would reduce the need for Government bodies to look after them. Everything possible must be done to lift this nation and its people back to the heights of prosperity. This is one way in which we, as a Government and duly elected representatives of the people who pay us, can earn our keep.

I implore every member of this House, regardless of party, to make this session of Parliament constructive, by doing our utmost to force Canberra to give back what has been robbed from this nation.

Private Practice by Full-time Specialists in Public Hospitals

Mr McELLIGOTT (Townsville) (10.37 p.m.): Recently, Cabinet approved a scheme whereby full-time specialists in public hospitals could engage in a limited amount of private practice. As justification for that scheme the Minister for Health and Environment (Mr Austin) indicated that a similar scheme had been in operation in the other States for many, many years. Quite frankly, I never thought I would see the day in Queensland when a Minister for Health of any political colour would say that things ought to be done in Queensland because they had been done in the other States. Since its introduction many years ago by a Labor Government, Queensland's free public hospital scheme has been the envy of the other States. I have obtained a document, reference M.O.P. 18-30-2.1, produced by the Department of Health, which sets out the way in which the scheme will be administered. A number of matters in that document cause me concern. First of all, the document indicates that—

> "Time for the care of public patients by participating specialists will be predetermined by the Medical Superintendent. Private practice must then be undertaken in addition to this time."

That is fair enough. It continues—

> "In the event of a need for the emergency or special care of a private patient involving significant time within a public patient duty period, the specialist must obtain the approval of the Medical Superintendent."

That could intrude into the time that should be devoted to public patients. It continues—

> "In general"—

and I emphasise the word "general"—

> "Interns, Junior, Senior and Principal House Officers and Registrars must not be used in the care of private patients."

Once again, so far so good—

> "However, in emergency and critical care situations, House Officers and Registrars may need to be involved in the care of private patients."

In a similar vein, the report states—

> "Referrals may be made to a participating specialist by full-time Senior Medical Officers, Specialists or by General Practitioners. Referrals by House Officers and Registrars will not be permitted"—

again, that is fair enough—

> "except as approved in special circumstances by the Medical Superintendent or his/her nominee."

Although the private practice undertaken by the full-time specialist is to be entirely separate from his public responsibilities, instances can be found in which the door is left open for the private practice of that specialist to intrude into his responsibilities as a servant of the public. The scheme indicates that the specialist may charge a fee which is not to exceed the service fee listed at that time in the Medicare Benefits Schedule. In effect, Medicare is meeting the private fees of the full-time specialist, and out of those fees the public hospital system will take from the specialist the facility charges and operating costs of the private practice medical agency.

There is also provision that a reasonable cost for surgical dressings and disposables will be borne by the hospitals board. So, allowing full-time specialists employed in the State public hospital system to engage in private practice involves a cost to that system.

The report states that areas of patient care in hospitals that have traditionally been restricted to public patients include intensive care, coronary care, neonatal intensive care, spinal unit, burns unit, renal dialysis and transplantation. Private practice will now be allowed in those areas, but it must be restricted to those specialists who hold appointments to the respective units for the treatment of public patients.

On the request of a participating specialist, the medical superintendent may declare an available public bed in the unit to be a private bed. Again, that is an intrusion of private practice into the public hospital system. The report concludes by stating—

> "It is recognised that difficulties may arise during the implementation of the scheme and during the initial phase of operations."

I am very, very concerned indeed that the Government has chosen to allow full-time specialists, who ought to be servants of the public, to undertake private practice in the State's public hospitals rather than negotiate a reasonable fee for the services of those specialists. That is what it amounts to. Obviously the specialists are complaining that they are not making enough money out of their public duties. The Government, rather than negotiating a reasonable fee has instead chosen to allow those full-time specialists in public hospitals to engage in private practice. That is much the same as the Government's failure to negotiate with nurses for a reasonable salary and conditions of service.

Private practice by full-time specialists in public hospitals is an indication of an attempt by the Government to privatise Queensland's public hospital system. On behalf

of the Opposition, I express very grave concern. As the document stated, there will be problems. In other States, those problems have already surfaced. I never thought I would see the day when a Minister for Health in this State would recommend that the public hospital system be used for private practice.

Time expired.

Horticultural Exports

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (10.42) p.m.): I wish to highlight some of the problems encountered by primary industries in trying to find and maintain export markets. The problem is not the efficient production of produce but the inability to have it delivered to its market on time. That problem was highlighted recently by a strike by the Waterside Workers Federation that put horticultural exports at risk. The strike jeopardised the Hong Kong market for Queensland-grown Chinese cabbage. For 10 days 12 containers of Chinese cabbage sat on the wharf at Fisherman Islands awaiting loading on to the Oriental Export. The vessel berthed to commence loading on Monday, 30 June, which was several days later than scheduled. The shipment represented the culmination of an integrated growing and marketing initiative by COD, as the cabbage was produced specifically for export to Hong Kong.

The sequence of events was that on Monday, 30 June, the Waterside Workers Federation announced an immediate and indefinite waterfront stoppage. On the second day of the strike a telex was sent by the general manager of COD, Mr Smith, to the Prime Minister, the Premier, the Minister for Primary Industries, the Minister for Trade and the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs to alert the Commonwealth and State Governments to the problem. At the same time the COD export manager, Mr Arthur Shand, made a direct approach to the Waterside Workers Federation in Brisbane to try to gain some co-operation in the loading of this produce. As a result, on the third day of the strike the Waterside Workers Federation assured COD that the 12 containers of cabbage would be on board before the Oriental Export sailed for Hong Kong.

The following day, 3 July, the Wateside Workers Federation publicly announced that the horticultural produce would be exempted from its strike action. That is not much good because, if other articles cannot be loaded, obviously the ships cannot leave the port. Whether the cabbage arrived in Hong Kong in a suitable condition after its journey is still questionable. The consignment was due to arrive in Hong Kong on 11 July, but it did not arrive until 22 July, 10 days later than expected.

Chinese cabbage is a perishable product. A delay in shipping causes a loss of quality. The overseas client has already expressed his concern about the quality of the produce.

Overseas buyers have already lost faith in the ability of Australian exporters to deliver produce by sea, or any other method, as and when required. Time and time again, confidence in our ability to deliver when required is lost. In addition, innovative exporters such as COD find it difficult to make an increased commitment to developing new fresh produce marketing ventures while their efforts are likely to be put so much at risk.

Recently, much has been said by the Prime Minister (Mr Hawke) about the need for the nation to work together, to export a significantly greater volume of goods and services, and to import less in an effort to overcome a serious balance of payments position. That is hollow rhetoric.

Undoubtedly, the Queensland horticultural industries wish to expand export activity. However, any major expansion will be severely handicapped by an unreliable shipping service.

Last week, when commenting on the assurances given by the Waterside Workers Federation, the general manager of COD (Mr Smith) stated—

> "While the industry very much appreciates the decision of the union to exempt horticultural products from strike action, it is doubtful that such exemptions provide a realistic solution to the problem faced by horticultural exporters.

The exemption may be of assistance if the ship decides to sail and not wait for other cargo but it is of no help at all if ships cannot unload to make room for containers of horticultural produce or wait out the strike.

Additionally, ships which have not berthed may decide to bypass a strike-affected port altogether."

Time expired.

Motion (Mr Wharton) agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.48 p.m.